

# Taking the measure of faculty diversity

## Introduction

**Martin J. Finkelstein,**  
Seton Hall University

**Valerie Martin Conley,**  
University of Colorado  
at Colorado Springs

**Jack H. Schuster,**  
Claremont Graduate  
University

Nearly a half-century after Title IX and affirmative action policies promised to transform the demographic profile of the American faculty, how far has American higher education progressed toward the goal of diversification? All too frequently the answer to that question depends on whom you ask. Armed with well-vetted national data, some—including Schuster and Finkelstein in *The American Faculty* (Johns Hopkins, 2006) and Smith, Tovar and Garcia (2012)—have seen indicators of discernable, if uneven and incomplete, progress in a generation’s time, reflected in greater proportionate representation of women and underrepresented minorities across the faculty ranks. Others—including Curtis (2011, 2015), Turner, Gonzales and Wong (2011), and Gray (2015)—have seen indicators of stubbornly persistent marginalization. Which is it? Or, can it be both? In our forthcoming book, *The Faculty Factor: Reassessing the American Academy in a Turbulent Era*, undertaken with support of the TIAA Institute and scheduled for publication in Fall 2016 by the Johns Hopkins University Press, we address this question.

That broad reappraisal of the American faculty 15 years into the 21st century, including a careful scrutiny of developments in its diversification, provides the basis for this paper. The *Faculty Factor* takes as its point of departure a central irony of our time: just as the doors of academe have been opened more widely than heretofore to marginalized groups, the opportunity structure for academic careers has been turned on its head. The available jobs tend, less and less, to be the conventional “good” jobs, that is, the tenure-track career ladder jobs that provide benefits, manageable-to-quite-good salaries, continued professional development opportunities—and, crucially, a viable future for academics. Indeed, the central question for our reassessment of faculty diversity is: What is the net result of the significant influx of women and minorities into a career opportunity structure that allows a greater range of faculty positions, particularly the much wider availability of part-time and otherwise more circumscribed work roles, but at the same time offers diminished future career opportunities and the threat of continued marginalization in more traditional academic positions? Thus our assessment here, informed by the most recent data, is anchored explicitly in the central reality of the current era: the dramatic *redistribution* of academic appointments and the still circumscribed place of women and underrepresented minorities within that redistribution. Indeed, in light of this reality, our salient questions become: How do women and minorities now fit in the new regime? And what are their prospects?

Beyond this central organizing frame, we have built our reappraisal on two methodological pillars. First, we employ *multiple indicators* of each statistical fact on the ground. Thus, when we look, for example, at how well represented women are in the various appointment categories or academic ranks over a 20-year period (1993–2013, the period for which reliable IPEDS data are available), we see not only how the actual *numbers* of women have changed, nor even simply the *proportion* of all faculty that are women at each point in time, but also the proportion of all women who fall in a particular *appointment* category (e.g., assistant professor) at any one point in time. Typically all three of these indicators do not precisely parallel each other; it is that unevenness—the disparities among these ongoing, two-decade-long “stories”—that provides the more textured or nuanced perspective on the status of women.

Second, in examining the status of underrepresented minorities, we apply the distinction sagely advanced by our colleague Daryl Smith, in distinguishing racial subgroups by their nativity. That is, to be considered an underrepresented minority [URM] assumes that you were born and educated in the United States. Thus, individuals who self-identified as Black on “race,” and who also indicated that they were born in the U.S. or were a naturalized citizen, would be classified as URM; yet another individual who self-identified racially as Black, but who was foreign born (hailing from Africa or the Caribbean, for example, and perhaps being socioeconomically advantaged rather than disadvantaged), and was in the U.S. on a visa would be considered a Non-Resident Alien (NRA), rather than a URM. This allows us to distinguish more effectively between truly underrepresented racial/ethnic minorities from foreign-born citizens who come

to the U.S. to study or work and who arrive well-educated and socio-economically advantaged (Smith, 2012)—a distinction that Smith and associates found to make a significant difference in their analyses.

Finally, as we examine how women and URMs have fared in the new academic workforce regime, we seek to attend to at least two other relevant matters. First is the complex intersection of gender and race: To what extent is our story about gender similar across racial groups? Or does the experience of URM or NRA women differ from majority women? Second is the factor of institutional type: To what extent does our narrative play out uniformly across institutional types? Or to what extent does the story unfold differently in research universities? Or community colleges? Or in the public as opposed to the private sector?

### The baseline: our point of departure

Table 1 below provides a baseline for our diversity-focused analysis by charting the number and proportion of faculty holding various types of academic appointments in 1993, 2003 and 2013. In some sense, the very last column tells the story in a nutshell. While the number of *headcount* faculty swelled overall by nearly two-thirds—64.6%—over the two-decade span, the number of *part-time* faculty more than doubled (114.5%). By glaring contrast, the number of *full-time* faculty did expand as well, but by a mere 31.3%—less than half the overall headcount growth rate. Moreover, among those full-time faculty, the “choice” tenured and tenure-track ranks increased by a scant 11%. The ranks for full-time, nontenure-track or contract appointments, meanwhile, mushroomed by fully 84%—more than seven

Table 1: Distribution of Faculty by Appointment Type, 1993, 2003, 2013

	1993	% of all Faculty	2003	% of all Faculty	2013	% of all Faculty	Change N, 1993-2013	% Change 1993-2013
<b>Total Full-Time</b>	530,550	59.9%	624,238	53.8%	696,402	47.8%	165,852	31.3%
Tenured	274,894	31.0%	282,831	24.4%	306,742	21.0%	31,848	11.6%
Tenure-Track	111,831	12.6%	127,566	11.0%	124,550	8.5%	12,719	11.4%
Non-tenure Track	143,825	16.2%	213,841	18.4%	265,110	18.2%	121,285	84.3%
<b>Total Part-Time</b>	354,991	40.1%	536,215	46.2%	761,290	52.2%	406,299	114.5%
<b>All Faculty</b>	885,541		1,160,453		1,457,692		572,151	64.6%

Source: IPEDS:93; IPEDS:03; IPEDS:13.

Notes: Includes four-year public; four-year private nonprofit; four-year for-profit; two-year public; two-year private nonprofit; and two-year for-profit Title IV institutions

times that rate. The big story, then, is one of overall growth, but growth very much focused in the area of so-called “contingent appointments”: that is, part-time and full-time nontenure-track appointments.

## Gender and appointment type

How does the trajectory of women compare to men? Table 2 charts the number and proportion of women and men in faculty jobs by appointment type between 1993 and 2013. What does it show? First, that among all appointments overall, women’s growth in numbers over two

decades (ca. 375,300 by headcount) very nearly doubled that of men (ca.196,900) and women’s growth in full-time appointments quintupled that of men (137,000 women compared to 28,300 men). But among tenured faculty appointments, women experienced remarkable change (an increase of ca. 46,700 vs. a decrease among males of ca. 14,900). Among all tenure-track faculty appointments (not including those already tenured), the contrast is similar: an increase of ca. 14,300 women compared to a decrease of about 1,600 men.

**Table 2: Distribution of Female and Male Faculty by Appointment type, 1993, 2003, 2013**

Female Faculty											
	1993	% of all Faculty	% of all Female Faculty	2003	% of all Faculty	% of all Female Faculty	2013	% of all Faculty	% of all Female Faculty	Change, 1993-2013	Percent Change, 1993-2013
<b>All Female Faculty</b>	342059	38.6%		503702	43.4%		717359	49.2%		375300	109.7%
<b>Full-Time</b>	177243	33.4%	51.8%	245914	39.4%	48.8%	314816	45.2%	43.9%	137573	77.6%
Tenured	68444	24.9%	20.0%	90477	32.0%	18.0%	115182	37.6%	16.1%	46738	68.3%
Tenure Track	45965	41.1%	13.4%	55969	43.9%	11.1%	60272	48.4%	8.4%	14307	31.1%
Non-Tenure Track	62834	43.7%	18.4%	99468	46.5%	19.7%	139362	52.6%	19.4%	76528	121.8%
<b>Part-Time</b>	164816	46.4%	48.2%	257788	48.1%	51.2%	402543	52.9%	56.1%	237727	144.2%
Male Faculty											
	1993	% of all Faculty	% of all Male Faculty	2003	% of all Faculty	% of all Male Faculty	2013	% of all Faculty	% of all Male Faculty	Change, 1993-2013	Percent Change, 1993-2013
<b>All Male Faculty</b>	543,482	61.4%		656,751	56.6%		740,333	50.8%		196,851	36.2%
<b>Full-Time</b>	353,307	66.6%	65.0%	378,324	60.6%	57.6%	381,586	54.8%	51.5%	28,279	8.0%
Tenured	206,450	75.1%	38.0%	192,354	68.0%	29.3%	191,560	62.4%	25.9%	(14,890)	-7.2%
Tenure Track	65,866	58.9%	12.1%	71,597	56.1%	10.9%	64,278	51.6%	8.7%	(1,588)	-2.4%
Non-Tenure Track	80,991	56.3%	14.9%	114,373	53.5%	17.4%	125,748	47.4%	17.0%	44,757	55.3%
<b>Part-Time</b>	190,175	53.6%	35.0%	278,427	51.9%	42.4%	358,747	47.1%	48.5%	168,572	88.6%

Source: IPEDS:93; IPEDS:03; IPEDS:13.

Notes: Includes four-year public; four-year private nonprofit; four-year for-profit; two-year public; two-year private nonprofit; and two-year for-profit Title IV institutions

At the same time, tenured plus tenure-track men were shrinking as a proportion of all male faculty: from just over half (50.1%) in 1993 to slightly more than one-third (34.6%) in 2013. In part, the availability of phased retirement programs for an aging, overwhelmingly male, professoriate has contributed to the shift among men from full-time tenured to part-time appointments. Contrariwise, among all tenured faculty appointments, the proportion held by women rose by half: from 24.9% in 1993 to 37.6% by 2013, while the proportion of full-time tenure-track appointments (not including those already tenured) held by women increased during that two-decade span from 41.1% to 48.4%.

The magnitude of women's growth in full-time and tenured or tenure-track appointments, however, pales in comparison to their growth in part-time appointments (144.2%) and full-time, nontenure-track appointments (121.8%). These results suggest, first, that while a disproportionate share of the growth among faculty women has been in part-time and nontenure-track appointments, women also have grown substantially (compared to men) in the number of tenured and tenure-track appointments they hold. This constitutes a clear, if incomplete, sign of progress for women.

From another vantage point, the results for women seem less sanguine. A much more complex picture emerges upon closer examination of the proportion of all women faculty who hold various appointment types: The proportion of all women faculty who are tenured or on the tenure track has actually declined from 20% to 16% and from 13% to 8%, respectively, while the percentage of all women who are in part-time appointments has increased from 48% to 56%, and the proportion of all women in full-time, nontenure-track positions has remained essentially the same (18% to 19%). Women continue to be less likely than men to hold full-time appointments (43.9% of women compared to 51.5% of

men) and less likely to be tenured—only one-sixth (16.1%) of women compared to one-quarter (25.9%) of men are tenured, although women are now roughly on par with men in the likelihood of being on the tenure track.

The ambiguity deepens when we examine the progress made by women in achieving the ultimate academic prize, i.e., the full professorship. Table 3 charts the number of women full professors in 1993, 2003 and 2013, as well as their changing proportion of all full professor appointments and the percentage of all women faculty who have achieved the full professor rank. As Table 3 shows, the sheer number of women who have achieved full professorships has more than tripled over the past two decades from just over 21,000 to 65,500, and the proportionate representation of women among all full-time faculty members who hold the full professor rank has more than doubled from 14.8% to 36.1%. At the same time, however, when one examines the cohort of women full professors as a proportion of all headcount women faculty, the proportionate size of this elite group relative to *all* women faculty has changed only modestly—rising from 6.1% to just 9.1% of all academic women from 1993 to 2013. This sobering reality is a function of the large-scale entry of academic women into a professoriate swept by a steeply rising tide of contingent academic appointments.

Based on these metrics, it would appear safe to say while women have been doing relatively better than men over the past two decades in securing full-time and tenured or tenure-track positions, and in moving into full professorships, most of the infusion of women into academic roles has been in part-time and nontenure-track appointments. Less than one in ten academic women have achieved the ultimate prize, a full professorship.

**Table 3: Number and Percent of Women who are Full Professors**

Year	1993	2003	2013
Full Professor (female)	21,022	39,366	65,459
All Full Professors	141,638	166,415	181,508
All Female Faculty*	342,059	503,702	717,359
% of Women who are Full Professors	6.1%	7.8%	9.1%
Women as % of Full Professors	14.8%	23.7%	36.1%

Source: IPEDS:93; IPEDS:03; IPEDS:13.

\*Includes part-time as well as full-time faculty, or total headcount

## Gender differences by institutional type

How does this picture change when institutional type is added to the mix? To what extent has this reconfiguration of appointments—and associated gender gaps—proceeded at an equal or differential pace across the institutional universe, defined by both institution type and control, particularly in light of the punishing decline of funding in the public sector over the past decade? Table 4 examines the ratio of male to female faculty by appointment type and by type of institution in 1993, 2003 and 2013.

Among all institutions, the ratio of men to women in the tenured ranks has been cut almost in half over twenty years: from 3.0 men for every woman in 1993 to 1.7 men for every woman in 2013. Similarly, if less dramatically, the ratio of men to women among tenure-track appointments has shrunk by nearly a third from 1.4 men for every woman to near parity in 2013: 1.1 men for every woman. The data suggest that most of the shrinkage in the gender gap in tenured appointments occurred prior to 2003—undoubtedly reflecting the economic conditions since 2003 that have served to constrain the number of tenure-track hires.

That said, the data also demonstrate some striking variations by institutional type. As recently as 20 years ago, men dominated women in the tenured ranks at research universities by a whopping 4.4 to 1. While that gender gap has shrunk by nearly half over the ensuing twenty years, it nonetheless remains fairly substantial (2.3 men to 1 woman) among tenured appointments at the research universities, especially the private research universities (2.5:1). The gender ratio among tenured appointments has shrunk to 1.5:1 at both the Bachelor's and Master's institutional types, while women actually outnumber men among the tenured ranks in the two-year sector, and even more so among the small number of tenured appointments in the for-profit sector.<sup>1</sup> Among tenure-track appointees, the gender gap has been virtually eliminated among all institutional types, except the research universities—and there the gap is still at about 1.3:1. However, that shrinkage (from 1.8 in 1993) comes amid the overall shrinkage in these types of appointments. Among nontenure-track, full-time appointments, the gender gap, already small back in 1993, has been essentially eliminated—and even slightly reversed in the two-year sector and the Master's institutions (to 0.8 in 2003) as women have become the new majority among nontenure-track full-time employees. Finally, among part-time appointments, whatever small gender gap had

existed in 1993 was either eliminated by 2013 or was reversed.

Taken together, these trends in the distribution of women faculty across institutional and appointment types suggest a pattern of movement, in the direction of broader representation, if not quite attaining equity at the highest levels—albeit largely achieved prior to 2003.<sup>2</sup> The historically large gender gap, especially among tenured appointments, has been reduced substantially, as has the less-extreme gender gap also among tenure-track and nontenure-track appointments—even as the overall numbers of such appointments (except full-time nontenure track) are declining. While research universities show a shrinking gender gap, it is one that remains stubbornly resistant to elimination.

## Race/Ethnicity and appointment type

In *The American Faculty*, Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) documented the gradual growth of a racial and ethnic minority presence in the professoriate from about 5% in 1975 to about 15% by 1998—noting that the proportionate presence among new hires had risen to about 1 in 5 by 2003. While that growth has remained steady, albeit small, we now ask, to what extent have racial and ethnic minorities found themselves disproportionately overrepresented among nontenure-track full- or part-time appointments?<sup>3</sup>

Table 5 shows the distribution of underrepresented minorities (URM), non-resident aliens (NRA), Asian-American, and White faculty by appointment type in 1993, 2003 and 2013. As described above, this analysis explicitly distinguishes between noncitizen black, Hispanic and Asian faculty members who are foreign-born and educated and classified as NRAs, and African-American, Hispanic, and Asian-American citizens who are native born and U.S. educated. The table also provides multiple indicators of representation, including raw numbers and the proportion each subgroup represents among all faculty in a given category, as well as the proportion that each appointment category subgroup represents of all members of the given racial/ethnic subgroup.

While the headcount number of white faculty increased by 43.3% between 1993–2013, the numbers of Asian-American and URM faculty grew by 170.5% and 142.8%, respectively—three times the rate of growth in white faculty. Moreover, among white faculty, the proportionate presence of women increased from 38.4% to 48.6%, suggesting that women are

**Table 4: Ratio of Male to Female Faculty by Type and Control of Institution and Appointment Type, 1993, 2003, 2013**

	N =	Full-Time					
		Tenured			Tenure Track		
		1993	2003	2013	1993	2003	2013
		262,564	269,069	292,064	103,231	117,837	113,896
<b>All Institutions</b>		3.0	2.1	1.7	1.4	1.3	1.1
Public		2.9	2.0	1.6	1.4	1.2	1.0
Private		3.3	2.4	1.9	1.5	1.4	1.1
Four-year		3.5	2.5	1.9	1.5	1.4	1.1
Two-year		1.5	1.1	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7
<b>Research Institutions</b>		4.4	3.0	2.3	1.8	1.6	1.3
Public		4.4	3.0	2.2	1.7	1.5	1.2
Private		4.2	3.3	2.5	2.0	1.8	1.4
<b>Master's Institutions</b>		2.7	1.8	1.4	1.2	1.1	0.9
Public		2.7	1.9	1.4	1.2	1.1	0.9
Private		2.5	1.8	1.4	1.2	1.1	0.9
<b>Bachelor's Institutions</b>		2.8	1.9	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.0
Public		2.4	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.3	1.1
Private		2.9	1.9	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.0
<b>Two-Year Institutions</b>		1.5	1.1	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7
Public		1.5	1.1	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7
Private		0.9	0.9	0.9	0.5	1.4	0.9
<b>For-Profit Institutions</b>		1.7	1.6	0.6	0.8	0.7	1.8
Two-year, private		3.1	1.6	0.6	0.1	0.7	2.0
Four-year, private		1.4	1.6	0.6	1.1	0.6	1.7

**Table 4: Ratio of Male to Female Faculty by Type and Control of Institution and Appointment Type, 1993, 2003, 2013 (cont'd)**

	N=	Nontenure Track			Part-Time		
		1993	2003	2013	1993	2003	2013
		125,029	195,394	231,530	323,763	514,513	721,647
<b>All Institutions</b>		1.3	1.1	0.9	1.1	1.1	0.9
Public		1.2	1.0	0.9	1.1	1.0	0.9
Private		1.4	1.3	1.0	1.3	1.2	1.0
Four-year		1.3	1.2	0.9	1.2	1.1	0.9
Two-year		1.1	0.9	0.8	1.0	1.0	0.8
<b>Research Institutions</b>		1.4	1.3	1.0	1.4	1.2	1.0
Public		1.3	1.2	1.0	1.3	1.1	1.0
Private		1.7	1.4	1.0	1.5	1.3	1.1
<b>Master's Institutions</b>		1.0	0.9	0.8	1.2	1.0	0.9
Public		1.0	0.8	0.7	1.0	1.0	0.8
Private		1.1	1.0	0.8	1.3	1.1	0.9
<b>Bachelor's Institutions</b>		1.3	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.1	0.9
Public		1.4	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.2	0.9
Private		1.3	1.2	1.0	1.1	1.0	0.9
<b>Two-year Institutions</b>		1.1	0.9	0.8	1.0	1.0	0.8
Public		1.1	0.9	0.8	1.0	1.0	0.8
Private		1.1	1.0	0.6	1.1	0.7	0.7
<b>For-Profit Institutions</b>		1.6	1.5	0.8	1.3	1.7	0.7
Two-year, private		1.7	1.3	0.7	0.9	0.9	0.7
Four-year, private		1.5	1.8	0.9	1.4	1.9	0.7

Source: IPEDS:93; IPEDS:03; IPEDS:13.

Notes: All institution counts do not include private for-profit institutions. Underrepresented racial minority includes Black, Hispanic, American Indian, and Alaskan Native individuals.



destined over the next decade—if current trends continue—to become the majority of white faculty. The reversal of fortunes of white versus nonwhite faculty is illustrated most dramatically when we focus on the growth of faculty in tenured and tenure-track appointments. The absolute number of white faculty—men and women combined—on tenured appointments actually declined slightly from ca. 242,700 to 238,500, while the number on tenure-track appointments declined during that period from 90,300 to 82,400—a *negative* growth rate.

The largest shrinkage in the proportionate representation of whites was among the tenure-track faculty: from over four-fifths (80.7%) in 1993 to less than two-thirds (66.2%) in 2013. During the same period, the number of Asian-American faculty in tenured and tenure-track appointments more than doubled from ca. 11,300 to ca. 27,000, and from ca. 6,600 to ca. 14,000, respectively. The number of URM faculty on tenured and tenure-track appointments grew by a much more modest rate, 60.9% and 30.1%, respectively, while mushrooming in numbers of nontenure-track full-time (142.9% growth) and part-time appointments (229.8% growth). Much as we found with academic women, the greatest inroads overall among any racial/ethnic subgroup into tenured (150.4% growth) and tenure-track appointments (141.3% growth) was by foreign-born and educated “nonresident aliens” or NRAs—increasing by about 150% in both categories but much less so among full-time nontenure-track and part-time appointments (30.1% growth).

Where are the nonwhite faculty members located by institution type? Both Asian-American and foreign-born and educated NRA faculty are disproportionately located at research universities. In 1993, 56.4% of all Asians/Pacific Islanders and 75.9% of all NRAs were at research universities; the corresponding figures for 2009 were 53.5% (Asians) and 79.1% (for NRAs) (Smith, Tovar and Garcia 2012).

As for the URM faculty, Table 6 displays the ratio of white to URM faculty by appointment type across and within institutional types in 1993, 2003 and 2013. Overall, the data show that the 15.0:1 ratio of whites to URMs among tenured faculty in 1993 had been nearly cut in half to 7.8:1

by 2013. While the ratio had been highest at research universities and at private institutions at all levels in 1993—and this relative position has persisted—nonetheless the ratio has been halved almost everywhere, with most of that shrinkage already having occurred by 2003. Among tenure-track appointees, the ratios of white to URM faculty had been half as large in 1993—on the order of 8.7:1—and the gap has narrowed at a slow pace, especially between 2003 and 2013. By 2013, that ratio stood at 5.7:1. Presumably this reflects the decline in the overall proportion of tenured and tenure-track appointments just as URMs are increasingly entering the academic pipeline.

Nonetheless, some progress is clear—although private sector institutions still lag behind public sector institutions. Among full-time nontenure-track appointments, the substantial ratio of whites to URMs persists—initially 10.2:1 in 1993 and more recently 6.8:1 in 2013. An exception is the case of public Master’s institutions where the ratio has actually grown from 4.6 to 6.0, suggesting that new hires to nontenure-track appointments have been disproportionately white at those institutions. Finally, among part-time appointments, white to URM ratios began lower (9.9:1 in 1993) and have shrunk substantially (to 5.7:1) 20 years later. Among part-timers, the two-year private institutions and the for-profit sector remain outliers—wherein white to URM ratios have shrunk dramatically.

In sum, the proportion of whites among all full-time faculty has shrunk by 11% between 1993–2013, from 84.1% to a still formidable 73.2% (as shown in Table 5), primarily due to the growth in Asian-American (4.7% to 8.6%) and Black and Latino URM faculty (8.2% to 11.1%). While foreign born and educated NRA and Asian-American faculty—in addition to white faculty—are most heavily represented in research universities, the largest absolute *number* of URM faculty (as distinguished from their proportion) are actually located in research universities and other four-year institutions, given their much larger corps of full-time faculty. The part-time faculty presents a largely similar pattern.



**Table 5: Distribution of URM, NRA, Asian-American, and White Faculty by Appointment Type, 1993, 2003, 2013**

URM Faculty											
	1993	% of all Faculty	% of all URM Faculty	2003	% of all Faculty	% of all URM Faculty	2013	% of all Faculty	% of all URM Faculty	Change, 1993-2013	Percent Change, 1993-2013
<b>All URM Faculty</b>	76,455	8.6%		121,612	10.5%		185,614	12.7%		109,159	142.8%
<b>Full-Time</b>	43,701	8.2%	57.2%	61,793	9.9%	50.8%	77,579	11.1%	41.8%	33,878	77.5%
Tenured	19,401	7.1%	25.4%	25,994	9.2%	21.4%	31,225	10.2%	16.8%	11,824	60.9%
Tenure Track	11,227	10.0%	14.7%	14,376	11.3%	11.8%	14,604	11.7%	7.9%	3,377	30.1%
Non tenure Track	13,073	9.1%	17.1%	21,423	10.0%	17.6%	31,750	12.0%	17.1%	18,677	142.9%
<b>Part-Time</b>	32,754	9.2%	42.8%	59,819	11.2%	49.2%	108,035	14.2%	58.2%	75,281	229.8%
NRA Faculty											
	1993	% of all Faculty	% of all NRA Faculty	2003	% of all Faculty	% of all NRA Faculty	2013	% of all Faculty	% of all NRA Faculty	Change, 1993-2013	Percent Change, 1993-2013
<b>All NRA Faculty</b>	19,317	2.2%		27,978	2.4%		30,515	2.1%		11,198	58.0%
<b>Full-Time</b>	10,677	2.0%	55.3%	20,881	3.3%	74.6%	19,294	2.8%	63.2%	8,617	80.7%
Tenured	1,351	0.5%	7.0%	2,043	0.7%	7.3%	3,383	1.1%	11.1%	2,032	150.4%
Tenure Track	3,396	3.0%	17.6%	7,587	5.9%	27.1%	8,196	6.6%	26.9%	4,800	141.3%
Non tenure Track	5,930	4.1%	30.7%	11,251	5.3%	40.2%	7,715	2.9%	25.3%	1,785	30.1%
<b>Part-Time</b>	8,640	2.4%	44.7%	7,097	1.3%	25.4%	11,221	1.5%	36.8%	2,581	29.9%

**Table 5: Distribution of URM, NRA, Asian-American, and White Faculty by Appointment Type, 1993, 2003, 2013 (cont'd)**

Asian-American Faculty											
	1993	% of all Faculty	% of all Asian Faculty	2003	% of all Faculty	% of all Asian Faculty	2013	% of all Faculty	% of all Asian Faculty	Change, 1993-2013	Percent Change, 1993-2013
<b>All Asian-American Faculty</b>	34,469	3.9%		58,853	5.1%		93,222	6.4%		58,753	170.5%
<b>Full-Time</b>	24,686	4.7%	71.6%	40,508	6.5%	68.8%	59,700	8.6%	64.0%	35,014	141.8%
Tenured	11,274	4.1%	32.7%	17,225	6.1%	29.3%	26,980	8.8%	28.9%	15,706	139.3%
Tenure Track	6,562	5.9%	19.0%	10,440	8.2%	17.7%	13,981	11.2%	15.0%	7,419	113.1%
Non tenure Track	6,850	4.8%	19.9%	12,843	6.0%	21.8%	18,739	7.1%	20.1%	11,889	173.6%
<b>Part-Time</b>	9,783	2.8%	28.4%	18,345	3.4%	31.2%	33,522	4.4%	36.0%	23,739	242.7%
White Faculty											
	1993	% of all Faculty	% of all White Faculty	2003	% of all Faculty	% of all White Faculty	2013	% of all Faculty	% of all White Faculty	Change, 1993-2013	Percent Change, 1993-2013
<b>All White Faculty</b>	744,983	84.1%		900,694	77.6%		1,067,668	73.2%		322,685	43.3%
<b>Full-Time</b>	450,618	84.9%	60.5%	495,003	79.3%	55.0%	518,403	74.4%	48.6%	67,785	15.0%
Tenured	242,678	88.3%	32.6%	236,298	83.5%	26.2%	238,528	77.8%	22.3%	(4,150)	-1.7%
Tenure Track	90,286	80.7%	12.1%	93,370	73.2%	10.4%	82,396	66.2%	7.7%	(7,890)	-8.7%
Non tenure Track	117,654	81.8%	15.8%	165,335	77.3%	18.4%	197,479	74.5%	18.5%	79,825	67.8%
<b>Part-Time</b>	294,365	82.9%	39.5%	405,691	75.7%	45.0%	549,265	72.1%	51.4%	254,900	86.6%

Source: IPEDS:93; IPEDS:03; IPEDS:13.

Notes: Includes four-year public; four-year private; four-year for-profit; two-year public; two-year; private; two-year for-profit. Asian/Pacific (2013) includes Asian and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. Two or more races was indicated in the 1993 and 2003 surveys.

**Table 6: Ratio of White to Underrepresented Minority [URM] Faculty by Type and Control of Institution, and Appointment Type, 1993, 2003, 2013**

	N=	Full-Time					
		Tenured			Tenure-Track		
		1993	2003	2013	1993	2003	2013
		250,365	248,665	256,206	94,199	99,398	88,798
<b>All Institutions</b>		15.0	9.2	7.8	8.7	6.6	5.7
Public		13.4	8.3	7.1	7.5	6.2	5.3
Private		20.3	12.7	10.5	11.6	7.7	6.4
Four-year		17.1	10.0	8.5	8.8	6.8	5.9
Two-year		8.9	6.5	5.5	6.9	5.8	4.7
<b>Research Institutions</b>		21.1	11.1	9.3	10.6	6.9	6.1
Public		22.8	10.6	8.9	9.6	6.5	5.8
Private		17.3	12.9	10.5	13.9	8.1	6.6
<b>Masters Institutions</b>		12.5	9.7	8.0	7.3	7.1	5.9
Public		10.7	8.4	7.0	6.0	6.4	5.2
Private		26.3	14.0	11.1	13.2	8.7	7.5
<b>Bachelors Institutions</b>		16.7	7.0	6.9	7.8	5.9	5.1
Public		8.3	3.2	3.3	5.5	4.9	4.9
Private		21.6	11.3	10.0	8.5	6.3	5.2
<b>Two-Year Institutions</b>		8.9	6.5	5.5	6.9	5.8	4.7
Public		8.8	6.5	5.5	6.6	5.7	4.7
Private		42.3	13.3	29.0	71.6	-	19.0
<b>For-Profit Institutions</b>		4.4	1.6	0.2	15.0	3.2	17.0
Two-year, private		3.7	1.5	0.2	11.5	2.8	-
Four-year, private		-	1.7	0.2	-	3.4	14.0

**Table 6: Ratio of White to Underrepresented Minority [URM] Faculty by Type and Control of Institution, and Appointment Type, 1993, 2003, 2013 (cont'd)**

	N=	Nontenure Track			Part-Time		
		1993	2003	2013	1993	2003	2013
		116,466	160,968	187,569	310,014	400,368	533,434
<b>All Institutions</b>		10.2	7.9	6.8	9.9	7.0	5.7
Public		10.3	8.0	7.1	9.0	7.0	5.9
Private		9.7	7.9	6.8	13.1	7.4	6.3
Four-year		9.7	8.1	7.1	10.9	7.8	6.6
Two-year		11.1	7.7	6.7	9.0	6.5	5.4
<b>Research Institutions</b>		12.0	9.2	7.8	11.8	9.2	7.3
Public		14.1	10.2	8.3	12.1	9.2	7.9
Private		9.0	7.8	6.9	11.3	9.1	6.6
<b>Masters Institutions</b>		6.1	7.4	7.2	9.8	7.4	6.2
Public		4.6	5.6	6.0	7.4	8.2	6.3
Private		12.6	11.2	8.6	15.2	6.8	6.1
<b>Bachelors Institutions</b>		9.4	5.3	5.0	11.6	5.9	5.8
Public		5.8	4.2	5.3	7.4	5.2	5.3
Private		10.4	5.7	4.9	13.1	6.4	6.1
<b>Two-Year Institutions</b>		11.1	7.7	6.7	9.0	6.5	5.4
Public		11.5	7.6	6.6	8.9	6.4	5.4
Private		7.5	25.1	9.8	14.9	14.9	4.7
<b>For-Profit Institutions</b>		11.7	5.6	3.1	13.7	4.2	2.2
Two-year, private		12.1	5.1	2.7	10.9	3.7	2.1
Four-year, private		11.1	8.8	5.3	20.7	4.9	2.5

Source: IPEDS:93; IPEDS:03; IPEDS:13.

Notes: All institution counts do not include private for-profit institutions. Underrepresented racial minority includes Black, Hispanic, American Indian, and Alaskan Native individuals.

## The intersection of race and gender

While the separate stories of women and underrepresented minority faculty in American higher education over the past generation largely parallel each other, a more nuanced account emerges at the intersection of gender and race/ethnicity. Table 7 below shows the distribution of female faculty by race/ethnicity and appointment type between 1993 and 2013, again being careful to distinguish between underrepresented minorities (URMs) and faculty born and educated abroad (NRAs).<sup>4</sup>

Among all headcount faculty members, white women have actually benefitted the least among all racial subgroups of women—although they remain the dominant numerical majority. Relative to the 109.7% increase in women between 1993 and 2013, white women increased by 81.5% compared to the 296.0% increase in Asian-American women, and the 189.9% increase in URM women (with Hispanic women outpacing both African-American and Native-Americans). Indeed, Asian-American women showed robust growth rates across all appointment types, ranging from 238.4% (among tenure-track, full-time faculty) to 321.6% (among tenured faculty); and 321.3% (among part-time faculty). Similarly, NRA women increased their presence among tenured faculty appointments by fivefold over the twenty-year period from 1993 to 2013, and by more than threefold among tenure-track appointments.

While URM women faculty more than tripled in total headcount over the two decades, from ca. 35,800 to 103,800, their growth in tenured and tenure-track full-time appointments has been much more modest—81.7% among tenured appointments (from ca. 7,900 to ca. 14,300) and 54.0% among tenure-track appointments, from ca. 5,200 to ca. 8,000. Indeed, their most robust growth has been among full-time nontenure-track appointments (177.4%) and part-time appointments (238%). Within the URM category, Hispanic women have grown at twice the pace of their African-American counterparts among tenured (112.7% vs. 54.0%) and tenure-track appointments (82.2% vs. 40.6%).

While somewhat dizzying, these growth rates must, however, be interpreted in the context of the actual numbers—which still remain small—and their proportionate presence among all women faculty, which shows modest growth over the two decade period (10.5% in 1993 vs. 14.5% in 2013). Moreover, these numbers pale in comparison to the overall rate of growth in the size of the female professoriate as a whole (77.6% growth in full-time women; 109.7% growth in women in all appointment types).

Thus, African-American women's proportionate presence among all women full-time faculty has remained virtually unchanged in two decades (6.6% in 1993, 6.9% in 2013); increasing from 7.1% to 7.6% among female tenure-track full-time faculty during this period, while their proportionate presence among the tenured full-time female faculty has actually *declined* from 6.3% to 5.8% between 1993 and 2013.

Latinas, meanwhile, have increased their proportionate presence among all women full-time faculty from 4.1% to 5.5% over those two decades; from 3.7% to 5.2% among the tenure-track, full-time female faculty; and from 4.8% to 6.1% of the tenured full-time female faculty. The tiny number of Native American women have increased their proportionate presence among the full-time female professoriate from 0.4% to 0.5% over two decades, have remained as 0.5% of the tenure-track female professoriate, and risen from 0.3% to 0.5% of the tenured female professoriate (but still the total number is only 556). While the proportionate presence of Asian-American women among all full-time female faculty members has nearly doubled from 3.5% to 7.5% (2.9% to 7.2% among tenured full-time female faculty, 3.9% to 10.2% of all tenure-track full-time female faculty), their numbers remain relatively small, and the “big picture” through this prism remains relatively static. While the situation of Asian-American and NRA women has improved the most, URM women more modestly, and white women the least, the numerical dominance of white women in 1993 continues largely unchanged in 2013.

**Table 7: Percent Distribution of Female Faculty by Race/Ethnicity and Appointment Type, 1993, 2003, 2013**

	1993	% of all Female Faculty	2003	% of all Female Faculty	2013	% of all Female Faculty	Change N, 1993-2013	% Change, 1993-2013
<b>All Female Faculty</b>	342,059		503,702		717,359		375,300	109.7
White	285,961	83.6	389,468	77.3	518,912	72.3	232,951	81.5
Asian-American	10,414	3.0	21,550	4.3	41,235	5.7	30,821	296.0
Underrepresented Minority	35,813	10.5	60,986	12.1	103,824	14.5	68,011	189.9
African-American	21,295	6.2	34,114	6.8	60,575	8.4	39,280	184.5
Hispanic	13,122	3.8	24,291	4.8	39,575	5.5	26,453	201.6
Native American	1,396	0.4	2,581	0.5	3,674	0.5	2,278	163.2
Two or more	–		–		5,542	0.8		
NRA (Non-Res Alien)	8,337	2.4	9,258	1.8	12,308	1.7	3,971	47.6
Unknown Race	1,534	0.4	22,440	4.5	35,538	5.0	34,004	2216.7
<b>All Full-Time Female Faculty</b>	177,243	51.8	245,914	48.8	314,816	43.9	137,573	77.6
White	148,657	83.9	194,321	79.0	233,270	74.1	84,613	56.9
Asian-American	6,220	3.5	13,113	5.3	23,564	7.5	17,344	278.8
Underrepresented Minority	19,666	11.1	29,889	12.2	40,621	12.9	20,955	106.6
African-American	11,662	6.6	16,386	6.7	21,713	6.9	10,051	86.2
Hispanic	7,274	4.1	12,188	5.0	17,309	5.5	10,035	138.0
Native American	730	0.4	1,315	0.5	1,599	0.5	869	119.0
Two or more	–		–		2,387	0.8		
NRA (Non-Res Alien)	2,426	1.4	6,157	2.5	7,251	2.3	4,825	198.9
Unknown Race	274	0.2	2,434	1.0	7,723	2.5	7,449	2718.6
<b>Tenured Full-Time Female Faculty</b>	68,444	38.6	90,477	36.8	115,182	36.6	46,738	68.3
White	58,404	85.3	74,249	82.1	88,971	77.2	30,567	52.3
Asian-American	1,973	2.9	4,131	4.6	8,318	7.2	6,345	321.6
Underrepresented Minority	7,855	11.5	11,259	12.4	14,273	12.4	6,418	81.7
African-American	4,340	6.3	5,510	6.1	6,683	5.8	2,343	54.0
Hispanic	3,307	4.8	5,305	5.9	7,034	6.1	3,727	112.7
Native American	208	0.3	444	0.5	556	0.5	348	167.3
Two or more	–		–		761	0.7		
RA (Non-Res Alien)	178	0.3	435	0.5	1,076	0.9	898	504.5
Unknown Race	34	0.0	403	0.4	1,783	1.5	1,749	5144.1

**Table 7: Percent Distribution of Female Faculty by Race/Ethnicity and Appointment Type, 1993, 2003, 2013 (cont'd)**

	1993	% of all Female Faculty	2003	% of all Female Faculty	2013	% of all Female Faculty	Change N, 1993-2013	% Change, 1993-2013
<b>Tenure-Track Full-Time Female Faculty</b>	45,965	25.9	55,969	22.8	60,272	19.1	14,307	31.1
White	38,100	82.9	41,847	74.8	40,471	67.1	2,371	6.2
Asian-American	1,815	3.9	3,812	6.8	6,142	10.2	4,327	238.4
Underrepresented Minority	5,202	11.3	7,295	13.0	8,013	13.3	2,811	54.0
African-American	3,265	7.1	4,163	7.4	4,591	7.6	1,326	40.6
Hispanic	1,716	3.7	2,829	5.1	3,127	5.2	1,411	82.2
Native American	221	0.5	303	0.5	295	0.5	74	33.5
Two or more	–		–		568	0.9		
NRA (Non-Res Alien)	730	1.6	2,246	4.0	3,055	5.1	2,325	318.5
Unknown Race	118	0.3	769	1.4	2,023	3.4	1,905	1614.4
<b>Nontenure-Track Full-Time Female Faculty</b>	62,834	35.5	99,468	40.4	139,362	44.3	76,528	121.8
White	52,153	83.0	78,225	78.6	103,828	74.5	51,675	99.1
Asian-American	2,432	3.9	5,170	5.2	9,104	6.5	6,672	274.3
Underrepresented Minority	6,609	10.5	11,335	11.4	18,335	13.2	11,726	177.4
African-American	4,057	6.5	6,713	6.7	10,439	7.5	6,382	157.3
Hispanic	2,251	3.6	4,054	4.1	7,148	5.1	4,897	217.5
Native American	301	0.5	568	0.6	748	0.5	447	148.5
Two or more	–		–		1,058	0.8		
NRA (Non-Res Alien)	1,518	2.4	3,476	3.5	3,120	2.2	1,602	105.5
Unknown Race	122	0.2	1,262	1.3	3,917	2.8	3,795	3110.7
<b>Part-Time Female Faculty</b>	164,816	48.2	257,788	51.2	402,543	56.1	237,727	144.2
White	137,304	83.3	195,147	75.7	285,642	71.0	148,338	108.0
Asian-American	4,194	2.5	8,437	3.3	17,671	4.4	13,477	321.3
Underrepresented Minority	16,147	9.8	31,097	12.1	63,203	15.7	47,056	291.4
African-American	9,633	5.8	17,728	6.9	38,862	9.7	29,229	303.4
Hispanic	5,848	3.5	12,103	4.7	22,266	5.5	16,418	280.7
Native American	666	0.4	1,266	0.5	2,075	0.5	1,409	211.6
Two or more	–		–		3,155	0.8		
NRA (Non-Res Alien)	5,911	3.6	3,101	1.2	5,057	1.3	(854)	-14.4
Unknown Race	1,260	0.8	20,006	7.8	27,815	6.9	26,555	2107.5

Source: IPEDS:93; IPEDS:03; IPEDS:13.

Notes: Includes four-year public; four-year private; four-year for-profit; two-year public; two-year; private; two-year for-profit. Asian/Pacific (2013) includes Asian and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. Two or more races was indicated in the 1993 and 2003 surveys.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System, biennial Fall Staff Survey, 1993, 2003, 2013



## Concluding thoughts

The broad societal movement to diversify the American faculty over the past quarter century continues to reshape the academic profession in many ways. Effects of the shift in the composition of the faculty (most notably in gender and race/ethnicity) and how those new faculty perform their jobs (e.g., reshape curricular content and pursue a less traditional mix of teaching and research) is explored in some detail in our forthcoming book, *The Faculty Factor*. The diversification process, evident during the past several decades, sometimes accelerates and at other times remains mostly static—reflecting, it seems, the relative financial health of higher education writ large.

With this pattern of fluctuation in mind, the above detailed narrative, grounded in data rather than hortatory rhetoric, is predicated on *selected* data—the years 1993, 2003 and 2013—for our analyses. These data points were available (not the case for all years), as well as reflective of developments spanning a recent, but not overly brief, time period. Selecting different years, of course, would have yielded a somewhat different—but *not* a substantially different—story.

The outpouring of data, as we have contended, reveals endless “subplots” amid a highly complex, reductionist resistant reality. But even the complexities highlighted herein obscure yet more complexity, not addressed given space limitations in these pages. One such important variable is academic field, subfield or discipline, as very different stories emerge when the faculty are viewed through the lens of academic field; their widely varying emphases yield innumerable aggregations and disaggregations.

With so much data to ponder, different interpretations are warranted. Ample grounds exist for emphasizing striking progress toward diversification, which has taken place and is occurring both throughout the higher education sector and demonstrably more in some of its subsectors. At the same time, however, evidence abounds for underscoring how much more work remains to be done. There is inevitable tension between these two narrative streams. We find both “plotlines” compelling.

Diversification among faculty is a function of many complex forces, as is true for other key higher education populations (e.g., students, staff at varying levels, governing board members and so on). There are the obvious nuanced issues of motivation, commitment and prioritization; these

fluctuate in part with the enviroing society, sometimes intensifying, sometimes receding. More pointedly, beyond the prevailing societal mood, efforts devoted to diversification are a function of formal policy at multiple governmental and organizational levels. Indeed, for much of the postwar era, stretching for decades prior to the two-decade span we have scrutinized here (that is, 1993–2013), such diversity policies have pivoted around efforts to pursue, or circumvent, affirmative action.

This monograph comes at a propitious time. Today, the use of affirmative action as a policy tool for leveraging expanded diversity has become increasingly contentious, triggering numerous judicial “pushback” cases. At this writing, a potentially pivotal case (actually a consolidation of cases) bundled under the title *Fisher vs. University of Texas* has been argued before the U.S. Supreme Court. A decision is widely thought to be impending. But that was prior to the recent vacancy on the closely divided court created by Justice Scalia’s death, which may alter the outcome of that case.

If the thrust of affirmative action is reversed, albeit as applied under the specified conditions of the University of Texas case, campuses will be obliged to seek other creative ways to encourage further diversity within the bounds of the U.S. Constitution. What is clear in this murky, many faceted legal arena is that campus policies designed to promote further diversification throughout postsecondary education would need to be reformulated, perhaps curtailed extensively, if the Supreme Court decides to reverse the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit’s ruling in this case, which supported the University of Texas’ consideration of race in its admissions decisions. The University of Texas case, and kindred litigation, will have a tremendous effect on future efforts to achieve further diversity. Thus the future composition of our nation’s campuses will in important ways depend on the future composition of the U.S. Supreme Court.

While these affirmative action cases focus mainly on aggrieved, would-be higher education *students*, our focus, for immediate purposes, is on efforts to further diversify the *faculty*. After all, we submit that the faculty comprise the essential core of a college or university, its epicenter. In many ways the faculty epitomize the values of their institutions. They serve, too, in important ways as role models for their students; for that to occur for *all* students, diversity in the faculty ranks is crucial. Further intensification of efforts to diversify the faculty remains, in our view, an imperative for American higher education.

1. This likely reflects the large number of faculty hired during the great expansion of the community college sector in the 1960s and 1970s, frequently drawing on teachers in the public schools.
2. While the data support a trend of *increasing* equity in the area of faculty appointments, we draw no conclusion that any standard of equity has been achieved in this area, let alone, as we document in other portions of the forthcoming book, such as workload and compensation.
3. In *The American Faculty* (Schuster and Finkelstein 2006), we reported that at least among full-time appointments, minority faculty were actually less likely than white faculty to be on nontenure-track appointments.
4. We developed a taxonomy for addressing race/ethnicity in *The American Faculty* (Schuster and Finkelstein 2006), which was described in considerable detail in Appendix I in that volume, p. 441–442. Since that time, the federal government has redefined the categories it uses to classify race and ethnicity in federal databases and reports [See Finkelstein, Conley and Schuster, *The Faculty Factor*, Appendix C, forthcoming]. In light of that change, and following the lead of our colleague, Daryl Smith (Smith et al. 2012), we have here reconceived our racial/ethnic taxonomy: a new category of nonresident alien (NRA) is introduced to also include foreign-born faculty who may in the past have been misclassified as URMs (underrepresented racial minorities). But that earlier classification ignored where they had been born or educated (that is, outside the United States, for example, African, Latin American, or Spanish immigrants). Native-born Asians now have been separated out as a category of nonwhites that are nonetheless hardly underrepresented in the academic or scientific workforce, and African-American and nonwhite Latinos, as well as native Americans, have been included separately (when possible), but also collectively under the rubric URM—a term employed by the National Science Foundation in its annual Science and Technology Indicators publication.

## References

- Curtis, John (2011). "Persistent Inequity: Gender and Academic Employment." Paper prepared for Equal Pay Day, April 11, 2011.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2015). "The Faculty Pipeline in Sociology and Other STEM Disciplines." Paper presented at Southern Sociological Society Annual Meeting, March 26, 2015.
- Gray, Mary. (2015). "The AAUP and Women." *Academe* 101 (January/February): 46–52.
- Schuster, Jack and Martin Finkelstein. (2006). *The American Faculty: The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smith, Daryl, Esau Tovar and Hugo Garcia. (2012). "Refining the Focus on Faculty Diversity in Postsecondary Institutions." In: Yonghong, Jade Xu (ed.). *New Directions for Institutional Research* 155 (Fall). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Turner, Caroline, Juan Gonzales, and Kathleen Wong. (2011) "Faculty Women of Color: The Critical Nexus of Race and Gender." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 4 December: 199–211.