

Faculty Gender Equity Indicators 2021

John W. Curtis

Data Report, Center for the Study of Academic Labor

Colorado State University

November 2021



Colorado State University

Center for the Study of Academic Labor: <https://csal.colostate.edu/>

The Center for the Study of Academic Labor (CSAL) promotes research and scholarship on the transformation of academic labor in higher education, especially the increasing reliance on contingent (non-tenure track) faculty.

The teaching mission of higher education, and the system of academic labor that puts it into practice, are under threat from escalating tuition costs, competition from on-line alternatives, shrinking state support for higher education, and administrative spending priorities. CSAL seeks to build a multidisciplinary network of scholars who have particular interests in the dramatic growth of contingent faculty throughout all of higher education and its impact on educational outcomes, faculty governance, academic freedom and the culture of higher education. In so doing, CSAL carves out an area of research that some have called “contingency studies.” CSAL publishes books, journals, papers and data on topics such as the characteristics and working conditions of contingent faculty, the academic labor market, university budgets, academic employment policies and the future of the tenure system. CSAL promotes respect for all faculty, fair treatment of all faculty, and dedication to the teaching mission of higher education.

Acknowledgments

The research reported here was made possible in part by a grant from the Spencer Foundation (Small Research Grant #201900031). The views expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Spencer Foundation. I want to thank Steve Shulman and Sue Doe of CSAL for supporting me in producing these data reports and the companion working paper. Any errors of omission or commission, however, are my own.

About the Author

John W. Curtis is an independent research and evaluation consultant based in Washington, DC. He is a faculty affiliate of the Department of Economics and Center for the Study of Academic Labor at Colorado State University, and faculty affiliate of the Maryland Population Research Center at the University of Maryland, College Park. Prior to starting his consulting practice, Dr. Curtis served as research director for the American Sociological Association (2014-2017) and American Association of University Professors (2002-2014). In earlier years, he held positions in institutional research at community colleges in Montana and Virginia, and as research associate at the Universität Bayreuth in Germany and the University of Nairobi, Kenya. Dr. Curtis completed a PhD in sociology at Johns Hopkins University with a specialization in international development.

E-mail: jwcurtis@colostate.edu

Table of Contents

What is in this Report	1
Women in Higher Education	2
Faculty Gender Equity Indicator 1: Employment Status.....	4
Faculty Gender Equity Indicator 2: Tenure Status.....	8
Faculty Gender Equity Indicator 3: Full Professor Rank	12
Faculty Gender Equity Indicator 4: Full-Time Faculty Salary	15
Conclusion	17
A Note on the Data	19
References	19
Appendix 1. Detailed tables.....	22

Figures

Figure 1. Degrees Earned by Women, by Level of Degree, 1980-81 to 2020-21.....	3
Figure 2. Faculty Members, by Gender and Institutional Category, 1995-2019.....	5
Figure 4. Faculty Employed Full-Time, by Gender and Institutional Category, 1995-2019 ...	7
Figure 5. Full-Time Faculty in Non-Tenure-Track Positions, by Gender and Institutional Category, 1995-2019.....	9
Figure 6. Faculty with Tenure, by Gender, 1995-2019	10
Figure 7. Faculty Employment Status, by Gender, 1995-2019	11
Figure 8. Full Professors, by Gender, 1995-2019	13
Figure 9. Faculty with Full Professor Rank, by Gender and Institutional Category, 1995-2019	14
Figure 10. Full-Time Faculty, Women's Average Salary as a Percent of Men's, by Rank, 1995-96 and 2019-20	16

Faculty Gender Equity Indicators 2021

What is in this Report

This report is an update and expansion of the *AAUP Faculty Gender Equity Indicators 2006* I co-authored with Marty West (West and Curtis 2006). As of this writing, the 2006 report has been cited more than 400 times according to Google Scholar, so I thought it would be useful to update it and include more data on trends over time. I want to emphasize at the outset that this 2021 report is not a product of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), which has not contributed to it in any way. This new data report is a companion to the working paper, “Faculty Diversity and Minoritized Student Outcomes: An Analysis of Institutional Factors” from the Center for the Study of Academic Labor (CSAL) at Colorado State University (Curtis 2021). Although that paper focuses on trends in racial diversity, the project of compiling the trend data for the working paper spurred me to make use of the same datasets to update the Gender Equity Indicators and produce two additional CSAL data reports.

The primary purpose of this report is to compile and make available current data on faculty employment, in a format more accessible to the general higher education audience than the typical (and now quite limited) publications of the National Center for Education Statistics. As such, the body of the report provides figures that highlight important aspects of the gender equity indicators, with detailed tables provided in an appendix. I will also make the data files used in the report available on the CSAL website.

The data for this report come from the US Department of Education’s Integrated

Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), which effectively serves as a census of US higher education. I wanted to utilize the publicly-available IPEDS data in part to make the tabulations more transparent, but also because they make it possible to look at trends in faculty employment over time. I have used the same four “faculty gender equity indicators” here as in the 2006 report, although the figures in the body of the report emphasize different aspects than the earlier version, partly due to the added complexity of showing a trend over time. In most cases, the trend covers data as of the fall of 1995, 2005, 2015, and 2019 (the most recent available at this time).

The “note on the data” section at the end of the report provides further details, but I want to provide a couple of basic notes at the outset. The data are compiled for all degree-granting institutions that reported employing faculty in each respective year. The figures and tables are limited to faculty reported in IPEDS, excluding graduate student and postdoctoral employees. Data on graduate student employees are available in IPEDS but were not included in the 2006 report. (This may be worthy of a later update.) To the best of my knowledge, data on postdoctoral employees are not available in IPEDS, at least not as a formally-designated category.¹

I want also to acknowledge that IPEDS data are limited in terms of gender to binary and exclusive “men” and “women” categories (Garvey et al. 2019). Given that this is a secondary analysis, we are limited to the categories used in the original data collection.

There are two further significant limitations to the tabulations presented

¹ The National Science Foundation Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering (<https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/srvygradpostdoc/>) collects data on a regular basis, but is limited to “science, engineering, or selected health fields.” That might serve as the basis for a supplemental report.

here: First, IPEDS data are not disaggregated by discipline, and a significant body of research indicates that gender disparities in academic employment vary widely by discipline (Fox and Gaughan 2021; O’Connell and McKinnon 2021). The tabulations presented here may thus understate the inequities present in many disciplines.

Second, as of this writing we cannot know the full consequences of the covid-19 pandemic, currently in its third academic year of significant disruption to higher education, for academic gender equity (National Academies 2021). As Misra and colleagues note,

Without engaged interventions, higher education post-COVID will most likely be less diverse, given the pressure the pandemic is placing on women and faculty of color. ... The pandemic has exacerbated gender inequality, as women have reduced their work hours more than men due to schooling and caregiving demands. In higher education in particular, women faculty members and those with children have been less likely to submit grant proposals and journal articles or register new projects. More and more faculty members fear a secondary epidemic of lost early-career scholars. (Misra et al. 2021)


The most recent data presented here are as of fall 2019 and thus represent the status prior to the pandemic.

Because this is primarily a data report, I do not attempt a thorough review of the research literature on the several aspects of gender equity in academic employment documented here and do not explore nuanced explanations for the gender differences that are apparent. The literature has grown quite a bit since 2006, and yet our ability to examine issues of academic gender equity in detail at the national level is severely compromised by the demise of the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF), last completed in 2004. As a nationally representative sample survey, NSOPF enabled comparisons utilizing very specific characteristics of individuals and institutional employers. We need new data allowing for that level of specific analysis in order to fully understand what progress toward gender equity we have—and have not—accomplished.

Women in Higher Education

The 2006 report noted that Title IX became law in 1972 and established a prohibition against “discrimination on the basis of sex in educational programs and activities that receive or benefit from Federal financial assistance” (HHS 2019). Although “the increased participation of women in higher education as students was well underway before Title IX was enacted in 1972,” the 2006 report notes further that “in 1972, women earned 41 percent of Master’s degrees awarded by U.S. universities, 6 percent of first professional degrees, and 16 percent of doctorates.” (West and Curtis 2006: 5).

Figure 1. Degrees Earned by Women, by Level of Degree, 1980-81 to 2020-21



Notes. Doctoral includes most degrees that were classified as “first-professional” prior to 2010-11, such as MD, DDS, and law degrees. Figures for 2020-21 are projected. **Source:** *Digest of Education Statistics 2020*, Table 318.10, prepared July 2020. Accessed August 14, 2021 (https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d20/tables/dt20_318.10.asp?current=yes)

Figure 1 updates the trend in degrees awarded to women, although without going back to 1960-61 as the corresponding figure in the previous report did. As of the 1980-81 academic year, women already earned more than half of associate’s degrees and half of the bachelor’s and master’s degrees awarded, but only 29 percent of the doctorates. (See the important table note regarding doctorates.) Women first earned half of doctoral degrees during 2005-06 and were projected to have received 54 percent of doctoral degrees awarded during 2020-21. The proportions of bachelor’s and master’s degrees awarded to women appear to have stabilized over the past

decade, at about 57 percent and 60 percent, respectively. It is now clear that women earn the majority of all college degrees, but what role models do they observe among their teachers and mentors on the faculty as they progress toward those degrees?

The following four sections examine trends in academic employment by gender over the past quarter century in the form of four equity indicators: employment status, both by institutional category and full- or part-time status; tenure status; achievement of full professor rank; and salary for full-time faculty members. The indicators are presented in rough order

from the most fundamental aspects of employment, culminating in the analysis of salary equity among full-time faculty. In this way, it becomes clear that the employment inequities in each aspect have a cumulative effect in maintaining the disadvantaged position of women in the faculty overall.

Faculty Gender Equity Indicator 1: Employment Status

In this section, we will examine two aspects of changes in the basic employment status of faculty members, the types of institutions where they are employed and whether they are employed full- or part-time. Because the type of institution where faculty members are employed has such a fundamental impact on other aspects of employment status, we begin in figure 2 with the distribution of women and men faculty by institutional category. The institutional categories are adapted from the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education that has been developed and updated over several decades (see the data note). The figure shows institutions grouped by the classification that was current at the time.

Figure 2 indicates that women faculty members have been employed at associate's degree (community) colleges in larger proportions than men throughout the period. The proportion of women employed at community colleges has declined from 37 to 30 percent, while the proportion among men has remained constant at about 25 percent. By contrast, a smaller proportion of women faculty members has been employed at research universities. The number and size of research universities grew during the period, such that the proportion of both men and women faculty members employed there grew. However, for women, the growth was from 19 to 26 percent, while the proportion among men increased from 28 to 33 percent. The comparison between community colleges

and research universities is not to imply that research universities are "better" institutions. Each category has its own mission and there are a wide range of working environments and opportunities for professional development within each of the categories depicted in figure 2.

Even so, in terms of employment, community colleges utilize a larger proportion of part-time faculty positions and pay lower salaries for full-time faculty, on average. Many community colleges do not award tenure and quite a few do not assign faculty ranks. Community colleges typically do not provide support for faculty members carrying out research at anything close to the levels of support provided by research universities; this is a fundamental distinction in their missions. Again, there is not one "ideal" faculty career path, despite some research studies that utilize that concept. Different faculty members can find rewards and satisfaction in different environments. However, looking at the American faculty as a whole, women's overrepresentation in positions at community colleges is a factor in all four of the equity indicators examined here.

The detailed tables provided in the appendix are each broken out by institutional category to allow for consideration of this fundamental observation.

Figure 2. Faculty Members, by Gender and Institutional Category, 1995-2019



Figure 3. Women's Representation on the Faculty, by Employment Status, 1995-2019





Figure 3 looks at the trend in women's representation on the faculty by the second aspect of employment status, which is full- or part-time employment across all categories of institutions combined. Given the binary division of gender available in IPEDS data, men's representation can easily be derived from the figure, but the figure is limited to women's representation for ease of presentation. In terms of the faculty overall, women's representation has grown from 40 percent in 1995 to 51 percent as of 2019. Women have made up a larger proportion of the part-time faculty than the full-time faculty throughout the period, moving from 47 to 54 percent of all part-time faculty members but 35 to 48 percent of the full-time faculty. Although we are approaching gender parity among full-time faculty

when all categories of institutions are included, women remain overrepresented in part-time positions.

Appendix tables 1.1-1.5 provide the additional breakdown by institution type, which reinforces the significance of women's overrepresentation at community colleges that employ a much larger proportion of part-time faculty.

Figure 4 depicts the combination of the two factors, institutional category and full-time employment, in separate charts by gender to illustrate the divergence. Both the women's and men's charts show the trend toward declining full-time employment that has characterized the period. At associate's degree colleges the proportion of women faculty employed full-time has been equal to that among men in recent years. But in the other

Figure 4. Faculty Employed Full-Time, by Gender and Institutional Category, 1995-2019



institutional categories, women are employed in full-time positions in proportions that are consistently several percentage points lower than for men.

Faculty Gender Equity Indicator 2: Tenure Status

In addition to the long-term shift in faculty employment toward more part-time positions, faculty appointments that are full time have increasingly been made off the tenure track.² However, non-tenure-track appointments have not been equally assigned to women and men. Figure 5 documents both the increasing share of full-time positions that are off the tenure track and the persistent overrepresentation of women in those full-time non-tenure-track positions.³ It is also broken out by institutional category, so that we can see the differences between types of institutions.

As was the case with part-time appointments, we see from figure 5 that the proportions of non-tenure-track appointments are similar for women and men at community colleges, where they made up nearly half of full-time positions in the fall of 2019. In other institutional categories, however, the proportion of women in non-tenure-track positions is consistently several percentage points higher than the corresponding proportion of men. For fall 2019, women's non-tenure-track proportion is 7 percentage points higher at baccalaureate and small master's degree institutions, 10 points higher at master's and doctoral universities, and 16 points higher at research universities. Women's overrepresentation in non-tenure-track appointments has persisted over the two

decades, with little or no convergence toward equity.

Figure 6 provides another perspective on gender differences in faculty tenure status, displaying the trend in the proportion of faculty appointments with tenure. That proportion has declined over 20 years for both women and men, yet the gap in tenure proportions has narrowed only slightly. Figure 6 combines all faculty positions at all categories of institutions, and therefore displays the additive effect of the factors examined previously: women are overrepresented at community colleges, where fewer of the positions are full time and many colleges do not award tenure; women are overrepresented in part-time positions; and when employed full-time, they are overrepresented in non-tenure-track positions. Thus, we observe from figure 6 that 20 percent of women faculty members were tenured in 1995 compared with 37 percent of men, and by 2005 the figures had decreased to 17 and 27 percent respectively. The gender gap in tenure narrowed from 17 to 9 points over the full 24-year span, but has remained essentially unchanged for 14 years. With the majority of new faculty appointments presently being made off the tenure track—as has been the case for 20 years or more—it does not seem likely this tenure gap will narrow significantly in the future.

² I chart the long-term trend of changes in academic employment status by both full- and part-time status and tenure in a separate CSAL data report, "The Long-Term Trend in Contingent Faculty Employment," available on the website.

³ I treat all part-time positions as contingent (non-tenure-track) in this report. See the "note on the data" section for more detail.

Figure 5. Full-Time Faculty in Non-Tenure-Track Positions,
by Gender and Institutional Category, 1995-2019




Figure 6. Faculty with Tenure, by Gender, 1995-2019





Figure 7 displays the accumulated differences in faculty employment status, combining tenure status and the full/part-time distinction. The proportion of women in full-time tenure-track positions has been equivalent to that among men since 2005, with both proportions having declined from the 1995 levels. However, as we noted from figure 6, the proportion of women in tenured appointments has remained consistently lower than that proportion for men, even as the gap has closed somewhat as tenured positions have declined overall. We also find that the proportions of women in the two contingent employment categories have consistently been higher than among men,

even as those proportions have grown overall. Note that the majority of women faculty members have been in part-time positions since 2005, corresponding to their overrepresentation at community colleges. That proportion for men has not yet reached one-half, and the part-time proportion for both men and women declined slightly in the most recent figures as more faculty members were hired into full-time non-tenure-track appointments.

In sum, women faculty members have been consistently overrepresented in non-tenure-track contingent positions and underrepresented in tenure-line positions.

Figure 7. Faculty Employment Status, by Gender, 1995-2019

Women**Men**

Faculty Gender Equity Indicator 3: Full Professor Rank

The final indicator related to faculty employment status is promotion to the rank of professor, referred to here as “full professor” to make the distinction from other ranks clear. Fox and Gaughan (2021) review the research literature on gender differences in promotion and find:

The advancement to full [professor] rank, in particular, is a challenge for women faculty. Compared to men, women are lower and slower in promotion to full rank. This is the case even after considering what is called “demographic inertia.” The inertia refers to the representation of women at given ranks, as subject to existing age and gender distributions that affect the proportional representation of newer doctorate holders, including women. A range of factors contribute to women’s stalled advancement to full professor. (p. 3)

Based on their analysis of recent survey results for women in academic science, they conclude:

Our findings point to a potential caregiving bias, whereby caregivers

continue to be disadvantaged in promotion to full professor. Furthermore, a particular caregiving bias appears, whereby the women caregivers are especially delayed in advancing. (p. 15)

In this report, we look at gender differences in promotion to full professor in two ways. First, figure 8 displays the gender breakdown for full professors across the full time period. Women have moved from constituting 18 percent of all full professors in 1995 to 34 percent in 2019, which certainly reflects considerable progress, albeit over 24 years. Reflecting on a similar long-term trend in the 2006 version of this report, we observed

this is a relatively rapid increase from a very low starting point [10 percent in 1974-75]. At this rate of change it does not appear that women faculty will attain equity in full professorships for many years. Thus, promotion to full professor constitutes a further point where inequities persist in the career progression of faculty women. (West and Curtis 2006: 11)

A further 15 years have not altered that conclusion.

Figure 8. Full Professors, by Gender, 1995-2019




Figure 9 adds important perspective to the consideration of this third equity indicator, since not all institutions assign professorial ranks and those ranks typically apply only to tenured or tenure-track positions. The proportion of full professors among all men faculty has declined at all categories of institutions, reflecting the more general decline of tenure-line appointments. The proportion among women faculty has increased slightly, so that there has been some narrowing of the gender gap in full professor appointments.


Appointments at the rank of full professor make up only a very small proportion of the faculty as a whole at community colleges, given that so many community college positions are part time and many of the colleges do not use faculty ranks. Therefore, we see in figure 9 that the

proportions of full professors there are now roughly equivalent for women and men (a change from the situation in 1995). That is not the case in other institutional categories, however. The gap between women and men's full professor proportions at baccalaureate and small master's institutions narrowed from 10 percentage points in 1995 to 3 points in 2019. At master's and doctoral universities, it shrank from 13 to 2 points. And the gender gap at the full professor rank decreased from a whopping 21 points in 1995 to 10 in fall 2019.


Considering all institutions together, then, 3 percent of all women faculty members held the rank of full professor in fall 1995, compared with 14 percent of men—an 11-percentage-point gap. By 2019, 5 percent of women were full professors and 9 percent of men, so that the gender gap

Figure 9. Faculty with Full Professor Rank,
by Gender and Institutional Category, 1995-2019

Women



Men



overall had narrowed to 4 percentage points. Women moved into the full professor rank in greater numbers over the past two decades, just as that rank itself became less prominent due to the growing proportion of faculty appointments that are part-time or full-time non-tenure-track.

Faculty Gender Equity Indicator 4: Full-Time Faculty Salary

The analysis of faculty gender equity culminates with examination of rates of pay—and yet we must begin immediately with two major caveats for the tabulations presented here. One has already been mentioned in the opening section of the report, and that is the absence of data disaggregated by discipline in IPEDS. Umbach (2007) was able to take advantage of the individual characteristics available in the NSOPF to examine discipline-level differences in salaries by gender. An aggregate tabulation such as that presented here therefore cannot evaluate the consequences of what are often explained as “labor market structures” that result in disciplinary differences in faculty pay. Although I remain skeptical of this “market” explanation (Curtis and Kisielewski 2016), the present report is limited to an updated tabulation using the most comprehensive data available and noting the persistence of an overall gender gap in faculty pay.

The second major limitation in this report is the lack of comprehensive data on part-time faculty pay. Since we have already seen in indicator 1 above that women are overrepresented in part-time faculty positions, this is a significant omission. However, IPEDS does not collect data on part-time faculty pay. Major primary data collections, such as that by the AAUP, have attempted to tabulate data on part-time faculty pay. The AAUP’s most recent annual report on faculty employment (AAUP 2021) includes “data for more than one hundred thousand part-time faculty


members who were employed in the prior academic year, 2019–20” from 360 institutions (p. 1, 37). Yet the part-time pay figures are not broken out by gender and the report does not attempt to consolidate part-time and full-time pay—a tabulation the data would not fully support. As the AAUP report laments, “the fact remains that basic questions about the makeup, compensation, and working conditions of adjunct faculty members are difficult or impossible to answer.” (p. 12)

Thus, given the lack of data on part-time faculty pay by gender, we must bear in mind that the tabulation here significantly underestimates the continuing disadvantage in pay experienced by women faculty members.

Figure 10 presents a deceptively simple visualization of a complex phenomenon. The columns in the chart depict women full-time faculty members’ average salary as a percent of men’s average salary, first for each of the three professorial ranks and then for all full-time faculty members combined. It shows the percentages at two time points, in academic year 1995–96 and in 2019–20, 24 years apart. Those percentages indicate that women at the full professor rank earned 84.9 percent of what men earned, on average, at the beginning of this period, and 85.2 percent at the end. Since parity in salary would be 100 percent, another way of expressing this is that women faculty members earned 14.8 percent less than men during 2019–20, even when holding the same full professor rank.

Women full professors thus made a minuscule step toward salary parity during the period. Women at the associate professor rank fared better, moving from 91.5 percent to 92.8, but still are left with a gap of more than 7 percent. At the assistant professor rank, women’s average earnings actually declined relative to men’s over this period, leaving a gap of more than 8 percent.

Figure 10. Full-Time Faculty, Women's Average Salary as a Percent of Men's, by Rank, 1995-96 and 2019-20



The combined figure for all faculty members shows women earning 82.8 percent of what men earn, on average, as of 2019-20. The 2006 version of this report remarked,

In 2005-06, across all ranks and all institutions, the average salary for women faculty was 81 percent of the amount earned by men. This comparison has remained virtually unchanged since the AAUP began collecting separate salary data for women and men faculty in the late 1970s. (West and Curtis 2006: 11)

We could thus extend that statement to 2019-20, with the small difference in percentage due primarily to the much larger set of institutions included in the

IPEDS tabulations here. Thus, even beyond what is shown in figure 10, we are forced to acknowledge that *overall average salaries for full-time women faculty members have not moved substantially toward equity with men's salaries in more than four decades of documented difference*. That is an astonishing conclusion, and we must remind ourselves that even that is an understatement, since it does not factor in women's continued overrepresentation in part-time positions that pay substantially less.

The persistent salary disadvantage experienced by women in full-time faculty positions is the cumulative result of the factors documented here. Women are overrepresented at community colleges

that pay lower salaries on average, an increasing proportion of women are being hired into non-tenure-track positions as displayed in figures 5 and 6, and women are underrepresented in the highest-ranking (and highest-paid) full professor positions. But as we see in figure 10, even when reaching the same rank, women faculty members are paid less on average than men.

An additional factor that accounts for the result shown for assistant professors in figure 10 is the increasing salary compression that has resulted from assistant professor salaries rising more quickly than those in the associate and full professor ranks. Assistant professor salaries have risen especially rapidly in fields such as computer science, engineering, accounting, and finance where men still predominate (Curtis and Kisielewski 2016).

Conclusion

With women now firmly established as the majority of students in US higher education, there is now significant and reasonable concern that men are being left behind in higher education and in education more generally (Thompson 2021). At the same time, despite some progress in moving into faculty positions, women are still overrepresented in positions that are part-time or in full-time positions that are off the tenure track. More women teach at community colleges, where the teaching loads are heavier and the pay lower, on average, and fewer women than men hold the highest academic rank of full professor. The multiple dimensions of employment status culminate in average salary among full-time faculty members that is 17 percent lower for women than for men as of fall 2019—even without taking into

account women's greater presence in part-time positions that pay substantially less.⁴

Some will argue that this is simply an example of broader trends in the US labor market, where Wilson (2021) documents

... the stubborn, structural nature of pay inequities that is manifold. ... even when employed in the same occupation, pay discrimination results in lower earnings for women relative to men, including among essential workers.... The lack of a national paid leave policy means that women are more likely to take unpaid time out of the workforce and have breaks in their work and earnings history. The combination of these factors means that, on average, women start their careers with a pay gap that they are never able to close.

But given the predominance of women as students, what message are we sending to those emerging professionals when their women faculty mentors and role models continue to face barriers to equity in academic employment?

As noted at the outset, we already know that the employment impacts of the ongoing covid-19 pandemic have been more significant for academic women than for men, so the prospects for improvement any time soon seem pretty bleak. I, personally, have been documenting these issues for 18 years and they have been the subject of vigorous debate and serious research for more than four decades. It's easy to become discouraged. So what can we do?

- As a researcher, I will say first, although perhaps not with absolute priority, that we need more and better data on all aspects of faculty work and compensation. And we need data

⁴ It might also be argued that other factors “explain” the gender differences in pay, such as fewer women faculty members holding PhDs, fewer years of experience, or less time spent on research. I would counter that these are simply adding detail to the aspects in which gender inequities persist and do not address the underlying structures.

collected in a disaggregated way that will allow us to examine all of the intersections in employment status and multiple dimensions of identity that characterize the academic workforce in 2021. The data from the most recent National Study of Postsecondary Faculty are now more than 15 years old. We need a “new NSOPF” now.

- Rather than trying to find ways to make women more competitive within the existing system, Mitchneck and Smith (2021) argue, “It’s taken decades for us to get to a place where most people agree that the academy is not the objective, level playing field we all hoped it would be. Now it is time to not just say the system is inequitable but also to start putting our finger on the particular pieces that require a reset.”
- Smith-Doerr (2021) advocates for institutions making better use of their own faculty researchers: “... all self-respecting colleges and universities have excellent social science faculty working in departments and centers who are contributing new basic knowledge on equity and inclusion. Sadly, however, that knowledge is rarely applied to the institutions themselves. ... Establishing faculty-led research that informs institutional change—and keeping that research and development for DEI units going as long as possible—will pay dividends in more effective approaches to the ultimate goal of equity on campus.”
- The NSF ADVANCE gender equity program, after more than 20 years funding institutional transformation and the dissemination of more research on gender equity in academic employment, has identified search committees and department chairs as critical change points in the

structure of academic work. (Furst-Holloway and Miner 2019)

- As noted in a brief recent case study featuring Florida International University (FIU), “it takes more than people of goodwill to really make progress on diversity, inclusion, and equity.” The FIU project described, underway for more than a decade, includes “a robust program of faculty development events, intensive mentoring, data collection, and departmental diversity, equity, and inclusion plans.” (AAC&U 2021) I do not have personal knowledge of the FIU project and therefore do not recommend it. However, the elements of the project as described serve as a good example of the comprehensive, integrated, participatory, and data-driven approach that is necessary.

Although this is a data report carefully tabulated from very complicated primary sources, I will conclude with two personal observations. First, when I began examining gender equity in academic employment in 2003 at the request of a woman colleague, I was astonished at the level of inequity that remained. Growing up in a household with a mother and grandmother who both had college degrees and had worked in professional occupations, and having worked myself in more than one position with senior women colleagues, I was simply unaware this could still be an issue. I was wrong, and it took an examination of the data to make me realize it. We must continue to collect disaggregated data and expand that data collection to facilitate the ongoing examination this report shows still to be necessary 18 years later.

Second, I have given presentations on the topic of gender equity in academic employment (and also on work/family balance there) to both academic and policy audiences. As best I can recall, those audiences were almost exclusively women. As long as we as a society

continue to treat gender inequities in employment (and caregiving) as a “women’s issue” rather than a societal one, we are not likely to make much progress.

A Note on the Data

As stated above, the data for this report are drawn from IPEDS, specifically from the “Fall Staff” section of what is now the Human Resources component. I have typically used the Fall Staff data for trends that go back prior to 2002, when the Employees by Assigned Position section was introduced. The analysis was completed on raw data files downloaded from the IPEDS “Use the Data” page (<https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/use-the-data>). The data are compiled for all degree-granting institutions that reported employing faculty in each respective year. (The institution count in a given year may include a few that are in the data file but reported zero faculty members.) The figures and tables are limited to faculty reported in IPEDS, excluding graduate student and postdoctoral employees, as discussed above.

Counts of faculty are reported by each institution in the aggregate according to the reporting categories established by IPEDS. That means individual faculty members, especially those employed part-time, may be double counted.

The IPEDS data do not actually use the term “faculty.” Instead, they denote

“employees whose primary responsibility is instruction, research, and/or public service,” or words to that effect.

Depending on the source file, counts may be split by these various “responsibilities.” I have utilized the figure labeled for all of these functions combined wherever possible.

For the categorization of faculty positions as “tenure-line” (tenured or tenure-track) or “contingent,” I have included all part-time positions in that employment status and in the broader contingent category. IPEDS does enable reporting of part-time tenured and tenure-track positions. According to a tabulation in the most recent AAUP report, these “part-time tenure-line” positions make up about 0.6 percent of the total faculty (AAUP 2021: table F, p. 16, my calculations). The positions are included as contingent in this report, whereas they would be counted as tenure-line in the AAUP categorization.

Report figures and tables that are broken out by “institutional category” utilize the Carnegie basic classification variable available in the IPEDS “header” (Institutional Characteristics) file for the given year. I have adapted the Carnegie basic classification into four categories: Associate’s Colleges, Baccalaureate Colleges and Small Master’s Universities, Larger Master’s and Doctoral Universities, and Research Universities. Some of the appendix tables provide breakouts for all four categories.

References

- American Association of University Professors (AAUP). 2021. “The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 2020–21.” July. (<https://www.aaup.org/report/annual-report-economic-status-profession-2020-21>)
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). 2021. “It Takes More than Goodwill: A Grassroots Effort to Increase Faculty Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.” August. (<https://www.aacu.org/aacu-news/campus-model/it-takes-more-goodwill-grassroots-effort-increase-faculty-diversity-equity-and>)

- Curtis, John W. 2021. "Faculty Diversity and Minoritized Student Outcomes: An Analysis of Institutional Factors." Working paper, Center for the Study of Academic Labor, Colorado State University. (<https://csal.colostate.edu/>)
- Curtis, John W., and Michael Kisielewski. 2016. *Faculty Salaries in Sociology and Other Disciplines, 2016 Update*. American Sociological Association. (<https://www.asanet.org/research-and-publications/research-sociology/research-briefs/faculty-salaries-sociology-and-other-disciplines-2016-update>)
- Fox, Mary Frank, and Monica Gaughan. 2021. "Gender, Family and Caregiving Leave, and Advancement in Academic Science: Effects across the Life Course." *Sustainability*, 13: 6820. (<https://doi.org/10.3390/su13126820>)
- Furst-Holloway, Stacie, and Kathi Miner. 2019 "ADVANCEing women faculty in STEM: Empirical findings and practical recommendations from National Science Foundation ADVANCE institutions." *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*. 38(2): 122-130. (<https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-03-2019-295>)
- Garvey, Jason C., Jeni Hart, Amy Scott Metcalfe, and Jennifer Fellabaum-Toston. 2019. "Methodological Troubles with Gender and Sex in Higher Education Survey Research." *The Review of Higher Education* 43(1): 1-24. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2019.0088>
- Misra, Joya, Dessie Clark, and Ethel L. Mickey. 2021. "Keeping COVID-19 From Sidelining Equity." *Inside Higher Ed*. February 10. (<https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2021/02/10/without-intentional-interventions-pandemic-will-make-higher-education-less-diverse>)
- Mitchneck, Beth, and Jessi L. Smith. 2021. "We Must Name Systemic Changes in Support of DEI." *Inside Higher Ed*. August 24. (<https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2021/08/24/academe-should-determine-what-specific-systemic-changes-are-needed-dei-opinion>)
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2021. *Impact of COVID-19 on the Careers of Women in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. (<https://doi.org/10.17226/26061>)
- O'Connell, Christine, and Merryn McKinnon. 2021. "Perceptions of Barriers to Career Progression for Academic Women in STEM." *Societies*, 11(27). (<https://doi.org/10.3390/soc11020027>)
- Smith-Doerr, Laurel. 2021. "Universities Should Look in the Mirror." *Inside Higher Ed*. September 15. (<https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2021/09/15/colleges-should-research-dei-their-own-campuses-opinion>)
- Thompson, Derek. 2021. "Colleges Have a Guy Problem." *The Atlantic*. September 14. (<https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2021/09/young-men-college-decline-gender-gap-higher-education/620066/>)
- Umbach, Paul D. 2007. "Gender equity in the academic labor market: An analysis of academic disciplines." *Research in Higher Education* 48(2): 169-192.
- U.S. Department of Health & Human Services (HHS). 2019. "Civil Rights Requirements- D. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, 20 U.S.C. 1681 et. seq." (<https://www.hhs.gov/civil-rights/for-individuals/special-topics/needy-families/requirement-d/index.html>)

- West, Martha S., and John W. Curtis. 2006. *AAUP Faculty Gender Equity Indicators 2006*. American Association of University Professors. (<https://www.aaup.org/reports-publications/publications/see-all/aaup-faculty-gender-equity-indicators-2006>)
- Wilson, Valerie. 2021. “Black women face a persistent pay gap, including in essential occupations during the pandemic.” Economic Policy Institute, Working Economics Blog. August 2. (<https://www.epi.org/blog/black-women-face-a-persistent-pay-gap-including-in-essential-occupations-during-the-pandemic/>)

Appendix 1. Detailed tables

Table 1.1. Faculty Employment Status, by Gender and Institutional Category and Control, Fall 1995 to 2019
(All Colleges and Universities)

Fall 1995	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	136,576	35.1	252,403	64.9	127,993	48.0	138,870	52.0	1,609
Private Nonprofit	55,312	33.8	108,459	66.2	46,696	43.9	59,751	56.1	1,925
For-Profit	2,097	37.0	3,566	63.0	4,656	42.1	6,400	57.9	354
All institutions	193,985	34.7	364,428	65.3	179,345	46.7	205,021	53.3	3,888

Fall 2005	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	184,278	41.5	259,648	58.5	199,863	51.1	191,395	48.9	1,694
Private Nonprofit	75,920	38.6	120,854	61.4	75,361	47.2	84,465	52.8	1,536
For-Profit	7,758	42.0	10,732	58.0	29,632	42.2	40,617	57.8	783
All institutions	267,956	40.6	391,234	59.4	304,856	49.1	316,477	50.9	4,013

Fall 2015	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	215,458	46.2	251,204	53.8	231,045	53.5	200,894	46.5	1,649
Private Nonprofit	101,449	44.6	125,783	55.4	107,580	51.0	103,360	49.0	1,734
For-Profit	9,998	55.3	8,093	44.7	50,272	55.6	40,084	44.4	1,256
All institutions	326,905	45.9	385,080	54.1	388,897	53.0	344,338	47.0	4,639

Fall 2019	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	231,894	47.6	255,087	52.4	228,140	54.2	193,021	45.8	1,626
Private Nonprofit	108,547	46.7	123,824	53.3	116,750	53.1	103,204	46.9	1,692
For-Profit	8,224	57.2	6,166	42.8	32,840	59.5	22,373	40.5	674
All institutions	348,665	47.5	385,077	52.5	377,730	54.2	318,598	45.8	3,992

Table 1.2. Faculty Employment Status, by Gender and Institutional Category and Control, Fall 1995 to 2019
(Institutional Category: Associate's Degree Colleges)

Fall 1995	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	44,314	46.2	51,701	53.8	85,681	49.2	88,643	50.8	995
Private Nonprofit	1,992	49.6	2,023	50.4	1,995	53.1	1,761	46.9	193
For-Profit	1,646	39.8	2,489	60.2	2,014	50.1	2,008	49.9	229
All institutions	47,952	46.0	56,213	54.0	89,690	49.3	92,412	50.7	1,417

Fall 2005	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	60,261	52.1	55,327	47.9	129,828	51.9	120,193	48.1	1,048
Private Nonprofit	1,134	52.9	1,011	47.1	1,465	56.6	1,122	43.4	100
For-Profit	4,662	46.6	5,336	53.4	5,856	53.3	5,127	46.7	499
All institutions	66,057	51.7	61,674	48.3	137,149	52.0	126,442	48.0	1,647

Fall 2015	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	66,650	54.6	55,431	45.4	141,896	53.9	121,548	46.1	1,006
Private Nonprofit	1,808	55.1	1,476	44.9	3,667	53.5	3,181	46.5	160
For-Profit	4,649	59.0	3,227	41.0	13,370	57.8	9,750	42.2	788
All institutions	73,107	54.9	60,134	45.1	158,933	54.2	134,479	45.8	1,954

Fall 2019	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	66,114	54.8	54,484	45.2	131,236	54.2	111,094	45.8	999
Private Nonprofit	1,409	52.5	1,274	47.5	3,049	55.0	2,495	45.0	143
For-Profit	3,947	59.7	2,665	40.3	8,816	63.6	5,035	36.4	421
All institutions	71,470	55.0	58,423	45.0	143,101	54.7	118,624	45.3	1,563

Table 1.3. Faculty Employment Status, by Gender and Institutional Category and Control, Fall 1995 to 2019
(Institutional Category: Baccalaureate Colleges/Small Master's Universities)

Fall 1995	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	12,695	34.7	23,872	65.3	6,924	39.6	10,558	60.4	212
Private Nonprofit	24,701	36.7	42,618	63.3	20,117	44.9	24,700	55.1	1,366
For-Profit	420	29.0	1,029	71.0	2,374	37.3	3,998	62.7	105
All institutions	37,816	35.9	67,519	64.1	29,415	42.8	39,256	57.2	1,683

Fall 2005	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	17,646	40.1	26,383	59.9	12,142	48.9	12,666	51.1	244
Private Nonprofit	27,877	40.9	40,348	59.1	25,020	47.3	27,888	52.7	1,047
For-Profit	2,288	35.1	4,223	64.9	9,966	39.4	15,347	60.6	245
All institutions	47,811	40.3	70,954	59.7	47,128	45.7	55,901	54.3	1,536

Fall 2015	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	17,836	45.6	21,282	54.4	11,891	51.6	11,155	48.4	210
Private Nonprofit	33,743	46.3	39,205	53.7	31,717	48.8	33,301	51.2	1,097
For-Profit	2,885	54.3	2,429	45.7	12,610	51.2	12,034	48.8	400
All institutions	54,464	46.4	62,916	53.6	56,218	49.9	56,490	50.1	1,707

Fall 2019	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	17,944	47.7	19,699	52.3	12,006	54.0	10,236	46.0	196
Private Nonprofit	35,832	48.3	38,320	51.7	35,272	50.8	34,104	49.2	1,063
For-Profit	2,456	60.0	1,634	40.0	9,398	60.8	6,055	39.2	191
All institutions	56,232	48.5	59,653	51.5	56,676	52.9	50,395	47.1	1,450

Table 1.4. Faculty Employment Status, by Gender and Institutional Category and Control, Fall 1995 to 2019
(Institutional Category: Master's and Doctoral Universities)

Fall 1995	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	42,242	34.6	79,703	65.4	23,363	49.8	23,578	50.2	317
Private Nonprofit	15,151	35.9	27,016	64.1	17,120	44.2	21,654	55.8	326
For-Profit	31	39.2	48	60.8	268	40.5	394	59.5	20
All institutions	57,424	35.0	106,767	65.0	40,751	47.2	45,626	52.8	663

Fall 2005	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	41,355	42.6	55,688	57.4	29,967	51.5	28,214	48.5	263
Private Nonprofit	22,529	43.3	29,500	56.7	36,420	48.1	39,253	51.9	329
For-Profit	808	40.8	1,173	59.2	13,810	40.7	20,143	59.3	39
All institutions	64,692	42.8	86,361	57.2	80,197	47.8	87,610	52.2	631

Fall 2015	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	47,874	47.9	52,175	52.1	41,444	55.0	33,956	45.0	276
Private Nonprofit	34,130	49.9	34,318	50.1	56,864	53.5	49,421	46.5	412
For-Profit	2,464	50.3	2,437	49.7	24,292	57.0	18,300	43.0	68
All institutions	84,468	48.7	88,930	51.3	122,600	54.7	101,677	45.3	756

Fall 2019	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	50,805	49.3	52,310	50.7	44,742	56.3	34,778	43.7	274
Private Nonprofit	36,719	52.0	33,903	48.0	61,796	55.8	48,893	44.2	421
For-Profit	1,821	49.4	1,867	50.6	14,626	56.5	11,283	43.5	62
All institutions	89,345	50.4	88,080	49.6	121,164	56.1	94,954	43.9	757

Table 1.5. Faculty Employment Status, by Gender and Institutional Category and Control, Fall 1995 to 2019
(Institutional Category: Research Universities)

Fall 1995	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	37,325	27.8	97,127	72.2	12,025	42.8	16,091	57.2	85
Private Nonprofit	13,468	26.8	36,802	73.2	7,464	39.1	11,636	60.9	40
For-Profit	0		0		0		0		0
All institutions	50,793	27.5	133,929	72.5	19,489	41.3	27,727	58.7	125

Fall 2005	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	65,016	34.7	122,250	65.3	27,926	47.9	30,322	52.1	139
Private Nonprofit	24,380	32.8	49,995	67.2	12,456	43.5	16,202	56.5	60
For-Profit	0		0		0		0		0
All institutions	89,396	34.2	172,245	65.8	40,382	46.5	46,524	53.5	199

Fall 2015	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	83,098	40.5	122,316	59.5	35,814	51.1	34,235	48.9	157
Private Nonprofit	31,768	38.5	50,784	61.5	15,332	46.8	17,457	53.2	65
For-Profit	0		0		0		0		0
All institutions	114,866	39.9	173,100	60.1	51,146	49.7	51,692	50.3	222

Fall 2019	Full Time				Part Time				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	97,031	43.0	128,594	57.0	40,156	52.1	36,913	47.9	157
Private Nonprofit	34,587	40.7	50,327	59.3	16,633	48.4	17,712	51.6	65
For-Profit	0		0		0		0		0
All institutions	131,618	42.4	178,921	57.6	56,789	51.0	54,625	49.0	222

Table 2.1. Full-Time Faculty Tenure Status, by Gender and Institutional Category and Control, Fall 1995 to 2019 (All Colleges and Universities)

Fall 1995	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				Inst
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Public	47,962	46.2	55,881	53.8	30,923	43.5	40,107	56.5	57,691	26.9	156,415	73.1	1,609
Private Nonprofit	21,188	42.3	28,925	57.7	16,323	40.8	23,667	59.2	17,801	24.2	55,867	75.8	1,925
For-Profit	2,007	37.1	3,403	62.9	5		7		85	35.3	156	64.7	354
All institutions	71,157	44.7	88,209	55.3	47,251	42.6	63,781	57.4	75,577	26.2	212,438	73.8	3,888

Fall 2005	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				Inst
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Public	72,798	49.6	73,875	50.4	40,292	45.5	48,222	54.5	71,188	34.1	137,551	65.9	1,694
Private Nonprofit	32,921	45.3	39,829	54.7	18,934	42.7	25,377	57.3	24,065	30.2	55,648	69.8	1,536
For-Profit	7,572	41.9	10,500	58.1	23		59		163	48.5	173	51.5	783
All institutions	113,291	47.7	124,204	52.3	59,249	44.6	73,658	55.4	95,416	33.0	193,372	67.0	4,013

Fall 2015	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				Inst
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Public	88,507	53.5	77,044	46.5	41,058	49.6	41,708	50.4	85,893	39.3	132,452	60.7	1,649
Private Nonprofit	48,869	51.5	45,941	48.5	20,650	47.5	22,817	52.5	31,930	35.9	57,025	64.1	1,734
For-Profit	9,807	55.2	7,951	44.8	37		43		154	60.9	99	39.1	1,256
All institutions	147,183	52.9	130,936	47.1	61,745	48.9	64,568	51.1	117,977	38.4	189,576	61.6	4,639

Fall 2019	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				Inst
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Public	101,121	54.5	84,256	45.5	43,583	50.4	42,970	49.6	87,190	40.5	127,861	59.5	1,626
Private Nonprofit	53,941	53.1	47,663	46.9	21,451	50.1	21,384	49.9	33,155	37.7	54,777	62.3	1,692
For-Profit	8,123	57.1	6,091	42.9	10		11		91	58.7	64	41.3	674
All institutions	163,185	54.2	138,010	45.8	65,044	50.3	64,365	49.7	120,436	39.7	182,702	60.3	3,992

Table 2.2. Full-Time Faculty Tenure Status, by Gender and Institutional Category and Control, Fall 1995 to 2019
(Institutional Category: Associate's Degree Colleges)

Fall 1995	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	17,656	49.4	18,087	50.6	6,309	54.8	5,208	45.2	20,349	41.7	28,406	58.3	995
Private Nonprofit	1,444	53.9	1,233	46.1	207	49.3	213	50.7	341	37.1	577	62.9	193
For-Profit	1,578	40.2	2,345	59.8	1		2		67	32.1	142	67.9	229
All institutions	20,678	48.8	21,665	51.2	6,517	54.6	5,423	45.4	20,757	41.6	29,125	58.4	1,417

Fall 2005	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	26,148	53.5	22,717	46.5	9,999	55.9	7,888	44.1	24,114	49.4	24,722	50.6	1,048
Private Nonprofit	955	53.6	827	46.4	53	49.5	54	50.5	126	49.2	130	50.8	100
For-Profit	4,529	46.6	5,189	53.4	6		27		127	51.4	120	48.6	499
All institutions	31,632	52.4	28,733	47.6	10,058	55.8	7,969	44.2	24,367	49.4	24,972	50.6	1,647

Fall 2015	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	30,048	55.3	24,288	44.7	10,065	57.6	7,407	42.4	26,537	52.8	23,736	47.2	1,006
Private Nonprofit	1,671	56.0	1,312	44.0	52		43		85	41.3	121	58.7	160
For-Profit	4,585	58.8	3,207	41.2	0		0		64		20		788
All institutions	36,304	55.8	28,807	44.2	10,117	57.6	7,450	42.4	26,686	52.8	23,877	47.2	1,954

Fall 2019	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	30,474	55.4	24,523	44.6	10,543	57.4	7,824	42.6	25,097	53.1	22,137	46.9	999
Private Nonprofit	1,230	52.2	1,126	47.8	81	57.0	61	43.0	98	53.0	87	47.0	143
For-Profit	3,935	59.7	2,660	40.3	0		0		12		5		421
All institutions	35,639	55.7	28,309	44.3	10,624	57.4	7,885	42.6	25,207	53.1	22,229	46.9	1,563

Table 2.3. Full-Time Faculty Tenure Status, by Gender and Institutional Category and Control, Fall 1995 to 2019
(Institutional Category: Baccalaureate Colleges/Small Master's Universities)

Fall 1995	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	5,329	43.1	7,031	56.9	3,214	38.5	5,138	61.5	4,152	26.2	11,703	73.8	212
Private Nonprofit	9,443	41.5	13,284	58.5	7,573	44.5	9,451	55.5	7,685	27.9	19,883	72.1	1,366
For-Profit	399	28.3	1,011	71.7	4		5		17		13		105
All institutions	15,171	41.6	21,326	58.4	10,791	42.5	14,594	57.5	11,854	27.3	31,599	72.7	1,683

Fall 2005	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	8,077	45.6	9,617	54.4	4,157	42.7	5,569	57.3	5,412	32.6	11,197	67.4	244
Private Nonprofit	11,650	44.9	14,303	55.1	7,332	44.3	9,229	55.7	8,895	34.6	16,816	65.4	1,047
For-Profit	2,235	35.1	4,138	64.9	17		32		36		53		245
All institutions	21,962	43.9	28,058	56.1	11,506	43.7	14,830	56.3	14,343	33.8	28,066	66.2	1,536

Fall 2015	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	9,540	49.9	9,594	50.1	3,102	48.0	3,363	52.0	5,194	38.4	8,325	61.6	210
Private Nonprofit	15,850	50.1	15,761	49.9	7,645	49.2	7,898	50.8	10,248	39.7	15,546	60.3	1,097
For-Profit	2,766	54.4	2,322	45.6	32	48.5	34	51.5	87	54.4	73	45.6	400
All institutions	28,156	50.4	27,677	49.6	10,779	48.8	11,295	51.2	15,529	39.3	23,944	60.7	1,707

Fall 2019	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	10,064	51.7	9,386	48.3	2,981	50.0	2,979	50.0	4,899	40.0	7,334	60.0	196
Private Nonprofit	17,449	51.6	16,348	48.4	7,970	51.2	7,605	48.8	10,413	42.0	14,367	58.0	1,063
For-Profit	2,368	60.2	1,567	39.8	10		11		78	58.2	56	41.8	191
All institutions	29,881	52.3	27,301	47.7	10,961	50.8	10,595	49.2	15,390	41.4	21,757	58.6	1,450

Table 2.4. Full-Time Faculty Tenure Status, by Gender and Institutional Category and Control, Fall 1995 to 2019
(Institutional Category: Master's and Doctoral Universities)

Fall 1995	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	10,262	52.6	9,256	47.4	12,434	44.6	15,438	55.4	19,546	26.2	55,009	73.8	317
Private Nonprofit	4,298	46.8	4,884	53.2	4,832	44.9	5,923	55.1	6,021	27.1	16,209	72.9	326
For-Profit	30		47		0		0		1		1		20
All institutions	14,590	50.7	14,187	49.3	17,266	44.7	21,361	55.3	25,568	26.4	71,219	73.6	663

Fall 2005	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	11,066	55.1	9,020	44.9	12,158	47.2	13,604	52.8	18,131	35.4	33,064	64.6	263
Private Nonprofit	8,206	50.2	8,147	49.8	5,999	49.3	6,178	50.7	8,324	35.4	15,175	64.6	329
For-Profit	808	40.8	1,173	59.2	0		0		0		0		39
All institutions	20,080	52.3	18,340	47.7	18,157	47.9	19,782	52.1	26,455	35.4	48,239	64.6	631

Fall 2015	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	14,020	57.5	10,353	42.5	11,840	52.5	10,723	47.5	22,014	41.4	31,099	58.6	276
Private Nonprofit	15,485	55.6	12,373	44.4	6,845	53.0	6,075	47.0	11,800	42.6	15,870	57.4	412
For-Profit	2,456	50.3	2,422	49.7	5		9		3		6		68
All institutions	31,961	56.0	25,148	44.0	18,690	52.7	16,807	47.3	33,817	41.9	46,975	58.1	756

Fall 2019	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	15,957	58.2	11,463	41.8	12,114	52.7	10,873	47.3	22,734	43.1	29,974	56.9	274
Private Nonprofit	17,836	57.6	13,116	42.4	6,937	54.8	5,724	45.2	11,946	44.2	15,063	55.8	421
For-Profit	1,820	49.4	1,864	50.6	0		0		1		3		62
All institutions	35,613	57.4	26,443	42.6	19,051	53.4	16,597	46.6	34,681	43.5	45,040	56.5	757

Table 2.5. Full-Time Faculty Tenure Status, by Gender and Institutional Category and Control, Fall 1995 to 2019
(Institutional Category: Research Universities)

Fall 1995	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	14,715	40.6	21,507	59.4	8,966	38.5	14,323	61.5	13,644	18.2	61,297	81.8	85
Private Nonprofit	6,003	38.7	9,524	61.3	3,711	31.5	8,080	68.5	3,754	16.4	19,198	83.6	40
For-Profit	0		0		0		0		0		0		0
All institutions	20,718	40.0	31,031	60.0	12,677	36.1	22,403	63.9	17,398	17.8	80,495	82.2	125

Fall 2005	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	27,507	45.8	32,521	54.2	13,978	39.8	21,161	60.2	23,531	25.5	68,568	74.5	139
Private Nonprofit	12,110	42.3	16,552	57.7	5,550	35.9	9,916	64.1	6,720	22.2	23,527	77.8	60
For-Profit	0		0		0		0		0		0		0
All institutions	39,617	44.7	49,073	55.3	19,528	38.6	31,077	61.4	30,251	24.7	92,095	75.3	199

Fall 2015	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	34,899	51.5	32,809	48.5	16,051	44.3	20,215	55.7	32,148	31.7	69,292	68.3	157
Private Nonprofit	15,863	49.0	16,495	51.0	6,108	41.0	8,801	59.0	9,797	27.8	25,488	72.2	65
For-Profit	0		0		0		0		0		0		0
All institutions	50,762	50.7	49,304	49.3	22,159	43.3	29,016	56.7	41,945	30.7	94,780	69.3	222

Fall 2019	Not on Tenure Track				Tenure-Track				Tenured				
	Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	44,626	53.4	38,884	46.6	17,945	45.7	21,294	54.3	34,460	33.5	68,416	66.5	157
Private Nonprofit	17,426	50.5	17,073	49.5	6,463	44.7	7,994	55.3	10,698	29.8	25,260	70.2	65
For-Profit	0		0		0		0		0		0		0
All institutions	62,052	52.6	55,957	47.4	24,408	45.5	29,288	54.5	45,158	32.5	93,676	67.5	222

Table 3.1. Faculty at Full Professor Rank, by Gender and Institutional Category and Control, Fall 1995 to 2019 (All Colleges and Universities)

Fall 1995	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	19,833	18.0	90,513	82.0	1,609
Private Nonprofit	8,867	17.8	40,925	82.2	1,925
For-Profit	<u>147</u>	24.1	<u>462</u>	75.9	<u>354</u>
All institutions	28,847	17.9	131,900	82.1	3,888

Fall 2005	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	29,469	25.9	84,129	74.1	1,694
Private Nonprofit	13,871	24.1	43,667	75.9	1,536
For-Profit	<u>320</u>	32.9	<u>653</u>	67.1	<u>783</u>
All institutions	43,660	25.4	128,449	74.6	4,013

Fall 2015	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	38,880	32.7	80,181	67.3	1,649
Private Nonprofit	19,798	30.5	45,037	69.5	1,734
For-Profit	730	39.2	1,130	60.8	1,256
All institutions	59,408	32.0	126,348	68.0	4,639

Fall 2019	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	43,058	35.0	79,950	65.0	1,626
Private Nonprofit	21,889	33.2	44,141	66.8	1,692
For-Profit	<u>557</u>	38.9	<u>875</u>	61.1	<u>674</u>
All institutions	65,504	34.4	124,966	65.6	3,992

Table 3.2. Faculty at Full Professor Rank, by Gender and Institutional Category and Control, Fall 1995 to 2019 (Institutional Category: Associate's Degree Colleges)

Fall 1995	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	4,855	36.4	8,490	63.6	995
Private Nonprofit	165	36.9	282	63.1	193
For-Profit	<u>39</u>	36.8	<u>67</u>	63.2	<u>229</u>
All institutions	5,059	36.4	8,839	63.6	1,417

Fall 2005	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	7,487	47.8	8,180	52.2	1,048
Private Nonprofit	150	56.8	114	43.2	100
For-Profit	<u>85</u>	43.8	<u>109</u>	56.2	<u>499</u>
All institutions	7,722	47.9	8,403	52.1	1,647

Fall 2015	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	9,456	52.7	8,474	47.3	1,006
Private Nonprofit	112	43.8	144	56.3	160
For-Profit	218	50.6	213	49.4	788
All institutions	9,786	52.6	8,831	47.4	1,954

Fall 2019	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	9,247	53.3	8,106	46.7	999
Private Nonprofit	153	49.2	158	50.8	143
For-Profit	<u>156</u>	49.4	<u>160</u>	50.6	<u>421</u>
All institutions	9,556	53.1	8,424	46.9	1,563

Table 3.3. Faculty at Full Professor Rank, by Gender and Institutional Category and Control, Fall 1995 to 2019 (Institutional Category: Baccalaureate Colleges/Small Master's Universities)

Fall 1995	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	1,495	17.2	7,206	82.8	212
Private Nonprofit	3,685	19.6	15,112	80.4	1,366
For-Profit	105	21.6	381	78.4	105
All institutions	5,285	18.9	22,699	81.1	1,683

Fall 2005	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	2,762	26.2	7,789	73.8	244
Private Nonprofit	5,322	28.0	13,699	72.0	1,047
For-Profit	<u>160</u>	32.6	<u>331</u>	67.4	<u>245</u>
All institutions	8,244	27.4	21,819	72.6	1,536

Fall 2015	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	3,083	32.9	6,281	67.1	210
Private Nonprofit	6,804	34.6	12,859	65.4	1,097
For-Profit	203	45	248	55	400
All institutions	10,090	34.2	19,388	65.8	1,707

Fall 2019	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	3,218	35.5	5,845	64.5	196
Private Nonprofit	7,215	36.8	12,373	63.2	1,063
For-Profit	140	43.9	179	56.1	191
All institutions	10,573	36.5	18,397	63.5	1,450

Table 3.4. Faculty at Full Professor Rank, by Gender and Institutional Category and Control, Fall 1995 to 2019 (Institutional Category: Master's and Doctoral Universities)

Fall 1995	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	7,607	18.6	33,393	81.4	317
Private Nonprofit	2,466	20.3	9,711	79.7	326
For-Profit	<u>3</u>		<u>14</u>		<u>20</u>
All institutions	10,076	18.9	43,118	81.1	663

Fall 2005	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	7,914	28.4	19,986	71.6	263
Private Nonprofit	4,057	28.9	10,002	71.1	329
For-Profit	<u>75</u>	26.0	<u>213</u>	74.0	<u>39</u>
All institutions	12,046	28.5	30,201	71.5	631

Fall 2015	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	9,889	35.6	17,865	64.4	276
Private Nonprofit	6,193	36.7	10,664	63.3	412
For-Profit	309	31.6	669	68.4	68
All institutions	16,391	36.0	29,198	64.0	756

Fall 2019	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	11,042	38.3	17,766	61.7	274
Private Nonprofit	6,803	39.5	10,415	60.5	421
For-Profit	261	32.7	536	67.3	62
All institutions	18,106	38.7	28,717	61.3	757

Table 3.5. Faculty at Full Professor Rank, by Gender and Institutional Category and Control, Fall 1995 to 2019 (Institutional Category: Research Universities)

Fall 1995	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	5,876	12.4	41,424	87.6	85
Private Nonprofit	2,551	13.9	15,820	86.1	40
For-Profit	0		0		0
All institutions	8,427	12.8	57,244	87.2	125

Fall 2005	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	11,306	19.0	48,174	81.0	139
Private Nonprofit	4,342	17.9	19,852	82.1	60
For-Profit	0		0		0
All institutions	15,648	18.7	68,026	81.3	199

Fall 2015	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	16,452	25.7	47,561	74.3	157
Private Nonprofit	6,689	23.8	21,370	76.2	65
For-Profit	0		0		0
All institutions	23,141	25.1	68,931	74.9	222

Fall 2019	Faculty at Full Professor Rank				
	Women		Men		
Control	No.	%	No.	%	Inst
Public	19,551	28.8	48,233	71.2	157
Private Nonprofit	7,718	26.7	21,195	73.3	65
For-Profit	0		0		0
All institutions	27,269	28.2	69,428	71.8	222

Table 4.1. Women's Average Salary as a Percent of Men's, by Institutional Category and Control, 1995-96 and 2019-20
(All Colleges and Universities)

1995-96		Professor			Associate Professor			
Control	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %		
Public	55,898	64,635	86.5	45,356	49,126	92.3		
Private Nonprofit	54,965	67,091	81.9	42,842	47,443	90.3		
For-Profit	26,285	34,864	75.4	19,203	24,714	77.7		
All institutions	55,451	65,282	84.9	44,422	48,523	91.5		
		Assistant Professor			All Full-Time Faculty			
	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Inst	Fac
Public	38,399	41,201	93.2	34,265	39,244	87.3	1,592	319,950
Private Nonprofit	36,488	38,817	94.0	27,584	37,687	73.2	1,651	132,645
For-Profit	22,276	24,956	89.3	20,559	24,670	83.3	234	4,244
All institutions	37,670	40,299	93.5	32,239	38,657	83.4	3,477	456,839
		Professor			Associate Professor			
Control	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %		
Public	105,982	124,401	85.2	83,148	89,812	92.6		
Private Nonprofit	121,530	141,901	85.6	85,475	91,857	93.1		
For-Profit	60,832	60,427	100.7	62,736	57,997	108.2		
All institutions	110,787	130,036	85.2	83,816	90,328	92.8		
		Assistant Professor			All Full-Time Faculty			
	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Inst	Fac
Public	71,967	78,733	91.4	76,498	91,154	83.9	1,614	427,780
Private Nonprofit	71,105	77,208	92.1	82,736	102,380	80.8	1,521	195,535
For-Profit	62,636	61,970	101.1	51,080	48,892	104.5	483	15,101
All institutions	71,548	78,101	91.6	77,671	93,808	82.8	3,618	638,416

Table 4.2. Women's Average Salary as a Percent of Men's, by Institutional Category and Control, 1995-96 and 2019-20
(Institutional Category: Associate's Degree Colleges)

1995-96		Professor			Associate Professor				
Control	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %			
Public	46,741	51,951	90.0	40,474	43,265	93.5			
Private Nonprofit	27,007	34,151	79.1	26,241	26,798	97.9			
For-Profit	16,733	23,624	70.8	22,832	19,158	119.2			
All institutions	45,931	51,146	89.8	39,402	42,275	93.2			
		Assistant Professor			All Full-Time Faculty				
	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Inst	Fac	
Public	35,333	36,875	95.8	36,010	38,728	93.0	992	95,395	
Private Nonprofit	27,207	25,141	108.2	21,379	23,957	89.2	165	3,834	
For-Profit	19,704	14,299	137.8	20,526	22,091	92.9	168	2,959	
All institutions	34,529	35,993	95.9	34,999	37,701	92.8	1,325	102,188	
2019-20		Professor			Associate Professor				
Control	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %			
Public	75,602	77,714	97.3	65,724	66,856	98.3			
Private Nonprofit	71,557	61,256	116.8	71,542	67,578	105.9			
For-Profit	38,467	38,015	101.2	56,360	49,346	114.2			
All institutions	75,537	77,534	97.4	65,768	66,850	98.4			
		Assistant Professor			All Full-Time Faculty				
	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Inst	Fac	
Public	58,798	59,873	98.2	66,169	67,586	97.9	952	114,454	
Private Nonprofit	57,197	49,939	114.5	45,223	45,900	98.5	70	1,811	
For-Profit				43,959	40,329	109.0	276	5,460	
All institutions	58,765	59,750	98.4	64,816	66,103	98.1	1,298	121,725	

Table 4.3. Women's Average Salary as a Percent of Men's, by Institutional Category and Control, 1995-96 and 2019-20
(Institutional Category: Baccalaureate Colleges/Small Master's Universities)

1995-96		Professor		Associate Professor				
Control	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %		
Public	48,374	59,553	81.2	42,963	48,474	88.6		
Private Nonprofit	43,957	52,382	83.9	37,664	40,794	92.3		
For-Profit	29,585	38,252	77.3	19,095	30,436	62.7		
All institutions	44,708	53,844	83.0	39,026	43,032	90.7		
		Assistant Professor		All Full-Time Faculty				
	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Inst	Fac
Public	37,258	42,642	87.4	22,739	34,882	65.2	198	23,061
Private Nonprofit	32,900	33,644	97.8	23,606	26,109	90.4	1,183	57,704
For-Profit	24,427	32,446	75.3	21,048	29,883	70.4	53	1,198
All institutions	34,070	36,266	93.9	23,326	28,619	81.5	1,434	81,963
		Professor		Associate Professor				
Control	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %		
Public	91,813	96,198	95.4	74,352	77,046	96.5		
Private Nonprofit	95,505	95,928	99.6	75,298	76,288	98.7		
For-Profit	67,535	66,811	101.1	71,305	72,656	98.1		
All institutions	94,083	95,656	98.4	74,939	76,490	98.0		
		Assistant Professor		All Full-Time Faculty				
	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Inst	Fac
Public	64,973	66,431	97.8	68,915	74,594	92.4	232	28,682
Private Nonprofit	64,103	64,593	99.2	72,530	77,166	94.0	976	60,903
For-Profit	65,903	63,838	103.2	54,367	52,331	103.9	168	5,257
All institutions	64,419	65,158	98.9	70,182	75,337	93.2	1,376	94,842

Table 4.4. Women's Average Salary as a Percent of Men's, by Institutional Category and Control, 1995-96 and 2019-20
(Institutional Category: Master's and Doctoral Universities)

1995-96		Professor			Associate Professor				
Control	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %			
Public	56,531	60,667	93.2	45,406	48,149	94.3			
Private Nonprofit	55,061	63,488	86.7	45,157	49,069	92.0			
For-Profit									
All institutions	56,167	61,311	91.6	45,331	48,418	93.6			
		Assistant Professor			All Full-Time Faculty				
	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Inst	Fac	
Public	37,937	39,762	95.4	34,361	36,254	94.8	317	111,380	
Private Nonprofit	37,462	39,978	93.7	28,555	34,915	81.8	263	40,153	
For-Profit							13	86	
All institutions	37,793	39,823	94.9	32,756	35,901	91.2	593	151,619	
2019-20		Professor			Associate Professor				
Control	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %			
Public	96,073	99,745	96.3	78,469	81,146	96.7			
Private Nonprofit	92,822	99,392	93.4	76,195	79,227	96.2			
For-Profit	58,241	59,362	98.1	57,200	53,787	106.3			
All institutions	94,212	98,751	95.4	77,102	79,821	96.6			
		Assistant Professor			All Full-Time Faculty				
	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Inst	Fac	
Public	68,259	71,636	95.3	73,458	81,187	90.5	246	85,945	
Private Nonprofit	64,500	66,681	96.7	69,932	78,310	89.3	395	65,493	
For-Profit	57,476	61,144	94.0	56,296	55,212	102.0	38	4,334	
All institutions	66,353	69,356	95.7	71,450	79,293	90.1	679	155,772	

Table 4.5. Women's Average Salary as a Percent of Men's, by Institutional Category and Control, 1995-96 and 2019-20
(Institutional Category: Research Universities)

1995-96		Professor			Associate Professor				
Control	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %			
Public	65,273	72,012	90.6	48,942	51,876	94.3			
Private Nonprofit	78,866	87,854	89.8	54,645	58,052	94.1			
For-Profit									
All institutions	68,946	76,155	90.5	50,260	53,219	94.4			
		Assistant Professor			All Full-Time Faculty				
	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Inst	Fac	
Public	41,429	44,439	93.2	35,078	43,877	79.9	85	90,114	
Private Nonprofit	46,603	48,041	97.0	38,129	60,173	63.4	40	30,954	
For-Profit							0	0	
All institutions	42,741	45,496	93.9	35,845	48,067	74.6	125	121,068	
2019-20		Professor			Associate Professor				
Control	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %			
Public	128,170	143,781	89.1	91,939	98,886	93.0			
Private Nonprofit	174,856	193,995	90.1	109,998	118,647	92.7			
For-Profit									
All institutions	140,633	158,101	89.0	96,136	103,646	92.8			
		Assistant Professor			All Full-Time Faculty				
	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Avg. Women	Avg. Men	Women %	Inst	Fac	
Public	79,015	87,801	90.0	86,751	107,961	80.4	184	198,699	
Private Nonprofit	93,737	105,151	89.1	111,041	142,239	78.1	80	67,328	
For-Profit							1	50	
All institutions	82,205	91,675	89.7	92,607	116,925	79.2	265	266,077	