

Summary of the Equity Survey for the CPA (2007-2009)

Report presented by Laura Boileau and Christine Daigle.

The survey was sent to 62 departments in all of Canada. 30 departments answered the survey¹. Here are some of the general characteristics of the departments that filled out the survey:

- 15 departments offer a B.A. program only
- 5 departments offer a B.A. program and an M.A. program
- 10 departments offer B.A., M.A. and PhD programs
- 1 francophone department responded

We would like to thank the departments who responded:

University of Alberta – Brandon University – Brock University – Campion College – Cape Breton University – Concordia University – Dalhousie University – University of Guelph – Lakehead University – Laurentian University – University of Lethbridge – McMaster University – Memorial University – Mount Allison University – Mount Saint Vincent University – University of New Brunswick – University of New Brunswick, Saint John – Queen’s University – University of Regina – Ryerson University – Saint Francis Xavier University – University of Saskatchewan – Simon Fraser University – Université de Sudbury – University of Toronto, Mississauga – Trent University – University of Western Ontario – University of Winnipeg – University of Victoria – York University

It seems that many departments were displeased with the task given the timing of the survey at a very busy time of the year, that is, the end of the academic year. However, we wish to remind everyone that collaboration is essential for the committee to reach its goals and by extension to help the CPA fulfill its mandate to pursue equity issues. We are thankful to all of you who took the time to fill out the survey.

Analysis

The data gathered in the survey continues to provide us with interesting information about the progress of equity in the profession. Some of the limitations of this method, however, involve inescapable issues surrounding identification of members of certain equity seeking groups. The problem is more acute for certain groups, such as; visible minorities, persons with disabilities and aboriginal persons. It is difficult to identify

¹ The Department at New Brunswick Saint John is the Department of Humanities and Languages. They have a Philosophy sub-division that consists of two persons, both males (1 full and 1 tenured senior instructor). All of their sessionals are male. We have not incorporated them in this report as any hiring they do is done department-wide which incorporates 3 other disciplines.

individuals belonging to these groups because few individuals self-identify when applying for entrance in a graduate program or for a job. At the same time it can be difficult, and even impossible, on the part of the person receiving applications to determine whether or not an applicant is a member of an equity-seeking group. Using the name of applicants alone to identify them can be misleading, not only for visible minorities and aboriginals but also women. For example, a woman who is a visible minority may have a gender-ambiguous, anglosaxon name, such as Chris Smith. Her name could easily be misread as standing for a white male. This is particularly problematic when gathering data on applications where there are few who are selected for a face-to-face interview. Even when there are interviews, without an invitation to self-declare, a person may not appear to belong to an equity-seeking group, but would culturally identify as such. In the U.S.A. individuals who are applying for a position are systematically asked whether they belong to an equity-seeking group or not; this is not the case in Canada. We can wonder whether such a procedure of self-identification is desirable or helpful. This would raise the issue of whether or not those applicants would feel comfortable disclosing this information, as they may fear that such information would be detrimental to their application.

There are no Aboriginal professors or students at either the Masters level or at the PhD level. There could be Aboriginal persons present in the departments that did not fill out the survey. In addition and in line with what we suggested above, it could be that some Aboriginal persons refuse to identify as such. An Aboriginal person might be such biologically, but not identify culturally for a myriad of reasons. Even if this were the case, we think it is safe to assume that the numbers would still remain very small. It would be worth looking at the numbers of Aboriginal persons who are at the B.A. level, although we would be faced with the same difficulties, and examine whether any of these students intend to pursue graduate work in philosophy. Nevertheless, we must ask why so few Aboriginal persons undertake study in philosophy.

The number of persons of visible minorities is greater at the professorial level than that at the graduate level. On average, in 2008-2009, 5.2% of professors are of a visible minority, with little variation in the distribution across the ranks. At the graduate level for this year, 7.83% of students at the Masters' level and 6.23% of students at the doctoral level make up this group. This means a slight increase from the results we gathered in 2007. Nonetheless, these numbers are extremely low and the improvements are slight.

Persons with disabilities are not well represented at all levels. The percentage is the highest at the level of full professors. We could interpret this as meaning that one can become disabled in the course of one's career and still retain one's job; however, one may not find employment if one is already disabled. It is important to state that it is difficult to identify such individuals. Determining disabilities has its own set of difficulties, especially in the case of 'invisible' impairments. Again, the problem of self-identification is one that could have a bearing on the survey results. In general, there is an ambiguity in the term "person with disability". Is it broad enough to cover visible and invisible as well as physical and mental? Perhaps a useful determining characteristic

would be the level of accommodation needed. It would be worth the Association's time and effort to look into this.

Gender equity is improving. In 2004-2005, 46.9% of assistant professors were women. In 2006-2007 that number had dropped to 38%. In 2008-2009 the number increased once again to 46.58%. Although it seems there was a backlash in 2006-2007, the survey sample for that year was not large enough to determine this. In fact, the numbers indicate a relative consistency in hiring. This percentage is lower among associate professors in 2008-2009 (33.33%) which is an increase from 2004-2005 (28.8%) but a decrease since 2006-2007 (36.9%). The representation of women is lower at the rank of full professors in 2008-2009 (21.21%) but is a significant increase over the 13.3% in 2004-2005 and 16.8% in 2006-2007. We expect that this is a trend that will continue as the women in tenure-track jobs will obtain tenure and move through the ranks.

The tendency is definitely more favorable for hiring women. It seems that departments have made a concerted effort to hire more women and to correct for past inequities. This past year, 21.06% of the job candidates were women resulting in 42.87% of the hires. The average for the past two years shows that 43.28% of doctoral degrees are awarded to women (with 42.8% for the year 2008-2009). While the percentage of female job applicants is at odds with the percentage of female graduates, the number of female hires is consistent with the number of female graduates. In such a quantitative study, we are in an impossible position to explain why the number of female job applicants is so small in comparison to the number of female graduates.

As for admission to the PhD level, the proportions seem to be respected in the number of admissions and registrations. In 2008-2009, 29.9% of the applications at the PhD level were made by women. Of the offers of admission, 28.03% of the offers were made to women. In 2008-2009, the female students registering at the PhD level represent 34.43% of students. These numbers are consistent with the data collected in previous years.

As previously mentioned, there is a lack of reliable data with regards to visible minorities, persons with disabilities and Aboriginal persons. Thus, it is extremely difficult to identify any trends in their representation. However, we do have reliable data pertaining to the representation of women and we are in a good position to say that the numbers seem to remain consistent thus showing a continued awareness of equity issues and desire to address them.

Finally, the research chairs are still mostly attributed to men. In 2008-2009, 9 senior research chairs were awarded only 2 of which were awarded to women. In 2005, we thought it difficult to determine a trend because of the small number of research chairs. However, with the combined results of the 2001-2005, 2005-2007 and the current survey, we can safely say that the vast majority of research chairs are awarded to men and this constitutes a trend.

19² departments said that they had an equity policy that dealt with gender; this policy was in place either at the departmental or at the institutional level. 14 had a similar policy for the other equity-seeking groups. There is a great variability amongst the policies and their objectives vary also. Most (11 of the respondents) state that they encourage all qualified applicants to apply, including equity-seeking groups, but they do not state their hiring procedures. 7 departments state that in the case of equal competency, they will hire an individual from an equity-seeking group. 2 of these respondents state that if their department has less than 40% of a particular group, then they hire from the underrepresented group. Two institutions invite candidates to self-identify in order to benefit from their equity programs. Two universities include “sexual orientation” and of these, one includes “gender identity” in their equity policies.

Finally, to the last question of our survey about the *Hiring Toolkit*, only 5 departments stated that they have consulted the online document. 2 said that they could not find it. We have to consider how to make this tool more accessible.

Conclusion

This survey indicates that departments have made an effort to correct past inequities and that they are conscious of problems related to discrimination. Although efforts are being made there is still a significant under-representation of certain equity-seeking groups, namely visible minorities, persons with disabilities and Aboriginal persons. In relation to these equity-seeking groups, if we take our numbers as more or less accurate, then their situation has not improved very much if at all.

One limitation of this survey is the response rate. Given that not all departments provide us with data pertaining to hiring and graduate students admission and graduation, we have to extrapolate from the data we do receive. This means that the situation might be otherwise than it appears through our analysis. What looks like a situation that is improving with regards to gender might be so only for those equity-conscious departments that do respond to the survey. This means that the general picture could be worse than our data suggests. Thus the low response rate is a continuing worry. We applaud the departments who participated.

Recommendations on Equity

One of our respondents had a question regarding LGBTQ persons and in what category to include them in the survey. If this survey does not encompass sexual or gender orientation as an equity category, it should be noted that the qualitative survey that was conducted over the summer of 2008 addresses sexual and gender orientation and the experiences of LGBTQ persons, among others. As with some other equity categories, there are obvious problems related to self-identification and declaration. However, there might be benefits to including this category in our survey to provide visibility to a group

² One department was aware of a policy, but unable to provide information about it.

that exists but is all too often not considered. The committee should begin to take in consideration issues pertaining specifically to this diverse group.

The question of self-identification is pressing. The practice of self-identification should be encouraged in order to improve the representation of all equity-seeking groups. The climate as to be such that individuals feel comfortable that their identifying in any way will not be detrimental to them and that equity policies, whatever those may be, are taken seriously and acted upon.

Departments have to continue to be proactive in their hiring and admission practices. Some measures that we recommend adopting are: 1- ensuring that at least one member of an equity-seeking group sits on hiring and admissions committees; and 2- ensuring that at least one member of hiring committees has equity training.

Recommendations for the Survey

In the past, we have decided to conduct the survey every two years so as to facilitate the work of chairs who are providing us with the data we need. Although we understand that April is not a good time of the year, there just does not seem to be a better time. April sees the conclusion of the academic year and, in most cases, cycles of hiring and admissions are complete. We thus recommend that the survey continues to be administered every two years.

APPENDIX 1

Question 1: Faculty component

The faculty component of departments in 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 is as follows:

		Total	Women	Men	Persons of Visible Minorities	Persons with Disabilities	Aboriginal Persons
Full Professors	2007-2008	109.5	24.5	85	6	3	0
	2008-2009	115.5	24.5	91	6	3	0
Associate Professors	2007-2008	121	34	87	7	1	0
	2008-2009	126	42	84	7	2	0
Assistant Professors (tenure track)	2007-2008	70	33	37	6	2	0
	2008-2009	62	29.5	32.5	4	1	0
Sessional/ Adjunct/ Limited Term	2007-2008	109	32	77	0	0	0
	2008-2009	90	26	64	0	0	0

Percentages

		Women	Men	Persons of Visible Minorities	Persons with Disabilities	Aboriginal Persons
Full Professors	2007-2008	22.37%	77.63%	5.48%	2.74%	0%
	2008-2009	22.21%	78.78%	5.19%	2.6%	0%
Associate Professors	2007-2008	28.1%	71.9%	5.79%	0.83%	0%
	2008-2009	33.33%	66.67%	5.56%	1.59%	0%
Assistant Professors (tenure track)	2007-2008	47.14%	52.86%	8.57%	2.86%	0%
	2008-2009	47.58%	52.42%	6.45%	1.61%	0%
Sessional/ Adjunct/ Limited Term	2007-2008	29.36%	70.64%	0%	0%	0%
	2008-2009	28.89%	71.11%	0%	0%	0%

APPENDIX 2**Question 2: Graduate studies**

5 departments offer an M.A. program only.

10 departments offer an M.A. and a Ph.D. program.

		Total	Women	Men	Persons of Visible Minorities	Persons with Disabilities	Aboriginal Persons	
Degrees in Progress	M.A.	217	82	135	17	1	0	
	Ph.D.	319	96	223	20	1	0	
Degrees Awarded	M.A.	2007-2008	90	28	62	1	0	0
		2008-2009	81	18	63	4	0	0
	Ph.D.	2007-2008	16	7	9	2	0	0
		2008-2009	21	9	12	4	0	0

Percentages

		Women	Men	Persons of Visible Minorities	Persons with Disabilities	Aboriginal Persons	
Degrees in Progress	M.A.	37.79%	62.21%	7.83%	0.47%	0%	
	Ph.D.	30.09%	69.91%	6.27%	0.31%	0%	
Degrees Awarded	M.A.	2007-2008	31.11%	68.89%	1.11%	0%	0%
		2008-2009	22.22%	77.78%	4.94%	0%	0%
	Ph.D.	2007-2008	43.75%	56.25%	12.5%	0%	0%
		2008-2009	42.86%	57.14%	19.05%	0%	0%

APPENDIX 3

Question 3: Doctoral programs

10 departments offer a doctoral program³.

		Total	Women	Men	Persons of Visible Minorities ⁴	Persons with Disabilities ⁴	Aboriginal Peoples
Applications Received	2007-2008	488	132	356	20	0	0
	2008-2009	468	140	328	21	1	0
Offers Made ⁵	2007-2008	135	51	84	8	0	0
	2008-2009 ⁶	132	37	95	7	0	0
Students Entering the Program	2007-2008 ⁷	43	21	22	7	0	0
	2008-2009 ⁶	61	21	40	3	0	0

Percentages

		Total ⁸	Women	Men	Persons of Visible Minorities	Persons with Disabilities	Aboriginal Peoples
Applications Received	2007-2008	100%	27.05%	72.95%	4.1%	0%	0%
	2008-2009	100%	29.91%	70.09%	4.49%	0.21%	0%
Offers Made	2007-2008	27.66%	37.77%	62.23%	5.93%	0%	0%
	2008-2009	28.21%	28.03%	71.97%	5.30%	0%	0%
Students Entering The Program	2007-2008	8.81%	48.84%	51.16%	16.28%	0%	0%
	2008-2009	13.03%	34.43%	65.57%	4.92%	0%	0%

³ Out of the 10 schools with PhD programs, 8 provided numbers for this question.

⁴ Some of the numbers provided are estimated. Some schools indicated that they did not know the answer, while others simply left this part blank.

⁵ Only 7 departments provided data for this question.

⁶ Alberta and York's numbers are all estimated.

⁷ Only 7 departments provided data for this question.

⁸ This is the total percentage compared to the number of applicants.

APPENDIX 4

Question 4: Hiring

Over the course of the past two years covered by this survey, only 22 departments provided data for this section. We are presuming that no hiring was done in the two years for those departments that did not answer this question. In addition, many departments did not provide data for persons of visible minorities, persons with disabilities and aboriginal persons.

		Total	Women	Men	Persons of Visible Minorities	Persons with Disabilities	Aboriginal Persons
Applications Received	2007-2008 ⁹	718	101 ¹⁰	617	8	0	0
	2008-2009 ¹¹	1434	302 ¹²	1132	61 ¹³	0	0
Long-Listed	2007-2008 ¹⁴	51	19	32	4	0	0
	2008-2009 ¹⁵	89	25 ¹⁶	64	4 ¹⁷	0	0
Short-Listed	2007-2008 ¹⁸	41	19	22	1	0	0
	2008-2009 ¹⁹	46	16	30	2	0	0
Hired	2007-2008 ²⁰	16	8.5	7.5	0	0	0
	2008-2009 ²¹	14	6	8	0	0	0

⁹ 9 departments did not provide data.

¹⁰ Ryerson was unable to provide specific data for this item.

¹¹ Only 10 departments provided data for this question.

¹² Queen's was unable to provide specific data for this item.

¹³ 40 are estimated.

¹⁴ Only 3 departments provided data for this item.

¹⁵ Only 7 departments provided data for this item.

¹⁶ U of T, Mississauga did not provide specific data for this item.

¹⁷ 2 are estimated

¹⁸ Only 8 departments provided data for this item.

¹⁹ Only 9 departments provided data for this item.

²⁰ Only 10 departments provided data for this item.

²¹ Only 10 departments provided data for this item.

Percentages

		Total ²²	Women	Men	Persons of Visible Minorities	Persons with Disabilities	Aboriginal Persons
Applications Received	2007-2008	100%	14.07%	85.93%	1.11%	0%	0%
	2008-2009	100%	21.06%	78.94%	4.25%	0%	0%
Long-Listed	2007-2008	7.10%	37.25%	62.75%	7.84%	0%	0%
	2008-2009	6.21%	28.09%	71.91%	4.49%	0%	0%
Short-Listed	2007-2008	5.71%	46.34%	53.66%	2.44%	0%	0%
	2008-2009	3.21%	34.78%	65.22%	4.38%	0%	0%
Hired	2007-2008	2.23%	53.13%	46.88%	0%	0%	0%
	2008-2009	0.98%	42.86%	57.14%	0%	0%	0%

²² This is the total percentage compared to the number of applicants.

APPENDIX 5

Question 5: Federal chairs

Only 2 departments were awarded CRCs in the past two years.

		Total	Women	Men	Persons of Visible Minorities	Persons with Disabilities	Aboriginal Persons
Junior Chair	2007-2008	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2008-2009	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Chair	2007-2008	1	0	1	0	0	0
	2008-2009	9	2	7	0	0	0

Percentages

		Women	Men	Persons of Visible Minorities	Persons with Disabilities	Aboriginal Persons
Junior Chair	2007-2008	0	0	0	0	0
	2008-2009	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Chair	2007-2008	0	100%	0	0	0
	2008-2009	22.22%	77.78%	0	0	0