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In the fall of 2001, Salk Institute President Richard Murphy asked that a committee be formed to advise him on faculty development at Salk. A committee was formed by the Academic Council with the following charge:

"The President’s Advisory Committee on Faculty Development should consider how the Salk Institute can best recruit and maintain a diverse faculty and promote its well-being and success. The Committee will advise the President and make recommendations to the Academic Council."

An important goal of this committee is to help define a working environment for all faculty members that enables the Institute to maintain and improve its high standards of research. The first issue that the committee examined was the one of gender equity at the Salk. The committee gathered information on the history of faculty appointments and promotions at the Salk over the past 30 years. This report identifies a number of trends regarding faculty appointments and proposes recommendations designed to move Salk toward greater inclusion of women. We note that many of the facts we uncovered are problems that are not unique to the Salk, but are trends that have been observed repeatedly at our sister institutions that have also undergone a self-examination exercise.

**Representation and Hiring of Women Faculty**

The Salk currently has 52 active faculty members. Of these, 7 are women. There are 32 active Professors or Distinguished Professors, of which 5 (15.6%) are women. There is 1 woman (12.5%) among the 8 Associate Professors. At the rank of Assistant Professor, there are currently 11 men and 1 woman (8.3%). The overall percentage of women faculty is 13%. Moreover, an alarming trend has occurred. If one examines our new faculty appointments historically (See Appendix I), it is obvious that we are doing worse
now in recruiting women faculty than in years past, while the number of women who are obtaining PhDs in the life sciences has risen dramatically (to near 50%). For instance, between 1970 and 1980, and 1980 and 1990, The Salk appointed 6 (of 33 total) and 5 (of 28 total) women faculty, respectively, while between 1991 and 2003, only 3 appointees (of 35 total) were women. An even more critical situation emerges when we examined new recruitments (from 2000-2003) (Appendix II). During this period of intensive recruitment, 14 individuals were offered an Assistant Professor position at the Salk. Of the 9 men offered positions, 7 have joined the Salk faculty. In stark contrast, no woman (of 5 offers made) has accepted a position at the Salk. The outcome of these failed recruitments is that the Salk currently has only 1 woman at the rank of Assistant Professor, a number that differs significantly from our peer institutions.

Tenure and Promotion

The analyses of promotion rates did not reveal significant differences between men and women (Appendix I). The committee also assessed time to promotion. At the Salk, as for other academic institutions, the request to accelerate or delay promotion is typically initiated by the candidate under consideration. For new appointments beginning in 1985, the analysis of time to promotion for Assistant Professors showed that women have slightly longer times to promotion than men (6.4 years vs. 5.6 years). The time for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor is longer for women than for men (by 1.7 years; average of 5.3 years for women vs. 3.6 years for men). Notably, 70% of men in the group cited above were promoted ahead of schedule. In contrast, only 1 woman in the Salk's history was promoted to Full Professor in a shorter period of time than those stated in the guidelines for Faculty Appointments and Promotions.

Compensation and Resource Allocation
The Director of Human Resources, the President, and the Chair of the Faculty Development Committee examined salary data for the Salk faculty, and concluded that there are currently no significant differences between the salaries of women and men, if one takes into account years at rank. The committee took note, though, of the fact that women have longer times to promotion to both Associate and Full Professor (averaging 2.5 years longer to reach the rank of Professor from Assistant Professor).

The committee did not have access to data about the allocation of resources and workloads. However, the committee looked at two issues for which objective information about the allocation of institutional resources was available: new faculty start-up packages (Appendix III) and Endowed Chairs (Appendix IV). For new Assistant Professor appointments during the past two years, comparable start-up packages have been offered to all. Informal feedback to the Chair of the Faculty Development Committee from candidates who declined a Salk offer indicated that these candidates thought that the Salk start-up package was "as good or better" than other offers. In contrast, senior women hold no endowed chairs, while 7 male Professors hold an endowed chair.

Recommendations

The following are the major recommendations of the Committee. Members believe that implementation of these recommendations will improve the situation for all faculty at the Salk.

Increase the number of women faculty at The Salk. The Committee recommends greater recruitment and hiring at both junior and senior levels. Specifically,
• The President and Board should seek funds specifically for recruiting and retaining women faculty. Specific emphasis should be placed in raising funds for endowed chairs for women faculty.

• The Faculty should address the flexibility of our hiring practices, especially how to recruit outstanding women scientists (both junior and senior) that might be considered targets of opportunity within and independently of ongoing searches.

• The Faculty should work towards greater representation of women in positions of academic leadership.

• The Institute should take a more active role in helping spouses/partners find a suitable position in the greater San Diego area.

• The VP of Academic Affairs, together with the Director of Human Resources, should work closely with Faculty Search Committees to maintain historical records on all faculty searches, including those that are and are not successful. The records should include the number and gender of applicants, finalists, offers, and acceptances.

• The chair of the Faculty Development Committee will obtain feedback from candidates that have accepted or declined Salk positions and will provide advice to Chairs of Search Committees, the Head of the Appointments Committee, and the President on issues that are considered important to new faculty recruits.

Better publicize Institute policies and establish a mechanism to keep current practices active. The Institute has a number of policies and practices that are designed to aid junior faculty and to integrate them into the Institutional decision-making process. However, the Committee identified several areas that need to be better publicized or established. Specifically, the President and Faculty should:
• Re-invigorate the professional mentoring program for all junior faculty. Specifically, mentors should assist in reviewing grant applications and provide advice on program and career development to junior faculty.

• Develop transparent, well-publicized policies to promote understanding among all faculty on issues such as tenure and promotion, and nominations for external and internal awards. A list of all prizes and awards should be maintained and special effort should be made to nominate women faculty for appropriate awards.

• Develop a process through which the President's office maintains data on resources such as allocation of space, and Institute contributions to ongoing operating expenses of labs and lab renovations. This database should take into account the total research expenditures of individual labs and should be perused on a regular basis for gender-specific inequities.
Appendix I: History of Salk Institute Faculty Appointments

Summary

1970-1980

33 faculty members appointed
16 were subsequently promoted to professor
5 were initially appointed as professor
2 were promoted from assistant to associate and left before subsequent review
1 was promoted from assistant to associate and not promoted to full professor
4 left before being reviewed for promotion from assistant to associate professor
5 were reviewed and not promoted from assistant to associate professor

6 appointees were women. Four were subsequently promoted to professor. One was reviewed and not promoted from associate professor to full professor; one left before being reviewed for promotion from assistant to associate professor.

1981-1990

28 faculty members appointed
11 were subsequently promoted to professor
2 were initially appointed as professor
8 were promoted from assistant to associate and left before subsequent review
2 were promoted from assistant to associate and not promoted to full professor
2 left before being reviewed for promotion from assistant to associate professor
1 was reviewed and not promoted from assistant to associate professor

5 appointees were women. Three were subsequently promoted to professor. One was promoted to associate professor and left. One was reviewed and not promoted from assistant to associate professor.

1991-present

35 faculty members appointed
12 are still in their initial appointment as assistant professor
4 were promoted to full professor
6 were initially appointed as professor
7 were promoted from assistant to associate professor
2 were promoted from assistant to associate and subsequently left
1 was initially appointed as associate professor
2 left before being reviewed for promotion from assistant to associate professor
1 was reviewed and not promoted from assistant to associate professor

3 appointees were women. One was promoted to associate professor. One left before being reviewed for promotion from assistant to associate professor. One is currently assistant professor.
Appendix II: Recent Faculty Recruitments

2000-present

Assistant Professor Offers Made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Laboratory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Reynolds</td>
<td>8.26.99</td>
<td>SNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland Riek</td>
<td>4.3.01</td>
<td>SBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Karseder</td>
<td>10.9.01</td>
<td>RBIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Umen</td>
<td>4.26.02</td>
<td>PBIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Dillin</td>
<td>6.24.02</td>
<td>MCBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Long</td>
<td>5.1.03</td>
<td>PBIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Hetzer</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>MCBL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rejected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Laboratory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prasad Jallepalli</td>
<td>3.19.02</td>
<td>MCBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Blackwell</td>
<td>4.23.02</td>
<td>SBL/CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Wildermuth</td>
<td>4.30.02</td>
<td>PBIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Pasquinelli</td>
<td>5.28.02</td>
<td>MCBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abby Dernburg</td>
<td>9.9.02</td>
<td>RBIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Straight</td>
<td>4.18.03</td>
<td>MCBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahna Skop</td>
<td>6.9.03</td>
<td>MCBL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III: Typical Junior Faculty Start-Up Package

(Last 2 years only)

Our "typical" start-up package includes:

- $200,000 for lab personnel (e.g., postdoctoral fellow, research technician) and supplies

- assistant professor salary and benefits, guaranteed for an initial period of five years, with the expectation that new faculty receive full or partial salary support from outside grants or contracts

- $300-600K for equipment (depending on needs and what is already here)

- housing package, including relocation, allocation for initial rent (or 6 months in Institute condo) and forgivable housing loan
## Appendix IV: Endowed Chairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF CHAIR</th>
<th>RESTRICTIONS</th>
<th>RECIPIENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vi and John Adler Chair for Research on Age Related Neurodegenerative Diseases</td>
<td>Support for age related Neurodegenerative diseases</td>
<td>Rusty Gage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Vincent J. Coates Chair In Molecular Neurobiology</td>
<td>Research related to molecular basis of neuronal activity in the brain and peripheral nervous system</td>
<td>Chuck Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieckhefer Distinguished Research Professorship</td>
<td>Leading molecular biologist</td>
<td>Francis Crick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March of Dimes Chair in Molecular and Developmental Biology</td>
<td>March of Dimes relevant research</td>
<td>Ron Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Frederik Paulsen Chair in Neuroscience</td>
<td>Research in Neuroscience</td>
<td>Jean Rivier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pioneer Fund Developmental Chair</td>
<td>Rotating chair for assistant professor</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick B. Rentschler Developmental Chair</td>
<td>Rotating chair for assistant professor</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salk Institute Council Endowed Chair in Genetics</td>
<td>Full professor in genetics</td>
<td>Steve Heinemann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Helen McLoraine Chair in Molecular Neurobiology</td>
<td>Molecular neurological laboratory - professor</td>
<td>Wylie Vale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Helen McLoraine Developmental Chair in Neurobiology</td>
<td>Molecular neurological lab – associate professor</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>