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- To develop plans for involving faculty throughout the University in the implementation of initiatives concerned with reducing racism and promoting a more multicultural University
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- To provide leadership for the faculty on issues and tasks related to the above goals
"Diversity matters at Michigan, today more than any day in our history.
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Executive Summary

Overall in 2008, Asians make up 14.2% of the full-time, tenure-track teaching faculty; Blacks make up 5.3% of this group and Hispanics 3.0%.

Since the 1994 Report, progress in increasing minority participation in the faculty has been very different for the different minority groups and for minority groups in the different faculty ranks. Since the 1994 Report, the percentage of Black, full-time, tenure-track teaching faculty has decreased in 8 Schools and Colleges; the percentage Hispanic faculty has decreased in 3 Schools and Colleges and the percentage of Asian faculty has decreased in two Schools and Colleges.

In contrast to the positive trends since 1994 in the number of new hires, overall, for males and females, and, overall, for minority males and females, there has been no significant change in the hiring rates for Blacks and Hispanics.

Since 1994, the trend in the participation levels of Black and Hispanic Assistant Professors has exhibited negative tendencies.

In 1994, the percentage of full-time, tenure-track teaching faculty who were U.S. citizens was 81% for Black faculty, 77% for Hispanic faculty and 44% for Asian faculty. In 2008, the percentage of full-time, tenure-track teaching faculty who were U.S. citizens was 86% for Black faculty, 69% for Hispanic faculty and 43% for Asian faculty.

Overall, Black faculty hires tend to leave the University at a higher rate than all other faculty groups. For assistant professors hired in 1994, 60% of Blacks, 55% of Hispanics, 54% of Asians and 57% of Whites are no longer at the University.

Recommendations

- That the University commit itself to a special effort to increase the participation levels of American Indians and Native Alaskans. The fact that their limited numbers did not allow for their inclusion in this study is an indication of their minimal participation.

- That in view of the long period over which we have worked for their full inclusion and the very minimal progress that has been made, the University commit itself to a special study of the factors limiting the participation of African-Americans within the faculty.
University Human Resources

- That UHR revise the race/ethnicity category for faculty. Options should be less broad, focusing more on distinct ethnic groups. Multiracial faculty should also be able to indicate at least a second race.

- That UHR work with the CMU and the Provost’s office to identify more appropriate measurable indicators of an individual’s cultural background.

Office of the Provost

- That the Provost appoint an ad hoc task force to assess the climate faced by minority faculty and determine the role of climate in any departures. This task force will develop plans for improving the climate for diversity.

- That the office of the Provost collect and share with this committee a complete and detailed record of the hiring pools for all current and future tenure track positions.

- That the office of the Provost annually report to the faculty, either through the CMU or SACUA, on the state of diversity at the university, any action plans or implementation steps, the successes and failures of previously implemented plans and any corrective steps taken or planning to be taken.

Units and Departments

- That each unit or department assess and report on the climate faced by minority faculty. The subsequent report also detail the local demographics of students, faculty and of the discipline generally.

- That each unit or department provide a diversity plan to remedy any deficiencies and cultivate a favorable climate to diversity.

- That each unit or department release an annual diversity report.

- That a faculty body oversee the above steps and regularly report to the CMU and the Dean.
Introduction

This document marks the third such report from the Committee for a Multicultural University since its creation as a committee of the Senate Assembly in 1989. This period of almost twenty years encompasses but a small slice of the time during which the faculty has been concerned with the issues of increasing the participation levels of minority faculty and underrepresented students. Indeed, the faculty’s collective interests and actions regarding these issues crystallized in the late 1960’s and reached a peak of activism in the early 1970’s during the Black Action Movement. While the faculty’s involvement did not remain at that level, the creation of this committee is evidence that those goals have not been forgotten and that continued vigilance, discussion and progressive action are a necessity.

There have been remarkable changes in the language with which we have considered questions of inclusion and social justice in the academy. As we have gone from integration to affirmative action to multiculturalism and currently to diversity, the central concerns and focus of our thought and efforts have not changed – creating access and opportunity in higher education for those elements of our population for whom those avenues have traditionally and systematically been denied, i.e. African-Americans, Native Americans, Hispanic-Americans and Asian-Americans.

University actions toward this goal of increased access and inclusion have not been limited to the faculty. Professor Thomas M. Dunn noted that the “Michigan Mandate,” whose broad scope included bringing access and opportunity to African-Americans, Asian-Americans and Native Americans through various initiatives and monitoring activities, was not a faculty-led effort. Claims of increasing diversity have, in recent years, actually camouflaged its true picture. While minority participation has indeed expanded, that overall growth has masked stagnation or significant declines in the participation of African-American, Native Americans and Hispanic-Americans.

As Professor Dunn also stated, the compelling feature for aggressive faculty involvement in the recruitment and retention of so-called underrepresented minorities “is the length of time we have had to secure their full inclusion and how much still remains to be accomplished.”

---

Summary of Earlier Published Reports

"The Quality of Climate for Minority Faculty...." December 12, 1994

- Recent efforts by the University of Michigan to recruit underrepresented minority faculty should be acknowledged and complimented. During the last decade the number and proportion of such individuals have increased in some units. However, the success in recruitment has not been matched by an equivalent success in retention and promotion.

- The University of Michigan should recommit itself to its established policy of advancing diversity and integration in academic life, and it should look for ways to strengthen this policy.

- To advance beyond the national trend, Colleges and Schools of the University of Michigan should research, deliberate and draft written policies and long-range plans for the recruitment and retention—which pointedly includes attention to climate of life at this university—of faculty of color. National studies analyze hindrances against reaching the goals of such efforts; but it appears that the efforts of the university’s Schools and Colleges are not informed by those studies.


Since the 1994 Report of the Committee for Multicultural University, the proportion of full-time, tenure-track teaching faculty at any rank for any ethnic group has changed very little. Overall Asians still make up 8% and Blacks 4.3% of this group, whereas the proportion of Hispanics has risen from 1.9% to 2.1% and that of native Americans from 0.25% to 0.26%.

It is noteworthy that the major concerns of these reports are still present in the findings of this study. The loss of focus as indicated in the second item of the 1994 report still exists. There appears to have been slippage in the recruitment success without any compensatory success in retention and promotion. Involvement of faculty at the unit and departmental levels are necessary for increasing the minority participation in the faculty. This was the thrust of the third point in the findings of the 1994 report. There is little or no evidence of systematic efforts to implement this recommendation.
Methodology

Data have been provided through University Human Resources (UHR) to SACUA on an annual basis since the late 1980's. Each data set reflects a snapshot of the university community on November 1 of the academic year. Year numbers in this report indicate the end of the academic year. Therefore the 2007-08 academic year will be found on the tables and graphs as 2008, and the data used to derive those tables and graphs come from the November 1, 2007 snapshot.

For each year a number of variables were extracted from the information provided including race, sex, date of birth, date of hire, job, unit, appointment fraction (both per job and overall), date of tenure and primary country of citizenship. For 200708, the data file provided by UHR contained 10,471 records representing 8,252 instructional faculty members. This study was limited to individuals who held a non-zero tenured or tenure-track appointment and whose total appointment was greater than or equal to 80%, leaving 2,986 people. Inasmuch as the major component of this study is the racial/ethnic component of multiculturalism, 10 individuals, who either opted not to select a race or chose “Not Included” were excluded from this study. Also excluded were two subsets due to their limited size: Instructors (4) and “American Indian/Alaskan Native” (14). Lastly, one individual was excluded because the professorial appointment was not in a unit, but in the Provost’s office. This left a study population of 2,957 for the 200708 academic year.

To determine a faculty member’s primary unit, the 2001 and 2008 data included an indicator for the primary appointment. In 1994, the following selection criteria were used for individuals with multiple appointments: (1) appointment fraction and (2) date of tenure.

The 1994 CMU study used visa status as the citizenship indicator; however, this metric was not available for all of the years of this study. In its place, the reported country of primary citizenship was used.

Four self-identified racial/ethnic categories are used in this report. Their designation in the data files and the shortened version used in this report are as follows:

- White, not of Hispanic origin – White
- African American/Black (not of Hispanic origin) – Black
- Asian or Pacific Islander (includes the Indian sub-continent) – Asian
- Hispanic/Latino (Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race)– Hispanic

Limitations

All race and ethnic descriptors used in this study are self-identified. It is unknown to us whether the basis this self-identification is biological or cultural.

The data list five categories for race/ethnicity: “White, not of Hispanic origin”, “Black/African-American”, “Asian/ Pacific Islander”, “Hispanic/Latino” and “American Indian/Alaskan Native.” Individuals can also choose “None” or Not Included.” Three major limitations with these categories hinder any investigation of the multicultural nature of this university.

First, the categories are far too broad. Culturally, “Black” and “African-American” are not synonymous. “Asian” is more of a geographical than a cultural dimension. Potentially included in the Asian category are individuals with ties to the Far East (Japan, China, Korea), Southeast Asia (Indonesia, the
Philippines, Malaysia) and Southern Asia (India, Pakistan) with "Pacific Islanders" also included in this category. The variations in culture, world view and history across this one category probably exceed those across the other three broad categories.

Second, the categories do not permit faculty to indicator more than one race/ethnicity.

Finally, in assessing the multicultural status of the university, an understanding of the cultural background of the faculty is needed. While race and ethnicity are strongly indicative of cultural background, the CMU recognizes the existence of other factors. Unfortunately, measures of such factors are not a part of the UHR database. Thus, the following findings are presented as the best assessment of the multicultural nature of the University of Michigan at this time and this committee will continue to seek new methods of executing its charge.

FINDINGS

Current Participation Levels

Over the past 14 years, minority participation has increased across all racial/ethnic categories. This growth, however, is almost completely centered in the Asian faculty. In 1994, minorities comprised 13.5% of the faculty. By 2008, Asian faculty members alone made up more than 14% of the faculty with the total minority participation reaching almost 23%. As Fig. 1 illustrates, the growth in the Black and Hispanic faculty has been minimal in comparison to that of their Asian colleagues.

When looking at the increase in minority participation in terms of rank, regular growth again appears at all ranks (Fig. 2). The increases in participation at the associate and full professor levels indicate that long term policies of encouraging diversity in hiring and promotion are changing the composition of the upper echelons of the faculty. When disaggregated by race and rank, that trend becomes less clear as shown in Fig. 3.

![Figure 1. Minority faculty as a percentage of all faculty. Shown are data from 1994 to 2008.](image1)

![Figure 2. Aggregate distribution of minorities across faculty ranks in 1994, 2001 and 2008.](image2)
Disaggregating Participation

While minority participation has increased at the university as a whole, it cannot be assumed either that those increases have occurred uniformly for all units or that those increases have resulted in an even distribution across the various schools. In fact they have not.

Minority participation at the unit level ranges from a low of 10.2% in the Law School to a high of 36.5% in the School of Business. Figure 4 illustrates the unit distribution of minority faculty for each category. By disaggregating the distribution additional conspicuous anomalies appear. The School of Education has the highest percentage of Black faculty but yet no Asian faculty. The School of Public Policy has the largest percentage of Hispanic faculty and one of the largest contingents of minority faculty yet has no Black faculty. Business and Engineering have two of the highest percentages of Asian faculty, but have below average levels of Black and Hispanic Faculty.

The challenges of the uneven distribution of minorities across units are compounded by the issue of decreasing participation levels in various units.

Figure 4. Minority participation at the unit level.
Asian Faculty

Asian faculty comprise 14.7% of the faculty, an increase from 7.6% in 1994. In the School of Public Policy, which had no full-time faculty in 1994, Asians now constitute 18.75% of the faculty. The School of Education has no full-time tenure-track Asian faculty. It, along with Art and Design, are the only two units which suffered declines in Asian faculty participation, dropping from 3.5% to 0% and 11.6% to 10.8% respectively. Outside of Public Policy, two other units, Business and Medicine, had increases greater than 10%, rising from 19.1% to 30.8% and 5.4% to 15.6% respectively.

Figure 6. Percent change in Asian faculty participation by unit, 1994-2008.
Hispanic Faculty

Hispanic faculty comprise 3% of the faculty, a 66% increase from 1.8% in 1994. The Law School had no full-time tenure-track Hispanic faculty in 1994 and continues to have none in 2008. The College of Pharmacy also saw no growth in the participation level of Hispanic faculty, remaining at 10%. The School of Art and Design no longer has any full-time tenure-track Hispanic faculty. However only it, along with Natural Resources and the Flint Campus, suffered declines in Hispanic faculty participation dropping from 3.8% to 0%, 3.2% to 2.9% and 2.6% to 2.5% respectively.

Figure 7. Percent change in Hispanic faculty participation by unit, 1994-2008.
Black Faculty

Black faculty comprise 5.1% of the faculty, an increase from 4.1% in 1994. While having one of the largest rates of minority participation, the School of Public Policy has no full-time tenure-track Black faculty. Kinesiology and Nursing have suffered the largest declines in Black faculty participation dropping from 13.3% to 5.6% and 11.1% to 5.6%, respectively. The largest increases were seen in Architecture and Law rising from 8.6% to 13.9% and 2.4% to 8.2% respectively. Overall, however, the increases in unit participation levels were not nearly as robust as those of the Hispanic and Asian faculty.

Figure 8. Percent change in Black faculty participation by unit, 1994-2008.
Reinvesting in Diversity

The 1994 CMU report recommended that “The University of Michigan should recommit itself to its policy of advancing diversity and integration in academic life, and it should look for ways to strengthen this policy.” While the previous sections of this report demonstrate that progress has been made, they also show that progress has been uneven. In promoting a diverse and multicultural faculty, the university has two principal tools — retention and hiring.

Retention and Promotion

While retention can be empirically measured, the validity of any interpretation of those measures is generally dubious. Efforts to achieve tenure or promotion usually take years to mature. Over that time, any number of factors can impact a faculty member’s desire and ability to remain at the university, from the climate for diversity to a new dean or chair (and the accompanying change in focus and priorities) to family obligations to outside opportunities. Circumstances evolve as do a person’s career goals. While some records exist as to why faculty members have left, they are both incomplete and unreliable. For example, an assistant professor who is notified after his three year review that he will not be able to meet the standards to achieve tenure would most likely either list no reason or something such as “pursuing other professional opportunities.” Consequently, it is very difficult to categorize, and therefore, summarize the reasons underlying faculty departures. The data upon which this study is based can, however, indicate if the different minority groups are retained and promoted at similar rates.

Table 1 charts the 2008 rank or status of full-time assistant professors in 1994. Across all groups, the percent of faculty still remaining at the university is very similar. While minor variations exist in the distribution among faculty ranks, the higher percentage in the advancement of White and Asian assistant professors to full professor is noteworthy. A Black or Hispanic assistant professor in 1994 is almost 50% less likely to reach full professor in 2008 than an Asian colleague.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1994 Assistant Professors</th>
<th>2008 Position</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Other Position at U-M</td>
<td>No longer at U-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. 2008 rank or status of the 1994 full-time assistant professors
Hiring

As illustrated in Figure 9, the growth of the different minorities in the assistant professorial rank has been uneven and disparate. For Blacks and Hispanics, the level of participation has fluctuated with little discernable gains over the 14 years of this study (Fig. 9). Meanwhile, the percentage of Asian assistant professors has grown dramatically. Tenure-track hires from 1994 to 2008 echo the trend in the assistant professor population (Fig. 10). Looking at numbers of hires, the number of Black faculty hired per year averaged about 8 with no overall increase between 1994 and 2008. The same can be said for Hispanic faculty except that statistically, the number of Hispanic faculty hired each year is declining significantly. Consistent with all previous findings, the hiring class for Asian faculty has grown strikingly, quadrupling between 1994 and 2008.

The disproportionate increases in the hiring of Asian faculty are not mirrored by the numbers of earned PhD's across the country. According to data released by the National Science Foundation as part of the S, as late as 2006, the numbers of Blacks, Hispanics and Asians being awarded doctorate degrees were growing at similar rates. In fact, more Black students garnered doctorates in 2006 than did Asians or Hispanics. However, the NSF survey pool is different from the University's potential hiring pool in one very important aspect - when classified by race, survey respondents are restricted to U.S. citizens.

Figure 9. Percent change in minority assistant professors as a percentage of all assistant professors, 1994-2008.

Figure 10. Tenure-track new hires, 1994-2008.

Figure 11. Number of doctorates awarded to U.S. citizens by race, 1986-2006. Data from Survey of Earned Doctorates, 2006.
Citizenship

The CMU believes that in the discussion of diversity, U.S. citizenship should be viewed in addition to race and ethnicity. The NSF makes that distinction in its reports. More importantly, as the University seeks to increase diversity and multiculturalism, it seeks not to simply increase numbers, but to expand the breadth of experience, a dimension to which our race and ethnicity categories fail to speak.

Most importantly, for American students especially, the University should strive to present them with an educational environment that can speak of the struggles, the triumphs and tragedies, and the perceptions and realities of growing up against a backdrop of discrimination, oppression and social neglect. In one sense, the addition of such individuals to the faculty is an act of social justice; but more significantly, their experiences allow us to create a foundation based on social history upon which we may grow as a society and through which the University can serve the common good. As observed by Professor Richard A. Tapia in his article, “True Diversity Does Not Come From Abroad”, published in the September 28, 2007 issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education,

“...foreign students and faculty members have not experienced anything like the hardships that members of domestic-minority groups have faced year after year. They were not viewed as racially or ethnically different in their countries of origin and, from their formative years on, made to feel that they were second-class citizens who did not belong in higher education or in leadership positions.”

Richard A. Tapia

While it is not clear why citizenship was studied in previous CMU reports, this committee felt it was certainly necessary to investigate it here. An important difference between the present and 1994 report, though, is that the present report uses “country of primary residency” to define citizenship whereas in the 1994 report citizenship was based upon “visa status.” Thus, the absolute numbers are somewhat different between the two reports.

The current report shows that since 1994 there has been a relatively constant decrease in the percentage of White, Asian and Hispanic faculty who are citizens. In contrast, the percentage of Blacks who are U.S. citizens has increased during this period. For Asian and Hispanic faculty, the decline in citizenship has been particularly sharp.

It is noteworthy that at the present time, there are more non-citizens than citizen among Asian faculty. This raises the question of whether Asian-Americans are adequately represented within the faculty. In a 2007 report entitled “A National Analyses of Minorities in Science and Engineering Faculties at Research Universities,” Professor Donna J. Nelson, comparing the citizenship of faculty in chemical engineering, suggested that Asian-Americans might be underrepresented in a field
in which Asians are overrepresented. As she states in that report, “Our own surveys of national origin at the top 50 department faculties in chemistry (FY2003) and in chemical engineering (FY2002), which included data disaggregation by national origin, revealed that 63% and 72%, respectively, of Asian faculty received their B.S. degrees overseas. When only Asian-Americans who obtained their B.S. degrees in the U.S. were considered, their representations among all faculty were much closer to that in the general U.S. population. When their representations among assistant professors were compared to those of Asian Americans among Ph.D. recipients in chemistry and in chemical engineering, Asian Americans were underrepresented slightly in both disciplines.”

Similar situations might also occur in many other disciplines, but the detailed data necessary for such an analysis are not yet available.

As mentioned earlier, the CMU seeks to discover a better indicator for a faculty member's cultural background. Combining citizenship and race was one possibility under discussion. It was realized, though, that this too is an imperfect, and potentially misleading, indicator of cultural diversity. While the CMU believes information on one's country(s) of birth and adolescence could have an impact on the impact a faculty member has on the diversity of this campus, the data currently available to the committee are not adequate for this purpose.

Figure 12. U.S. citizenship of tenure-track faculty by ethnic/racial category -1994-2008

---

Recommendations

The Committee for a Multicultural University recognizes that the University of Michigan has improved the diversity of its full-time, tenure-track faculty since our last report in 1994-95. It is also noteworthy, though, that this growth has been uneven across both races and academic units. One conspicuous example of under-representation is the small number of American Indian faculty. With only 14 individuals holding a full-time, tenure-track position in 2008, this group could not be included in this study while still providing a semblance of anonymity. In comparison to the state of Michigan as a whole, American Indian/Alaskan Native faculty are vastly under-represented, comprising only .5% of the study-relevant faculty, while according to the 2000 census, encompassing upwards of 1.25% of the state’s population.

To increase the diversity of the faculty and enrich the multicultural environment of the university, the Committee for a Multicultural University proposes the following action plan:

- That the University commit itself to a special effort to increase the participation levels of American Indians and Native Alaskans. The fact that their limited numbers did not allow for their inclusion in this study is an indication of their minimal participation.

- That in view of the long period over which we have worked for their full inclusion and the very minimal progress that has been made, the University commit itself to a special study of the factors limiting the participation of African-Americans within the faculty.

University Human Resources

- That UHR revise the race/ethnicity category for faculty. Options should be less broad, focusing more on distinct ethnic groups. Multiracial faculty should also be able to indicate at least a second race.

- That UHR work with the CMU and the Provost’s office to identify more appropriate measurable indicators of an individual’s cultural background.

Office of the Provost

- That the Provost appoint an ad hoc task force to assess the climate faced by minority faculty and determine the role of climate in any departures. This task force will develop plans for improving the climate for diversity.

- That the office of the Provost collect and share with this committee a complete and detailed record of the hiring pools for all current and future tenure track positions.

- That the office of the Provost annually report to the faculty, either through the CMU or SACUA, on the state of diversity at the university, any action plans or implementation steps, the successes and failures of previously implemented plans and any corrective steps taken or planning to be taken.
Units and Departments

- That each unit or department assess and report on the climate faced by minority faculty. The report should also detail the local demographics of students, faculty and of the discipline globally.

- That each unit or department provide a diversity plan to remedy any deficiencies and cultivate a favorable climate to diversity.

- That each unit or department release an annual diversity report.

- That a faculty body oversee the above steps and regularly report to the CMU and the Dean.
APPENDIX
Average Age

Overall, the age of the faculty has increased since 1994. This holds true across all ranks and for every race except Hispanics. The mean age of White Male professors has significantly increased across all ranks. At the Assistant Professor level, the mean age of Asians, both men and women, increased significantly, the only subgroup at the level to show such a change beside White males.

Table 1. Mean Age of the Faculty by Rank, Race and Sex in 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.32</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>40.27</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>294</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.42</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>39.92</td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.26</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>37.56</td>
<td>5.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.36</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>38.33</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.19</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>39.70</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>464</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>48.15</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>773</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>1383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.93</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>49.93</td>
<td>1.383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bolded figures indicate an increase from 1994 to 2008 at p<0.05
Figure 1. Mean Age of the Faculty by Rank, 1994 - 2008.

Since 1994, the mean age of the faculty has increased at all ranks. The rising average age of Assistant Professors seems to indicate that the University is hiring faculty into the tenure track later in life.

Figure 2. Mean Age of the Faculty by Rank and Sex, 1994 - 2008.

Since 1994, the mean age of the faculty has increased for men across all ranks. In addition, female Full Professors have also seen a significant increase in their mean age.

Figure 3. Mean Age of the Faculty by Race, 1994 - 2008.

Since 1994, the mean age of the faculty has increased in all races except for the Asian faculty. In fact, their average age has decreased slightly over that time period.
Average University Experience

Overall, the experience of the faculty at the University of Michigan has remained approximately the same since 1994. The mean for both Assistant and Full Professors has decreased slightly while the mean for Associates has increased slightly. While significant change is rare, Hispanics at both the Assistant and Associate Professor levels have on average been at the University significantly longer in 2008 than in 1994.

Table 2. Mean University Experience of the Faculty by Rank, Race and Sex in 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>12.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>8.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>8.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>9.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>11.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>20.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>773</td>
<td></td>
<td>802</td>
<td>1,383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bolded figures indicate an increase from 1994 to 2008 at p>0.05
Figure 4. Mean Experience of the Faculty by Rank, 1994 - 2008.

Since 1994, the mean university experience of the faculty has increased as a whole. Most interesting is the increase for Associate Professors coupled with the decrease in Full Professors.

Figure 5. Mean Experience of the Faculty by Rank and Sex, 1994 - 2008.

When looking at rank and sex, the average university experience has changed very little since 1994. The largest change was for male Associate Professors with an increase of .63 years.

Figure 6. Mean Experience of the Faculty by Race, 1994 - 2008.

Since 1994, the mean experience of the faculty has increased in all races except for the Asian faculty. For both the Black and Hispanic faculty, those increases are statistically significant.