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## The Changing Academy?

## A Portrait of Canada's University Teachers

Despite some notable progress in the past decade towards greater diversity, the Canadian academy remains largely white and male. Census data shows an ongoing underrepresentation of women, First Nations, and visible minority professors, as well as significant earnings and unemployment gaps for many of these groups. Other key findings include:

- Over $30 \%$ of professors were aged 55 and older in 2006
- $5.6 \%$ of professors were over the age of 65
in 2006 , up significantly from $3.8 \%$ in 2001.
- Of all full professors, just over $20 \%$ are women.
- Full-time female faculty members earn $88.8 \%$ of the average salaries of their male counterparts.
- Aboriginal Canadians remain largely absent from the ranks of the professoriate.
- Visible minority university teachers earn well below the average salaries of all
professors and are more likely to experience unemployment.


## Age Distribution of Faculty

Census data show that the overall number of university teachers in Canada increased by $22.5 \%$ between 2001 and 2006, reversing the decline of $5.3 \%$ between 1996 and 2001. Some of this increase is explained by the rise in the number of part-time academic staff. Statistics Canada’s University and College Academic Staff Survey (UCASS), a survey that counts only full-time professors at all universities, showed more moderate growth of $15.4 \%$ over 2001-2006 and a decline of $2.2 \%$ over 1996-2001. The decline in the number of academic staff between 1996-2001 coincided with a sharp reduction in government expenditures on post-secondary education at both the federal and provincial levels.

Figure 1:
Faculty distribution by age, 2001 and 2006


Source: Statistics Canada, 2001 and 2006 Census

Table 1 University Teachers Aged 65+ by Five-Year Cohort, 2006

| Post-65 Age Group | Men | Women |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Aged 65-69 | 1,720 | 515 |
| Aged 70-74 | 410 | 155 |
| Aged 75-79 | 170 | $55^{*}$ |
| Aged 80-84 | 65 | -- |
| Aged 85+ | $35^{*}$ | 0 |

Source: Statistics Canada, 2006 Census

* Small sample, use with caution
-     - Results statistically insignificant

Over the period of 1996-2001, the number of university teachers under the age of 40 declined by $22.5 \%$, well in excess of the overall labour force rate of $5.2 \%$. Conversely, over 2001-2006, the under 40 cohort increased by $31.7 \%$, compared to overall labour force growth of $22.5 \%$.

The reversal in trends has been most pronounced for university teachers under 30 . In the period between 1996 and 2001, there was a $37.2 \%$ decline in the number of professors under 30 , reflecting a period of little hiring. Between 2001 and 2006, however, the number of faculty under 30 jumped by $26.5 \%$.

Table 2 University Faculty by Rank and Gender

|  | 2001 |  | 2006 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| Full Professor | 56.8\% | 15.1\% | 79.4\% | 20.6\% |
| Associate Professor | 68.4\% | 31.6\% | 64.1\% | 35.9\% |
| Assistant Professor | 58.8\% | 41.2\% | 57.5\% | 42.5\% |
| Other | 48.0\% | 52.0\% | 48.6\% | 51.4\% |
| All Ranks Combined | 71.3\% | 28.7\% | 66.9\% | 33.1\% |

Source: Statistics Canada, University and College Academic Staff Survey

Table 3 Female Faculty by Major Discipline

|  | $\mathbf{1 9 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Education | $37.0 \%$ | $44.1 \%$ | $49.9 \%$ |
| Fine Arts | $31.9 \%$ | $36.8 \%$ | $42.0 \%$ |
| Humanities | $30.8 \%$ | $36.0 \%$ | $41.3 \%$ |
| Social Sciences | $25.3 \%$ | $29.6 \%$ | $34.9 \%$ |
| Agriculture and Biological Sciences | $20.8 \%$ | $23.5 \%$ | $27.4 \%$ |
| Engineering and Applied Sciences | $6.9 \%$ | $9.3 \%$ | $12.0 \%$ |
| Health Professions | $29.9 \%$ | $34.9 \%$ | $39.5 \%$ |
| Mathematics and Physical Sciences | $8.7 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ |

Source: Statistics Canada, University and College Academic Staff Survey

Table 4 Distribution of Faculty by Rank and Gender, 2006

|  | Men |  | Women |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% of All Men | Number | \% of All Women |
| Full Professor | 9,765 | $40.8 \%$ | 2,535 | $21.4 \%$ |
| Associate Professor | 7,677 | $32.1 \%$ | 4,305 | $36.3 \%$ |
| Assistant Professor | 5,823 | $24.3 \%$ | 4,311 | $36.3 \%$ |
| Other | 684 | $2.9 \%$ | 723 | $6.1 \%$ |

Source: Statistics Canada, University and College Academic Staff Survey

While the number of younger faculty has risen, the overall professoriate is aging, and many are staying attached to the workplace beyond the age of 65. Over 2001-2006, the total number of university faculty aged 65+ grew by $81.7 \%$. Since 1996, the post-65 population grew by $118.5 \%$. This is largely explained by the elimination of mandatory retirement in most jurisdictions.

## Women Remain Under-Represented and Under-Paid

Statistics Canada's University and College SAcademic Staff Survey (UCASS) shows that between 2001 and 2006, the proportion of women university professors grew from about $29 \%$ to $33.1 \%$. Notably, there has been some improvement in women's representation at the highest academic ranks, rising from $15 \%$ to over $20 \%$ in just five years (see Table 2).

Moreover, women's presence in the academy varies widely across disciplines, from a high $49.9 \%$ in education-related disciplines to a low of just $12 \%$ in engineering and applied sciences disciplines (see Table 3).

Census data also show a modest decline in the earnings gap between men and women working as university teachers. The gap decreased slightly among the mostly full-year and/or full-time academic workforce, from $19.8 \%$ to $18.1 \%$, over the $2000-2005$ period (see Table 5). This gap is largely explained by women's relative under-representation at the most senior and highest paid academic ranks and the fact that women are more likely to have worked part-year or part-time.
Female academics had an unemployment rate of $5.2 \%$ in $2006^{1}$, compared to $3.4 \%$ for their male colleagues (see Table 6). Since 1996, the unemployment rate gap between men and women has narrowed from 3.6 percentage points to 1.8 .

Table 5 Average Earnings of Male and Female University Teachers (Current \$)

|  | 2000 |  |  |  | 2005 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Men | Women | Difference | Men | Women | Difference |  |
| Worked full-year, full-time | $\$ 80,290$ | $\$ 64,409$ | $19.8 \%$ | $\$ 96,635$ | $\$ 79,133$ | $18.1 \%$ |  |
| Worked part-year or part-time | $\$ 47,650$ | $\$ 32,784$ | $31.2 \%$ | $\$ 52,599$ | $*$ | - |  |

[^0]| Table 6 Unemployed University Teachers by Gender |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population | $\mathbf{1 9 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ |  |  |
| University Teachers - Total | 48,090 | 45,645 | 55,880 |  |  |
| \% that are Women | $33.4 \%$ | $35.2 \%$ | $38.7 \%$ |  |  |
| Unemployment Rate of Men | $3.7 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ |  |  |
| Unemployment Rate of Women | $7.3 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ |  |  |

Source: Statistics Canada, 1996, 2001, and 2006 Census

## Aboriginal \& Visible Minority Professors

Aboriginal Canadians remain most seriously under-represented amongst university teachers in Canada. In 2006, only $2.1 \%$ of all university teachers reported having Aboriginal ancestry, compared with $4.3 \%$ of the experienced labour force aged 25 and over.

Visible minority university teachers make up about $17 \%$ of the profession, slightly above that of the overall labour force (see Table 7). There are significant variations amongst different populations, however. Filipinos make up $1.3 \%$ of the workforce, but only $0.2 \%$ of the professoriate. University
teachers who self-identify as Black constitute $1.6 \%$ of all university teachers, while comprising $2.2 \%$ of the overall labour force. By contrast, Arab or West Asian visible minorities make up $2.8 \%$ of university teachers, but just $1.3 \%$ of the overall labour force.

Census data also reveal that visible minority university teachers experience an earnings gap. In 2005, all professors earned an average of about $\$ 77,000$, while visible minority professors earned just under $\$ 69,400$, for an earnings gap of about $10 \%$ (see Table 8). This was slightly lower than the earnings gap of $12 \%$ recorded in 2000.

While all visible minority groups have lower earnings than the average for all

## Table 7 Visible Minority Identification* of Total Labour Force \& University Teachers, 2006 (\% of total)

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Labour Force | University Teachers |
| Not a visible minority | $84.6 \%$ | $83.0 \%$ |
| South Asian | $3.7 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |
| Chinese | $3.9 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ |
| Arab or West Asian | $1.3 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ |
| Black | $2.2 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ |
| Latin American | $1.0 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |
| Japanese | $0.3 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| Korean | $0.4 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Southeast Asian | $0.7 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Filipino | $1.3 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| Other | $0.5 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ |
| Total visible minority | $15.3 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ |

Source: Statistics Canada, 2006 Census
*Visible minority identification categories used here are taken directly from the Census.

| Table 8 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average Employment Income of |  |
| University Professors (Current \$) |  |  |$|$

Source: Statistics Canada, 2006 Census
professors, some groups fare particularly poorly. Latin American professors in Canada earn just under $70 \%$ of the average, and Black professors earn just over threequarters (75.8\%) of the average earnings of all professors.

This earnings gap cannot be explained by differences in job qualifications alone. It is likely the result of institutional practices and salary structures that are discriminatory in effect, as well as overt discrimination in hiring and promotion decisions. In fact, a similar though less pronounced gap exists in the labour market as a whole.

Unemployment is also more pronounced for visible minority professors. Overall, visible minority professors experienced a 6.4\% unemployment rate in 2005, compared to $3.7 \%$ for professors that are not members of a visible minority group.

At 7.6\%, female visible minority professors experienced an even higher rate of unemployment. There is a persistent gap between this group and both women who are not members of a visible minority group and men who are. For women, the difference in unemployment rates between visible minorities and those not in a visible minority are more pronounced relative to the male population.

While a more thorough analysis is difficult because of the small counts of male and female university teachers among several visible minority groups ${ }^{2}$, additional observations can be made for several groups. Latin

American professors, for instance, have the highest unemployment rate - between 13\% and $15 \%$. Black professors have an unemployment rate in of $9.4 \%$. The estimated unemployment rate for Arab/West Asian professors is about $9.2 \%$. Only Chinese professors have unemployment rates approximating those of their non-visible minority colleagues.

## Conclusion

D espite longstanding employment equity policies and practices mandated by federal legislation, the challenge of reducing these inequities remains. Women are still seriously under-represented among tenured professors and within certain disciplines. Both women and visible minorities experience an earnings gap and experience higher unemployment than their white male colleagues. Aboriginal peoples continue to be the most under-represented equityseeking group among the ranks of Canada's university professors.
These employment and pay gaps are explained by practices and patterns of discrimination that limit opportunities for individuals from marginalized groups. These can be intentional, as in the case of overt discrimination in hiring and promotion decisions, such as those that are a product of mentorship among like groups (i.e. white males tending to mentor white males).
More routinely, they are the by-product of university employment and salary structures and procedures which have the effect of discriminating against certain groups. For instance, university salary structures with many progress-through-the-ranks (PTE) steps on the grid have the effect of limiting everyone's ability to progress to the top salary scales. Simply put, the more steps built into a salary scale, the fewer the
number of faculty who will reach the top end of the scale. The steep lifetime compensation curve tends to also disproportionally award those with significant occupational tenure and make it more difficult to achieve equity for traditionally under-represented groups such as visible minority faculty. Women tend to be more disadvantaged by such salary grids, as they are more likely to experience career interruptions related to child-rearing. This slows their progress through the salary grid and results in significantly lower lifetime earnings
compared to their male colleagues.
Institutions and faculty associations therefore need to look more critically at the structures and practices that may be perpetuating inequities. Pay scales with large numbers of increments and segregation by discipline are two areas that merit attention. In addition, given the aging academic workforce in Canada, post-secondary institutions face ongoing issues of renewal. Universities should use this opportunity to make promoting greater equity a central objective as retiring faculty are replaced by new hires.■

## Notes:

1. Data is for the week prior to Census Day (May 16, 2006), so this is not an annualized figure.
2. Specifically, Black women, Filipinos, Latin Americans, Arab/West Asian women, Koreans and Japanese professors.

[^0]:    Source: Statistics Canada, 2006 Census

    * The standard error of average employment income for 2005 female university teachers working part-year or part-time was $\$ 6,492$, with a reported average of $\$ 49,635$, so these results are not statistically reliable. By contrast, data for women from 2000 has a standard error of only \$632, and data for men from 2005 has one of \$1,015.

