

Ad-hoc Demographics Committee report

I: OUR CHARGE:

In 2009, Past President Justin London formed the ad-hoc Demographics Committee and asked it to determine the following:

1. What are the overall breakdowns on gender and ethnicity in higher education: gross statistics, in other words, on undergraduate, graduate, and jr. vs. sr. faculty?
2. What are the more relevant breakdowns for grad students and faculty in the humanities?
3. From NASM how many full-time music theorists are there? (N.B. We would supplement this with an estimate for non-NASM schools, as a good number of music theorists at small colleges like Carleton and non-conservatory research schools like the Ivies are not affiliated with NASM).
4. From SMT's own records, what is/are our demographics?

Our committee met in Montreal for the first time in 2009, and met again on November 5, 2010 in Indianapolis and at that point our membership was as follows:

Jennifer Bain
 Evan Jones, chair
 Jan Miyake
 Irna Priore
 Kendra Rutgers
 Alexander Sanchez-Behar
 John Schaffer

Evan Jones had to step down as Chair immediately after the Annual Meeting of the Society because he was elected to the Board as a member-at-large; at that point, Jennifer Bain was appointed chair, and Morwaread Farbood was added to the committee.

II: OUR FINDINGS:

We have found the sources for some of the statistics and some have been compiled in individual tables, but we have not put together a method for storing the data for the purposes of comparison.

1. What are the overall breakdowns on gender and ethnicity in higher education: gross statistics, in other words, on undergraduate, graduate, and jr. vs. sr. faculty?

This data is obtainable for undergraduate and graduate students through IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System), which holds statistics on gender

and ethnicity at the undergraduate and graduate levels (for degree completers only), *but not for faculty*. It is searchable online (<http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/>).

The Council of Graduate Schools' 1999-2009 summary includes this information as well for graduate students, but it would be better to gather statistical information from a single source (IPEDS) across all of these categories to maintain consistency.

Alexander Sanchez-Behar has compiled data on ethnicity for degree completers at the Bachelor, Master and Doctoral levels from 1994 to the present from IPEDS. He has compiled NASM (National Association of Schools of Music) data for doctoral completers in music theory, musicology, and ethnomusicology.

Justin London suggests that using the "broad category" dataset from IPEDS will provide us with statistics on the trends in specific hard sciences, psychology and social sciences, humanities, and arts and music. He suggests as well that since IPEDS also has a category for all students of music, we can look at music majors at different kinds of schools and he has put together a pivot table with this data, broken down by gender.

2. What are the more relevant breakdowns for grad students and faculty in the humanities?

Again, we have the data for graduate students, but not for faculty in the humanities in general, and we ran out of ideas about where to find it.

As Evan Jones indicated in his October 2010 report we have data on university faculty in English and foreign languages from a 2006 MLA survey and a 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, but this does not give us enough complete data for relevant statistical comparisons.

Justin London suggested ERIC (Education Resources Information Center), but it is a digital library of education literature and can't provide consistent datasets for faculty (although some samples may be included in individual journal articles), which is what we need.

3. From NASM how many full-time music theorists are there? (N.B. We would supplement this with an estimate for non-NASM schools, as a good number of music theorists at small colleges like Carleton and non-conservatory research schools like the Ivies are not affiliated with NASM).

The NASM documents (compiled by HEADS) do not provide any breakdown according to area (not even distinguishing between academic and performance areas).

The committee suggests that SMT membership data could be used as a reasonable estimate for the number of active theorists at each rank.

What Justin London recommends is to do this by hand. In email correspondence in

July 2011 he suggested that we “take a sample of various kinds of NASM schools (conservatories, private colleges, private universities, public universities w/schools of music, etc., etc.) and look at theory faculty website by website; log how many faculty (full and part-time) are listed as teaching theory and related courses, and also note the other teaching areas and degrees held by each. Then extrapolate from the sample.

The thing we won't get from SMT membership lists, and need to get, is the extent to which theory (and related courses) are being taught either (a) by non-theorists, and (b) by theorists and/or composers who are not affiliated with SMT.”

I'm not actually sure how a sample would tell us how many full-time music theorists there are in total, and how that information would help us unless we're also recording male/female ratios (which may involve some guessing when names are ambiguous) and whether or not people are visible minorities, which can only be determined by photographs and not all websites include photographs of faculty. It seems a rather sketchy way to proceed.

4. From SMT's own records, what is/are our demographics?

SMT data is incomplete. We have membership data from 2001-2003 and from 2009. The 2010 data was not going to be ready until January 2011 and it still needs to be obtained. The 2001-2003 data provides no breakdown by gender or ethnicity. SMT has no data from 2004-2008. UC Press either did not compile data those years or they lost it. Alex Sanchez-Behar contacted UC Press, past diversity committee chairs, and Vicky Long, but nobody has the data.

III: OUR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COMPLETING THE ORIGINAL CHARGE OF THE COMMITTEE:

- (1) Use IPEDs only to secure gender and diversity data for undergraduate and graduate student populations, understanding that this gives us information only on *completion* rates, but is consistent in what it presents across those two populations;
- (2) use faculty data from SMT, AMS and EMS; if data from other disciplines in higher education is deemed important, gather it from similar professional societies;
- (3) improve the standards of data collection for SMT, both in gathering the data from our members and maintaining it (see section IV below);
- (4) maintain centrally the statistical records and files of (1), (2), and (3) above. To do this the Society should either find a volunteer with a statistics background from within the society or hire someone (perhaps a graduate student with experience in statistics) to develop a system of accessible files using Microsoft Excel, or an actual database using something like Microsoft Access (not available for Mac) to

store and maintain all of these statistics, setting up a model for future gathering and maintenance of demographic information.

IV: RECOMMENDATIONS ON IMPROVING THE STANDARDS OF DATA COLLECTION FOR SMT:

- (1) Ask the Professional Development Committee, the Diversity Committee and the Committee on the Status of Women to review the statistical information gathered by the society and determine if it is adequate and what else would be useful for the Society to track (for example, should there be a “prefer not to answer” or “other” category in the question on gender? should the ethnicity list be expanded? should we ask about tenure status? time to tenure? time to promotion? course loads? etc.);
- (2) gather this information when members join and every year when members renew as part of the membership or membership renewal process to ensure participation;
- (3) make sure that privacy is maintained by not linking the members’ names with the collected demographic data, and stress that the Society is concerned with privacy in the data collection process;
- (4) although this is the final recommendation, it is actually what held the most interest for the committee when we met in person and through email correspondence, and what everyone agreed is probably the most significant factor in attracting a broader and more representative demographic base: gather information on research areas. The website currently asks about research interests but with the stated purpose of finding other people who share your interests, and not everyone will fill out that section voluntarily. The committee recommends that members be asked to “click” on one or more areas that reflect their research interests with a list provided, and they should be asked on whether or not they thought that the Society represented their interests well in the society’s journals and meetings. We did not, however, come to a consensus on what that list should be.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Bain, Chair
Ad-hoc Demographics Committee