

WOMEN'S NONPROFIT LEADERSHIP INITIATIVE

GENDER DIVERSITY ON PHILADELPHIA'S EDS AND MEDS BOARDS: AN UPDATE, March 2021.

Some regional nonprofit higher education and healthcare institutions (eds and meds) have improved the representation of women on their governing boards of trustees since a comprehensive fall 2019 report on *The Gender Gap in Nonprofit Boardrooms* by Women's Nonprofit Leadership Initiative (WNLI) and La Salle University's Nonprofit Center. However, without a concerted effort to change the population of new board members, a significant number of these eds and meds will continue to fall below a generally-accepted minimum goal of 30% women trustees and remain many years away from reaching parity, as shown in this brief update provided by WNLI. The situation is even more dire for reaching real racial/ethnic diversity, particularly for women of color.

This WNLI update focuses on the higher education and health systems that fell below a minimum goal of 30% women board members in the 2019 report. The earlier report found that 14 eds and 13 meds were governed by trustee boards that did not reach a minimum standard of 30% representation by women, a benchmark used by prominent national organizations and the Pennsylvania House of Representative when it passed a resolution urging both for-profit and nonprofit boards to reach a 30% minimum by 2020.

www.phillymag.com/business/2017/05/02/pennsylvania-house-resolution-to-boost-number-of-women-on-boards/)

The encouraging news is that there has been some progress since the 2019 report and some conscious efforts toward board diversity. Admittedly, only two of the higher eds whose boards fell below the 30% mark in 2019 have actually met the benchmark of 30%, and two showed a decrease in women's representation. But the trend is unquestionably moving in the right direction for nine of the additional 11 educational institutions that were in the below 30% category. The 14th university is not counted because, as a result of the merger of Philadelphia University and Thomas Jefferson University, the governing board is now the Jefferson board. The Jefferson and the University of Pennsylvania boards are actually governing boards in both the eds and meds category, with their health systems governed by the university boards. Jefferson has achieved a significant increase in gender diversity and has also chosen a woman as its next board chair.

Among the meds, four institutions have increased the percentage of women, with two at 30% or above. One showed no change and two showed a decrease in gender diversity. Five of the medical institutions included in the 2019 report are no longer separately listed, since they are now governed by the boards of institutions with which they have merged or that control them, like Thomas Jefferson University and University of Pennsylvania. Another institution, Holy

Redeemer, is not listed because its website provides no board information, and, since we used the websites to get the most current information (as of February 15, 2021), we left it out of the count.

Below are the lists of governing boards that had fewer than 30% women trustees in the 2019 analysis, showing how women’s representation changed from 2019 to 2021.

Eds	Percent Women	
<u>Percent Women Trustees Increased</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2021</u>
Ursinus College	29.6%	37.5%
University of Pennsylvania	28.6	30.3
Drexel University	23.5	25.4
Villanova University	20.0	23.5
St. Joseph’s University	19.4	27.3
Thomas Jefferson University	17.9	28.5
Temple University	17.6	22.2
Widener University	16.7	21.7
Phila College of Osteopathic Med	14.3	16.7
Wilmington University	11.8	13.3
Eastern University	8.3	17.0
<u>Percent Women Unchanged or Declined</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2021</u>
University of the Sciences	28.6%	25.0%
LaSalle University	23.7	18.9

Meds	Percent Women	
<u>Percent Women Trustees Increased</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2021</u>
Bancroft Neurohealth	29.4%	35.3%
Virtua W Jersey Health Syst	17.6	25.0
Albert Einstein Healthcare	14.8	16.6
Inspira Health Network	14.3	30.7
<u>Percent Women Unchanged or Declined</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2021</u>
Children’s Hospital of Phila	23.5%	22.0%
Chester County Hospital	23.1	23.1
Cooper University Health System	22.7	20.0

Racial diversity challenges

The 2019 report also drew attention to the gap in racial diversity on the top 50 governing boards and the particular underrepresentation of women of color. In the Higher Education sector, men of color occupied 8.3% of seats while women of color held only 5.1% of seats. In the Healthcare sector men of color comprised 7.2% of trustees and women of color held only 5.7% of seats.

A count of the racial composition of just those boards that fell below 30% percent women shows that in 2021, the membership on both eds and meds boards continues to be dominated by white men (64% of higher education boards and 66.4% of health boards). In fact, in this group of twenty institutions, the percentage of men of color is slightly higher than our prior figures for all 50, but the percentage of women of color is lower. These proportions signal that more attention must be paid to recruiting racially diverse women and men candidates for the leadership of these all-important regional institutions.

Higher Ed Board Members by Race and Sex

	<u>2021</u>
Women of Color	4.6%
Men of Color	11.5%
White Women	19.8%
White Men	64.0%

Healthcare: Board Members by Race and Sex

	<u>2021</u>
Women of Color	4.8%
Men of Color	8.8%
White Women	20.0%
White Men	66.4%

Three things to keep in mind in thinking about board diversity going forward.

1. Comparing the health sector to the higher education sector, it is worth noting the significant differences in the size of governing boards in the two sectors. Higher eds typically have much larger boards than do health care institutions, many of which have separate foundation/fundraising boards. These larger ed boards therefore need to recruit greater numbers of women to reach and exceed the 30% threshold.
2. Mergers and acquisitions in both healthcare and education mean the larger institution generally puts some board members from the smaller institution on the remaining governing board, but the number of board members that participate in governing the two separate institutions is reduced. That means fewer opportunities for women and

people of color to serve, though, by taking some women and people of color from the smaller institution, the surviving board may become more diverse.

3. Though there has been an improvement in the number of eds and meds listing the board members on their websites, great variation continues to exist in the amount of information in those lists, presenting challenges for determining board composition. The less information provided, the harder it is to judge its degree of diversity. Not only should every one of these institutions list their boards on their websites, but in the interest of transparency and the kind of disclosure now being demanded by many voices in the for-profit corporate sector, these nonprofit eds and meds should make it easy for their stakeholders to follow their progress towards achieving true diversity by publishing full names of board members, photographs, some biographical information, and ideally report by self-identified characteristics including gender, race/ethnicity, and LGBTQ+ .