



COMMISSION<sub>ON</sub>  
DIVERSITY<sub>AND</sub>  
INCLUSION

# Gender Equity Report

Submitted to:  
Chancellor Mark S. Wrighton  
Provost Holden Thorp

---

June 26, 2017

# Recommendations for Promoting Gender Equity

June 26, 2017



Last year the Chancellor and Provost charged the Commission on Diversity & Inclusion with making recommendations to implement a twelve-point action plan designed to make Washington University in St. Louis a more diverse and inclusive community. The Commission in turn requested the Sex and Gender Equity working group explore and consider how to best implement action item number 2: “The university will commit increased resources to ensure that we recruit, hire, and support diverse faculty through a variety of initiatives...” and action item number 3: “Deans, leaders, and managers will review and assess hiring, promotion, and retention practices for the purpose of promoting greater staff diversity and inclusion...” In consultation with this working group, the Commission on Diversity & Inclusion makes the following recommendations.

## BACKGROUND

Concerns about gender equity in the academy are longstanding and have been substantiated in the literature across multiple disciplines. Several studies have documented gender bias in the classroom with students being more likely to give women lower ratings and to describe them in more negative terms on course evaluations, to challenge their authority and competency-- particularly if they are women of color (gendered racism) (MacNell, Driscoll, & Hunt, 2014; Pittman, 2010; Stark, Ottoboni, & Boring, 2016; Wagner, Rieger, & Voorvelt, 2016). This gender bias also negatively impacts perceptions of scholarship. In one study, involving the evaluation of identical conference abstracts the use of a male name generated higher ratings of scientific quality (Knobloch-Westerwick, Glynn, & Huges, 2013). Gender bias has been noted in grant funding, in collaborative research between men and women (Guo, 2015; van der Lee & Ellemers, 2015). A gender citation gap has been found indicating that women authors

are cited less often, and men are more likely than women to cite their own work (King, Correl, Jacquet, Bergstrom, & West, 2015; Knobloch-Westerwick & Glynn, 2013; Maliniak, Powers, & Walter, 2013). Savonick and Davidson (2016), authors of “Gender Bias in the Academe: An annotated bibliography of important recent studies” summarized key findings by noting, “...changing only the gender identification of the person being judged radically and consistently alters the way others evaluate the quality of that person's work. Work by people assumed to be men—as students, as colleagues, as authors, as experts—is consistently judged to be superior to that by people assumed to be women—even when the only difference is the author's gender-specific name.”

**Part I-Faculty.** Issues of gender equity at Washington University in St. Louis have been addressed through various committees, task forces, interest groups and grant proposals over the last couple of decades at both campuses. At the Medical Campus the Academic

Women's Network (AWN) was formed in 1990 as a voluntary faculty organization to promote professional interactions, career development and to allow for networking and mentoring of women in medicine and science. Subsequently in 1995 the Association of Women Faculty (AWF) was established on the Danforth Campus to promote professional and social interactions among women faculty members and to advocate for women faculty members' interests. Both of these special interest groups for women faculty have had significant impact on the environment for women faculty. These groups have advocated for an improved work climate and culture to advance the careers of women faculty. Advocacy around issues such as timely promotion, pay equity, endowed professorships, leadership appointments, enhanced dependent care, flexibility in career paths and improved benefits for part-time employees has led to impactful changes in policy and practice. Expanded day care and gender pay equity studies would not have transpired without the

years –long advocacy efforts of these women’s groups. The Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA) at the School of Medicine (WUSM) was established in large part as a result of AWN’s advocacy.

After an associate dean for faculty affairs (ADFA) was appointed, it was decided that the ADFA would lead two standing committees on faculty diversity, one of which is the Gender Equity Committee (GEC.) The GEC and ADFA have been responsible for advocacy and consensus building around several initiatives important to women’s career success and satisfaction through the years, including being the catalyst for the

2005 amendment to the University’s Tenure Document allowing for pauses of the tenure probationary period for life’s exigencies. Additionally they have advocated for parity in endowed professorships and other leadership positions, equity in compensation and benefits, enhanced dependent care options and provided leadership in grant writing around women faculty advancement. The ADFA was the PI & co-PI on two University proposals for the NSF ADVANCE Institutional Transformation Award which is aimed at increasing the participation and advancement of women in academic science and engineering careers.

Other committees and task forces through the years have focused on issues of equity and advancement for women faculty. In 2008 following contentious events around the loss of Dean Mary Sansalone and the awarding of an Honorary Doctorate to Phyllis Schlafly, Chancellor Wrighton asked Diana Gray and Gerhild Williams to establish and co-chair an “Advisory Committee on Women Faculty.” The committee had representatives from all Schools, and met several times through the fall semester of 2008 to study issues and make recommendations for the allocation of new resources to improve the climate at the University for women faculty.

---

Recommendations summarized in a final report dated January 2009 included the following:

- To establish the Office of Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity and recruitment of a leader to direct efforts focused on improving the climate for women and underrepresented minority faculty and increasing faculty diversity at all levels at the University. (established with Adrienne Davis in said role for past six years)
- To establish a Faculty Ombuds Office to provide informed and confidential counsel to faculty members and to advocate, when appropriate, for individual faculty rights. (established at both campuses for past several years)
- To utilize diversity funds provided by the Chancellor for the development of specific programs to promote the retention, advancement and professional development of women faculty at all levels. Examples of such programs included:
  - Temporary (2-3 year) Chairs (\$45-50K) for women faculty at assistant or associate professor rank to allow them to advance their careers through more focused effort with the assistance of a post-doc, graduate student or fellow of their choosing. The women faculty would also participate in chair/ leadership training opportunities and leadership mentoring opportunities would be provided to their graduate students or postdoctoral fellows.

- A small grants program (~\$5K) for junior women faculty (assistant professors) to support career development such as travel to meetings, additional childcare during such travel, bridge funding to those balancing family and work responsibilities during the preparation of grant applications.
- Sponsoring/hosting Women & Diversity Conferences at the University.

These final recommendations have not been completely implemented in exactly the manner outlined above, but the Provost’s Office has sponsored small Diversity & Inclusion grants for the past several years which have enabled innovative faculty initiatives to be funded for short term projects.

Other notable advancements in gender equity that have transpired as a result of continuous advocacy efforts of AWF, AWN and other women leaders include:

- Women being nearly 50% of the membership of the University Council (17 or 33). Of the academic members of the Council (tenured faculty appointments), 8 are women and 8 are men.
- For the first time in our University’s history three of the seven deans on the Danforth campus are women: Dr. Mary McKay in the Brown School of Social Work, Dr. Barbara Schaal in Arts & Sciences, and Dr. Nancy Staudt, JD in the Law School.

However, some schools have never had a woman dean, and none of the executive vice chancellors are women.

An important recent initiative was developed through the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement and Institutional Diversity to support efforts to increase women in leadership roles at the University and in the academy at large--the Women Faculty Leadership Institute. This is a 5 day training program that brings together a cohort of women leaders across disciplines from both the Danforth and Medical campuses to provide them with access to local and national experts to build their capacity for leadership and expand their professional network. This training program has received excellent evaluations and participants have credited it for contributing to subsequent career advancements in leadership roles. The second cohort launched this spring (2017) with another outstanding group of women faculty. In addition to the 5-day training, participants have been reunited and at times joined by other women leaders across campus for opportunities to engage in social networking and to attend subsequent leadership-focused programming. This is an investment in women faculty and their career advancement that needs to be maintained.

There is also recognition by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement and Institutional Diversity that both men and women who are new to leadership roles (department chairs and associate deans) are in need of training to be most effective in these important institutional positions. In the 2017-2018 academic year a new 5 day training will be launched for faculty who have been recently appointed to these positions. An aspect of this training will focus on gender equity and

diversity to expand the institutional impact of these efforts on improving the climate on campus for women and underrepresented minorities.

While the climate for women faculty at the University has clearly improved over the past 20 years, there is still progress to be made. In the 2015 Faculty Work Life Survey of Danforth faculty women had responses that were worse than men on 39 indicators and better on only 4. Women faculty were less satisfied being a faculty member, with work life balance, start-up funds, resources for administrative and committee work, teaching responsibilities, time available for scholarship, and more work related stress. They were less likely to feel that tenure criteria were clearly communicated and more likely to leave the University within the next 3 years. Women were more likely to feel excluded from informal networks, to believe they have to work harder to be perceived as a scholar, and 47% did not feel that they have adequate mentoring. They feel less comfortable than men raising personal/family obligations or gender bias issues. They are less likely to see the environment as welcoming for women or minority faculty and reported experiencing substantially higher rates of bias--by leadership (yes=58%), by colleagues (yes=57%), and students (yes=49%).

The results for School of Medicine women faculty on the 2015 survey revealed that women were equally as satisfied as men (4.0 on a 5-point scale) with their overall role as a faculty member and with work-life balance. However, there were 11 items across the three faculty tracks where women responded significantly more negatively about their work environment than did men. These included items such as feeling excluded from informal networks, having to work harder to

be perceived as a scholar, and feeling the environment is not welcoming to women or minority faculty members. Like the women faculty on the Danforth Campus, School of Medicine women faculty reported very high rates of perceptions of bias by leadership (51-62% depending upon faculty track), by colleagues (34-50%) and students (14-23%.) These were all statistically significantly higher than the male faculty respondents. Less than half of the women on the Clinician Track feel they have received adequate mentoring compared to significantly higher rates for male faculty respondents on all faculty tracks. Another area in which a statistically significant difference was found for women faculty compared to men was in leadership roles. Whereas 40% of male faculty on the Investigator Track had served in a leadership role in the previous 5 years, only 24% of women had done so, yet on both the Clinician and Investigator Tracks women and men responded as being equally willing to serve in leadership roles.

Of tenured and tenure-track faculty, only 32% on the Danforth Campus are women, only 26% of full professors are women and the number of associate (38%) and assistant (40%) female professors has declined slightly in the last five years. At the School of Medicine women comprise 45% of the Clinician Track faculty and 23% of the Investigator Track (tenure track) faculty. These are the two primary academic faculty tracks for the School where just 19% of the full professors, 14% of endowed professors and 40% of associate professors are women. If the University is going to have the most talented faculty, it needs to recruit, retain and advance women faculty, as women now comprise at least 50% of postgraduate trainees in many fields

and more than 50% in some fields. The two most recently conducted gender pay equity reports reflected gender differences that favor male faculty. “Women appear on average to be paid less than men” in all six schools. The School of Medicine was not included in this most recent analysis, but in the last gender pay equity study conducted at the School of Medicine, reported in ’09-’10, women on average were paid 4% less than their male colleagues. Given that each analysis across points in time and schools reveals gender pay inequities, even after they have been previously corrected, it is critically important that the University commits to a process of continuously monitoring pay equity.

In a systematic review of the literature

on gender equity in academic medicine, which was informed by several National Institute of Health studies, Westring and associates (2016) concluded that: “A comprehensive framework is needed to address change at many levels—department, institution, academic community and beyond—and enable gender equity in the development of successful biomedical careers. The authors suggest four distinct but interrelated aspects of culture conducive to gender equity: equal access to resources and opportunities, minimizing unconscious gender bias, enhancing work-life balance, and leadership engagement” (p.1). These scientifically based recommendations were repeatedly articulated by faculty across disciplines that were consulted

for this report.

In drafting the recommendations below for faculty, we reviewed existing institutional level data, scientific literature, conducted individual interviews with key stakeholders, incorporated the BYOI Group Report, and solicited ideas from the voluntary women faculty groups on both the Medical and Danforth Campuses. We believe that policies, practices and resources should continue to be developed to support women faculty and staff in their career advancement. Accountability also needs to be established for many of these initiatives to see that they are effective and sustained.

---

### RECOMMENDATION #1

Increase the percentage of female tenured/tenure-track faculty from its current level of 32% to a target goal of 50% on the Danforth Campus; for the Medical Campus, increase the Investigator Track women faculty substantially and achieve parity on the Clinician Track. Identify and remove barriers to equity in hiring and promotion across ranks.

- Ensure consistency in the levels of transparency in processes, criteria, and metrics for promotion.
- Expand and strengthen mentoring opportunities within, across and outside the University.

- Develop effective strategies to address the negative impact that two-career relationships can have on recruitment and retention of women faculty.
- Conduct exit interviews to identify reasons for leaving, and potential systemic patterns that may need to be addressed within a unit, department, school or the University.
- Vigorously enforce policies related to gender-based discrimination to combat hostile, abusive or toxic work environments and hold people accountable for such conduct.

---

### RECOMMENDATION #2

Minimize the effects of gender bias both conscious & unconscious.

- Recognize and address the way that gender bias impacts teaching (student expectations, classroom dynamics, grading, and course evaluations).
  - Provide training and informational resources for faculty and administrators on the expression of gender bias in classroom dynamics and student interactions.
  - Administrators need to consider the potential role of

gender bias in teaching evaluations when conducting annual reviews and tenure.

- Increase opportunities for faculty across campus to discuss and strategize on managing student gender bias in and outside the classroom.
- Schools, departments and units should conduct an analysis by gender on the type and amount of service provided to assess equity. If discrepancies are found, protocols and policies should be put in place to track and ensure equity. Disproportional service should be considered when assessing academic productivity and progress during annual reviews and tenure.

Assure equal access for all women faculty to resources and opportunities as compared to their male colleagues.

Both of these will require engagement and training of all University leaders on best practices for improving gender

equity and minimizing the effects of gender bias in all arenas including hiring, compensation, retention, and career advancement.

---

### RECOMMENDATION #3

Ensure gender pay equity

- Implement the methodological and policy recommendations from the 2016 report (Full report: <https://facultysenate.wustl.edu/policies-resolutions/>)
  - Explore why there are gender differences in extramural funding in STEM fields.
  - Determine extent to which gender differences in paid administrative roles and extra teaching result from differences in interest vs. differences in opportunities.
- Deans should ensure equal access for female and male faculty members to opportunities for supplemental pay. Greater transparency about supplemental forms of compensation would help ensure equal access to these opportunities.
- Negotiations should be monitored for potential gender differences.
- Committees to examine Gender Pay Equity at the University should continue on a regular basis, at an interval of 3-5 years.

---

### RECOMMENDATION #4

Continue to enhance work/life balance and career flexing opportunities

- Consider options such as more shared faculty positions.
- Consider options for career advancement when working less than 1.0 FTE.
- Develop and implement a small grants program for junior faculty women with children.
- Review childcare needs for both campuses and develop new child care opportunities to meet the needs.
- Review lactation support needs for both campuses and further develop resources to meet the needs.

---

### RECOMMENDATION #5

Hold leaders accountable for gender equity in annual reviews (department chairs, division chiefs, program directors, deans)

- Accountability would include tracking and incentivizing gender equity in faculty numbers, rank, time to promotion, all components of compensation including starting salary, base and incentive pay, pay increases, start-up and retention packages, space and resource allocation & endowed professorships.
- Working to assure a more balanced gender representation in committees, speakers at symposia and seminars and in award recipients.

---

### RECOMMENDATION #6

There is strong support for the establishment of an Office for Women Faculty on both the Medical and Danforth campuses. For the entirety of the University's history, advancement of women has been driven by and dependent upon the voluntary and service efforts of women faculty, often with some costs to their own scholarly productivity. It is time to move from a reliance on volunteerism to a place of true institutional commitment to provide the continuity and structure needed to advance these initiatives. The establishment of these offices could provide the institutional support, leadership, resources, and accountability needed to

focus on the advancement of women, implement the above recommendations and close the gap on gender equity.

- Develop a strategic plan to address problems women face across both Danforth and Medical School Campus.
- Develop and implement trainings and programs on gender bias, differences in communication and leadership style, best practices to promote diversity & inclusion.
- Develop reporting systems to document and track bias and unprofessional communications and behavior.

- Develop policies and procedures to address unprofessional communication and behavior and improve professionalism; advance equity in recruitment, retention, promotion, committee representation, honors and awards.
- Develop systems to recognize and reward activities and tasks that are disproportionately delegated to women such as mentoring, teaching, committee work, and other administrative activities.

**Part II-Staff.** University staff across both Danforth and Medical School campuses are predominately female (73%). However, there does not seem to have been any data analysis of gender equity among staff. It is important to recognize that even in employment contexts that are predominately female, it is possible for gender biases to exist that lead to inequities in pay rates and opportunities for advancement (Budig, 2002). Furthermore, studies have demonstrated that negative bias against women has been found when they were being evaluated for position

traditionally held by men (Isaac, Lee & Carnes (2009). Although women are nearly  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the staff workforce, only 66% of leadership titles are held by women. For underrepresented minority women, that number drops to 7%. In a recent Harvard Business review article (2016), it was noted that if there is only one women or person of color in a group of finalists for a job, they were highly unlikely to be hired and that this effect was related to unconscious bias. Having two or more women or people of color in a pool of finalists substantially increased the likelihood

of a woman or person of color being selected.

Across the University, there are a larger number of women with leadership titles at the medical school (74%) than on the Danforth campus (56%). Many of the women with staff leadership titles at the School of Medicine, are in nursing, clinical operations, clinical trials, research labs, and business/administrative operations. (For example, 95% of nurse supervisors and 75% of research lab supervisors at the School of Medicine, are women.)

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS					
<u>Women in Staff Leadership Titles</u>					
	# of Women	% of Women	# of Men	% of Men	Total #
Business Unit	-	-	-	-	-
School of Medicine	589	74%	211	26%	800
Danforth Campus Schools	107	61%	67	39%	174
Central Fiscal Unit	233	54%	199	46%	432
Danforth Subtotal	340	56%	266	44%	606
Total University	929	66%	477	34%	1,406

Includes EEO-1 Categories "A" and "B" as of March 31, 2017.

## WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS

### Women in Staff Leadership Titles: by Race/Ethnicity

	# of URM	% of URM	# of Asian	% of Asian	# of White	% of White	# of Men	% of Men	Total #
Business Unit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
School of Medicine	51	6%	23	3%	515	64%	211	26%	800
Danforth Campus Schools	11	6%	4	2%	92	53%	67	39%	174
Central Fiscal Unit	32	7%	4	1%	197	46%	199	46%	432
Danforth Subtotal	42	7%	8	1%	289	48%	266	44%	606
Total University	94	7%	31	2%	804	57%	477	34%	1,406

Includes EEO-1 Categories "A" and "B" as of March 31, 2017.

Under-Represented Minorities (URMs) include: African-American, Hispanic/Latinx, Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander, and Native Alaskan / Native American.

Assessing for gender equity among staff is complicated by a lack of transparency and significant variance across units in titles, grade and pay. Additionally, some people in administrative support and mid-management are misclassified. There is often a lack of clarity in understanding how and why someone has been given a title, grade or pay rate that anecdotally has led to perceptions of inequity based on gender and/or ethnicity, which can adversely impact the climate of the work environment.

Women of color experience the impact of microaggressions and unconscious bias based on both race and gender, which contributes to a sense of distrust, of being invisible and not being groomed for promotion or leadership. There is strong interest in support for professional development, but a belief that there is a lack of investment in their growth and that they are not being advised about opportunities for it. The Diversity Engagement Survey

(2014/2015) that was implemented with faculty and staff across both the Medical School and Danforth campuses found that African-Americans, women and LGBT employees responded less positively across most measures than their white, male and heterosexual colleagues. These experiences and perceptions speak to the need to bring intersectionality into our institutional analysis of gender based inequities and our strategies for addressing them.

### RECOMMENDATION #7

- Endorse the value of transparency in title, grade, pay and opportunities for professional development as a mechanism for achieving equity among staff.
- Prepare and train supervisors, managers and administrators in the classification changes that will be implemented to ensure that staff across campus will be classified and paid fairly. Human Resources has an RFP out to hire a consulting firm to help develop new processes and procedures to increase transparency, reduce variance and disparities in titles, grade and pay, and job misclassifications. Training will be essential for effective implementation of these anticipated changes.
- Continue to enhance work/life balance and career flexing opportunities
  - Consider options such as more shared staff positions;
  - Consider options for career advancement when working less than 1.0 FTE;
  - Develop and implement a small grants program for women staff with children;

- Review childcare needs for both campuses and develop new child care opportunities to meet the needs. Recognize that for some employees the currently available University childcare is unaffordable. Develop a subsidized childcare model to expand access for employees earning lower incomes.
- Review lactation support needs for both campuses and further develop resources to meet the needs.
- Continue to conduct diversity engagement and climate surveys to gain insight into the experiences of staff that can inform policy and practice changes that will support equity.
- Examine staff exits, retention, transfers and promotions to assess equity across gender and ethnicity.
- Conduct a gender pay equity analysis for staff as is being done with faculty.
- Expand access to opportunities for professional development such as mentoring, coaching and networking.
- Provide equity in paid leave between staff and faculty. Current policy requires staff to exhaust sick time and vacation time before taking unpaid leave, which puts parents in a position of having no available time off as they transition into parenthood.

## REFERENCES

- Budig, M. J. (2002). Male Advantage and the Gender Composition of Jobs: Who Rides the Glass Escalator? *Social Problems*, 49(2), 258-277. doi:10.1525/sp.2002.49.2.258
- Guo, J. (2015, November 13). Why men get all the credit when they work with women. Retrieved June 26, 2017, from [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/11/13/why-men-get-all-the-credit-when-they-work-with-women/?utm\\_term=.fddec2ecb0a5](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/11/13/why-men-get-all-the-credit-when-they-work-with-women/?utm_term=.fddec2ecb0a5)
- Isaac, C., Lee, B., & Carnes, M. (2009). Interventions that affect gender bias in hiring: a systematic review. *Academic medicine: journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, 84(10), 1440.
- Johnson, S. K., Hekman, D. R., & Chan, E. T. (2016). If there's only one woman in your candidate pool, there's statistically no chance she'll be hired. *Harvard Business Review*, 26(04).
- King, M. M., Correl, S. J., Jacquet, J., Bergstrom, C. T., & West, J. D. (2015). Men set their own cites high: Gender and self-citation across fields and over time. *Eigenfactor*. Retrieved June 26, 2017, from <http://www.eigenfactor.org/gender/self-citation/SelfCitation.pdf>
- Knobloch-Westerwick, S., Glynn, C. J., & Huge, M. (2013). The Matilda Effect in Science Communication: An Experiment on Gender Bias in Publication Quality Perceptions and Collaboration Interest. *Science Communication*, 35(5), 603-625. doi:10.1177/107554701247268
- Knobloch-Westerwick, S., & Glynn, C. J. (2013). The Matilda Effect—Role Congruity Effects on Scholarly Communication. *Communication Research*, 40(1), 3-26. doi:10.1177/0093650211418339
- MacNell, L., Driscoll, A., & Hunt, A. N. (2014). What's in a Name: Exposing Gender Bias in Student Ratings of Teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, 40(4), 291-303. doi:10.1007/s10755-014-9313-4
- Maliniak, D., Powers, R., & Walter, B. F. (2013). The Gender Citation Gap in International Relations. *International Organization*, 67(04), 889-922. doi:10.1017/s0020818313000209
- Pittman, C. T. (2010). Race and Gender Oppression in the Classroom: The Experiences of Women Faculty of Color with White Male Students. *Teaching Sociology*, 38(3), 183-196. doi:10.1177/0092055x10370120
- Savonick, D., & Davidson, C. (2017). Gender bias in academe: an annotated bibliography of important recent studies.
- Stark, P., Ottoboni, K., & Boring, A. (2016). Student Evaluations of Teaching (Mostly) Do Not Measure Teaching Effectiveness. *ScienceOpen Research*. doi:10.14293/s2199-1006.1.sor-edu.aetbzc.v1
- Van der Lee, R., & Ellemers, N. (2015). Gender contributes to personal research funding success in The Netherlands. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(40), 12349-12353. doi:10.1073/pnas.1510159112
- Wagner, N., Rieger, M., & Voorvelt, K. (2016). Gender, ethnicity and teaching evaluations: Evidence from mixed teaching teams. *Economics of Education Review*, 54, 79-94. doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2016.06.004

The Promoting Gender Equity for Faculty and Staff effort was led by the following Commission members:

**Tonya Edmond**

Associate Dean for Diversity and Associate Professor, The Brown School.

**Diana Gray**

Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs; Professor of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Radiology, School of Medicine.

To view the full report click [here](#);  
to view the Executive Summary of the report, click [here](#).