

Report of the Gender Pay Equity Recommendation Committee

Committee Members:

Lara Boyd, Gillian Creese, Deena Rubuliak, Mark Trowell, Claire Young

July 2012

Table of Contents:

Introduction

A. Addressing the Gender Pay Gap

- **The Legal Context**
- **Methods of Compensation**

B. The Gender Pay Equity Exercise Experience at Other Universities

- **Monitoring Gender Pay Equity**
- **Improved Record Keeping to Facilitate Tracking and Data Analyses**
- **Recurring Pay Equity Studies**
- **Other Methods of Monitoring Equity**
- **Preventing Inequity from Reappearing**
- **Employment Equity-Specific Training**
- **Senior Appointment on Women Faculty Issues**
- **Mentoring**
- **Preventing Gender Pay Inequity in Starting Salaries**
- **Starting Salary Information Provided to All Short-Listed Candidates**
- **Equity-Focused Recruitment Funds**
- **Other Measures to Prevent Gender Pay Inequities in Starting Salaries**

C. Recommendations

- **Current Analysis (2011)**
- **Pay Adjustment**
- **Monitoring and Preventing Future Inequities**

Introduction

In 2007 and 2009, UBC's Equity Office released two reports, which had analyzed gender pay equity in the salaries of full-time tenure track professors at UBC. Both studies found a statistically significant salary wage gap between men and women faculty. The studies resulted in the formation of two working groups, the Pay Equity Analysis and Resolution Working Group (DATA) and the Structural Measures and Resolution Tactics (SMART).

The DATA Working Group's mandate was focused on a quantitative analysis of the pay gap. The findings of the DATA report were summarized as follows¹:

- The regression analysis of the annual salaries of full-time professors employed at the Vancouver campus (excluding the Faculty of Medicine) as of June 9, 2010 shows a gender differential of \$14332.20 in average pay and of \$15625.00 in median pay.
- About half of the average gender pay differential is accounted by the underrepresentation of women at the Full Professor level. While women account for about 38% of faculty members at the Associate and Assistant level, they account for only 21% at the Full Professor level. Given that the salaries of Full Professors are less constrained than the salaries of Associate and Assistant Professors, it is not surprising to find such a large effect.
- Another quarter of the average gender pay differential is accounted for by gender differences in the allocation of faculty members across Departmental units. For example, 6.6% of male faculty members are in the high paying Faculty of Commerce versus 3.3% of female faculty members. Conversely, 1.2% of female faculty members are in the low paying Department of Central, Eastern, and Northern Europe Studies versus 0.6% of male faculty members.
- After additionally accounting for experience (measured by a quadratic in Years in Rank) and for Canada Research Chairs and Distinguished University Professors), there remains an unexplained female pay disadvantage of about \$3000. This finding is robust to alternative specifications of the gender gap decomposition.
- The unexplained female pay disadvantage of about \$3000 can be considered discriminatory under the assumptions that male and female faculty members are equally productive.
- While the committee did not have complete data on faculty productivity, the analysis of Merit awards in 2008 and 2009 shows no female disadvantage. Women and men professors are awarded merit at the same rate in both years.
- This study did not analyze special circumstances that might affect productivity such as parental leave². We note that the earlier UBC study, "Statistical Analysis of UBC Faculty Salaries II" by Marmer and Sudmant (2009), showed that when years of experience were corrected for maternity leaves, this did not change the results of the salary analysis (in other words, whether or

¹ From Karen Bakker, et al., "An Analysis of the Gender Pay Gap in Professorial Salaries at UBC: Report of the Pay Equity (Data) Working Group," University of British Columbia, 2010, p 2-3.

² The Tri-Council funding agencies allow for mention of special circumstances, which might affect productivity. Specifically, NSERC defines special circumstances as "health problems, family responsibilities, disabilities or other circumstances (e.g., the time necessary to complete a monograph, file a patent, or commercialize an industrial process or product)". SSHRC defines special circumstances as "child-rearing, administrative responsibilities, illness or disability, which may have delayed or interrupted studies or research"

not a female faculty member has taken maternity leave had virtually no impact on the female pay disadvantage). This gives us confidence that our assumptions would be supported by a more complete analysis, and that parental leave does not alter the salary disadvantage.

- Moreover, some of the “explanatory” factors included in the pay analysis may themselves carry some gender biases (for example, rank), thus the female salary disadvantage found in the study can be interpreted as a lower bound.

The SMART Working Group’s mandate was focused on structural measures to prevent and redress gender inequities among faculty, focusing on “equal pay for equal work.”³

The following table summarizes the recommendations of the SMART working group⁴:

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	
Starting Salaries	A1. Provide short-listed Tenure Track Faculty (TTF) candidates with salary and compensation for relevant disciplines during the selection process
	A2. Conduct annual audits at the Faculty and University level to review past year’s starting salaries and revise as appropriate
	A3. Develop UBC principles and guidelines on starting salaries free of gender bias
Equity Training	B1. Equity training for Deans, Heads and Directors
	B2. Equity training for P&T Committees
	B3. Equity Training for Search committees (including Deans and senior administrators)
Mentoring	C1. Establish UBC-V and UBC-O mentoring offices. Generate and maintain written material describing the UBC mentoring program, with separate packages targeted to individual equity seeking groups
	C2. Revise the UBC-CV to include a section on mentoring received and mentoring provided
Working Climate and Equity Initiatives at UBC	D1. Create Senior Advisor to Provost, focusing on women faculty
	D2. Initiate Working Climate/Equity Studies in priority faculties
	D3. Develop an implementation plan for Valuing Difference Strategy ³ , focused on women faculty
Monitoring and Accountability	E1. Comprehensive annual employment equity and periodic pay equity audits
	E2. Reporting by Equity Office/Faculty Relations to key groups (Provost, Deans, Faculty Association)
	E3. Review and revise, as appropriate, governance structures for faculty-related gender equity issues at UBC; including (for example) an equity-focused governance body at Senate-Board level

As a result of the reports and recommendations of these two working groups, the Faculty Association and Provost jointly sponsored the Gender Pay Equity Recommendation Committee.

The Gender Pay Equity Recommendation Committee was given the following terms of reference:

³ From Karen Bakker, et al., “Preventing Gender Inequities: Structural Measures and Resolution Tactics (SMART) Working Group,” University of British Columbia report, January 27, 2011, p 3.

⁴ From Karen Bakker, et al., “Preventing Gender Inequities: Structural Measures and Resolution Tactics (SMART) Working Group,” University of British Columbia report, January 27, 2011, p 4.

1. The committee is charged with considering the recommendations of the SMART and DATA reports, including the model solutions set out in Appendix E of the Data Working Group, and on the basis of this examination:
 - a. Develop a set of alternatives and a recommended approach for addressing the pay gap (past compensation and current salary corrections) as identified in the Data Working Group report⁵;
 - b. Recommend a design of a monitoring process for gender pay equity for female faculty⁶ in order to prevent the pay gap from reappearing including a recommended process for periodic readjustment of salaries as necessary;
 - c. Develop recommendations on how to prevent gender salary inequities specifically pertaining to starting salaries and discretionary pay (retention, merit, PSA).

A. Addressing the Gender Pay Gap

In order to develop a set of alternatives and a recommended approach for addressing the pay gap (past compensation and current salary corrections) as identified in the Data Working Group report, the committee discussed issues of importance to redressing the gender pay gap by raising salaries. In doing so, we looked at the experiences of other universities that have distributed salary awards as a result of a pay equity study to help inform our approach.

Legal Context for UBC

- The primary, relevant legal framework for UBC is the provincial *Human Rights Code* (“Code”).
- The issue for UBC is an “equal pay for equal work” (versus “pay equity”) issue. The legal right to equal pay for the same or substantially similar work long pre-dates the right to pay equity in Canadian law and, unlike pay equity, exists in all Canadian jurisdictions.
- In discussion in the current committee, the parties accept the equal pay for equal work framework, and the significance it accords to differences of rank, discipline and experience.
- Section 12 of the *Human Rights Code* entitles any employee who has been paid less for performing similar or substantially similar work to an employee of the other sex, the difference between what the employee was paid and what the employee ought to have been paid, both going forward and retroactively for the preceding 12 months. The difference between what the employee was paid and what s/he should have been paid is only that portion of the pay difference that is attributable to sex, and cannot otherwise be reasonably justified. Differences in pay due to seniority or merit are justified. Moreover, to be comparable, the “core duties” of the job must be substantially similar.

Methods of Compensation

More than one method exists for salary increases to eradicate pay differentials. As context for this discussion, it is useful to note that multiple-regression analysis is a method of identifying group (or “class”) differences across the population surveyed (in this case, all women faculty). Multiple-regression analysis results refer to group rather than individual differences. Accordingly, some argue that a group approach to salary awards for *all* women is the most appropriate strategy, as it is the best method to

⁵ As identified in Article 4 of the original Terms of Reference: Pay Equity Analysis & Resolution Working Group.

⁶ The work of the Gender Pay Equity Recommendation Committee grew out of the DATA and SMART Committees and was solely focused on the pay discrepancy between male and female faculty and therefore did not contemplate diversity issues of a broader nature.

ensure that the highest-paid women have salaries more like the highest-paid men, and the lowest-paid women will have salaries more like the lowest-paid men. Others argue that, because of heterogeneity in average and individual salaries across the university, a case-by-case approach should be adopted. The three most common types of compensation methods are group salary awards, below-the-line corrections, and case reviews. Each method has its own set of inherent advantages and disadvantages.

Group Salary Awards

Group salary awards are given to all women, including highly paid outliers. Consistent with multiple regression analysis, group salary awards align the intercepts of the male and female regression lines. This method is time-efficient as the awards are applied across the board, eliminating the need for time-consuming case reviews. A disadvantage to this approach is that the group salary award (based on an average pay differential owing to gender) may be significantly more or less than the difference between an individual women's actual salary and predicted salary.⁷

Below-the-Line Corrections

Below-the-line corrections are applied only to individuals whose actual salaries are below their predicted salaries, as determined by regression analysis. Time-consuming to administer, this approach is inconsistent with multiple regression analysis as correcting below-the-line salaries does not align the intercepts of the male and female regression lines, which typically result in the perpetuation of gender pay inequity in future studies. However, if financial resources are scarce, this method focuses the remedy on those with the greatest "residual" or disadvantage.

Case Reviews

The case review method often puts the onus on the individual to apply to have their salary examined for adjustment. Individuals whose predicted salaries are above their actual salaries may receive awards. Case reviews may provide a cost savings to the university as not all those eligible for an adjustment will apply for or receive an award. This approach is time-consuming to administer. Decisions are subject to potential bias or may be perceived to perpetuate bias, which may lead to controversy and conflict within departments. As with below-the-line corrections, this method is inconsistent with multiple regression analysis. It does not align the intercepts of the male and female regression lines, resulting in the continuation of gender pay inequity in future studies. Because it penalizes top performers, case reviews risk confirming the stereotype that women are low performers.

Modified Group Salary Award

In addition to the standard models described above, the current committee has considered a modified group salary award approach. In this approach, the average percentage gender pay difference within each Department or Faculty and rank would be determined (assuming that a statistically reliable calculation can be performed).

⁷ The University of Western Ontario, "Report of the Faculty Pay Equity Committee," August 2005, p. 23, accessed January 4, 2012, <http://www.uwo.ca/pvp/facultyrelations/documentation/Pay%20Equity%20Report%202005.pdf>.

B. The Gender Pay Equity Exercise Experience at Other Universities

The committee looked at the experience of 17 universities in Canada and the United States that considered or distributed salary awards to women faculty upon the recommendation of a gender pay equity report. These universities included:

Canada:

- University of Western Ontario
- University of Guelph
- University of Lethbridge
- University of Calgary
- University of Manitoba
- York University
- Queen's University
- University of Waterloo
- McGill University
- University of Toronto

United States:

- University of Wisconsin – Madison
- University of California – Irvine
- University of Illinois at Urbana – Champaign
- Washington University
- Washington University School of Medicine
- University of Hawaii
- Central Connecticut State University

Universities were chosen according to the availability of data on both their processes for determining pay equity and the results of their distribution of awards. Some universities made the results of their gender pay equity studies publically available, while others were not particularly forthcoming about their studies and only partial data was procured. However, these university cases demonstrate the range of outcomes resulting from the various methods of compensation.

Examples of universities using group salary awards to correct gender pay inequities are few and far between. Only one of the universities we looked at—the University of Manitoba—chose to use group salary awards to equalize pay between women and men faculty. It is important to note that the group salary award was recommended along with other policy changes to prevent further inequities, including monitoring appointments, initial salaries, and promotion and promotion-related processes. None of these additional policy recommendations were put into effect. A follow-up study found that the inequity, which had been eliminated with the group salary awards, reemerged to nearly the same degree it had been previous to the distribution of awards. It is unclear whether this negative outcome should be assigned to the compensation method used or to the failure to enact all of the recommendations, including the salary inequity prevention measures.

Below-the-line corrections are a commonly used method for addressing gender pay inequities among university faculty. Five universities in this report opted to use below-the-line corrections.⁸ The most successful examples are the University of Western Ontario and the University of Wisconsin at Madison. Both of these universities found that inequity reemerged in follow-up studies, yet they continued to pay out awards using below-the-line corrections. A repeating cycle of regression analysis and award distribution is a common scenario for universities that use below-the-line corrections to address gender pay inequity. A more unfortunate result was observed in the case of York University, where frustrations with the process and with the full reemergence of pay inequity led some women faculty to file grievances under the *Employment Standards Act's* 'equal pay for equal work' provisions. These women faculty—who alleged that they were inequitably paid relative to male faculty even after the distribution

⁸ These universities included University of Western Ontario, York University, Queen's University, McGill University, and University of Wisconsin – Madison.

of below-the-line awards—won a mediated settlement in August 2008. In every case of below-the-line corrections, universities found gender pay inequity in repeat or follow-up regression analyses. Eight universities used case reviews to analyze pay equity and/or distribute salary awards.⁹ The University of California – Irvine (UC Irvine) found inequity, which appeared to be concentrated in a few departments. Forty-three faculty requested case reviews, 20 of which were forwarded for review. Some awards were made, although the exact number is unknown. Unfortunately, they continued to find inequity in all subsequent studies. The UC Irvine example is typical of the experiences of the other universities that used case reviews. In the majority of the other university experiences of case reviews, the outcome was ineffective or poorly executed, leaving many without awards. Follow-up studies, when available, confirmed that pay inequity was not eliminated by the case reviews. The exception to this outcome was the University of Guelph, where the case review method was used for analysis. No statistically significant inequity was found and no awards were made.¹⁰

Monitoring the Gender Pay Gap and Preventing Inequity from Reappearing

In all cases, universities have acknowledged that a salary correction mechanism does not prevent the problem from reappearing. As Marx Ferree and McQuillan note, “Addressing institutionalized inequity involves taking proactive steps to change institutional culture and functioning.”¹¹ Monitoring gender pay equity and instituting salary inequity prevention measures are key to ensuring that inequity does not reemerge after the distribution of awards. Accordingly, universities have initiated a range of measures designed to address the causes of salary inequities. A combination of measures is likely to have the greatest effect.

Monitoring Gender Pay Equity

Monitoring gender pay equity requires thorough record keeping. Up-to-date records reduce the time and difficulty of future data analyses. The most common method of monitoring gender pay equity is by performing recurring or cyclical pay equity studies, although other methods exist to measure gender equity.

Improved Record Keeping to Facilitate Tracking and Data Analyses

Improved record keeping devices may track gender equity in employment offers, startup packages, availability of office and lab space, research development funds, retention packages, teaching loads, and/or housing subsidies. Improved record keeping facilitates data gathering and cleaning and allows for easier assemblage into tables, graphs, and summaries.

After the University of Lethbridge completed its most recent gender pay equity study, the committee made a series of recommendations, including: 1) protecting data used in completed studies for future

⁹ The universities that used case reviews included University of Guelph, University of Calgary, University of Waterloo, University of Lethbridge, Washington University School of Medicine, University of California – Irvine, University of Illinois at Urbana – Champaign, and University of Hawaii.

¹⁰ This was an unusual example, as the standard for pay equity review is regression analyses, not case reviews. The remaining universities—Washington University, Central Connecticut State University, and University of Toronto—had not distributed awards by any method at this time.

¹¹ Myra Marx Ferree & Julia McQuillan, “Gender-Based Pay Gaps: Methodological and Policy Issues in University Salary Studies,” *Gender and Society* 12, no. 1 (1998): 9.

analysis; and 2) adding to the types of information that the human resources department collects, such as minority status and detailed degree attainment information, in order to better document information on faculty for future studies.¹²

Recurring Pay Equity Studies

Many universities we looked at endorsed recurring pay equity studies as a method for monitoring gender pay equity. The University of Western Ontario performs cyclical pay equity analyses no more than five years apart to ensure continued salary equity.¹³ Waterloo's Working Group on Women's Salary Equity has recommended that pay equity studies be repeated every five years.¹⁴ The McGill Association of University Teachers and the McGill University Administration agreed that gender pay equity studies would be required "as an ongoing policy,"¹⁵ with the Administration committing to performing a study every other year.¹⁶ The committee researching gender pay equity at Washington University in St. Louis recommended salary studies every two years.¹⁷ The University of Lethbridge's 2008 gender pay equity report called for regression analyses of faculty salaries to be performed "at regular intervals."¹⁸

Other Methods of Monitoring Equity

Closely related to gender pay equity is promotion timeline monitoring. Since a significant determinant of pay is rank, monitoring promotions may lead to greater equity between men and women faculty members' salaries. Promotion timeline monitoring usually entails the regular review of the status of women faculty in the associate professor rank and discussions between Deans and Department Heads about the files of women who have been in the rank for a longer than normal period. Universities may also perform promotion timeline studies that look for differences by gender or ethnicity. The Central Connecticut State University performed such a study in 2009.¹⁹

The American Association of University Professors also recommends monitoring the ratio of women to men in tenure track and tenured positions, particularly the breakdown by rank. Two other simple ways to measure gender equity, beyond analyzing salaries for equity, include looking at the number and

¹² University of Lethbridge Faculty Association & The University of Lethbridge, "Salary Equity Committee Report to the University of Lethbridge Community," November 2008, p. 25.

¹³ University of Western Ontario, "Gender-Based Salary Anomaly Study," November 2009, p. 41, accessed October 11, 2011, [http://www.uwo.ca/pvp/facultyrelations/documentation/UWO%20Gender%20Pay%20Equity%20Report%20091103%20\(2\).pdf](http://www.uwo.ca/pvp/facultyrelations/documentation/UWO%20Gender%20Pay%20Equity%20Report%20091103%20(2).pdf).

¹⁴ University of Waterloo, "Report of the Working Group on Women's Salary Equity," April 2009, accessed October 23, 2011, <http://www.fauw.uwaterloo.ca/Links/WomensSalaryEquity.pdf>.

¹⁵ Kohur N. GowriSankaran, "Salary Policy (MAUT position)," *MAUT – APBM Newsletter* 29, no. 2 (2003), p. 8, accessed January 4, 2012, [http://maut.mcgill.ca/NewslettersVols25-32/Newslt29\(2\)summer2003.pdf](http://maut.mcgill.ca/NewslettersVols25-32/Newslt29(2)summer2003.pdf).

¹⁶ Anthony C. Masi, "Memorandum: Update to the Administrative Response to the CASP Report on Academic Salary Differentials by Gender," May 18, 2011, p. 1.

¹⁷ Washington University in St. Louis, "Report to the Faculty Senate Council on Gender Pay Equity on Danforth Campus," May 6, 2010, p. 24, accessed January 6, 2012, <http://faculty senate.wustl.edu/presentations/Documents/FinalPayEquityReport.pdf>.

¹⁸ University of Lethbridge Faculty Association & The University of Lethbridge, "Salary Equity Committee Report to the University of Lethbridge Community," November 2008, p. 25.

¹⁹ Carolyn R. Fallahi & Sally A. Lesik, "Report on Gender/Race Equity at Central Connecticut State University," August 2009, accessed January 23, 2012, <http://www.ccsu.edu/uploaded/PDFs/EquityStudy.pdf>.

visibility of committees that address issues of importance to women and the number of women in leadership positions (Department Heads, Deans, etc.).

Preventing Inequity from Reappearing

Salary inequity prevention measures are key to preventing inequity from reappearing. The more common measures include employment equity-specific training, creating a senior appointment on women faculty issues, and mentoring.

Employment Equity-Specific Training

Employment equity-specific training involves educating members of appointments, promotions, and tenure committees in systemic bias and may include a workshop that covers the institutional expectations with respect to employment equity.

McGill “requires that search committees submit an Employment Equity Data Report to the Provost when a recommendation to hire is made. Hires are not generally approved in the absence of this report. Moreover, hiring units that choose not to interview female candidates for a position are expected to justify the exclusion of women applicants from their short lists. These measures are intended to encourage personnel involved in hiring decisions to be aware of equity issues during the recruitment process and to increase the likelihood that women and candidates from other underrepresented groups are given full consideration for faculty openings at McGill.”²⁰

One of the policy changes that the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) put into place after its 1999 Reports on the Status of Women Faculty in Science was to purposefully include women faculty on search committees and to educate all search committee members about “unconscious bias and how actively to seek applications from women.” Aware of the fact that unconscious bias may not only be present at MIT, but at originating universities as well, search committees have also been warned to “read letters of recommendation for women candidates with attention to bias,” which is “easier” than “getting the letters to change.”²¹

Senior Appointment on Women Faculty Issues

A senior appointment on women faculty issues can help bring issues to the attention of the president or support programs and enforce policies that prevent gender inequity. The University of Calgary has an Advisor to the President on Women’s Issues, whose role is to “advise the President on policy relating to the status of women at The University of Calgary”; to contribute to “the development of employment equity policies and procedures”; to improve “communication among university groups concerned with women’s issues”; and to “take steps to encourage research that bears on the status of women at the university.”²² Central Connecticut State University has an Affirmative Action Officer who oversees all

²⁰ Anthony C. Masi, “Update to the Administrative Response to the CASP Report on Academic Salary Differentials by Gender,” Document # D10-66, Appendix A, May 18, 2011, p. 8.

²¹ Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “A Report on the Status of Women Faculty in the Schools of Science and Engineering at MIT, 2011,” March 20, 2011, pp. 8, 14, accessed January 7, 2011, <http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/images/documents/women-report-2011.pdf>.

²² University of Calgary, “Terms of Reference,” Advisor to the President on Women’s Issues website, 2010, accessed January 6, 2012, <http://www.ucalgary.ca/advisoronwomensissues/>.

faculty search committees to ensure that “all searches meet the affirmative action guidelines [of the university] and comply with existing law and policies.”²³

Mentoring

One way to support women in their professional growth, and consequently improve the aforementioned benchmarks of gender equity, is to institute a mentorship program on campus. In a review of the literature on mentoring in academe, Zellers, Howard, and Barcic reported that mentored faculty “feel greater support for their research,” experience improved confidence and job satisfaction, and are “more likely to have a productive research career.” Mentoring in the academic setting “has also been found to enhance the teaching effectiveness of new faculty members, ease their adjustment to the academic environment, and relieve the feelings of isolation and alienation that many new faculty members experience.”²⁴

The University of Wisconsin – Madison initiated a Women Faculty Mentoring Program in 1989 to support women Assistant Professors through the tenure process. Women Assistant Professors apply to the program by filling out a survey of their interests. An applicant is paired with a tenured woman faculty mentor in another department who shares the applicant’s interests. Mentors and mentees must file evaluations on an annual basis. The Mentoring Program also sponsors events and is home to several peer mentoring groups.²⁵ In 2011, MIT re-issued their mentorship guide in an effort to “standardize mentoring policies across MIT” departments.²⁶ Because mentoring often increases research productivity, mentoring may also aid in preventing gender pay inequity discretionary pay.

Preventing Gender Pay Inequities in Starting Salaries and Discretionary Pay

Policies aimed at preventing inequity in starting salaries and discretionary pay have proven instrumental to continued pay equity at several universities. Establishing policies that support equitable hiring and starting salaries negotiation may have a significant impact on the results of future pay equity studies at UBC. Similarly, policies that promote equitable distribution of discretionary pay ensure that equity in starting salaries is not lost over the course of a career.

Preventing Gender Pay Inequity in Starting Salaries

Many inequities begin right at the moment of hire. Some measures to prevent these inequities—such as the provision of starting salary information to candidates—are inexpensive to implement.

²³ Carolyn R. Fallahi & Sally A. Lesik, “Report on Gender/Race Equity at Central Connecticut State University,” August 2009, p. 66, accessed January 23, 2012, <http://www.ccsu.edu/uploaded/PDFs/EquityStudy.pdf>.

²⁴ Darlene F. Zellers, Valerie M. Howard, & Maureen A. Barcic, “Faculty Mentoring Programs: Reenvisioning Rather Than Reinventing the Wheel,” *Review of Educational Research* 78, no. 3 (2008): 558.

²⁵ Office of the Provost, University of Wisconsin-Madison, “Women Faculty Mentoring Program at the University of Wisconsin-Madison,” 2011, accessed November 21, 2011, <http://www.provost.wisc.edu/women/mentor.html>.

²⁶ Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “A Report on the Status of Women Faculty in the Schools of Science and Engineering at MIT, 2011,” March 20, 2011, p. 8, accessed January 7, 2011, <http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/images/documents/women-report-2011.pdf>.

Starting Salary Information Provided to All Short-Listed Candidates

The McMaster University Faculty Association (MUFA), in agreement with McMaster University, provides to academic candidates an information package with salary statistics, including salary floors, and information about negotiating a starting salary and other conditions of the appointment.²⁷

At Central Connecticut State University, the Faculty Senate Diversity Committee recommended giving all final candidates a “hiring guide” to assist in salary negotiation. The hiring guide would describe the salary negotiation process, including the name of the person with whom they could negotiate this aspect of their offer, the department’s salary range, and the salaries offered to new faculty for the previous two to three years.²⁸

Equity-Focused Recruitment Funds

Equity-focused recruitment funds are targeted to assist departments in recruiting and retaining female faculty and supporting dual career programs. In the 2011-2012 school year, the University of Wisconsin-Madison pledged \$1,000,000 to the Strategic Hiring Fund, targeted to recruit minorities and women to disciplines in which they are under-represented.²⁹

Other Measures to Prevent Gender Pay Inequities in Starting Salaries

The American Association of University Professors recommends instituting policies that 1) prevent search committees from penalizing “candidates for ‘resume gaps’ that coincide with childbearing and childrearing years” and 2) ensure that committees have “members who are sensitive to gender equity issues.”³⁰ The case of the University of Western Ontario illustrates the importance of equity in starting salaries. When they performed a follow-up study after the distribution of salary awards, gender pay inequity was only found among the subset of women faculty who had been hired since the previous study (and the subsequent distribution of awards). These measures are targeted to prevent salary inequities during the hiring process.

C. Recommendations

Pay Adjustment Guiding Principles

In considering a recommended implementation model, the committee has developed the following guiding principles:

- a fair and reasonable approach to the problem

²⁷ McMaster University Faculty Association, “Information for Academic Candidates,” 2010, accessed October 24, 2011, <http://www.mcmaster.ca/mufa/BrochureAcadCandidates2010.pdf>.

²⁸ Carolyn R. Fallahi & Sally A. Lesik, “Report on Gender/Race Equity at Central Connecticut State University,” August 2009, p. 83, accessed January 23, 2012, <http://www.ccsu.edu/uploaded/PDFs/EquityStudy.pdf>.

²⁹ Steve Stern, “Memorandum: Faculty Strategic Hiring Initiative, 2011-12,” September 30, 2011, accessed November 21, 2011, <http://www.provost.wisc.edu/hiring/facshi.html>.

³⁰ American Association of University Professors, “Gender Equity Guidelines for Department Chairs,” September 2008, accessed January 20, 2012, <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/women/genequity.htm>.

- transparency of process
- predictability and certainty of outcomes
- minimizing individual discretion and conflicts arising from comparison of individuals
- instituting procedures to ensure the gap does not reoccur
- costs of implementing pay adjustments
- simplicity of implementation

Current Analysis

The committee developed an updated data set (October 31, 2011 data) that includes all faculties at UBCV and re-ran statistical analyses following the same analytic plan as outlined in the 2010 DATA report. The current data analysis results in a finding consistent with that reported in the 2010 Data Working Group's findings. In particular, the current data suggests an unexplained difference in average salaries of approximately \$2830 (1.7%) that can be attributed to gender discrimination in pay. Statistically, rounding this result to a 2% differential is appropriate.

Salary Award Recommendation and Time Frame

The committee has considered the alternative implementation models in light of the agreed upon guiding selection principles. The modified group salary award alternative (in which the average percentage gender pay difference within each Department or Faculty and rank would be determined) is not supported from a statistical significance perspective.

As a result, the committee is recommending a 2% group salary award for all current female full-time faculty members in a tenure-track, grant or tenured position (Instructor I, Instructor II, Senior Instructor, Professor of Teaching, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor) at UBCV with a recommended effective date of July 1, 2010. The adjustment would be applied to base pay salary only (excluding any clinical income) and have no implication on pension and benefits or other forms of salary adjustments (e.g. CPI, Merit, PSA etc.) that may have been applied to salary between July 1, 2010 and the date of implementing the salary award.

Monitoring and Preventing Future Inequalities

The committee has considered the recommendations of the SMART working group (summarized on p.3 of this report) and has prioritized the recommendations as follows:

Immediate priorities:

Starting Salaries – Develop UBC principles and guidelines on starting salaries free of gender bias and provide short-listed Tenure Track Faculty (TTF) candidates with salary and compensation for relevant disciplines during the selection process. It was the committee's view that this could be done immediately, perhaps through the Office of the Senior Advisor to the Provost on Faculty Women.

Working Climate and Equity Initiatives at UBC – With the Senior Advisor to the Provost on Faculty Women in her position, the initiation of a working climate/equity studies in priority faculties should be promptly undertaken. We recommend that the Senior Advisor assist with the identification of priority

areas. We further recommend that the Senior Advisor be tasked with the developing an implementation plan for Valuing Difference Strategy³¹ focused on faculty women.

Short-term initiatives:

Mentoring. Establishing mentoring offices on both campuses. Generate and maintain written material describing the UBC mentoring program, with separate packages targeted to individual equity seeking groups. The committee recommends that action on this quickly. Further, the UBC-CV should be revised to include a section on mentoring received and mentoring provided so that mentoring is recognized as a valuable service activity and taken into consideration with respects to workload assignments.

Equity Training. The Committee understands that the University is already undertaking to provide some training with assistance from the Senior Advisor to the Provost on Faculty Women. The committee encourages a continued focus on the delivery of this training with a particular focus on those in decision-making and other leadership positions across the University.

Longer-term initiatives:

Monitoring. In order to prevent inequities from arising or creeping back in, the Committee agreed that following the pay adjustment arising out of the current report, the University should implement a process to conduct annual audits at the Faculty and University level to review past year's starting salaries and revise as appropriate. We further advise that the University undertake comprehensive annual and periodic employment equity and pay equity audits.

³¹ From Karen Bakker, et al., "Preventing Gender Inequities: Structural Measures and Resolution Tactics (SMART) Working Group," University of British Columbia report, January 27, 2011, p 3.