



# **Davis Division Academic Senate**

## **Request for Consultation Responses**

### **Joint Task Force Report - Analysis of Faculty Salary Equity**

**January 24, 2014**

The Joint Senate/Administration Task Force on Salary Equity's report is forwarded for review and feedback. Please note the document includes a Supplemental Guidelines for Analysis Report.

# Affirmative Action & Diversity

January 15, 2014 1:54 PM

The Affirmative Action & Diversity Committee has reviewed and discussed the Joint Task Force Report-Analysis of Faculty Salary Equity and has the following response. We find this report to be impressive, important, timely, careful, thoughtful and organized. We feel the task force has done incredibly important work to move the University towards a transparent process that can be applied to faculty files under review. Of particular importance is the identification and definition of independent variables that can be used in quantitative assessment of candidate files. Such an approach is required to "level the playing field" and minimize unconscious bias.

Specific comments from the committee include:

- 1) This report of the UC Davis Joint Administrative-Academic Senate Task Force analyzes salary inequities based on gender, race, or ethnicity at UC Davis, in response to a UC System-wide concern for salary equity. The report is highly critical of the 2011 Yahr Report that relied heavily on the analytical methods of the American Association of University Professors that suggests a focus on measuring demographic variables. The UCD Task Force Report suggests measuring faculty performance along with demographic considerations is crucial. Specifically, it recommends A Structural Equation Model of Salary Variation (p. 20), which separates base and negotiated salary components. They emphasize that "gender and race/ethnicity could have both direct and indirect impacts on negotiated salary components," according to the "perceived value of a faculty member to the campus." Therefore, the Task Force recommends Developing Performance Metrics as Part of the Faculty personnel Process (22-23).
- 2) However, I suggest that this recommendation will not have as much effectiveness as to the degree to which UCD concomitantly explores what the report identifies as an underlying problem: tracing "impacts of historical and cohort factors on salary variation" (11). In other words, how have different salary components have, over time at UCD, contributed to current salary variations and the possible gender and race/ethnic biases underlying those variations. One thing that UC Davis could do is to rectify what the Task Force says is a major deficiency: "UC Davis does not currently have systems in place to extract summary metrics from faculty records across the campus" (19). As we all know, issues of gender, racial, and nationality bias are deeply embedded in world and U.S. history and contemporary global relations, and institutional history must be understood along with quantitative models to remedy these historical inequities.
- 3) One thing that is missing from this report and will need to be addressed in any implementation is a specific methodology to deal with the increasing trend towards large interdisciplinary research teams and projects. Such projects are increasingly required for large scale funding, but participants may be undervalued in terms of "output" despite proactive and major engagement in large team projects.
- 4) Will alternate models and methodologies be considered?
- 5) I think the real problem is that it will be hard to get any such analysis taken seriously without at least a rudimentary attempt to take performance into account, which as they (and Yahr) point out is a very thorny problem.



# **CAP Oversight Committee**

**January 30, 2014 2:51 PM**

*Response continued on next page.*

## **Task Force Report On Analysis of Faculty Salary Equity**

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) discussed the Joint Task Force Report on "Analysis of Faculty Salary Equity at the University of California, Davis" and offers the following comments:

- 1) A core opinion of CAP is that the quality of faculty performance cannot be evaluated or measured by algorithms, including the approach outlined in the Supplement to the Task Force Report.
- 2) CAP is therefore pleased that the Task Force Report (page 22) "does not advocate the replacement of our current, holistic evaluation system with robotically applied numerical algorithms".
- 3) CAP questions whether the "Structural Model of Salary Variation" (Model 2, page 20) would yield useful or meaningful estimates of salary equity given the current number of faculty members of different genders and different races/ethnicities within the "salary comparison units" described on pages 15-16 of this report.
- 4) CAP recommends generating models of faculty performance only if the statistical properties of the data permit quantitative comparisons to be made.
- 5) Given the differences related to time of hire (including those described on pages 15-20), some members of CAP feel that it may be more practical or plausible to restrict comparisons to recent hires.
- 6) CAP is wary of finding correct answers for wrong reasons. CAP recommends that models be generated after identifying data that are causally related to salary disparity.
- 7) CAP recommends that models for evaluating faculty performance should be derived by persons who are qualified to develop quantitative methods. Colleagues on campus should be recruited for this purpose. They might find it beneficial to consult with experts in the private sector. This is consistent with recommendation #4 on pages 29-30 of the Task Force Report.
- 8) Some members of CAP questioned the long-term benefit of instituting metrics to track faculty performance.
- 9) CAP cautions that, given the sensitivity and importance of salary and inequity, conclusions drawn from incorrect analyses could tarnish the reputation of those who perform the analysis and, ultimately, the reputation of the campus as a whole.

## **Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (LS: SOC SCI)**

**December 2, 2013 5:56 PM**

The L&S Executive Committee lauds the goals of this proposal but wonders how feasible the creation of metrics will be across very different departments. It seems as if a lot of faculty time will need to go into establishing and debating the metrics. But the issue is important and the proposed procedure seems very carefully thought through, so it may be worth trying.

# **Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (MEDICINE)**

**January 10, 2014 11:17 AM**

The School of Medicine, Faculty Executive Committee reviewed and discussed the Joint Task Force Report - Analysis of Faculty Salary Equity. The committee thought the study looked complicated to perform but that the concept behind it was a good one. One question was why was it limited in its scope and why it didn't include the HSCP faculty who contribute so much to our university.

# Faculty Welfare

**January 15, 2014 10:19 AM**

The Faculty Welfare Committee believes that the collection and evaluation of data concerning salary inequities are very important. There were several concerns and suggestions expressed.

(1) The scope and volume may be too large for a graduate student or postdoc. The study needs to be done properly and precisely, so an outside consultant should be considered.

(2) While laudable, the development of more quantitative evaluation metrics might be time-consuming, controversial, and, potentially, biased. It is important to avoid a "standardized test" mentality that would adversely influence the direction of faculty academic careers.

(3) As expressed previously by this committee, the faculty should be further educated about the options (i.e. a career equity review) that are currently available to address individual salary inequities.

# **Graduate Council**

**November 15, 2013 11:17 AM**

*No response at this time.*

# **Planning & Budget**

**January 27, 2014 12:14 PM**

CPB discussed the Joint Task Force Report – Analysis of Faculty Salary Equity. CPB recommends using other UC faculty with expertise in statistics for the full, campus-wide analysis of salary equity.