



Davis Division Academic Senate

Request for Consultation Responses

Systemwide Review: UCAAD Salary Equity Study

December 8, 2011

UPDATE 9/15/2011: Deadline Extended by UC Academic Senate given the number of fall requests for systemwide review. ===== The UC Academic Senate is submitting the UCAAD (University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity) Salary Equity Study for consultation.

Administrative Partners (DANN TRASK)

December 9, 2011 5:42 PM

Dear Professor Bisson,

The L&S Executive Committee has reviewed the UCAAD Salary Equity Study and concluded that the report raised more questions than it answered. Indeed, the report itself acknowledges its notable limitations. The committee had the following specific comments:

- The length of time from degree and length of time at UC are very limited pieces of data.
- There is no attempt to explain why these differences exist or how to address them.
- To understand the results, much more work will be required, boring down into individual divisions or departments to explain the differences. For example, one conjecture was that retention actions tend to favor men over women faculty. Establishing this statistically would require a huge amount of work.
- The main value of the report seems to be simply to document that differences, based on the limited data collected, exist, and perhaps should be investigated further. In particular, the report should not be cited as conclusive proof that UC discriminates on the basis of gender given the reservations we have listed above.

Sincerely,

Abigail Thompson, Chair
Executive Committee
College of Letters and Science

Affirmative Action & Diversity

November 9, 2011 9:38 AM

Systemwide Review: UCAAD Salary Equity Study

The committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity would like to recommend that the results of the salary equity study be made generally available to both senate and federation faculty. The data are convincing that pay inequities (particularly for gender) are prevalent throughout the UC System and a concerted effort should be made to address the actual pay differences as well as the underlying causes of the inequities. We hope that a genuine and concerted effort is made by the campus leadership to address the gender inequities in salary that were identified in the study, and that a discussion of specific strategies for doing so is forthcoming from the administration in the near future.

CAP Oversight Committee

November 21, 2011 10:34 AM

UCAAD Salary Equity Study

The UCAAD study is a descriptive statistical analysis that shows relatively consistent and large salary gaps related to gender, with less statistical evidence related to ethnicity. CAP believes that further study is needed in order to determine possible causes of the gender salary gap, as well as to obtain more detailed information concerning salary differentials both systemwide and on the Davis campus.

Systemwide, CAP recommends, if possible, a follow-on study to examine a series of alternative explanations of the gaps identified, by including such variables as rank and step and years of active service (in addition to the more general number of years employed by the UC system that was used in the UCAAD study). A longitudinal study would be useful.

On our campus, CAP recommends consultation with the UC Davis Affirmative Action and Diversity Committee (AADC). Any discrepancy related to gender or ethnicity is potentially a very serious issue. Because institutional discrimination and other issues related to affirmative action and diversity may be relevant to the salary gap, CAP considers that discussions with the AADC will be helpful in developing potential remedies.

In order to understand the magnitude and trajectory of salary inequities related to gender and ethnicity at UC Davis, it would be useful to conduct a longitudinal study on our campus analogous to the one at UC Irvine that tracked pay differentials between men and women from 1998-1999 to 2010-2011. The UCI study found that across the general campus as a whole, pay inequity for women has increased 6- to 7-fold over the last 13 years, going from about \$700/woman in 1998-1999 to about \$4,500/woman in 2010-2011.

CAP also recommends systemwide examination of the impacts of off-scale salaries on pay differentials between men and women, with extension of the study, if possible, to potential ethnicity disparities, using the same longitudinal methodology mentioned above. This question is key to understanding whether CAP plays any role in creating or minimizing discriminatory pay differentials related to gender and ethnicity at Davis. On our campus, CAP's determinations play no role in setting off-scale salaries, in contrast to approximately half of the other campus CAPs. A comparison of Davis data with those from other campuses will help to identify the impact of CAP decisions systemwide in the context of off-scale salaries.

Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction

November 3, 2011 9:49 AM

No response at this time.

Faculty Privilege and Academic Personnel Advisers

September 20, 2011 2:22 PM

no comment from this committee

Faculty Welfare

December 8, 2011 6:36 PM

Submitted on behalf of the 2011-12 Academic Senate Faculty Welfare Committee Chair Stuart Hill

The Salary Equity Study indicates that there are gender inequities in the salaries UC faculty receive. The implication of the empirical analysis is that gender discrimination plays a potentially large role in determining how much men and women earn, producing an average loss in earnings of more than \$4,000 per year for women. The members of the Faculty Welfare Committee believe that claims of gender discrimination are serious and should be examined carefully. Our discussion produced two distinct reactions to the Study and its conclusion. Some members of the Committee were skeptical about the study's methodology. A simple model that identifies only 2-3 possible causes for the salaries faculty earned in diverse disciplines and institutional units over many years is vulnerable to the charge that the model is inadequately specified. This study might be sufficient to suggest that there is a problem but it does not provide a sufficiently rigorous test to credibly eliminate explanations other than gender discrimination. The debate about this issue will take a considerable amount of time and work to resolve. The second reaction that dominated our discussion was that Davis faculty should be educated about the options that are currently available to them. It is our judgment that surprisingly few faculty are aware that they can request a career equity study to determine if their work at Davis has been given the recognition that it deserves in terms of rank and step. We may not know for some time whether there is a systemic problem of gender discrimination at UC. While we await that institutional verdict, individuals can ask whether their personal records of achievement have been appropriately rewarded.

Planning & Budget

November 3, 2011 9:49 AM

No response at this time.

Research

November 3, 2011 9:49 AM

No response at this time.