



*Jim Chalfant*  
*Telephone: (510) 987-0711*  
*Fax: (510) 763-0309*  
*Email: jim.chalfant@ucop.edu*

*Chair of the Assembly of the Academic Senate*  
*Faculty Representative to the Regents*  
*University of California*  
*1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor*  
*Oakland, California 94607-5200*

October 27, 2016

**AIMÉE DORR**  
**PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT**  
**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

**Re: Recommendations for Future Faculty Salary Equity Analyses**

Dear Aimée:

At its September 28 meeting, the Academic Council voted unanimously to endorse the attached recommendations from the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE) for best practices for future campus analyses of faculty salary equity on the basis of gender and ethnicity.

Last year, UCAADE conducted a careful review of the salary equity studies produced by UC campuses between 2012 and 2015. The committee found that although campuses had identified a variety of factors contributing to inequities, the wide variations in methodologies used and variables considered prevented meaningful comparisons on a systemwide basis. UCAADE recommends that campuses conduct regular, biennial salary equity analyses according to a standardized set of parameters, to allow for these comparisons.

Council joins UCAADE in requesting that you distribute the recommended best practices to campus Executive Vice Chancellors, Vice Provosts for Academic Personnel, and other relevant administrators for review and feedback. UCAADE's next meeting is in January, so any comments or other feedback would be welcome by January 5, 2017. I have also asked Senate division chairs to circulate the recommendations to campus Senate Committees on Diversity, Academic Personnel, Faculty Welfare, and others as appropriate, for similar discussion and feedback. UCAADE's attached cover letter provides guidance to the campuses about the kind of feedback the committee is seeking. Needless to say, this is a topic of ongoing interest, and this request is not intended as a formal review with a fixed date after which the recommendations cannot change, so the committee would welcome comments at any later time as well.

Council shares UCAADE's view that salary equity is critical to the morale of our faculty and to our ability to recruit and retain them. We believe that the recommendations outlined here will help inform the University's understanding of factors contributing to and perpetuating inequities, as well as to subsequent actions campuses may take to address them.

On behalf of both committees, I would also like to express appreciation to everyone involved in campus studies, for their consideration of these recommendations.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Jim Chalfant". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jim Chalfant, Chair  
Academic Council

Cc: Academic Council  
Senate Director Baxter  
Senate Executive Directors



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, DIVERSITY  
AND EQUITY (UCAADE)  
Amani M. Nuru-Jeter, Chair  
[anjeter@berkeley.edu](mailto:anjeter@berkeley.edu)

ACADEMIC SENATE  
University of California  
1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, California 94607-5200

October 20, 2016

**JAMES A. CHALFANT**  
**ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR**

Dear Jim:

Please find enclosed the document, “**Equity for faculty salaries at the University of California: Suggestions for future faculty salary equity analyses**” submitted to Academic Council on behalf of the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE).

We appreciate having the opportunity to discuss these recommendations with Academic Council last month. While Council’s response was very positive, we acknowledge that there is tremendous variability across the 10 campuses, and there is a need to prioritize the enclosed list in the interest of striking a balance between standardization across campuses and campus autonomy. Having been approved by Council, we request that the enclosed recommendations be sent to Provost Dorr for transmittal to the 10 UC campuses for comment. Our goal is for each campus to carefully consider the proposed recommendations and provide feedback related to the following questions, to help UCAADE understand individual campus resources and other capabilities for conducting such studies.

- What are the unique strengths of your campus/academic units in conducting future salary equity analyses according to the proposed list of recommendations?
- What are the unique challenges your campus/academic units face that will make these recommendations overly burdensome and/or difficult to accommodate?
- What are your suggestions for prioritizing the enclosed list of recommendations and why (e.g., what parameters would be included in the most rigorous baseline model)?
- Who is responsible for conducting salary equity analyses on your campus? What, if any, capacity issues do you face that make conducting future salary equity analyses challenging?
- What other variables, not included here, should be considered in future salary equity analyses (e.g., accelerations, formal vs. informal (e.g., CAP vs. Dean) promotions)?
- What professional standards should be included in future salary equity analyses (e.g., team led by statistician)

- Any other feedback

We ask administrators to work with divisional diversity committees to convey the information to UCAADE through UCAADE representatives.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Amani M. Nuru-Jeter', is centered below the text 'Respectfully,'.

Amani M. Nuru-Jeter, Ph.D.  
Chair, UCAADE

cc: Shane White, Academic Council Vice Chair  
Hilary Baxter, Academic Senate Executive Director  
Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel and Programs  
UCAADE Members  
Joanne Miller, Senate Analyst

University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE)

**Equity for faculty salaries at the University of California: Suggestions for future faculty salary equity analyses**

Submitted to Academic Council: Sept. 28, 2016

**Equity in the academy is fundamental to culture and climate**

Equity is fundamental to the culture and climate in the academy at The University of California (UC) for reasons including, but not limited to: 1) faculty perceptions about fairness matter for job satisfaction and retention, 2) faculty judge the fairness of their treatment based on how their peers are treated, and 3) perceived inequity can lead to loss of morale, loss of productivity, and various maladaptive behaviors such as resistance and hyper-competitiveness, both of which can reduce collegiality and motivation for collaboration. Perceived lack of equity among faculty members may also prompt faculty to seek outside offers of employment, which can then cost the university substantial amounts in matching offers, retention packages that include equipment, space, personnel support, etc., and even separation from the University.

Faculty salary is an equity metric that is critical to track and analyze because faculty have an expectation that they will be assessed fairly and compensated equitably. This expectation is reinforced by the rank/step salary system of UC, which should remove subjectivity in determining faculty salaries as stated by UC APM 620: “In order to preserve the significance and value of the salary scales, salaries should be on-scale to the greatest extent feasible.” Despite the use of off-scale salaries, the underlying principles of equity and objectivity conveyed by APM 620 remain significant parameters for judging current practices. Faculty salary equity analyses constitute a mode of transparency that allows for data driven remediation of inequities when they are found.

**Implementation of Faculty Salary Equity Analysis**

In September 2012, UC President Mark G. Yudof charged the chancellors to implement faculty salary equity analyses on the campuses. Prompted in part by a 2011 study<sup>1</sup> by Pauline Yahr, the former Chair of the Senate’s University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (now UCAADE), Yudof instructed the campuses to do the following:

“Each campus will determine the administrators and faculty committees who will be involved in the faculty salary analysis; the period of salary equity reviews (annual, biannual, other); the units to be studied; plans for addressing and reporting any pattern of discriminatory salary differences; and the methodology to be employed.”

---

<sup>1</sup> Analysis of UC Pay Equity By Sex and, Among Men, Ethnicity, 2009-10  
([http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/\\_files/committees/ucaade/documents/payequityreport-2011.pdf](http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/committees/ucaade/documents/payequityreport-2011.pdf))

This was an important first step in better understanding where inequities may exist and taking meaningful action toward resolving those inequities. The University of California and each of the campuses are commended for the time and attention spent on these analyses and on plans to address the inequities identified through the analyses. They provide objective documentation of the need for salary equity adjustments and helped to inform the President's implementation of salary equity adjustments across the UC over the past two years.

### **Campus methodologies varied widely**

The resulting salary equity analyses undertaken by campuses varied widely in the methodology applied and in the variables considered. The Senate's University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity (UCAADE) has reviewed the summary reports from the campuses and found divergent results based, in no small part, on variations in the analyses. The considerable autonomy given to campuses in determining approaches and parameters had both disadvantages and advantages.

One major disadvantage of highly variable methodologies for faculty salary equity analyses on individual campuses is that many of the analyses were incomplete because critical variables were unaccounted for in the analysis. It follows that future analyses may use different variables, thereby preempting longitudinal analysis on individual campuses. The other major disadvantage of campus-specific methodology is the lack of standardization in methodology, precluding the possibility of meaningful comparisons across campuses.

There were also important advantages in conducting campus specific analyses. Although system-wide analysis has the advantage of critical mass, campus specific data allows a level of granularity helpful for contextualizing the circumstances surrounding the distribution of salaries in academic units. Additionally, each campus identified important distinct parameters that contribute to salary inequities. UCAADE has compiled and annotated these campus-identified variables into a collective set of recommended parameters that all campuses should consider tracking in future salary equity analyses. We do not provide recommendations on the specific statistical approaches or models to be used.

The UC and each campus learned a lot from the first set of analyses. The goal of the recommendations provided here, is to use what was learned to make improvements for the next round of analyses such as enabling better comparisons across campuses and future longitudinal assessments.

### **Recommended parameters to be considered in future campus salary equity analyses**

UCAADE strongly urges UC to encourage campuses to work with their Academic Senate and Administration to include the following in future salary equity analyses:

- **Multivariate regression analysis:** Multivariate analysis should be conducted for total and off-scale salaries while controlling for rank/step for units with comparable salary structures. Additional minimum control variables should include decade of hire, rank and salary at hire, and time since PhD (or other terminal degree). Models should be run to examine the independent effects of race/ethnicity and gender as well as the interaction between the two (i.e., race/ethnicity X gender). Multivariate regression is critical to ensure the analysis is undertaken on comparable groups with controlled variables.
- **Retention offers:** Documentation of external offers and retention increases should be collected centrally. Tracking retention offers provides important information on who is being recruited and how retention impacts salary. Separate models (as described above) should be run controlling for *receiving a retention offer*, and additional models should be run to examine race/ethnicity and gender as predictors of receiving a retention offer. Central documentation would be informative for broadening the reporting of faculty exit survey data, which capture both departures and retention, and continued monitoring of progress toward both salary equity and broader diversity goals at UC.
- **Rate of advancement:** Determine whether normative time to promotion is consistent across disciplines. Tracking of advancement rate across disciplines should be standardized. Understanding disciplinary specific rates of advancement may allow for appropriate adjustments to process or salary equity adjustments. Rate of advancement should be included as a control variable in separate regression models (as described above for retention offers) in addition to modeling race/ethnicity and gender as predictors of rate of advancement.
- **Faculty progress rate:** Consistent with the need to track rate of advancement, campuses should monitor whether faculty are achieving merits and promotions on time. Campuses should track the association between progress rate and off-scale salaries as well as progress by division and discipline (as expectations vary) and identify if there are ranks/steps where faculty tend to stagnate and if race/ethnicity/gender predict faculty progress rate. Some campuses identified no correlation between rate of advancement in the merits and promotions system and off-scale salaries, suggesting that quality scholarship, teaching and service are not the metrics used to inform off-scale salaries. This is a rich area for potential equity adjustment.
- **Stop-the-Clock, Active Service-Modified Duties (ASMD), Leaves and Tenure Clock:** Track the effect of policy usage on salary equity for faculty by gender and ethnicity. Campuses that included these factors in prior analyses found significant effects on salary. We understand that there are some data access limitations that would need to be overcome to track this consistently across campuses.
- **Decade of hire:** Decade of hire was the most common significant predictor of salary inequity: faculty hired in earlier decades had lower total and off-scale salaries and steps within ranks. This should be included in all future analyses. The “loyalty tax” needs to be identified and addressed by equity adjustment.

- **Links between service and salary:** Tracking the association between service load, rate of advancement, and salaries, especially going from assistant to associate and from associate to full professor, should be standardized across campuses to the extent possible. National studies show a link between these factors, suggesting the need to monitor equity in relation to these variables; and some campuses are already starting to consider these linkages. Continuing discussion should be focused on how to assess and weigh the different kinds of service to ensure equity in service load both by race/ethnicity and gender, as well as rank. We understand that quantifying service and teaching may be somewhat subjective for health sciences faculty, where varying categories of formal and informal teaching and mentoring make objective service more difficult to assess; UCAADE looks forward to discussing this issue with the health sciences campuses with the goal of drafting a set of recommendations for quantifying academic work on those campuses.
- **Health sciences campuses:** We emphasize the importance of the health science campuses sharing their results and challenges and the need to enhance consistency in analyses. We recommend that health science campuses conduct separate sets of analyses with common or shared parameters to enable meaningful comparisons, while also allowing campus-level flexibility in determining what fits best for each campus.
- **Faculty opportunity:** The analyses should be able to determine whether service and leadership opportunities are being distributed equitably. This may inform the need for equity adjustment via improving faculty engagement opportunities and ensuring diversity in faculty leadership and decision-making.
- **Standardization of faculty that are included in analyses:** There should be careful consideration of the inclusion criteria and justifications of which faculty to include in the analyses. Campuses should consider only including those with similar salary structures in the same analysis; and should include a control for percentage effort to account for differences in percentage of paid effort. This may be of particular concern on the Health Science campuses.

In addition to the parameters described above, we recommend standard intervals for performing new salary equity analyses to allow for longitudinal assessment of the impact of salary equity programs. Ideally, intervals for the surveys would be standardized across campuses (e.g., every 2 years initially, and then every 3 years once salary equity is achieved).

In conclusion, we recognize that the availability of some recommended data parameters may be limited to only a short period of time at some campuses. However, the recommendations are made to ensure that the recommended parameters would be both collected and analyzed regularly. This will enable meaningful comparisons across campuses and trend analyses in the future.