Recommendations Regarding Faculty Salary Equity at the University of Minnesota
Women’s Faculty Cabinet and University Senate Equity Access and Diversity Committee
Draft as of April 10, 2012

Background
The Women’s Faculty Cabinet (WFC) is a body of faculty women with an investment in an equitable and supportive culture for women faculty across all academic units at the University of Minnesota; the WFC acts as an advisory board to the Provost. The University Senate Equity, Access, and Diversity (EAD) Committee includes faculty, staff, and students who advise the President and administrative offices on the impact of University policies, programs and services on equal opportunity, affirmative action and diversity from a system perspective.

In light of recent reports on salary equity (conducted by the WFC and external consultant Dr. Murray Clayton) that found unexplained gender gaps in faculty salaries, the WFC and EAD considered a variety of possible University responses. In part 1, we identify key principles for a thorough response that aims to address current inequities and minimize future concerns.

Parts 2-4 offer more detailed recommendations for monitoring salary equity by gender, identifying possible salary adjustments for faculty, providing training to department chairs/heads and deans, and. See parts 2-4. These recommendations primarily represent an endorsement of the suggestions laid out by Dr. Clayton in his December 26, 2011 report, with some additions that emerged in conversations about implementing these processes at University of Minnesota. The recommendations may not be implemented exactly as laid out here in each college/school, but we believe that modifications in process should be consistent with the key principles described in Part 1.

Part 1. Key principles for the University response

1. The salary equity reports should be taken as an opportunity to review decision-making criteria and processes and to increase the transparency of decision-making regarding salaries within departments and colleges/schools.
2. All units on the Twin Cities campus, including units within the health sciences, should participate in the salary review process with appropriate customization of procedures.
3. There should be a broad process of reviews of women’s salaries initially, rather than only occurring if the faculty member comes forward with a request for an equity review.
4. Salary data should be analyzed by gender regularly, with reports available to the University community and public.

Part 2. Recommendations to the Provost’s Office and Deans on oversight, training, and communications regarding faculty salary equity

1. The Provost’s Office should work with the Office for Equity and Diversity and the Office of Human Resources to provide guidance and assistance to departments and colleges/schools regarding the establishment of salary review procedures.
2. The Provost’s Office should lead on monitoring salary equity in the future and responding to issues uncovered in future analysis. This would involve:
   • Reviewing current data to determine which factors identified in Clayton 12/26/11 report are currently available in institutional records, whether retrospective data is available, and which factors might be incorporated into systems in the near future.
• Preparing an annual report for the Twin Cities campus as a whole and also for each college/school separately that compares the following by gender and by race/ethnicity:
  o average starting salary of faculty;
  o average starting salary at each faculty rank;
  o number of faculty hired into each rank;
  o dollar value of “start-up” packages for faculty;
  o average percentage raise for faculty;
  o for faculty promoted in that year, average number of years to tenure and promotion and average number of years between promotion to Associate and promotion to Full Professor;
  o for each retention sought, the gender of the faculty member, the value of any salary increment, other support dollars, other conditions (e.g. provision of staff, lab space, etc.) in a University of Minnesota counter-offer and whether or not the retention bid was successful.
• Reviewing college/school reports with Deans and college/school SEACs (see below).
• Conducting a more comprehensive statistical analysis (similar to that conducted by Dr. Clayton in 2011) every 3 years.
• Creating a University website to serve as a repository of reports related to salary equity.

3. The Provost’s Office should incorporate additional training related to salary equity into the existing leadership development provided to chairs/heads and provide similar training and support to members of SEACs (see below).
4. Deans should require departments to describe their normal merit review process and salary decisions in explicit terms and share that information with faculty and the college/school SEAC in order to increase transparency and minimize inequities.
5. Deans should discuss salary equity concerns and identify remedies from department chairs/heads annually.
6. The Provost’s Office should evaluate the sufficiency of the salary equity review processes, with consultation with the Office for Equity and Diversity, Office of Human Resources, Deans, and faculty, including the Women’s Faculty Cabinet and the Faculty Senate, after two years.
7. The Provost’s Office should share salary equity review processes and reports with the coordinate campuses.
8. The Provost’s Office should identify funds for salary adjustments, with the expectation that colleges/schools will cost-share for the initial adjustments and colleges/schools will be responsible for more of the funds required for adjustments identified in future years.

Part 3. Recommended process for case-by-case salary assessments: Initial round of reviews

1. With the support and guidance from administration (as described in Part 2), departments should create Salary Equity Adjustment Committees (SEACs) to determine the size (if any) of the appropriate adjustment for each female faculty member.\(^1\) Departmental SEACs will be formed within large departments and by combining the task for 2-3 smaller departments. The SEAC should involve an uneven number of members, not less than three, and include tenured faculty and clinical faculty from the department(s) and one person from outside the department, normally a faculty member who is serving or recently served on the college/school SEAC.

\(^1\) Transgender faculty who do not identify as female (including faculty who do not identify as male or female) are welcome to request a salary equity review as described in part 2.
2. Deans should create college/school SEACs to review the recommendations of departmental SEACs. These committees should be comprised of 5 tenured or clinical faculty members, at least 2 women, with input on membership from the Dean, WFC, FCC, and Provost’s Office.
3. For units that are not departmentalized (e.g. Law), a single SEAC should be formed to determine appropriate adjustments. Members will be appointed in the same way as college/school SEACs. Smaller colleges or schools may cooperate with another school with similar faculty in these processes.
4. SEACs may “triage” salary reviews by first examining the full professors (where both reports found larger gender gaps) and then turning to associate and assistant professors in the following year or by using a regression model to identify and prioritize reviews of women faculty whose actual salary differs from the predicted salary by a certain amount. All women faculty should be reviewed within 2 years.
5. Departmental SEACs should make a recommendation for each eligible female faculty member by examining that person’s record and those of three other faculty deemed to be comparable or nearly comparable. (See Clayton 12/26/11 report, page 3, for more detail on the comparison process).
6. Once departmental SEACs have determined any recommended adjustments, their recommendations and justifications should be forwarded to the college/school SEAC. Each faculty member reviewed should receive a copy of recommendations and justifications for her case. In addition, each faculty member reviewed should be told that she can make a counterproposal to the college/school SEAC.
7. College/school SEACs should review departmental recommendations and any counterproposals. College/school SEACs will affirm departmental recommendations or make a different recommendation, providing a justification based on the same comparison criteria.
8. Deans will receive departmental and college/school SEAC recommendations and take appropriate action. Faculty who were reviewed, but are dissatisfied with the action taken on their cases may appeal through normal University procedures.
9. The above processes should be conducted outside of usual annual salary adjustment reviews for merit.

Part 4. Recommended case-by-case salary assessments in future: Requested reviews

1. After the initial round of reviews, any member of the faculty may request a salary equity review from their departmental SEAC or from their college/school SEAC. Procedures for the review, justification, counterproposal, college/school SEAC recommendation to the Dean, and appeal will parallel those of the initial reviews of women faculty.
2. Chairs/heads and Deans should identify faculty whose salaries seem to be outliers in light of their performance and productivity and request an equity review on their behalf.