Re: Review of the “Analysis of UC Pay Equity by Sex, and Among Men, Ethnicity, 2009-10”

Dear Bob,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and opine upon the above-referenced report. Upon receipt of the report, I asked the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP), the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity (CODEO), Council on Planning and Budget (CPB), Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) and all the FECs to review and opine. As is our custom, all other Academic Senate Committees were also welcome to respond. The Executive Board, which speaks for the Division on such matters, reviewed all of the received responses together with the report.

Our Division is very concerned about issues of pay equity, and therefore was very interested in reviewing the data contained in the report. The Board was not surprised to learn that gender pay disparities exist, and was disappointed in the limited analysis contained in the report. The paucity of “action items” was a disappointment to many of the reviewing groups.

Several committees had recommendations for further analyses. For example, we recommend that there be an analysis of gender by ethnicity interactions. Are there pay inequities for faculty women of color compared to white men or men in general? Sample sizes would be small, which of course is a problem in and of itself. However, we believe such analyses would be useful in potentially revealing the full extent of pay inequity by both gender and ethnicity.

The Board also was concerned that, among men, Asians, who are not an underrepresented minority, were grouped with Blacks, Latinos, and American Indians for this study. It would have made more sense to have used the generally accepted categories as outlined by the NIH and NSF. Do pay inequities exists when one compares Blacks, Latinos, American Indians/Native Alaskans, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders—who are underrepresented—with white/Caucasians and Asians? This additional analysis might be plagued by small sample sizes, but would be worthwhile.
Nevertheless, the Board found the study to be compelling evidence sufficient to make the following recommendations:

• Chancellors should clearly and regularly communicate the University’s commitment to diversity to the campuses, and encourage individual faculty members to discuss these issues with their Deans or Department chairs.

• Proactive mechanisms should be instituted to address pay inequity that do not require individual faculty to institute proceedings to seek remedies. Deans and Department Chairs should be required to address pay inequities in a proactive way. They should demonstrate a full understanding of the pay inequities of their respective organizations, have identified the mechanisms that will be used to address these issues, and have an articulated plan in place that demonstrates how pay inequity will be corrected.

• Deans and Department Chairs who are successful with regard to pay equity and UC diversity priorities should be recognized and their best practices highlighted for the broader university community.

• Various committees pointed out other means of sharpening the research approach (for example, use principal component analysis as an alternative to linear regression). While we understand the rationale for not examining rank and step because they might be confounded by gender and ethnicity, we still believe that examination of these factors might add additional explanatory power to the models. As future studies are commissioned, it is critical to clearly explain the rationale for whichever approach is used.

Thank you again for the opportunity to review and opine on this important report. Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of further service.

Sincerely,

Andrew Leuchter  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Cc: Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate  
Jaime R. Balboa, PhD., CAO Academic Senate
November 22, 2011

To: Andrew Leuchter, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Council on Academic Personnel

RE: Analysis of UC Pay Equity by Sex, and, Among Men, Ethnicity, 2009-10

The Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) at UCLA has reviewed the report, “Analysis of UC Pay Equity by Sex, and, Among Men, Ethnicity, 2009-10”. Although CAP on this campus is not charged with negotiating or approving faculty salaries, we read and discussed the report. We had the following reactions:

Although the analysis of pay equity by gender and by ethnicity (among men only) was comprehensive and the rationale for the regression method clearly stated, CAP was disappointed that the report was purely descriptive. Basically what we learned is that there is gender inequity but not ethnicity inequity among men. Pay inequity exists for women compared to white men (women as a group earn less), but no statistically significant pay inequity exists for racial/ethnic minority men compared to white men. There was no attempt to interpret these disparate gender and ethnicity findings, to discuss the extent to which UC practices are or are not meeting regulations such as Title IX, to document patterns of inequity by rank and step, or to provide either policy guidelines or recommendations. We therefore wondered what, if anything, the report would be used for – at the very least, how it might guide efforts to redress gender pay inequity. It seemed to us that the campuses have known about gender inequity for quite some time (the UCI longitudinal data attest to that). We were not persuaded that this report was sufficiently informative or nuanced to tell us what the university can or should be doing about such chronic pay inequity.

We were concerned that the method of analysis may have masked pay inequity by ethnicity. There were two reasons for our concern.

(1) There was no attempt to examine gender by ethnicity interactions. Specifically, are there pay inequities for faculty women of color compared to white men or men in general? Even though sample sizes would be small in some units (an important issue to highlight in and of itself) if such analyses were carried out, we believe they are necessary to uncover the full extent of pay inequity by both gender and ethnicity.

(2) In the ethnicity analysis for men only, we question why the minority male category included all Asians, Blacks, Latinos, and American Indians combined into one group. Concerns about inequities due to
race/ethnicity in large part are guided by concerns about racial/ethnic
groups who are underrepresented in the sciences and engineering. The
NIH and NSF definitions of those groups include Blacks, Latinos,
American Indians/ Native Alaskans, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific
Islanders. It seems odd to us, therefore, that Asians – the one racial group
not underrepresented in those core fields – would be included in this
analysis contrasting white men and minority men with no accompanying
explanation. We believe that the ethnicity equity analyses should be re-
done excluding Asian men.
November 28, 2011

To: Andrew Leuchter  
Academic Senate, Chair

From: Francisco Ramos-Gomez  
Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity, Chair

Re: Analysis of UC Pay Equity by Sex and, among men, Ethnicity, 2009-10

The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity reviewed the Analysis of UC Pay Equity by Sex and, among men, Ethnicity, 2009-10. After thorough review, the Committee thoughtfully done and commends the committee for addressing the differences between campuses and departments, but had a number of concerns:

1. The report was extremely statistical, and difficult to read unless you are familiar with survey analysis. An executive summary would make the report more comprehensive.
2. The equations for white men are not always significant. In these cases, the predicted pay differences have little meaning. Different and/or additional criteria may be required for these Departments. One possibility is to add step and then an interaction term for step*sex or step*ethnicity. This would examine whether differences in pay are explained by location on UC’s career ladder, which is not explored in the current analysis.
3. The report lack recommendations and action items.

We applaud the recommendation for a central diversity office to coordinate diversity efforts and to assure that efforts for graduate diversity are well coordinated.

Cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Dottie Ayer, Assistant to Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Brandie Henderson, Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
November 21, 2011

Professor Andy Leuchter
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Council on Planning on Budget Response: Analysis of UC Pay Equity by Sex and, Among Men, Ethnicity, 2009-10

Dear Professor Leuchter,

The Council on Planning and Budget began its discussion of this Report at its October 31 meeting and completed its discussion on November 14, 2011. One reason for the carry-over was that we frankly did not know what to make of this odd document. In the intervening two weeks, and with the assistance of one Council member in particular, we learned the background of this report, including reasons it was so long in the making and seems so incomplete. This study reports gender and (among men) ethnic pay equities by department for each UC campus, using a multiple regression model that adjusts for two independent variables...year since degree and years of service at UC. Its broad conclusion is that gender inequities within departments are widespread, even when these two factors are taken into account. In contrast, ethnicity seems to play little if any role. However, there is no analysis or policy discussion beyond these bare descriptive facts, which were already generally familiar to most CPB members. We understand that some campuses, including UCLA, did implement particular programs following an earlier version of the Report, but these programs were largely voluntary, requiring that aggrieved individuals take the initiative and, in the view of many, of limited effect.

Council members had differing views on how best to meet the challenges suggested in the Report, and the need for additional research. Most members did agree that the Report is incomplete, and requires policy discussion and implementation if it is to do more than gather dust.

Regards,

David Lopez,
Chair, Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Linda Sarna, Vice Chair, Academic Senate
    Ann Karagozian, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Linda Mohr, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
November 22, 2011

To: Andrew Leuchter  
Academic Senate, Chair

From: Joel Aberbach  
Faculty Welfare Committee, Chair

Re: Analysis of UC Pay Equity by Sex and, among men, Ethnicity, 2009-10

The Faculty Welfare Committee reviewed the Systemwide Analysis of UC Pay Equity by Sex and, Among Men, Ethnicity, 2009-10 at its meeting on Tuesday, November 8, 2011. The committee agreed that the study raises a number of important questions, but lacks definitive evidence of discrimination due to flawed methods of analysis. The committee believes that a more in-depth study should be conducted.

We thank you for the opportunity to participate in this process.

Cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Dottie Ayer, Assistant to Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Brandie Henderson, Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
TO: Jaime Balboa, CAO  
Academic Senate  
3125 Murphy Hall

FROM: Alan J. Laub, Professor  
Chair, HSSEAS FEC

DATE: November 10, 2011

RE: RESPONSE TO ACADEMIC SENATE – ANALYSIS OF UC PAY EQUITY BY SEX AND AMONG MEN, ETHNICITY, 2009-10

There is no rationale given for why linear regression was chosen (why not, for example, principal component analysis?). There seems to be no clearly articulated final goals or outcomes to the report. There are so many factors involved in analyzing why UC Pay is what it is, that a study like this simply adds to the confusion. If there are specific instances of the pay of an individual or group of individuals not being appropriate, then the FEC opines that such instances should be studied separately. Apart from that, the report does not merit further comment.
Memorandum
Faculty Executive Committee, School of Theater Film and Television

November 9, 2011

Andrew Leuchter, Chair, Academic Senate

Dear Andrew,

Below are the responses from the Faculty Executive Committee of the School of Theater, Film and Television for the five review items we have recently received.

**Item #1 - Review of New APM 668, Negotiated Salary Program**

After extensive dialog the committee opposes the implementation of the proposed “Negotiated Salary Program”. The committee expressed the following concerns:

1) That the NSP policy/program weakens the central administration responsibility to provide fair and appropriate salary for its entire faculty.

2) That the NSP policy/program has the potential to create large disparities between “marketable” and “non-marketable” disciplines.

3) That the NSP policy/program would generate additional burdens on academic departments because of the required one/two year commitment stipulation.

4) Confusion about the mechanism by which Chairs would engage in “NSP negotiations” and approve “NSP proposals”.

5) Confusion about the potential use of “Professional Fees” for NSP.

**Motion:** We applaud and appreciate the President’s and Chancellors’ efforts to increase salaries for faculty across the board. However, we do not endorse this proposal to increase compensation through resources that the faculty themselves are required to earn or secure for the school.

The motion passed. The vote was unanimous.

**Item #2 – Review of New APM 670, Health Sciences Compensation Program**

The faculty found the proposed APM discipline-specific and decided to abstain from responding.

**Motion:** To abstain from responding.

The motion passed unanimously.
Item #3 – Analysis of UC Pay Equity by Sex and Among Men, Ethnicity 2009-2010

The committee reviewed the data and conclusions of the study conducted by Professor Pauline Yahr.

**Motion:** To encourage the university to continue to understand the dynamics according to ethnicity and gender and to take actions to bring fair and equal levels of pay for its entire faculty.

The motion passed unanimously

Item #4 – Revision by UCEP to Senate Regulation 610 addressing “Residency”

The committee reviewed the proposed policy clarification and new policy language.

**Motion:** To endorse the policy revisions as written.

The motion passed unanimously

Item #5 – BOARS Policy on Transfer Admissions

The committee had an extensive dialog regarding the proposed policy. Concerns were expressed about the potential student pool limiting factor of the proposal. The committee also felt that the proposal does not generally apply to the fields of study in our School. Yet, generally it was seen as a positive step for the University.

**Motion:** To endorse the proposed BOARS policy as a mechanism to more effectively bridge the transfer process and to facilitate graduation in the appropriate time.

The motion passed unanimously

Sincerely,

Fabian Wagmister  
*Associate Professor, Department of Film, Television and Digital Media*  
*FEC Chair, School of Theater, Film and Television*
November 23, 2011

To: Andrew Leuchter, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Michael Meranze, Chair
    UCLA College Faculty Executive Committee

Re: College FEC response to the “Analysis of UC Pay Equity by Sex and, among Men, Ethnicity, 2009-10”

Thank you on behalf of the College Faculty Executive Committee for the opportunity to review and opine on Pauline Yahr’s report concerning pay equity among UC faculty. We discussed the report at our November 18, 2011 meeting, and I recount here a brief summary of the points that were made during that discussion.

1. We are concerned, although not surprised, by the continued pay inequity that female faculty face across disciplines and campuses. We wish to affirm in the strongest terms our support for efforts that seek to redress this problem.

2. The FEC believes that concrete mechanisms should be put in place to ensure that Deans and Department Chairs address these inequities in a proactive way. Specifically, we believe that Deans and Chairs must have a full understanding of the pay inequities of their respective organizations, have identified the mechanisms that will be used to address these issues, and have an articulated plan in place that demonstrates how pay inequity will be corrected in a timely fashion.

3. The Committee also urges the Senate Leadership to monitor these efforts and issue periodic reports as a means of holding campus stakeholders accountable.

Our membership appreciates the consultative process and welcomes the opportunity to opine on future reports. In the meantime, you are welcome to contact me at meranze@history.ucla.edu with questions. Kyle Stewart McJunkin, Academic Administrator, is also available to assist you and he can be reached at (310) 825-3223 or kmcjunkin@college.ucla.edu.

cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Lucy Blackmar, Assistant Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education Initiatives
Jaime:

My colleague Barbara Lawrence kindly agreed to look at the analysis and has the following comments:

“Here are a few comments:
1) Looks like a thoughtful study. The committee did a good job addressing the differences between campuses and departments.
2) The equations for white men are not always significant. In these cases, the predicted pay differences have little meaning. Different and/or additional criteria may be required for these Departments. (We fall into this category.)
3) One possibility is to add step and then an interaction term for step*sex or step*ethnicity. This would examine whether differences in pay are explained by location on UC’s career ladder, which is not explored in the current analysis.
4) The report provides no recommendations. Are there suggested procedures for assessing observed differences?”

Thanks and best regards,

Eduardo