

**The 2000-01 Faculty Gender Pay Equity Exercise at the
University of Wisconsin - Madison**

January 2002

Prepared by:

Margaret N. Harrigan, Policy & Planning Analyst, Budget Planning & Analysis

Linda S. Greene, Associate Vice Chancellor, Office of the Provost

Martha L. Casey, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Budget Planning & Analysis

Reviewed by:

Helen H. Madsen, Associate Director, Administrative Legal Services

This report describes the 2000-01 faculty gender pay equity exercise for the University of Wisconsin at Madison. It begins with a brief background and history for the exercise. The exercise grew out of recommendations to the Provost by the Committee on Women in the University and the faculty Follow-up Committee to the 1993 Gender Pay Equity Exercise and the 1998 analyses by an outside consultant. The report summarizes the process followed for the gender equity exercise, including the efforts of the Provost's Office and those of each school and college. As a result of the 2000-01 gender pay equity exercise, 42 women were granted pay adjustments. On average, these women received salary increases of approximately \$5,000. Other efforts by the university to monitor and address salary equity are also noted in this report. We believe this description will help guide discussions about the exercise and plans for future monitoring of salary equity.

1. Background/ History

The June 1992 Gender Equity Study of Faculty Pay at the University of Wisconsin - Madison found a significant gap in salaries between men and women. As a result of the study, an amount equal to 3.8 percent of women faculty salaries was set aside to address pay inequity (approximately \$830,000). The Faculty Senate adopted a plan to provide salary adjustments to women faculty on a case-by-case basis. Salary increases were provided to 372 women (86 percent of all women faculty) in June 1993. In addition, the Senate called for a follow-up study that would make further recommendations to ensure gender pay equity on a continuing basis.

In 1995, analysis by a follow-up committee to the 1993 Faculty Gender Pay Equity Exercise found that the exercise had eliminated any aggregate gender gap. Nonetheless, the follow-up committee asked the university to "monitor, on a routine basis, the salaries of faculty, and to hold each school/college accountable for achieving and maintaining gender equity." The Committee on Women in the University was designated as one of three committees to advise on such monitoring. In 1997, the Committee on Women in the University requested that the Office of Budget, Planning & Analysis (OBPA) conduct a follow-up study. That office performed multiple regression analyses in 1998, using the methodology of the 1992 pay equity study. The analyses use several variables, including rank, years since terminal degree, years of service at UW, and market value of area of specialty.

The OBPA report, based on 1997 salaries, showed no statistically significant evidence of gender inequity in faculty salaries across campus or in any school or college. (A copy of the report can be found at www.wisc.edu/provost/GEFS.html.) An outside consultant, Delores Conway (Associate Professor of Statistics, University of Southern California), was retained to assist UW-Madison in interpreting the OBPA analyses and to advise on next steps. Professor Conway concluded that the OBPA regressions show no statistically significant evidence of gender inequity in faculty salaries across campus or across schools. Despite this finding, she cautioned that regression analyses cannot show whether individual cases of gender salary inequity exist in schools or colleges. An individualized analysis is necessary in order to make a judgment about the gender equity of an individual female faculty member's salary.

Professor Conway considers graphs of salary distribution, by rank, for individual departments, schools, and/or divisions within a school to be important tools for flagging situations for further review. Once individuals with unusually low salaries are flagged, she cautions, they need to be compared to individuals who are truly comparable - by rank, area of specialization, and other factors indicating similar positions.

The Provost consulted with the Committee on Women in the University, deans, and others and determined that the university should take steps to examine individual women faculty salaries for evidence of gender inequity. The Committee on Women in the University made recommendations about the process to be used to examine salaries for inequity. Many of their suggestions were incorporated into the guidelines and procedures established for the exercise.

The Provost did not recommend a review of all women faculty, as was done in the 1993 gender pay equity exercise, for two reasons. First, as noted above, the statistical analysis found no overall gender gap in faculty salaries for the university as a whole or for any of the schools or colleges. Second, the Follow-up Committee to the 1993 Gender Equity Pay Exercise reported that the 1993 exercise, although successful, was complex and time-consuming to conduct. Instead, the Provost determined that each school and college would be responsible for conducting a review of faculty salaries, using graphs of salary by rank and years of experience for each department. Individual women faculty could ask that their salaries be examined for equity. In addition, any women's salaries identified by the school/college as being unusually low would also be evaluated. The salaries chosen for further evaluation would be reviewed through an analysis of comparables similar to the 1993 exercise.

In September 1999, the Provost asked the deans of UW-Madison schools and colleges to initiate a review to determine whether the salaries of individual female faculty members were equitable compared to comparable male faculty members. The original timeline for the gender pay equity exercise was established so that it would occur separately from the normal merit review process that takes place each spring. However, the subsequent delay by the state legislature in approving the biennial budget and state pay plan resulted in a postponement of the gender pay equity exercise until 2000-01. As described in the Provost's memo to the deans, since the 1993 Faculty Gender Pay Equity Exercise, the chancellor has stated that ongoing equity in faculty pay is a key responsibility of the schools and colleges and is to be funded out of each school/college's faculty salary base. No central funding was available for this exercise.

2. Basic Method for 2000-01 Salary Equity Review

A. Instructions and Guidelines

The Provost asked Linda Greene, Associate Vice Chancellor (hereinafter AVC) to coordinate completion of the exercise. Throughout the course of the exercise, the AVC consulted an advisory group consisting of Margaret Harrigan, policy and planning analyst, Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis, Martha Casey, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Office of Budget,

Planning and Analysis, and Helen Madsen, Associate Director, Administrative Legal Services.

The provost's office sent out several memoranda containing instructions for conducting the gender pay equity exercise. The first memo, sent August 1999, established the original time line and procedures for the exercise and included guidelines for implementing the faculty pay equity review. As noted above, the Provost postponed the exercise because the state biennial budget and 1999-2000 pay plan were delayed. A revised timeline was sent out in February 2000, followed by a final memo of instructions in August 2000. Tables and graphs of 2000-01 faculty salaries by rank, years since degree, and gender for each tenure department were distributed in August. An example of the tables and graphs prepared by OBPA is included in the Appendix. (See www.wisc.edu/provost/GEFS.html for copies of the memoranda and guidelines for the exercise.)

Each school or college dean's office was charged to examine its total faculty salary profile using graphs, such as scatter plots reflecting 2000-01 salaries, and the office's experience to identify any female "outliers." Since this review grew out of recommendations that women faculty members' salaries be monitored for gender equity and followed the 1992 analysis that found statistically significant disparities between salaries of men and women, this review was limited to female faculty.

Women faculty members could be chosen for review through one of three avenues. The dean's office could elect to examine the case of any particular woman faculty member. In addition, the department chair could request an individual's salary be reviewed. Finally, all women faculty members were informed by their dean's office in writing that they could request that their cases be examined. Guidelines for the review were posted on a website so that all interested parties had information on the process and the issues to be considered.

The guidelines spelled out the process for analyzing whether a salary difference between a woman and appropriate comparables represented gender inequity requiring correction. The working assumption was that salary inequities between men and women may or may not represent a gender inequity. The guidelines required the identification of specific reasons for salary differences and required that unexplained salary gaps be corrected.

For each female faculty member selected or nominated for review, the school or college conducted a salary comparison with three male faculty members who are comparable in degree/training, academic rank, years since degree, general area of specialization, and academic unit - to determine whether any differences in salary appear to be justified by differences in other compensable factors that determine merit in that unit, such as:

- performance in research, publication, teaching, outreach, and service;
- record of obtaining grants or other outside additional funding for programs;
- market demands for particular skills and specialties, including a record suitable for attracting offers of employment from other universities or research institutions;
- assumption of administrative or supervisory duties that normally merits additional salary;

- additional factors (other than gender) that normally determine merit pay in the unit.

The reviews were based on the curriculum vitae and the annual activities report or summaries of recent activities for the faculty members being compared, plus any further materials or consultations the dean's office found useful.

For each female faculty member reviewed, the dean's report included a recommendation (whether for an increase or no increase) and a justification in writing, with reasons and a statement of the factors used to reach the decision. The affected faculty member was given a copy of the recommendation and justifications and an opportunity to appeal the decision to the dean or the dean's designee. Persons not involved in the original review and recommendation heard the appeals.

B. Implementation by Schools and Colleges

The guidelines permitted some flexibility, within specified parameters, on how each school or college would implement the gender equity exercise. Deans could undertake responsibility for administering the exercise themselves, or delegate to a faculty committee or college administrator such as an associate dean. However, regardless of who conducted the review, the same rules applied in each unit for notifying women, selecting comparables, making salary comparisons, and hearing appeals.

As noted above, all schools and colleges were required to notify women faculty of the exercise and to offer the opportunity to be included in the review. The AVC prepared a sample letter for the deans to use. It included information on the purpose of the exercise, procedures and deadline for self-nomination, and the web address of the university's red budget book for comparative salary data.

In each school or college, the dean or dean's designee used the graphs and tables of faculty salaries by years since degree and other information to identify any women faculty whose salaries should undergo a more detailed review. The dean was directly involved in the initial stages of the gender equity exercise and participated in determining which cases should be reviewed in seven schools and colleges (Agricultural and Life Sciences, Letters and Science, Human Ecology, Pharmacy, Nursing, Veterinary Medicine, and Continuing Studies). In four schools, this responsibility was delegated to a faculty committee (Business, Education, Medicine and Law). Department chairs were charged with identifying cases for review in the College of Engineering. Associate deans and human resources staff were also involved in the initial review in several schools.

Faculty committees conducted the actual analysis of comparables in eight units (Law, Human Ecology, Letters and Science, Business, Education, Medicine, Nursing, and Agricultural and Life Sciences). These committees were generally made up of three to eight tenured faculty members and were specially appointed for this task or were formed as a subcommittee of a standing faculty committee, such as the college's academic planning council, budget committee or equity and diversity committee. In several schools, associate deans or other dean's office staff also served on the committee or assisted the committee.

The guidelines required that appeals be handled by a person or group not involved in the earlier review. In three schools (Business, Law, and Education), the dean reserved that role for himself. Associate deans or assistant deans in Letters and Science, Human Ecology and Medicine considered appeals in those units.

Deans were instructed to involve the school/college equity & diversity (E & D) committee in the review process. In some schools, the E & D committee (or members of it) was responsible for conducting the review of the overall data and individual cases. Medicine, Agricultural and Life Sciences, Education, Nursing, and Human Ecology all used members of the school's E & D committee in the comparative review. In other units, the equity & diversity committee (or a subset of it) was provided with the data and the dean's draft report on the review process, and asked to give advice on it before the dean prepared a final report. E & D committees in Veterinary Medicine, Engineering, and Continuing Studies performed this role.

C. Role of the Provost's Office in the Review

The AVC was responsible for monitoring the efforts of the schools and colleges to ensure that they were complying with the procedures. In addition to establishing timelines and guidelines for the exercise, the AVC also served as a resource person for the deans as they completed the exercise. As resource person, she gave advice to the schools and colleges in interpreting the guidelines. The deans regularly consulted with the AVC throughout the process. All deans followed the procedures outlined and accepted and followed the advice provided.

Before the dean or dean's designee notified women faculty members of the school or college recommendation, the deans sent draft decisions to the AVC. The AVC and the advisory group reviewed the dean's report to assure that the guidelines for the exercise were followed. This review focused primarily on three areas. First, the review verified that the report documented the process used in the school or college, including information on how women were chosen to be reviewed, who conducted the reviews and how women were notified of their rights. Second, the AVC advisory group verified that in each case three male comparables were chosen according to the guidelines. If the comparables were not of the same rank or department, or had dissimilar years of experience compared to the woman, the report must contain a rationale for the appropriateness of the comparables. Finally, the AVC advisory group verified that appropriate justifications for salary differences were provided (for example, a statement that an individual had substantially more publications in prestigious journals or that a person was compensated for additional administrative duties). If the report required correction or revision, the AVC communicated directly with the dean or dean's designee to resolve the issues. The AVC and advisory group provided further guidance to all schools and college that requested it during the exercise. In addition, the AVC and the advisory group reviewed all appeals decisions before they were finalized.

3. Results

Table 1 shows for each college, the number of women faculty, the number who were reviewed, and the count of those who received an adjustment. In addition, the table examines

the distribution of women in the exercise by whether they nominated themselves or were nominated by their dean or department chair. The pay equity exercise reviewed the salaries of 117 women -- 23 percent of all women faculty at UW. Of those examined, about 47 percent were selected by deans or department chairs to be reviewed and 53 percent nominated themselves for review. In total, 42 women received a gender pay equity adjustment, representing about 36 percent of those who were reviewed. These adjustments are retroactive to the beginning of the 2000-01 academic year and are made a permanent part of the faculty member's salary.

Women nominated themselves for review in six colleges. Two colleges reported both self-nominations and dean or department chair nominations. The Business School chose to review all female faculty members, not including one member on leave for 2000-01 who resigned during the review period. Similarly, the School of Pharmacy reviewed all women faculty whose primary appointment was in Pharmacy. About twelve percent of all women faculty nominated themselves for review. However, in some schools and colleges, women were asked to self-nominate before the dean's office or department chairs made their own nominations. In other units, women who were nominated by the dean's office or department chair were notified that they would be reviewed and did not need to nominate themselves. Thus, the number who nominated themselves might have been higher had they not already been selected for review.

Information on the rank of women faculty who participated in the gender pay equity exercise is displayed in Table 2. Over one-fourth of all women professors and associate professors and about 14 percent of women assistant professors were reviewed. Assistant professors were less likely to nominate themselves for review than were women faculty of higher ranks -- five percent of female assistant professors nominated themselves for review, compared to about 15 percent of tenured women faculty.

Fifty-two percent of assistant professors reviewed were granted a gender equity salary adjustment. In contrast, adjustments were recommended for about 35 percent of associate professors and 30 percent of professors who were reviewed. Because of the small number of individuals under review, a different decision in one or two cases would have a large impact on the percentage calculations for the group. Thus, although these differences by rank appear large, they are not statistically significant (95 percent confidence level). Of those women who nominated themselves, 29 percent received a gender equity adjustment; 44 percent of women nominated by deans or department chairs had their salaries adjusted. This difference between self-nominations and other nominations is also not statistically significant.

Table 3 shows the number of women recommended for an adjustment initially, the number of appeals, and the final results of the gender equity exercise by school or college. Prior to appeals, 32 women were recommended for an increase in salary as a result of the exercise (27 percent of those reviewed). About 17 percent of women who were reviewed appealed the initial decision in the dean's report. Three women initially recommended for an adjustment and 17 women not recommended for an adjustment appealed the initial decision. As a result of the appeals, adjustment amounts were modified in 12 cases. In total, 42 women (8 percent of all women faculty) received a gender pay equity adjustment through the exercise.

Table 4 provides a distribution of the equity adjustments. The median salary adjustment for those who received one was \$5,000; recommended adjustments ranged from a high of \$14,500 to a low of \$1,000. About one-fourth of the women with a pay adjustment received \$2,500 or less. Two women were granted an adjustment of over \$10,000. On average, women who benefited from the pay equity exercise received a 5.6 percent increase in salary. Forty-five percent of the women with an increase received less than five percent. About twenty percent of the women received an increase between seven and eleven percent. The salaries of six women were increased by more than 11 percent.

Data about the size of the gender equity adjustment by faculty rank is presented in Table 5. Half of the assistant professors that were granted adjustments received less than \$3,000. For associate and full professors, the median adjustment was \$5,000. When measured as a percent of salary, the median adjustment was 4.5 percent of salary for assistant professors, 8.1 percent for associate professors, and 4.7 percent for full professors.

As a result of the exercise, the total payroll for women faculty is increased by less than \$200,000. This amount is approximately 0.5% of the total payroll for all women faculty in 2000-01. In comparison, the average percentage merit increase for all faculty was 5.2% in both 1999-00 and 2000-01.

4. Other Efforts

For over 20 years, the university has monitored the average merit increases for faculty and staff for gender equity. As noted in the annual budget instructions for 2001-02, "It is expected that the average salary increase percentages for eligible men and eligible women [as a group] will be equal. This expectation pertains separately to both faculty and academic staff. Significant variance requires prior approval..." The Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis and Office of Human Resources monitor the proposed merit increases at the school/college/division level and must approve any exceptions.

The university provides detailed guidelines for base adjustment rate increases in the Unclassified Policies and Procedures Manual. Any adjustment related to market (such as for an outside offer) or equity requires the department to prepare an analysis of the effect of the adjustment on the salary structure within the department, including the effect on gender/race pay equity. Adjustments involving more than one person also require an analysis from the dean or director on the effect of the adjustments on pay equity within the division.

In their reports to the provost, several deans described how they made an effort, prior to this exercise, to monitor pay equity and adjust any anomalies. For example, the report of one school states that they undergo an annual review to "...carefully consider relative salaries to ensure that differences are based on factors such as performance, nature of assignment, levels of qualifications, and similar factors." As a consequence, no women were found to have a salary inequity in this unit. In addition, because the gender equity exercise was announced and then postponed due to state budget delays, schools had an opportunity to review salaries

and make adjustments prior to the exercise. Several colleges reported that they did not wait until the pay equity exercise to examine faculty salaries and make adjustments where needed.

In some of the reports, pay disparities that were not the result of gender inequity were identified. Although not a part of this exercise, deans indicated that these inequities would be addressed through normal base adjustment procedures.

5. Conclusions

This report describes the 2000-01 faculty gender pay equity exercise for the University of Wisconsin at Madison. It summarizes the efforts of the Provost's Office and the reports submitted to the provost by each school and college. We believe this description will help guide discussions about the exercise and plans for future monitoring of salary equity.

All women faculty were given an opportunity to have their salaries reviewed for pay equity through the exercise. Both self-nominations and nominations by dean or department offices occurred. Schools and colleges used the provost's guidelines to review the salaries of 117 women faculty and granted pay adjustments to 42. The median pay equity adjustment was \$5000, or about 5.6 percent of the woman's salary before the adjustment.

The gender equity exercise took several months longer than anticipated. The original timeline was established, in part, to separate the pay equity exercise from the normal merit exercise that occurs each spring. However, the process demanded time-consuming, careful analysis and therefore the timeline was extended. The AVC and the advisory group, dean's offices, and faculty committees devoted a substantial number of hours to the exercise.

Table 1

**Women Faculty Considered for Gender Pay Equity Adjustment
by School/College and Nomination and Review Status**

School/College	Total Faculty	Total Women Faculty	Nominated for Review:			Total Reviewed	Reviewed as % of Women Faculty	Adjustment Recommended	Recommended as Percent of Reviewed
			Self	Dean/ Dept. Chair	Other College				
Agricultural & Life Sciences	295	45		4		4	9%	1	25%
Business	76	11		10		10	91%	10	100%
Education	144	56	3			3	5%	0	0%
Engineering	185	17		1		1	6%	1	100%
Human Ecology	39	26	5	7		12	46%	6	50%
Inst. for Environmental Studies	10	1				0	0%		0%
Law	37	12		3		3	25%	1	33%
Letters & Science	890	241	37		2	39	16%	12	31%
Library	2	0							
Medicine	372	73	13	26	1	40	55%	13	33%
Nursing	22	22	3			3	14%	0	0%
Pharmacy	30	5		4		4	80%	0	0%
Veterinary Medicine	57	11				0	0%		0%
Continuing Studies	19	11	2			2	18%	0	0%
Grand Total	2118	511	62	55	3	117	23%	42	36%

NOTES: Total faculty excludes 49 men and 8 women faculty who either hold zero-dollar appointments or hold both faculty and full-time administrative appointments such as dean. These men and women are ineligible to be reviewed or used as comparisons for the faculty pay equity exercise. Twenty women and 40 men have tenure homes in more than one school or college. They are counted only once in the Grand Total but are shown in each school/college in which they hold a tenured or tenure-track appointment. Therefore, columns may not sum to total. Colleges reviewing women with joint appointments had to seek concurrence from the other unit (reported in "Other College" column). In some units, women were asked to self-nominate before the dean's office or department chair made their own nominations. In other schools/colleges, women who were nominated by the dean's office or department chair were notified that they would be reviewed and did not need to nominate themselves. In the Medical School, two women who nominated themselves and were nominated by their department chairs are shown here as self-nominated.

SOURCE: October 2000 IADS appointment data; School and College Reports on the Results of 2000-01 Faculty Gender Pay Equity Exercise
Prepared by: Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis 1/24/2002

Table 2

**Rank of Women Considered for Gender Pay Equity Adjustment
by Type of Nomination and Whether Received an Adjustment**

Total Women Faculty	Self-Nominated				Other Nomination				Total Reviewed				
	Reviewed		Adjustment Recommended		Reviewed		Adjustment Recommended		Reviewed		Adjustment Recommended		
	Percent		Percent of		Percent		Percent of		Percent		Percent of		
	Number	of Total	Number	Reviewed	Number	of Total	Number	Reviewed	Number	of Total	Number	Reviewed	
Faculty Rank													
Assistant	160	8	5%	3	38%	15	9%	9	60%	23	14%	12	52%
Associate	123	21	17%	7	33%	13	11%	5	38%	34	28%	12	35%
Professor	228	33	14%	8	24%	27	12%	10	37%	60	26%	18	30%
Total	511	62	12%	18	29%	55	11%	24	44%	117	23%	42	36%

NOTES: Total women faculty excludes four women with zero-dollar appointments and four professors who also hold full-time administrative appointments (such as dean). These eight women are ineligible for the current exercise. In some schools and colleges, women were asked to self-nominate before the dean's office or department chair made their own nominations. In other schools/colleges, women who were nominated by the dean's office or department chair were notified that they would be reviewed and did not need to nominate themselves. Two women who nominated themselves and were nominated by their department chairs are shown here as self-nominated.

SOURCE: School and College Reports on the Results of 2000-01 Faculty Gender Pay Equity Exercise and October 2000 IADS appointment data.

Prepared by: Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis

1/25/02

Table 3

Women Faculty Considered for Gender Equity Salary Adjustment by School/College

School/College	Total Women Faculty	Women Reviewed	Recommended for Adjustment		Appeals		Final Results		
			Number	Median Adjustment	Filed	Granted	Number of Adjustments	Percent of Women Faculty	Median Adjustment
Agricultural and Life Sciences	45	4	1	7500	0		1	2%	7500
Business	11	10	10	2637	0		10	91%	2637
Education	56	3	0		0		0	0%	
Engineering	17	1	1	7500	0	0	1	6%	7500
Human Ecology	26	12	5	3000	1	1	6	23%	3000
Inst. for Environmental Studies	1	0	0				0	0%	
Law	12	3	1	1500	0		1	8%	1500
Letters & Science	241	39	7	2500	12	6	12	5%	5000
Medicine	73	40	9	7000	8	5	13	18%	6500
Nursing	22	3	0		0		0	0%	
Pharmacy	5	4	0		0		0	0%	
Veterinary Medicine	11	0	0				0	0%	
Continuing Studies	11	2	0		0		0	0%	
Grand Total	511	117	32	3750	20	12	42	8%	5000

NOTES: Total women faculty excludes four women with zero-dollar appointments and four women who hold both faculty and full-time administrative appointments (such as dean). These women are ineligible for the faculty pay equity exercise. Twenty women have tenure homes in more than one school or college. These faculty are counted only once in the Grand Total but are counted in each school/college in which they hold a tenured or tenure track appointment. Therefore, columns may not sum to total. Median adjustment is calculated based only on those women who were recommended for a gender equity salary increase. Only those women participating in the initial review were eligible to appeal. However, both women who were recommended for no adjustment and those recommended for an adjustment could appeal.

SOURCE: School and College Reports on the Results of 2000-01 Faculty Gender Pay Equity Exercise, October 2000 IADS appointment data.
 Prepared by: Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis 1/25/2002

Table 4

Women Faculty Considered for Salary Equity Adjustments by Size of Adjustments

Size of Equity Adjustment in Dollars	Women Faculty Reviewed	Percent of Those with Adjustments	Equity Adjustment as Percent of Salary	Women Faculty Reviewed	Percent of Those with Adjustments
No adjustment	75		No adjustment	75	
\$1,000 - 2,500	10	23.8%	1.0 to 3.0%	9	21.4%
2,501 - 5,000	16	38.1%	3.01 to 5.0%	10	23.8%
5,001 - 7,500	9	21.4%	5.01 to 7.0%	8	19.0%
7,501 -10,000	5	11.9%	7.01 to 9.0%	4	9.5%
10,001 or more	2	4.8%	9.01 to 11.0%	5	11.9%
			11.01 to 13.0%	2	4.8%
			13.01 to 17.0%	4	9.5%
Total with adjustments	42	100.0%	Total with adjustments	42	100.0%
Median adjustment	\$5,000		Median salary	\$82,450	
			Median percentage increase	5.6%	

NOTES: Median salary, median adjustment, and median percentage increase are calculated for those who received an adjustment. The maximum adjustment granted was \$14,500; the minimum was \$1,000.

SOURCE: School and College Reports on the Results of 2000-01 Faculty Gender Pay Equity Exercise

Prepared by: Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis

01/25/02

Table 5

Women Faculty Considered for Salary Equity Adjustments by Size of Adjustments and Rank

Adjustment in Dollars	Assistant Professor		Associate Professor		Professor		Total	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Total Reviewed	23	100%	34	100%	60	100%	117	100%
No Adjustment	11	48%	22	65%	42	70%	75	64%
\$1,000- 2,500	5	22%	2	6%	3	5%	10	9%
2,501- 5,000	3	13%	5	15%	8	13%	16	14%
5,001- 7,500	3	13%	3	9%	4	7%	10	9%
7,501-10,000	0	0%	2	6%	2	3%	4	3%
10,001 or more	1	4%	0	0%	1	2%	2	2%
Total with Adjustment	12	52%	12	35%	18	30%	42	36%
Median Adjustment (Adjustment recipients only)	\$3,000		\$5,000		\$5,000		\$5,000	
Median salary prior to adjustment (Adjustment recipients only)	\$72,279		\$64,166		\$84,782		\$82,450	
Median percentage increase (Adjustment recipients only)	4.5%		8.1%		4.7%		5.6%	

NOTES: Median salary, median adjustment, and median percentage increase are calculated for those who received an adjustment. The maximum adjustment granted was \$14,500; the minimum was \$1,000.

SOURCE: School and College Reports on the Results of 2000-01 Faculty Gender Pay Equity Exercise

Prepared by: Office of Budget, Planning and Analysis 01/25/02

APPENDIX A

September 2000 Faculty Salaries - Department A

Faculty Name	Sex	Yrs Since Degree	Rank	Tenure % this Dept	2000-01 Salary	Pay Basis	9-Month Salary	Faculty		Term Degree	Degree Year
								Start Date	Tenure Date		
A	F	NA	Prof	100.0	70,879	C	70,879	AUG88	AUG90	PHD	99
B	M	1	Asst	100.0	46,200	C	46,200	AUG99	.	PHD	98
C	F	2	Asst	100.0	47,500	C	47,500	AUG00	.	PHD	98
D	M	2	Asst	100.0	46,827	C	46,827	AUG98	.	PHD	97
E	M	3	Asst	100.0	49,498	C	49,498	AUG98	.	PHD	95
F	M	5	Asst	100.0	50,128	C	50,128	AUG95	.	PHD	95
G	M	5	Asst	50.0	49,200	C	49,200	AUG98	.	PHD	94
H	F	6	Assoc	100.0	55,926	C	55,926	AUG96	AUG96	PHD	93
I	F	7	Asst	100.0	50,712	C	50,712	AUG94	.	PHD	88
J	F	12	Prof	100.0	65,647	C	65,647	AUG86	AUG93	PHD	88
K	M	12	Prof	100.0	64,730	C	64,730	MAR91	AUG93	PHD	88
L	M	12	Assoc	100.0	53,438	C	53,438	AUG92	AUG99	PHD	88
M	M	12	Assoc	100.0	57,257	C	57,257	JAN92	AUG97	PHD	88
N	M	12	Assoc	100.0	60,500	C	60,500	JAN91	AUG95	PHD	88
O	F	15	Prof	100.0	68,488	C	68,488	AUG85	AUG90	PHD	85
P	F	15	Assoc	100.0	69,465	C	69,465	AUG98	AUG99	PHD	85
Q	M	16	Prof	100.0	73,441	C	73,441	JUN91	JUN91	PHD	84
R	F	16	Assoc	100.0	63,071	C	63,071	JAN92	AUG95	PHD	84
S	M	17	Prof	100.0	93,502	C	93,502	AUG92	AUG92	PHD	83
T	M	18	Prof	100.0	82,957	C	82,957	AUG84	AUG88	PHD	82
U	M	19	Prof	100.0	112,142	C	112,142	JUN92	JUN92	PHD	81
V	F	19	Prof	50.0	78,754	C	78,754	JAN92	JAN92	PHD	81
W	M	19	Prof	100.0	73,667	C	73,667	JAN89	AUG90	PHD	81
X	M	19	Prof	100.0	77,869	C	77,869	AUG91	AUG91	PHD	81
Y	M	20	Prof	100.0	70,870	C	70,870	JUN89	JUN89	PHD	80
Z	F	20	Prof	100.0	86,148	C	86,148	AUG82	AUG84	PHD	80
AA	M	21	Prof	100.0	84,664	C	84,664	JAN92	JAN92	PHD	79
BB	M	21	Prof	100.0	87,351	C	87,351	JAN79	AUG83	PHD	79
CC	M	22	Prof	100.0	104,563	C	104,563	JUN89	JUN89	PHD	78
DD	M	23	Prof	100.0	89,418	C	89,418	AUG88	AUG88	PHD	77
EE	M	25	Prof	100.0	58,994	C	58,994	AUG75	AUG80	PHD	75
FF	F	26	Prof	100.0	74,970	C	74,970	SEP71	AUG77	PHD	74
GG	M	26	Prof	100.0	84,003	C	84,003	JAN93	JAN93	PHD	74
HH	M	29	Prof	100.0	101,104	C	101,104	AUG72	AUG76	PHD	71
II	M	29	Prof	100.0	90,288	C	90,288	AUG73	AUG75	PHD	71
JJ	F	30	Prof	100.0	98,256	C	98,256	AUG84	AUG84	PHD	70
KK	M	30	Prof	100.0	74,074	C	74,074	SEP70	AUG75	PHD	70
LL	M	30	Prof	100.0	73,685	C	73,685	SEP67	AUG73	PHD	70
MM	M	31	Assoc	100.0	39,770	C	39,770	AUG74	AUG78	PHD	69
NN	M	32	Prof	100.0	96,123	C	96,123	SEP70	SEP71	PHD	68
OO	M	33	Prof	100.0	117,575	C	117,575	SEP66	SEP69	PHD	67
PP	M	34	Prof	100.0	117,653	C	117,653	AUG80	AUG80	PHD	66
QQ	M	34	Prof	100.0	68,596	C	68,596	SEP66	SEP71	PHD	66
RR	M	34	Prof	100.0	83,444	C	83,444	SEP70	SEP70	PHD	66
SS	F	34	Prof	100.0	70,962	C	70,962	AUG73	AUG77	PHD	66
TT	M	40	Prof	100.0	125,543	C	125,543	SEP68	SEP68	PHD	60
UU	M	43	Prof	100.0	98,616	C	98,616	SEP67	SEP67	PHD	57

NOTES:

- 1) Faculty members are shown in each department where they hold a tenure or tenure-track appointment. The percent tenure commitment for the department is shown in the table under "Tenure % this Dept."
- 2) Tables report 2000-01 Salary on a 12-month basis for "A" appointments and 9-month basis for "C" appointments. The table column labeled "9-Month Salary" converts all 12-month salaries to a 9-month basis. The graphs show all salaries on a 9-month basis.
- 3) Faculty with \$0 appointments or 100% administrative appointments are listed in the table at no salary and are excluded from the graphs. Faculty with missing degree dates are also excluded from graphs.

SEPTEMBER 2000 FACULTY SALARIES - DEPARTMENT A

