

ADDENDUM TO 2019 COSOW SALARY EQUITY STUDY: RECOMMENDATIONS & NEXT STEPS

UNC-CH's Committee on the Status of Women (COSOW)
Co-Chairs: Elizabeth Dickinson (Business); Brent Wissick (Music)
2019 Salary Equity Study Lead: Noah Eisenkraft (Business)
Authors of this Addendum: COSOW

Monday, April 22, 2019

I. BACKGROUND

On March 8, 2019, the Committee on the Status of Women (COSOW) presented a gender salary equity study to UNC-CH's Faculty Council meeting (materials can be found [here](#)).ⁱ To summarize our (COSOW's) main finding: from 2014 to 2017, at UNC-CH, men on UNC faculty earn 28% more than women, with the highest gap in the Medical School (39%) and the lowest in the School of Nursing (-8%).

COSOW has been invited to extend this discussion in UNC-CH's Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) meeting on Monday, April 22, 2019, along with recent salary findings in the School of Medicine.

In this addendum document to our re-analysis study, we (COSOW):

1. Provide context and information about our task. We contextualize pay gaps within academia, specifically addressing the "pipeline" and "leaky pipeline" metaphors that we'll use throughout as a way to structure the conversation.
2. Highlight four recommendations and next steps to address gender pay inequity at UNC-CH. Specifically, we ask the chancellor to create a task force to address the issue.

II. CONTEXT & TASK

Context. COSOW's 2019 study confirms that UNC-CH is not an anomaly, in the market place at large nor in the academy, of having a gender pay gap among faculty members. Both in and out of higher education, numerous studies show that women are compensated less than men. As a 2017 literature review of gender wage gap scholarship concludes, "the gender pay gap is persistent across all sectors."ⁱⁱ

Nationally, women make 80% of what their male colleagues make. Important to note: this discrepancy increases when women are disaggregated by race: Native Hawai'ian and other Pacific Islander women earn 62%, black women 61%, American Indian and Alaska Native 58%, and Latinas 53%, respectively, of what white (non-Hispanic) men make. Previous research has indicated that "women in academic medicine make 90 cents for every dollar made by their male counterparts."ⁱⁱⁱ A 2017 *Chronicle of Higher Education* article attests that academic workplaces are not exempt from gender-based pay inequity, and a 2016 *JAMA Internal Medicine* study, which included UNC-CH's School of Medicine, "found that annual salaries of female academic physicians were 8.0% (\$19,879) lower than those of male physicians. This difference represents 38.7% of the unadjusted difference in salary between men and women."^{iv}

Pipelines and Leaky Pipelines: Within conversations about women's underrepresentation and inequity across industries, fields, and positions "the pipeline" metaphor is often used. This well-established "pipeline" analogy holds that, across time and with advances in education and retention, women have

increasing representation in fields and occupations where they have been historically underrepresented. However, a "leaky pipeline" metaphor has been established as a trend that scholars and activists have labeled to describe how women slowly but significantly become underrepresented in specific fields and discussion.^v

Task: UNC-CH Chapel Hill can use this opportunity to become a leader among North Carolina system institutions and its peers by tackling this inequity and put in place policies and procedures to prevent the "leaky pipeline" perpetuation of gender-based salary inequities.

III. FOUR RECOMMENDATIONS: USING A CHANCELLOR'S TASK FORCE TO RECOGNIZE, RESEARCH, RETAIN, & REPAIR

We have come up with four specific recommendations and next steps to address gender pay inequity at UNC-CH, as well as address the "leaky pipeline" problem and biases that underlie gender pay inequities. We present these as four "R's:"

1. **Recognize:** The first step is recognizing and acknowledging that there is a gender pay gap among faculty at UNC-CH. Our study takes a step in this direction. We can only address the problem when we recognize that there is one. Currently, we need recognition from administration and faculty members that COSOW's study legitimately illustrates a gender pay gap.
2. **Research & Transparency:**
 - a. **Research:**
 - i. *Establish a Chancellor's Task Force:* COSOW's primary "ask" is to recommend a chancellor's taskforce. This task force will continue research that has already been done but also, and most important, serve as an accountability mechanism.
 - ii. *Aid the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA):* Second, to assist this task force, we think that the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) should receive support in the form of an additional staff position to study gender and other possible pay inequity at UNC-CH at the level of individual departments.
 - iii. Combined, the task force and OIRA might possibly further research the following topics:
 1. How years of training and other measurable aspects of qualification do or do not impact salary, comparative length of time in associate position (before full), and the relative frequency by gender with which faculty are nominated for distinguished professorships and other positions with attached stipends. These results should be benchmarked to peer institutions of the department's recommendation.
 2. A literature review for clear understanding pay inequity, the leaky pipeline, and potential solutions.
 3. A study of the reasons why women faculty leave UNC-CH. (See more about retention below.) The task force would communicate with HR about what records HR keeps, including rates of women's tenuring and women's experience with retention and promotion as fixed term faculty. Currently, that COSOW knows of, it appears UNC does not have a very robust exit interview process.

- b. **Transparency:** The College of Arts & Sciences' head of finances conducted a detailed salary compression review, including benchmarking to external peer departments. We hope that this study can set a precedent for transparency across units.
- 3. **Retain:** Retention has been an ongoing issue of discussion at UNC-CH. Addressing the pay gap will aid retention, and proactive retention offers can be a mechanism to rectify the gender pay gap. Specific steps:
 - a. **Reiterate current policies and ensure their consistent implementation:** UNC-CH currently has several policies, benefits, and procedures that have the potential to contribute to gender equity among faculty across campus. Among our peers, we are in the middle of the pack in the areas of parental leave, tenure extension, and lactation accommodations. We reiterate the need for equitable access and work-life balance:
 - i. *Tenure clock extension:* The form that tenure-track faculty can use to request an extension to their tenure clock, should they need to take family leave, has been recently revamped and simplified. It is now easier for faculty to a) find the form online and b) fill out the form. However, we need to strengthen the *culture* of supporting all faculty, of all genders, accessing this benefit. Deans, chairs, and senior faculty members should explicitly and implicitly encourage and support faculty using this benefit.
 - ii. *Family leave requests:* The form that faculty can use to request paid family or caregiving leave (separate from FMLA leave), should they need to take family leave, has been recently revamped and simplified. It is now easier for faculty to a) find the form online and b) fill out the form. However, as with the tenure clock extension, colleagues and administrators should actively encourage (and not discriminate against) individuals who wish to take this leave.
 - b. **Investigate new benefits:** There are several benefits that have the potential to improve conditions for women at UNC-CH, promoting their retention. The task force could develop a strategic plan for the selection of policies for implementation at UNC-CH and facilitate policy implementation. The task force could contract with system dynamics modelers to forecast the effects of policy changes (e.g., increased numbers of faculty stopping the tenure clock, availability of on-site childcare, etc.) on gender equity in salary.
 - i. *Childcare:* Victory Village, founded with UNC-CH funds, is a good start. However, some have noted its high cost, inconvenient location, and long waitlist. Other options can include an on-site, subsidized child care center that would benefit all UNC faculty, not just women. An equally valuable resource would be back-up care (for when a child cannot attend day care due to illness or school is cancelled unexpectedly), which several UNC peer institutions offer.
 - ii. *Paid Parental/Family Leave:* One option is to require UNC-CH benefits to pay parental leave instead of letting this fall to grants, effectively cutting investigators' funded periods short. While this does not apply to all faculty, it is a major issue for others.
- 4. **Review & Repair:** We recommend that all departments, in all University units, undertake an explicit, shared review of departments' and units' compensation philosophy and criteria. Once this phase is accomplished, chairs and deans should include clear data in their annual reviews about how their departments/units are meeting (or not) the established metrics and goals. This should include:
 - a. **Compensation policy review (at the department level):**
 1. Review how *initial compensation* offers are determined, and identify guidelines for future negotiations that establish concrete, quantifiable criteria that would justify

additional compensation (e.g., additional experience, awards/recognition, publications, etc.) in order to minimize bias. Policies within compensation plans that promote bias (“the chair may use discretionary funds to _____”) should be avoided. Departments should develop detailed answers to the question, what constitutes “merit?”

2. Review how *annual raises* are determined, and establish clear criteria on which to base these determinations that is shared with all members of the department.
3. Review how *service* is assigned, measured, and compensated, since women (and especially women of color) disproportionately perform department “housework” and such labor frequently slows women’s time to promotion.^{vi} If service is not the grounds for an increase, how will it be rewarded? How will the unit ensure that all members of the unit are contributing equitably?
4. *Report Cards*: Chairs should submit “report cards” on the salaries of their faculty and account for any potential inequities as part of their annual review by their deans. Deans should prioritize these report cards as indicators of the department’s health and equity.

Ultimately, what we’ve come up with here are ideas that a Chancellor’s task force can undertake. Again, we would be thrilled to see UNC-CH be a pioneer in this area, and we believe we are the kind of institution that is capable of doing this hard, but very important, work.

End Notes

ⁱ <https://facultygov.unc.edu/faculty-council/meeting-materials-2018-19/march-8-2019/>

ⁱⁱ Bishu and Alkadry, “A Systemic Review of the Gender Pay Gap and the Factors that Predict It.” See also the American Association of University Women, “The Simple Truth about the Gender Pay Gap” (Fall 2018). A 2016 study, “Sex Differences in Physician Salary in US Public Medical Schools,” which included UNC-CH-Chapel Hill and 23 other schools, found that male physicians were paid an average of \$20,000 more than their female colleagues.

ⁱⁱⁱ Freund, K. M.; Raj, A.; Kaplan, S. E., Terrin, N.; Breeze, J. L.; Urech, T. H.; & Carr, P. L. (2016). Inequalities in academic compensation by gender: A follow-up to the national faculty survey cohort study. *Academic Medicine*, 91(8).

^{iv} <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Gender-Pay-Gap-Persists-Across/239553>; see also: <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamainternalmedicine/fullarticle/2532788>

^v Specifically within STEM fields, women become underrepresented despite being almost equally represented in Ph.D. graduation rates. Several recent STEM-focused studies include Mason, Wolfinger, & Goulden’s *Do Babies Matter?* (<https://www.amazon.com/Do-Babies-Matter-Gender-Families/dp/0813560802>) and Ecklund and Lincoln’s *Failing Families, Failing Science* (<https://www.amazon.com/Failing-Families-Science-Work-Family-Conflict/dp/147984313X>)

^{vi} See, for example, Guarino, C. M and Borden, V. M. H. “Faculty Service Loads and Gender: Are Women Taking Care of the Academic Family?” *Research in Higher Education* 57.1 (2016) DOI 10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2