

SALARY EQUITY (June 2020)

By: Andrea M. Cuellar
Chair GEDC

BACKGROUND

What are the issues at stake?

- Salary inequities are a persistent feature of the salary structure of universities.
- Even when corrections are applied, inequities tend to reappear in time, hence the need of periodic reviews.
- The factors behind salary inequities, affecting members of equity-seeking groups include:
 - Lower starting salary
 - Inequities in merit allocation
 - Service work not recognized/remunerated
 - Impact of teaching evaluations
 - Bias in peer-review, lags in publications and grant awards
 - Career interruptions, e.g., the “mommy penalty”

Why are we interested in this at the moment?

- The UofL is well-overdue for a salary anomaly review.
- Last salary review, in 2008, did not lead to a correction.
- The last correction happened in the 2002/2003 year.
- Currently, salary corrections are happening on a one-to-one basis. This is disadvantageous for members, especially to members of equity-seeking groups.

See Equity Working Group Report for a detailed history: [https://www.ulfa.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Equity%20Working%20Group%20\(December%202017\)%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf](https://www.ulfa.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Equity%20Working%20Group%20(December%202017)%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf)

What do we currently have in our collective agreement?

- Indirect reference that conditions of employment shall not discriminate against faculty members on any protected grounds (Article 11.02.5). Salary inequities are a form of discrimination.
- Schedule R. MOU - Diversity, Equity and Inclusion.

What current articles does it impact?

For BRC to consider.

What do we hope to achieve this round?

- Commitment to create an ULFA-Board group to carry out a salary anomaly review on a periodic basis (e.g. every 5 to 8 years).
- Commitment to apply any necessary corrections and redress.
- Commitment to create a permanent salary anomaly fund.
- Commitment to address practices that enable salary inequities in the first place (e.g. start-up salary grids, equity-informed parameters of merit allocation).
- If all four are not possible, then prioritize in descending order.

*** Additional support for this is the collection of faculty demographic information, to enable reviews that contemplate more than gender.

Where does this issue fit in our negotiating typology?

Gaps, mid-high contentiousness.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE ELSEWHERE?

- Salary reviews.
- CA language around salary equity/anomalies (over 30 institutions in Canada).
- Salary anomaly permanent fund.
- Note: most reviews address only **gender** inequities.

A. Five common comparator institutions:

University of Alberta: Spring 2019. **Gender** pay gap identified. 5.8% base salary increase for **female** faculty at the rank of Professor in addition to \$1,500 for “damages to dignity and self-worth.”

<https://edmontonjournal.com/news/local-news/u-of-a-academics-vote-to-accept-pay-raise-for-female-professors>

CA language? No

University of Calgary: Fall 2019. Board and Faculty Association agreed to joint **gender** equity salary review. They have undertaken two such reviews in the last 10 years.

<https://www.ucalgary.ca/news/progress-towards-gender-equity-campus>

CA language? Yes.

<https://www.ucalgary.ca/hr/sites/default/files/teams/239/tucfa-ca.pdf>

University of Regina: No salary reviews. Only a document about gender pay gap.

<https://www.urfa.ca/the-gender-pay-gap-on-campus>

CA language? No. But it has somewhat developed language about equity and the collection of faculty demographic information to help track equity issues.

[https://www.caut.ca/docs/default-source/collective-agreements/urfa-\(academic\)-collective-agreement.pdf](https://www.caut.ca/docs/default-source/collective-agreements/urfa-(academic)-collective-agreement.pdf)

University of Saskatchewan: No salary reviews.

CA language? Not on across the board salary reviews, but on one-to-one review of salary anomalies.

<https://careers.usask.ca/agreements/documents/usfa/agreement-2017-2022/usfa-ca-2017-2022.pdf>

Trent University: No salary reviews.

CA language? No.

<https://www.trentu.ca/humanresources/sites/trentu.ca.humanresources/files/documents/TUFACA2016-19Finalwsignatures.pdf>

B. Other institutions in chronological order (this is not an exhaustive search):

University of Toronto: Spring 2019. **Gender** pay gap identified. All tenure-stream women receive a 1.3% increase. Not retroactive.

<https://www.utoronto.ca/news/u-t-implement-salary-increase-more-800-women-faculty-members>

<https://www.provost.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/155/2019/04/April-26-2019-Joint-statement-re-GPE.pdf>

Wilfrid Laurier University: Spring 2017. **Gender** pay gap identified at the Associate Professor and Professor rank. Increase of 3% for all female faculty at the rank of Associate Professor and 3.9% at the rank of Professor. Could not find a document with the study, but this news release talks about the creation of a committee about equal pay.

<https://www.wlu.ca/news/news-releases/2017/may/laurier-gender-equity-analysis-results-in-salary-increases-for-university-female-associate-and-full-professors.html>

Simon Fraser University: Fall 2016. Ambiguous on the identification or acknowledgement of a gender pay gap across the board. A larger gap was identified in departments where faculty earn higher salaries. See proposed remediations on pages 4-5.

<https://www.sfufa.ca/salary-equity-agreement/>

http://www.sfu.ca/content/dam/sfu/vpacademic/files/vp_academic_docs/pdfs/Salary%20Equity%20Recommendation%20Ctte%20Final%20Report%2020160901.pdf

McMaster University: Spring 2015. **Gender** pay gap identified. All full-time female faculty receive a base salary adjustment of \$3,515 (prorated for part-time female faculty).

https://www.mcmaster.ca/vpacademic/documents/MUFA%20Gender%20Salary%20Gap%20Analysis_May%202015.pdf

HOW SHOULD WE ADDRESS THE ISSUE THIS ROUND?

Proposed language:

For BRC to consider.

Justification, why is this important for ULFA and the employer:

- Members' dissatisfaction with the lack of action on a review of salary anomalies.

This is accentuated by public disclosure of the Sunshine List, as faculty members (especially those of equity-seeking groups) obtain evidence of salary inequities.

See Report on the 2018 ULFA Survey of Faculty Perceptions on EDI:

<https://www.ulfa.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Report-EDI-Perception-Report.pdf>

- The EDI Report (by the employer) also highlights the need to address salary equity: https://www.uleth.ca/sites/default/files/2019/03/presidents_advisory_committee_on_diversity_equity_and_inclusion_public_report.pdf
- Inaction around salary anomalies, while there are compelling reasons to believe that they exist, contravenes legislation against discrimination.

USEFUL RESOURCES (BY INDIVIDUAL ASSOCIATIONS, UMBRELLA ORGANIZATIONS, OTHERS)

CAUT

No bargaining advisory on salary equity. Only a 2008 advisory on “Realizing Equity” (<https://www.caut.ca/sites/default/files/realizing-equity-apr-2008.pdf>) which has a section on Salary Discrimination and Anomalies. It includes the fact that “salary anomaly processes and anomaly funds have become a permanent feature of many collective agreements” (p.5). It stresses the need for anomaly reviews to be regular, to involve more than gender, and to check the factors that enable anomalies to re-emerge or new anomalies to appear after corrections take place.

In 2018 the CAUT published a report entitled “Underrepresented & Underpaid. Diversity and Equity Among Canada’s Post-Secondary Education Teachers.” It tracks patterns of representation and income gaps and extends the analysis beyond gender, including Indigenous and racialized academic staff.

https://www.caut.ca/sites/default/files/caut_equality_report_2018-04final_0.pdf

OCUFA

Pay Equity Among Faculty at Ontario’s Universities (2016), it compares approaches by various universities in Ontario, it has a good review of measures to address the gender wage gap.

<https://ocufa.on.ca/assets/OCUFA-Submission-on-the-Gender-Wage-Gap-FINAL.pdf>

UBC Faculty Association

Report of the Pay Equity Recommendation Committee (2012), it is notoriously thorough and well laid-out, it includes an excellent summary of recommendations.

https://www.facultyassociation.ubc.ca/assets/media/GenderPayEquity_UBCV_ReportRecommendationCommittee2012-07.pdf

Academic resources

Momani, B.; Dreher, E. and K. Williams. 2019. “More Than a Pipeline Problem: Evaluating the Gender Pay Gap in Canadian Academia from 1996 to 2016” *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 49(1): 1-21. A peer-reviewed article referenced in various places that deal with this problem.

<https://journals.sfu.ca/cjhe/index.php/cjhe/article/view/188197/186327>