Task Force on Faculty Salary and Equity

Final Recommendations, 15 Jan 2018

The Task Force on Salary and Equity was created by the Faculty Senate 30 April 2015 and later revised with Senate Document Number 0415F. The first such task force at UNCA was convened in 2004. We recommend readers of this report read the former task force report as well.

Members:
Dee Eggers, (Chair), Environmental Studies
Volker Frank, Sociology/Anthropology
Michael Gass, Director of Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning
Jeff Konz, Dean of Social Sciences
Jackie Langille, Environmental Studies
Steve Patch, Mathematics
Cathy Whitlock, Mathematics
Scott Walters, Drama

Temporary members:
Marietta Cameron, Computer Science
Archer Gravely (retired), Director of Institutional Research
Bruce Larson (retired), Economics

The Task Force was charged with making recommendations concerning:

- equity adjustments;
- allocating salary increases for merit, tenure, promotion, and post tenure review;
- allocation of future salary increases into merit and cost of living;
- starting salary offers;
- compensation for department chairs and program directors; and,
- compensation for faculty members coming from or partially in UNCA administrative positions.

While substantive salary increases have not been available for several years, tuition increases effective for 2015-16 and 2016-17 made available additional funds for salary adjustments.

Timeline

Planning and data acquisition

Early summer 2015: We met with Archer Gravely and Bruce Larson who led the 2004-5 Task Force on Salary and Equity to receive their guidance. They and Provost Urgo requested we suspend our analysis efforts until a new Director of Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Planning could be hired and then become available as a resource to us, which they estimated would not be until the spring 2016. We also met with the Deans regarding their methodology for then-recent market based salary adjustments.

Discussion and analyses
During the fall and spring semesters, we generated recommendations, acquired salary data, generated missing values for peer salaries, and performed statistical analyses.

Equity Adjustments

Discussion
To address the issue of equity adjustments, we developed regression models which are discussed in Appendix A. The use of multiple regression models served to confirm the robustness of our findings. In each model, variables thought to best and most reasonably predict faculty salary over time and discipline were included. As well, dummy variables were used to provide insight into the relationship between salary, gender and race for tenure track faculty and Lecturers. This regression was performed twice for all tenure track faculty using two peer salary data sets for rank and discipline. In two additional regressions, only the white-male population were included and dummy variables for gender and race were excluded.

The latter, so-called white-male model has been and remains the preferred model to use in the investigation of wage bias associated with gender and race. Scott (1977) notes this model is advantageous because it creates "an estimate of what the salary of a female or minority faculty member would be if she or he were a white male with the same attributes and experience." Specifically, this model uses only the population of white males to predict how their salaries change as they move through their careers. The model can then be used to predict the salary for all faculty members by incorporating into the model their specific attributes and experience. The percent by which an individual deviates from the predicted salary is then calculated using the expression (actual salary / predicted salary) x 100.

Limitations: By definition, models are simplified simulations of reality. Thus, they provide limited approximations of true parameter estimates. Because race and gender bias can affect merit, models may be strengthened by either capturing merit rankings for individuals or testing them separately for any race and gender effects. Merit information is, however, considered part of each employees' confidential personnel record. We were therefore not able to obtain merit data for each individual. Instead, we were provided aggregate merit data showing the number of individuals of each sex receiving each level of merit by dean area for each year from 2001 to 2015. (Due to the small number of minorities and resulting possibility one could identify individuals from such a data set, we were not provided merit by minority status.) The data we were provided indicated no gender bias in allocation of merit. Additional factors that have been found to vary systematically by gender and race include starting salary and student rating of instruction. We found no evidence of bias in starting salaries. We were unable to obtain data on student rating of instruction.

We caution the administration against simply reviewing faculty members with the lowest salaries. This would fail to capture bias that, if it exists, would be expected to exist across all salary levels. As well, we caution against targeting individuals by the total difference between

predicted and actual salary. This would focus the reviews on members of the faculty with higher salaries, for which there does not appear to be a basis. Finally, we recommend against the use of standard deviation (or some percent thereof) as a basis for selection because it would also bias toward higher salaries the group identified for review. Example: Professor X may have a predicted salary of $80,000 and an actual salary of $72,000, (a difference of $8,000 and 10% below the predicted salary). Professor Y, on the other hand, may have a predicted salary of $60,000 and an actual salary of $52,000 (still a difference of $8,000, but here it is 13.3% below predicted salary). This example illustrates the advantage of using a "percent of predicted" review threshold for review over any method based on the absolute difference.

Because black and other minority populations on the UNCA campus are small, we recommend that salaries of all minority faculty members be reviewed. Parameter estimates and analyses of regression model residuals for women and minorities on campus indicated patterns that suggest their salaries are, on average, less than would be predicted when we considers rank, discipline, and years of experience. We therefore find reviews are warranted for some females, all non-black minorities, and black males.

To some extent, faculty salaries are artifacts reflecting the history of both varying internal models of compensation over time, such as salary adjustments for promotion, and larger-scale economic factors, such as the significant across-the-board raises available in some years prior to 2000 or the dearth thereof following the recession. For Full Professors, specifically, the regression residuals show a population in the early-middle years of that rank (approximately the 2nd quartile) who have salaries lower than predicted. This pattern is masked by the overall average for that rank.

Once faculty are identified for review, we recommend salary be considered in light of an individuals' history. It is important that the criteria employed in conducting these reviews be made known to the UNCA faculty because this will contribute to an understanding of fairness in the process as well as communicate and strengthen institutional norms and values.

Recommendation 1. Use multiple, reasonable models for predicting salary such as the models summarized in Appendix A, Table 2. To predict salaries for individual faculty members, the variables concerning minority status should be dropped, the Female variable coded to 0 (to predict the salary expected for a male), and the current status of the faculty member input for all of the other variables. Recommendations 3 and 4 address how this predicted salary should be used to identify faculty for salary equity review.

Recommendation 2. Future task forces should seek to model data based on those factors recognized to most reasonably and fairly predict what would be expected to influence salary over time and discipline, rather than seek to generate the highest R-squared value.

Recommendation 3. Identify faculty for review according to the percent by which their actual 9-month salary deviates from their predicted salary.

Recommendation 4. Review the salaries of all faculty members *within each rank* who are in the bottom half of the salary structure within their rank and fall at or below 95% of expected salary, with priority given to those falling at or below 90% of predicted salary.

Recommendation 5. Review the salaries of all minority faculty on campus.

Recommendation 6. Create and communicate a systematic salary review process.

Recommendation 7. In some instances, the actual salary of a faculty member substantially exceeds predicted salary. We strongly encourage the administration to identify and correct compensation practices that result in excessive or undue compensation over time.

Recommendation 8. Future task forces should analyze whether systematic bias for gender or race via student rating of instruction appears to exist on this campus.

Merit and Cost of Living

Discussion

In recent years, the State of North Carolina has provided few across-the-board increases to university faculty base salary, leaving merit as the only standard increase in compensation available to the faculty. Merit pay serves to motivate faculty and improve retention and morale. It is important to maintain and increase merit pay to the extent practicable.

We find that the existing model of adding all merit pay to base salary under-rewards the vast majority of the faculty and may result in over-compensation for one-time performances. If we assume the cost of living is increasing at 1.5% per year, current merit compensation levels now result in a real dollar salary increase for fewer than 10% of the faculty (i.e., only those receiving the highest merit awards). In addition, the current model is likely to cause substantial salary inequities over time. Consequently, we propose the range of merit compensation be tightened and, in the case of Exceptional Merit, combined with one-time bonus.

Merit is now funded by faculty turnover. This pool will be reduced as the average age of the faculty decreases, which is why we recommend seeking additional funding sources for merit increases.

Recommendation 9. We recommend replacing the geometric model for merit compensation with a linear model and changing the current level of compensation for Exceptional Merit to an addition to base pay combined with a one-time bonus.

We suggest the following model for merit compensation:
Retain the existing 5 levels of merit. Allocate merit compensation added to the based pay according to the following formula:
(0x) Does Not Meet Expectations
(1x) Merit

(2x) Exceeds Expectations
(3x) High Merit
(4x + a fixed, one-time bonus amount) Exceptional Merit

Recommendation 10. We recommend that merit compensation be changed for the 5 levels to at least $0, $400, $800, $1,200, and $1,600 + an $800 one-time bonus.

Recommendation 11. The formula for merit should remain consistent from year to year.

Recommendation 12. New sources of funds for merit compensation should be identified.

Recommendation 13. Because cost of living increases are seldom available, we recommend that, when they are available, cost of living adjustments be conducted after merit is awarded.

Compensation for Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review

Discussion. We agree with the current compensation models.

Starting Salary Offers

Discussion. We continue to conduct national searches for tenure track faculty and thus must be competitive with salaries and conditions of employment in the broader market. To hire qualified candidates who are most committed to our unique mission, starting salary offers should consider relative salaries for disciplines inside and outside UNCA.

Additionally, according to Haignere (2002), “Even relatively small differences in initial salary grow over time. If annual across-the-board salary increments average 3.5 percent, a [new faculty member] who earns $1,000 less than a colleague at the outset would accumulate $84,550 less over a forty-year career. If $1,000 a year were invested or saved in an account at 5 percent interest, at the end of forty years the account would hold $210,684.” The author continues, “For a salary difference of $2,000, this figure would more than double, owing to compounding."

Recommendation 14. We agree with the earlier task force that “starting faculty salaries should be established in light of faculty salaries and conditions of employment by discipline at comparable institutions, in order to attract and retain a diverse faculty of excellence that reflects the mission of the university.” At the same time, over time, we seek to strive for the competing value of equal pay for equal work. For further elucidation, refer to Appendix B.

Compensation for Department Chairs and Program Directors

Discussion. The work of most chairs is substantially similar. At the same time, we recognize the competing tensions of both equal work for equal pay and that some consideration of market

forces is desirable in hiring, compensating and retaining valued members of the faculty. The members of the task force find that basing chair compensation solely on existing salary (i.e., granting an additional month of salary) is inequitable. However, given that chairs must spend some time working during the summer, basing a portion of chair compensation on the 9-month salary is warranted.

Our proposed compensation model recognizes our competing core values of equal work for and market factors by slightly compressing the range of chair compensation, bringing greater equity to the lower-paid chairs. This will also serve to decrease the associations among discipline, years of experience, and rank with chair compensation. The current model makes serving as chair more attractive to faculty approaching retirement, which can be problematic for several reasons, and less attractive to mid-career faculty.

In some cases, chairing includes additional duties that should be considered in compensation. For example, some departments involve a higher degree of complexity than others due to external reporting requirements, accreditation responsibilities, public performances and exhibitions, or the number of faculty and students. The additional time required by these factors varies substantially.

Recommendation 15. Reallocate the amount currently spent on Chair or Program Director compensation as follows: Combine a fixed amount (e.g., $5,000) + 2 weeks base salary (i.e., 5.5% of their 9-month salary).

Recommendation 16. This new compensation model should become effective for all new chair contracts beginning in fall 2019. We recommend contracts signed before that time remain in effect for the duration of the contract.

Recommendation 17. Continue the current practice of awarding compensation only for the duration of tenure as Chair or Program Director.

Recommendation 18. Continue the current practice of allocating release time based on hours rather than courses.

Recommendation 19. Continue the no fixed compensation approach to Chairs or Program Directors with extra duties, and the current practice of considering such factors and giving appropriate additional release time, per administrative discretion.

Recommendation 20. When a Chair or Program Director is hired from outside the university, the base salary should be established as for a regular faculty member. Additional compensation for duties performed as Chair or Program Director should follow established guidelines.

Compensation for Deans

Recommendation 21. Each Dean should be compensated at roughly the same amount as the other Deans.

Recommendation 22. Upon return to the faculty, salaries should be adjusted based on their 9-month salary prior to becoming Dean. In addition, their base salaries should be increased at the equivalent of the Superior category for each year of service as Dean plus any cost of living adjustments or other relevant adjustments to faculty salaries over the course of the Dean's tenure.

Recommendation 23. For Deans returning to our faculty, we recommend a one semester PDL option.

Recommendation 24. Deans should have the option to teach while Dean.

Lecturer Compensation

Discussion. Lecturer salaries demonstrate far more variability than those of tenured and tenure track faculty members. Modeling Lecturer salaries is difficult for several reasons. A broader set of factors affect Lecturer salaries. For each individual, salary is an artifact which may be influenced by negotiated starting salary, relevant experience, performance, substitutability, terminal degree, spouse accommodation, the lack of inter-institutional standardization in Lecturer salaries, variations in annual budgets, and market forces. Several of these factors are neither captured nor possible to capture in our analysis. A substantial further complication is the relative lack of available data on Lecturer salaries at peer institutions. Although the variable that captures rank and discipline predicts strongly the salary for tenure-track faculty, it is far less successful in predicting Lecturer salaries. With a few notable exceptions, Lecturers are paid at roughly the same rate across disciplines. Additionally, at the time of this analysis, some Lecturers on campus were thought of as "Senior Lecturers" and receive significantly higher salaries for that reason, even though their rank did not reflect this status. With the new rank of Senior Lecturer, we expect modeling salaries to improve. As well, some Lecturers seem to play a role comparable to Visiting Assistant Professors. Even given those parameters, the data suggest that there is more variation in Lecturer pay than would be expected based on the characteristics and histories of individuals.

Recommendation 25. The Faculty Welfare and Development Committee and the Provost should work together to examine the roles and responsibilities of Lecturers and other non-tenure track faculty on the UNCA campus, so as to further systematize their compensation. This examination should include, but not be limited to, consideration of special institutional needs, the scope of faculty searches, and the possibility of additional distinctions among the rank of Lecturer.

Additional Recommendations

Recommendation 26. The practice of regular equity adjustments should continue for both internal and market equity. In addition, equity adjustments should be given a high priority

whenever UNCA has campus-based tuition increase or other available funding that can be used for such purposes.

Recommendation 27. The Faculty Welfare and Development Committee and the Provost should convene a task force every five years to perform an equity study of faculty salary distribution. The next task force should be convened in Fall 2022 and should address salaries of all full time faculty in all ranks (i.e., it should include tenure track faculty members, Lecturers, Visiting Assistant Professors and any individuals in substantially similar positions).

Appendix A: Statistical Analysis

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the distribution of faculty salaries at UNCA for systematic patterns of disparity by comparing *actual* to *predicted* salaries. The UNCA study included all faculty in the analysis and review of salary equity. The AAUP publication *Paychecks: A Guide to Conducting Salary-Equity Studies for Higher Education* (Haignere, 2002) was used as a reference manual for establishing the study methodology and selecting predictor variables. The study was conducted by task force members and the Director of Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Planning.

It is imperative for those conducting future analyses to work with staff in Academic Affairs to identify what portion of individual salaries are from sources that are not part of the 9-month salary data, e.g., chair compensation, retention salary, distinguished/named chair compensation, and one-time payments. At the time of this analysis, such compensation was combined in the Institutional Effectiveness data.

This task force was approved in the spring of 2015 and began work immediately. Archer Gravely, the former Director of Institutional Research, played a key role in the 2004-05 task force and was expected to do so again. But he was within a few months of retiring. We were asked to delay our work until his replacement could be hired and become available to us after external reporting requirements were fulfilled. Michael Gass began working with the task force in early 2016. We received salary data from his office that January. The data were corrected for our purposes by the task force chair in conjunction with Elaine Warren in Academic Affairs over the following weeks.

The deans conducted a market equity adjustment on faculty salaries prior to the salary data being made available to the task force. We therefore do not know whether, or the extent to which, bias associated with gender or race existed at the time the task force was formed. We analyzed the data provided which indicated investigation of female and black salaries is warranted.

While the task force report is not subject to senate approval, we thought it could be useful to solicit feedback from members of that thoughtful body on the draft recommendations. The chair delayed this for the final two meetings of the semester, pushing into fall 2016-17. We were not on the agenda that fall. However, because salary inequities arise over time, and the salary data we had were immediately post-adjustment, we elected to wait to see if disparities would arise. In December 2017, FWDC requested the report, which was then finalized.

Predicted salaries were generated using a multiple regression analysis. It is important to note that this study does not take into account any performance or personnel evaluation measures in generating predicted salaries.

Methodology

Population

The population for the study included 202 faculty employed during the Fall 2015 semester. The personnel data are as of January 1, 2016. The salary equity study population is based on full-time instructional faculty. The following were not included in this analysis:

1. visiting faculty members,
2. tenured administrators,
3. one full-time instructional faculty member whose duties include substantial administrative activities,
4. one full-time instructional faculty member who retired in December 2015,

Definition of Salary

The analysis is based on instructional faculty nine-month salaries in all departments except Education where it is based on a 10-month salary. Chairs and others with administrator salaries were adjusted to nine-month faculty salaries without the administrative component (chair compensation). Distinguished faculty holding endowed positions had state and non-state salary amounts excluded. Faculty receiving additional payments for teaching distance education courses did not have these amounts included in their nine-month instructional salaries. Faculty retention compensation was removed from salary.

Statistical Analysis

We approached the examination of potential disparities in faculty salaries through multiple models that were informed by our review of the literature including best practices at other universities. We generated models for the full faculty and white males, as described earlier. The resulting parameter estimates from the white male model were then used to predict the salaries for minorities and women faculty as well as white males. Actual salary as a percent of predicted salary should be used to identify faculty for administrative salary equity review.

Tenure track and tenured faculty:

A relatively consistent set of factors influence (or should influence) salaries at most institutions. As a result, methods for modeling salaries of faculty in this category are largely standardized.

1. A basic multiple regression procedure was used to calculate a predicted salary for each faculty member in the study population using predictor variables described in Table 2. This was done using peer rank salaries from two sources: our UNC General Assembly peers (GA Peers) and Carnegie Baccalaureate institutions (CB Peers). While each peer group has some substantial differences from UNCA, in general, we considered the GA Peer salary data to be a slightly better approximation of our salary structure than the CB Peer data. Where salary data were unavailable

in some peer*rank combinations, they were estimated. These two models provide a general picture of how faculty salaries are distributed based on the predictor variables.

2. The second regression analysis was based on white males only.

Lecturers

Lecturer salaries demonstrate a far higher degree of variability than those of tenured and tenure track faculty members. Modeling lecturer salaries is difficult for several reasons. A broader set of factors influences lecturer salaries. For each individual, salary is an artifact which may be influenced by various combination of factors such as negotiated starting salary, substitutability, terminal degree, experience, performance, spouse accommodation, the lack of inter-institutional standardization in lecturer salaries, variations in annual budgets, and market forces. Several of these factors are neither captured nor capturable in our analysis. A further complication is the lack of available data on lecturer salaries at peer institutions.

The regression models for lecturers included all faculty members at UNCA. Again, we performed regression analysis using two methods, parallel to the above approach. Fundamentally, lecturer salaries are far more variable than those of tenure track faculty. Additionally, there is a dearth of peer salary data for lecturers. Peer rank data for faculty members may help predict lecturer salaries, however market forces are different, and not consistent among disciplines for lecturers and tenure track faculty. Use of the new rank of Senior Lecturer should improve the stability of the model in future lecturer analyses. We suggest an updated lecturer analysis be conducted.

Very special consideration of outliers is important with this group of faculty. For example, a single lecturer in a subgroup under consideration has a salary 44% higher than predicted. That salary exerts so much leverage on the regression line for that person's subgroup, that it masks all effects, making the subgroup appear to be paid, on average, more than expected.

Table 2: Predictor Variables

Variable	Type	Description
Full Professor	Dummy Coded	1 = yes 0 = No
Assoc Professor	Dummy Coded	1 = yes 0 = No
Asst Professor	Dummy Coded	1 = yes 0 = No
Female	Dummy Coded	1 = yes 0 = No
Black	Dummy Coded	1 = yes 0 = No
Other Minority	Dummy Coded	1 = yes 0 = No (All races other than White or Black)
Years In Current Rank	Continuous	Years employed in current rank at UNCA
Rank-Degree Years	Continuous	Years from highest degree to employment in current ranktenure track at UNCA
GA Peer or CB Peer	Continuous	Peer rank salary from CB either or GA peers
*Distinguished/ Endowed	Dummy Coded	1 = yes 0 = No faculty member holds distinguished or endowed chair or professorship

*MGMT ACCT	Dummy Coded	1 = yes 0 = No Faculty member is in MGMT or ACCT

* These variables were included in some models and not others. Consensus as to their inclusion was not reached by members of the task force.

Items for Consideration in Future Studies

Lack of peer salary data
For some disciplines, peer salary data are not available. In this analysis, Steve Patch and Michael Gass formulated a method to estimate these.

Significance
Because this analysis includes the entire population, significance is not interpreted as it would be a sample of a population. The measure provides some indication coefficient variability, but could otherwise be ignored.

Plot residual values for all populations of interest
Plotting model residuals can reveal patterns that would not emerge in other ways. Simply investigating the percent in each category below 90 or 95% of predicted salary is absolutely necessary, but it does not reveal whether there is another substantively important narrative embedded in the data. For example, plotting residuals clearly shows compression among mid-career faculty and second quartile full professors. In addition, plotting residuals for black males and females separately shows that any disparity in compensation is found primarily among black males.

Chair compensation
From approximately 1969 to 2004, chair compensation was an amount added to base pay every year the individual served as chair. As a result, some senior members of the faculty who served for chairs during several years during that period have higher than expected salaries.

Endowed/Distinguished Chair/Professorship
Financial compensation for those positions varies broadly. Some faculty in these positions are compensated not by salary but by course releases and/or discretionary funds. In addition, the named chairs are a special subcategory of this group and are financially compensated variably via higher base salary or an addition to base salary or no compensation. Where special financial compensation occurred in this population and could be identified separate from base salary, we removed it from the base. We trust the administration to fairly factor in the unique attributes of each compensation package in consideration of salary adjustments. We note that females and minorities are both less likely than white males to hold these positions and more likely to be in endowed chairs that are not monetarily compensated. To some extent, this is probably a reflection of changes in faculty demographics over time. We expect it to reflect those changes as more females and minorities enter senior ranks in the coming years.

Dummy variable for faculty in MGMT ACCT

Faculty in Management and Accountancy are paid much more than faculty in other disciplines. Adding a variable to account for this should be discussed.

Appendix B. A Statement on Salary Differences According to Discipline

The first version of the following statement was originally prepared by two members of the task force. In principle, all members of the task force agreed to some extent with the ideas herein. Yet most members found that ignoring market forces entirely at this time would serve neither our institution nor our students. Consideration of this conversation within academia does, however, raise issues about historical artifacts of race- and gender-associated salary biases among disciplines that are relevant to our task force's charge. We all find value in the idea of opening a conversation about disciplinary salary variability and how it should affect compensation over time in a faculty member's career. As one member of the task force said, "If we really do our job according to the mission of this university, we become less competitive in the market as we move through our careers."

Ultimately, this statement is neither a task force recommendation nor a criticism of existing institutional practice: it is simply an invitation to thoughtfully consider and perhaps participate in the emerging dialogue on this issue. We find that several of our existing practices and task force recommendations already reflect an attempt to balance these competing values in that they compress salary adjustments related to service, merit and time in as faculty members at UNCA. We also encourage continued consideration of this issue.

A Statement on Salary Differences According to Discipline

Our primary purpose in creating this report has been to make a contribution to increased equity in the payment of faculty on our campus. As the title of the introduction of the book we have used as a touchstone (Paychecks) states, we are seeking "equal pay for equal work." We also recognize that we would be doing a disservice to the institution and our students if we ignore market forces in hiring and compensation decisions. At this time, these competing values cannot be simultaneously optimized.

It would be wrong to argue that longstanding historical disciplinary inequities regarding race and gender should not be addressed; such discrimination has been devastating. Indeed, our focus in this report as well as the previous report has been on those issues, and while the problem has not been eradicated as yet, steps have been taken. There is, however, another issue of inequity that has not only not been addressed in the past, but that has been actively endorsed: salary differentials according to discipline.

Historically, disciplines are defined in terms of the U.S. Department of Education's Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP), and these classifications are used in tandem with the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources annual report "Faculty Salary Survey for Four-Year Colleges and Universities By Discipline, Rank and Tenure Status" (formerly the "National Faculty Salary Survey by Discipline & Rank") as guidelines for determining salary expectations for all disciplines. We used the findings in the CUPA-HR Report as an element of this examination of salary equity on our campus.

According to the CUPA-HR report for 2015, the average starting salary for a new Assistant Professor of Education at a Bachelor's Institution was $51,882. By comparison, the average salary for a new Assistant Professor in Mathematics was $57,763, and the average salary for all disciplines combined at a Bachelor's institution was $58,205.
The justification for this disparity is "market forces" – that people in certain disciplines require higher salaries than others in order to be able to compete with industry for the best hires. However, one could argue that those same "market forces" have determined that a woman's work is worth only 79 cents for every dollar a man works, and that an African-American's work is worth only 65 cents of a white person's work.

According to Paychecks, "Even relatively small differences in initial salary grow over time. If annual across-the-board salary increments average 3.5 percent, a [new faculty member] who earns $1,000 less than a colleague at the outset would accumulate $84,550 less over a forty-year career. If $1,000 a year were invested or saved in an account at 5 percent interest, at the end of forty years the account would hold $210,684." The authors continue, "For a salary difference of $2,000, this figure would more than double, owing to compounding." Campuses across the US, including our own, recognize that this disparity is problematic, and most are doing something to address it. Not so the difference between an Education and a Mathematics or Business professor – we shrug off the idea that an Education professor's work is worth 66 cents compared to the Business professor.

In a 1997 article in the *Journal of Higher Education* entitled "Disciplinary Differences in Faculty Salaries: Does Gender Play a Role," Sociologist Martha L. Bellas found that "faculty in disciplines with higher proportions of women suffer a financial penalty relative to those in disciplines where women are scarce." She goes on, "Fields with higher proportions of women [also] show the slowest salary growth over time….The results of this study are consistent with research on the larger labor market that documents an inverse relationship between the proportion of women in occupations and wage levels." While "market forces" are frequently used to justify disciplinary salary differentials, such forces are not wholly independent from the effects of historical sexism. By failing to recognize the cultural factors at play, we reify historical injustice."

A University that finds pride in critically examining societal values and practices would seek to demonstrate the courage and integrity to apply the same standards of inquiry and action when it comes to matters of salary difference according to academic discipline.

Works Cited

Haignere, L. 2002. *Paychecks: A guide to conducting salary-equity studies for higher education*. Washington D.C.: American Association of University Professors.

Scott, E. 1977. *Higher education salary evaluation kit.* Washington D.C.: American Association of University Professors.