

Executive Summary
Final Report on a Study of
Gender and Ethnic Minority Equity in Faculty Salaries
at the University of Iowa, 2004-2005

Conducted and prepared by Lee Anna Clark, Professor, Department of Psychology
and former Associate Provost for Faculty

and

Beth Ingram, Professor and Chair, Department of Economics

with the assistance of Grace Chan, Director, Statistical Consulting Center,
Kristina Yows, Office of the Provost,

and

George Woodworth, Professor of Statistics and Actuarial Science

November 16, 2005

In response to a recommendation from a 2001-02 salary equity committee report and a mandate from the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity (EOD), in order comply with relevant federal requirements, a salary-equity analysis focused on gender and minority status in full-time faculty on the tenured or clinical track was conducted using 2004-05 data. This report presents the method and results of that study.

Based on the literature, six factors that have been shown to affect faculty salaries had been identified previously (in the 2001-02 report): college/department, type of terminal degree (e.g., master's, "PhD-type" doctorate, health-sciences doctorate), years since obtaining terminal degree (as a way of measuring seniority), tenure status, faculty rank, and administrative experience. In the current analyses, at the request of EOD, administrators were removed from the data set, necessitating that that factor be removed from the analyses. Moreover, also at the request of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity (EOD), the data were analyzed in three groups: academic-year (9-month) tenured-and-tenure-track (AT) faculty, fiscal-year (12-month) tenured-and-tenure-track (FT) faculty, and fiscal-year (12-month) clinical-track faculty.

As was found in the earlier salary study, most faculty salary variation—regardless of track or whether the appointment is based on the academic or fiscal year—was due to the five factors that are known and expected to affect salary, specifically: *discipline* (college/ department), *type of terminal academic degree* (e.g., masters' degree; health-science doctoral degree), *seniority* (number of years since obtaining terminal degree), *tenure status*, and *faculty rank*. These variables accounted for all but approximately 20% of faculty salary variation, and **when these five factors were taken into account, there were no overall statistically significant gender- or minority-status based salary differences in any of the three faculty groups.**

The bulk of salary variation was due to departmental differences in salaries (e.g., faculty in Finance earn more than those in Classics; faculty in Neurosurgery earn more than those in

Preventive & Community Dentistry). When this departmental variation was not considered, some significant differences based on gender, and a few on minority status, were found, which suggests that, in particular, **women faculty are more likely to be in departments that have lower overall salaries**. Test of this hypothesis were strongly supported for gender. For example, in the academic tenure-track, broadly speaking, faculty in the Arts and Humanities were roughly 50% women and earned the least, those in the Social Sciences had one-third women and earned middle-range salaries, whereas those in Physical Sciences, Math, Law, Engineering, and Business had only about 15% women on average and earned the highest salaries. Similar results were obtained in the fiscal tenured-and-tenure-track faculty and clinical-track faculty groups.

Importantly, however, in only one case was it clearly reasonable not to consider departmental variation: **In the College of Public Health, there was a statistically significant difference (16.6%) between male and female salaries beyond that explained by the combination of tenure, faculty rank, type of degree, years since degree, and department**. This discrepancy decreased to 11.7% in FY06, suggesting that the College is taking steps to remedy the situation. Moreover, across the 3 primary and 14 secondary comparisons made in which gender-based differences were not significant, only three favored women: (1) the primary comparison of the Full Model in the AT faculty; (2) the secondary comparison of the Full Model in just the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS), and (3) the secondary comparison of the model omitting *department* in the College of Business. Thus, **although the differences did not reach statistical significance, there was a small but fairly consistent pattern of women receiving lower salaries**: 3.0% lower in the FT faculty and 4.3% lower in the CT faculty—with the exception of CLAS (and Business where men earned a trivial 0.06% more). In contrast, there was no clear pattern favoring minority or non-minority faculty in salaries.

Recommendations: (1) That central administration conduct a close examination of faculty salaries in the College of Public Health to determine whether the significant discrepancy between male and female faculty salaries in the college can be justified on appropriate grounds (e.g., differences in merit based on quality and quantity of publications, grants, etc.), and correct any inequities found.

(2) That the small but consistent pattern of lower salaries for women faculty (with the notable exceptions of the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences and Business) be examined further to try to understand its causes. Only when we understand this persistent difference can we work effectively towards fully equitable work and salary distributions.

(3) That the University devise and implement both short- and long-term strategies to hire more women in departments that are (a) high salary and (b) low female. For example, incentives may need to be provided to encourage diverse hiring in these fields. Because there are relatively few women in these departments' candidate pools, the University may have to pay a premium to recruit those who do exist. That is, to recruit more women into these departments, they may have to be brought in at salaries that exceed the departments' current maximum salaries, but such "drastic" solutions may be necessary to break out of the current stalemate.