

Pay equity among faculty at Ontario's universities

**OCUFA's Submission to the Ontario Gender
Wage Gap Steering Committee**

OCUFA

Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations
Union des Associations des Professeurs des Universités de l'Ontario

Pay equity among faculty at Ontario's universities: OCUFA submission to the Ontario Gender Wage Gap Steering Committee

January 2016

Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA)

The Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA) has been the provincial voice of university faculty since 1964. OCUFA represents over 17,000 professors and academic librarians in 28 faculty associations across Ontario. We represent both full-time tenure stream faculty and contract faculty members who work either on a limited-term contract or on a per-course basis.

17 Isabella Street, Toronto, Ontario M4Y 1M7

416-979-2117 | ocufa@ocufa.on.ca

www.ocufa.on.ca

Overview

Over the past 30 years, the gender gap in earnings among university faculty members has slowly begun to close. But a gender wage gap nonetheless persists as the salaries of female faculty members are stalled at around 90 per cent of that of their male colleagues. Faculty associations have advocated for the implementation of a range of tools to address the gender wage gap in the university sector, which have been achieved through the collective bargaining process. Despite the availability of measures to mitigate against the gender wage gap, gender-based salary inequities persist among tenure stream faculty. Moreover, women are overrepresented in the ranks of poorly paid, precariously employed contract faculty members, which means that despite a shrinking but persistent gap between the salaries of men and women in tenure stream positions, within the broad realm of academic work women on average continue to earn significantly less than their male colleagues.

To address the gender wage gap in the university sector, the challenges faced both by tenure stream and by contract faculty must be addressed.

For tenure stream faculty, the salary anomaly review process in place at many universities has played an important role in correcting the gender wage gap for university faculty. Continuing to undertake these reviews on an ongoing basis where they already exist, and expanding their use to institutions where they have not yet been implemented, will act as an important tool for eliminating the gender wage gap among faculty at Ontario's universities. The review of gender pay equity alone, however, is not enough. Ensuring that adequate mechanisms and funds are in place to support the correction of anomalous salaries through salary increases is perhaps even more important when it comes to the elimination of gender-based pay inequities. Additionally, given tentative evidence that lower starting salaries and lower rates of merit pay among women may be a key driver of the persistence of the gender wage gap among university faculty, improvements in non-salary provisions, including the expansion of pre-hiring meetings with the faculty association and policies that ensure the equitable allocation of merit pay will also be important.

For contract faculty, the improvement of the terms and conditions of contract academic work (including access to full-time academic positions) is important not only from the perspective of working to ensure that every academic job is a good job, but given the overrepresentation of women in contract faculty positions, it is also an important step toward addressing the gender wage gap in Ontario.

There are two key factors that have contributed to reducing the gender wage gap among university faculty in recent decades: the salary anomaly review process and the ability to advocate for these processes and other gender equity-promoting measures through collective bargaining. Based on the experience of university faculty, therefore, OCUFA would support measures that expand access to collective bargaining and the expansion of gender equity salary reviews in all workplaces.

The roots of the gender wage gap of course run much deeper than what goes on at the level of workplace policy and decision-making. Two key policy measures would help support broader societal reorientations and increased gender equality: Parental leave provisions that normalize a more equal distribution of childcare and domestic responsibilities would promote greater equality among men and

women in the home while also working to ensure that the career impact of parental leave is more equitably shared among women and men in the workplace. Parental leave policies in Sweden, for example, reserve a portion of parental leave days for the father and award a bonus to couples who share parental leave equally between mother and father. Such policies could serve as a model to be followed. Recognizing that the parental leave provisions under Employment Insurance (EI) are federal jurisdiction, this is a measure the provincial government should advocate for in discussions with its federal counterparts. Within the realm of provincial policy jurisdiction, improving broader access to high quality, affordable childcare for all families in Ontario would help to ease the disproportionate burden borne by women for childcare and other domestic responsibilities.

Addressing – and eliminating – the gender wage gap in Ontario will require a concerted effort on the part of government, employers, and the unions and associations that represent academic workers in the province.

Snapshot of the gender wage gap among faculty at Ontario's Universities

Tenure stream faculty

Despite some progress over the past decade, the academic gender wage gap persists in Ontario. The latest Ontario Council of Academic Vice Presidents (OCAV) data show that, on average and across all academic ranks, women, who accounted for 38 per cent of the total professoriate, earned only 89.97% of what their male colleagues earned. However, recent research (CAUT, 2011) suggests that controlling for age and academic rank tends to reduce the size of the gender wage gap in all Canadian provinces. Nevertheless, a small but significant wage gap persists, most noticeably at more senior academic ranks (associate professor and above).

In 2011, the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) published *The Persistent Gap*, a study examining the effect of age, rank, and discipline on academic gender wage disparities. Unequal distribution of men and women according to these characteristics skew the overall wage gap, and it is therefore important to take them into account when analyzing the wage gap problem. When controlling for age, the wage gap becomes most apparent in the higher academic ranks. There is virtually no gap for lecturers, the lowest rank, while the gap is 4.5 per cent for full professors. While this may seem small, it can have significant consequences; for women at senior academic ranks, it means a yearly shortfall of nearly \$8,000 (CAUT, 2011: 7).

Some disciplines – like engineering and mathematics - enjoy a salary premium, and women unfortunately remain underrepresented in these fields. However, taking disciplinary differences into account only closes the gap slightly. For full professors, discipline only accounts for 1.2 per cent of the wage differential. The under-representation of women in STEM fields is a problem unto itself, but it does not explain the persistent and apparently structural wage gap between men and women in senior academic ranks.

While the CAUT study examines 2006 data, it is important to recognize that the overall wage gap has stayed virtually the same between 2006 and 2013. So it is reasonable to conclude that the differentials, and the patterns observed between different ages, ranks, and disciplines, continue to persist for women tenure-stream faculty in Ontario.

Contract faculty

In addition to earning less than their male counterparts in the full-time, tenure-stream ranks, women are overrepresented in the growing numbers of sessional and contract faculty members. These growing numbers of contract faculty face job insecurity, lack of access to benefits and pensions, last-minute hiring practices, and significantly lower pay than their full-time colleagues. Contract faculty are hired only to teach and are often remunerated on a per-course basis, receiving separate contracts for each course they teach. Contract faculty will often hold multiple contracts, sometimes from multiple universities, in order to cobble together a living wage. Stipends for contract faculty range from just under \$4000 to just over \$8000 per semester-long course – even assuming an unusually high teaching load, this is significantly lower than the average salary of a tenured or tenure-stream faculty.

Research undertaken by Indhu Rajagopal (2002) shows that part-time or contract faculty work has become increasingly feminized at Ontario's universities. As jobs in higher education – “a job sector traditionally dominated by men” – became increasingly “temporary, insecure, and deregulated” in response to uncertain economic conditions, women came to predominate these jobs, especially in disciplines such as arts and humanities (Rajagopal, 2002: 97).

Rajagopal's survey of part-time academics across Canada showed that 40.8 per cent of contract faculty members in 1989-90 were women. Compared with the gender distribution of full-time faculty for the same period, wherein women accounted for just over 21 per cent of full time faculty in 1992, the proportion of women in part-time contract positions was extremely high. Moreover, women accounted for 53 per cent of “Contemporaries” (i.e. contract faculty “who hold mainly academic part-time positions” [2002: 90, 128]) but only 32 per cent of “Classics” (i.e. “those who have full-time non-academic jobs” [90, 128]). This suggests that women were overrepresented among those who relied exclusively on low-paid and precarious academic jobs.

More recently, studies undertaken by University of Toronto higher education researcher Cynthia Field (2015) and by Richard Wiggers (2015) for the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) suggest that the overrepresentation of women in precarious, low-paying contract faculty positions persists.

Based on surveys and interviews with contract faculty at four universities in Ontario (Lakehead, Trent, Ottawa, and Toronto) in 2014, Field et al. (2015) found that 59.5% of contract faculty respondents were female, compared with 33.3% men (the remainder chose not to indicate their gender). Moreover, women were more likely to be among the ranks of precarious contract faculty (i.e. contract faculty who earn their main income from sessional instruction and aspire to have a full-time academic career) than men, whereas men were more likely to find themselves among the ranks of classic contract faculty (i.e. retirees and professionals who engage in sessional instruction as a supplement to a separate career). A HEQCO survey of contract faculty at 23 universities across Ontario in 2014 similarly found that women are overrepresented among the ranks of contract faculty, with 63% of survey respondents identifying as female (Wiggers, 2015).

The findings from both of these recent surveys of contract faculty show that the overrepresentation of women in low-paid and precarious academic jobs has increased dramatically in recent decades. While the gender wage gap among tenure-stream academics is narrowing, women are increasingly overrepresented among the ranks of contract faculty. This dynamic is cause for concern because the number of contract faculty positions is increasing, the availability of tenure-stream positions has stalled, and there are few provisions in place to convert contract faculty into full-time positions. OCUFA estimates that the number of courses taught by contract faculty has doubled since 2000. With women overrepresented among the ranks of contract faculty, their opportunities for career progression and increased earnings potential are greatly limited.

Given the disproportionately high number of women among the ranks of contract faculty, addressing the poor wages and working conditions of contract academic staff becomes important not only from the perspective of preserving the quality of academic jobs but also as a key component of the work that must be done to address the gender wage gap.

Sources of the gender wage gap among faculty at Ontario's Universities

The OCUFA Status of Women Committee has identified three key factors that contribute to the gender wage gap for faculty in Ontario: starting salary, differentials in terms of merit pay, and parental and other caregiving leaves. Following a brief overview of the full-time faculty salary structure, each will be reviewed in turn below.

In short, faculty salary structures are complicated. In addition to having a number of variously-defined, related but disparate components, salary structures are heterogeneous across institutions (and sometimes even across academic units within the same institution). Collective agreements typically stipulate salary floors, and often also ceilings, for particular academic ranks. Starting salaries are, however, habitually negotiated and can be a significant source of gender disparities. Beyond starting salary, salary increments and increases can be broadly divided into those that are automatic and those based on some form of performance criteria.

Many collective agreements thus also have salary grids (often called “progress through the ranks” or PTR) which stipulate consecutive salary increments between minima and maxima. What determines movement along the grid varies: it can be based purely on length of job tenure, on more-or-less complex performance criteria, or some mixture of the two. In addition, some institutions also have separate merit pay that further tops-up salaries. Merit pay can also take many forms. For example, it can be a fund of fixed-sum awards, it can also be applied based on some global measure of research productivity or be more discipline-specific. Beyond this, some institutions have also created “market anomaly” funds that, again, have a wide range of criteria to adjust salaries: for example, some apply only to certain disciplines, others are used for faculty retention. When collective agreements are renegotiated, any of these components can be subject to increases by a percentage or a fixed amount. Together, this variety and complexity of salary components can widen and entrench gender-based salary discrimination.

A low **starting salary** can have a significant and long-term impact on overall earnings. Research in the field of psychology suggests that women are less likely to negotiate their starting salary and anecdotal evidence from OCUFA members confirms that women in the university sector tend to have lower starting salaries than their male colleagues. While province-wide time-series data on starting salary by gender are not available, a reasonable proxy exists and supports this anecdotal evidence for 2013-14 in the form of salary data of faculty who were appointed to their present rank in the current year.¹ These data, collected and reported by OCAV (the Ontario Council of Academic Vice Presidents), show that women appointed to the rank of Assistant Professor in 2013-14 on average earned only 92 per cent of what their male colleagues earned. These lower starting salaries for women mean that even as they earn annual career progression salary increases, women will earn less than their male colleagues over the course of their entire academic careers.

¹Appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor can reasonably be used as a proxy for faculty starting salary, since tenure-stream positions typically begin at the Assistant Professor rank.

Differentials in terms of **merit or performance pay** also contribute to overall salary levels. The model of merit pay, whereby faculty can augment their earnings based on an exemplary record of research and publications, assumes the possibility of an unencumbered academic, able to devote significant time and effort to the production of robust body of research and rewards those who are able to adhere to that norm. However, the unencumbered academic is simply not a realistic option for many academics and for women in particular. Despite significant progress toward gender equality in the labour force and in social norms over the past half century, women continue to assume primary responsibility for childcare and other household responsibilities. Women's greater degree of responsibility for this so-called "second shift" of unpaid domestic work (Hochschild, 1989) means that their ability to devote additional time outside of normal working hours to the production of a strong record of research is lower than that of their male colleagues. Moreover, research suggests that women's academic work may be evaluated differently than that of their male colleagues (Baker, 2012), which may contribute to less favourable assessments of their research record, and lower levels of merit or performance pay. Finally, anecdotal reports from some OCUFA members suggest that women's ability to produce a robust and ongoing record of research productivity is further undermined by teaching and university service expectations that are unevenly distributed along gendered lines. For example, women are sometimes responsible for more university service work than their male colleagues, or are more frequently assigned larger, introductory level classes, which take more time and other resources to deliver.

Women are more likely to take **pregnancy, parental or other caregiving leaves** than their male colleagues, which can also contribute to the persistence of a gender wage gap, since taking such a leave can delay or impede career progress, or reduce opportunities for merit based salary increases. If faculty take parental leave prior to achieving tenure, in many cases they have the opportunity to stop the tenure clock (that is, extend the probationary period and the time to tenure decision) for a period equivalent to the length of their leave. These provisions are an important measure that helps to level the playing field by providing adequate time to produce a robust research record prior to tenure consideration. Nonetheless, stopping the tenure clock may delay career progress and the ability to advance to higher ranks of Associate or Full Professor, where earning potential is higher. Those women who already have tenure when they take a parental or other caregiving leave are unable to develop an adequately robust publication record at the same rate as their colleagues who do not have any career interruptions, which may compromise their ability to advance to higher ranks or to earn merit pay increases on the same scale as their colleagues. In addition to the implications of parental or other caregiving leaves on tenure and promotion, both granting agencies and institutional merit pay calculations do not have a good record of accounting for career interruptions when evaluating publication records. As such, those who cannot demonstrate an uninterrupted publication record may face additional challenges in accessing external research funding and/or may earn lower levels of merit pay in the years following a leave.

The causes of the gender wage gap for university faculty identified above highlight the importance of putting in place measures to ensure equity in the process of negotiating starting salaries and in the calculation and awarding of merit or performance pay increases. The root causes of the gender wage gap for university faculty are shared with the broader population: women are overrepresented in lower-paid job classes, their starting salaries tend to be lower, and their capacity for career advancement and increased earnings is ultimately limited by the uneven division of caring responsibilities between women and men.

Tools for addressing the gender wage gap at Ontario's Universities

Given the numerous and diverse factors that contribute to female faculty members earning less than their male colleagues, faculty associations have advocated for two broad sets of measures to address the gender wage gap for faculty: salary anomaly reviews, which exist to correct gender-based salary inequities, and a range of non-salary measures, which seek to ensure workplace gender equality. Both of these broad sets of measures will be reviewed below.

Salary reviews

Gender equity salary anomaly reviews seek to measure the extent to which the gap between the salaries of men and women can be explained by gender and to what extent they can be explained by other legitimate or fair causes of salary differentials, such as rank, years of service, years since highest degree, or disciplinary area (factors which admittedly may themselves be gendered, but are nonetheless legitimate bases for differences in salary). This is done using a multiple regression model to calculate predicted salary based on these other factors that contribute to differentials in salary and identifying the differences between the predicted salary and the actual salaries of faculty members.

Of the 28 OCUFA member associations, 12 have in place provisions in their collective agreements that allow for the review, identification, and correction of salaries that are anomalously low. In some cases, gender is specifically identified as a potential cause of anomalous salaries, while in other cases, any kind of anomalies, resulting from year of hire or other discriminatory factors are eligible for identification and correction. An overview of the salary anomalies review process at five universities is detailed below.

McMaster

McMaster University's recent gender wage gap review and correction stands as a well-known example of a university faculty gender equity salary anomaly review process. Prior to 2015, pay equity had been assessed at McMaster in 1991, and resulted in modest adjustments to the salaries of individual faculty members, with the total value of all payments capped at 0.25 per cent of the overall salary base. In July 2015, the university awarded base salary increases of \$3,515 to all full-time female faculty members. These salary adjustments were made on the basis of an extensive study which sought to establish the extent to which the gap between the average male and female salaries (a gap of \$14,575 in 2012 and \$18,544 in 2013) was related to gender as distinct from differences in levels of experience, discipline, or appointment type. The study analyzed data on all faculty salaries in 2012 and 2013 using a multiple regression model and found that "the average annual salary of female faculty members was lower than the average annual salary of male faculty members at McMaster University by \$2,992 in 2012 and by \$4,037 in 2013, after controlling for all other statistically significant predictors of annual salary in the model" (McMaster Institutional Research and Analysis, 2015: 3). The average annual salary difference over the two years was \$3,515 and this was the amount the Joint Committee agreed would be awarded to all female faculty members, regardless of rank.

Western

Western University has undertaken five salary anomaly reviews since the mid-1970s. Notably, the 1995 and 2005 studies, which used multiple regression analyses to identify salary anomalies resulting from

gender, both found that women faculty at Western are paid less than their male colleagues of similar experience and accomplishment.

The 2005 study found that on average “women earn \$2,162.31 less per year than men after controlling for all other statistically significant predictors of salary that were available for analysis [...] In other words, a woman earns \$2,162.31 less than a man who is employed at the same Rank in the same Faculty and who has the same number of Years since Highest Degree, Years since First Degree, Years at Western, Years at Current Rank, Relative PAI (a measure of academic activity and achievement), and Departmental Average Salary” (Campbell et al., 2005: 13). Rather than distributing salary increases of \$2,162.31 to every woman faculty member at Western, the committee responsible for the implementation of the salary adjustments identified in the pay equity report developed an algorithm for the distribution of funds. The algorithm calculated “salary adjustments on a sliding scale where the largest increments go to those experiencing the largest gender-based anomaly in their salary” (Campbell, 2006: 2). Funds were distributed as follows (Campbell, 2006: 6):

1. 91% of female Assistant Professors would receive a correction. For those receiving a correction, the average value is \$ 3986 (average correction of 5.5% of salary) and the individual corrections range from \$49 to \$10,145.
2. 57% of female Associate Professors would receive a correction with an average correction of \$2355 (average correction of 2.5% of salary). Individual corrections range from \$86 to \$6610.
3. 72% of female Professors would receive a correction with an average correction of \$2759 (average correction of 2.5% of salary). Individual corrections range from \$261 to \$7617.

The 2009 study found that “there is on average no statistically significant salary difference between male and female faculty at Western,” however, gender effects on salary persisted among certain subgroups of probationary and tenured faculty, namely recent hires and at the full professor rank (Sicular et al. 2009: 39). The implementation committee used the same algorithm as the 2005 study to calculate the distribution of funds. Based on that calculation, they recommended that “the salaries of 48 of the 74 female Probationary and Tenured faculty hired since 2005/2006 be adjusted. The average adjustment recommended was \$2,282” (Sicular et al., 2010: 1). The persistence of gender effects on salary for faculty hired after the 2005 study and salary adjustments suggests a systematic gender bias in the starting salaries of new faculty as a possible culprit for the persistence of a gender wage gap.

Windsor

In 1990, the University of Windsor undertook a study of faculty salaries led by Kai Hildebrant and Edward J. Czilli that identified significant, systemic gender-based salary anomalies. According to the report, “the analysis uncovered systemic (gender-related) anomalies, some systemic differences between Faculties and Department, as well as sufficient room for individual (non-systematic) variation in salaries, some of which might be considered anomalous” (Hildebrant and Czilli, 1990: 17). The Windsor University Faculty Association (WUFA) Status of Women, Diversity and Equity Action Committee reports that the gap was so significant that it was the position of the Faculty Association bargaining team that the anomaly awards should be given in equal amounts to all women faculty.

Following the 1990 salary review, a salary anomaly review process remains in place at Windsor to identify and correct anomalies resulting from gender, year of hire, disciplinary differences or other anomalies. The review process is overseen by a committee composed of five individuals, including

representation from both genders, and consists of two individuals appointed by the University President, two members appointed by the Faculty Association President, and a fifth member is mutually agreed upon by the Committee. The committee relies on a third-party report prepared by Dr. Michael Ornstein, Department of Sociology at York University, who uses multiple regression models to review salaries and determine the distribution of the anomalies fund each year. While the last three reviews of salary anomalies at Windsor (conducted in 2006, 2010, and 2012) did not find a systemic gender wage gap and payments from the anomalies fund were not distributed specifically on the basis of gender, the WUFA collective agreement nonetheless continues to contain provisions for the review and redress of salary anomalies and a process for review under the current agreement is underway.

Waterloo

At the University of Waterloo, institution-wide salary reviews are combined with annual reviews of salaries within each faculty, led by deans. An institution-wide salary review is currently underway, with two reviews having occurred in previous years – the most recent of which was undertaken seven years ago. Following the second institution-wide salary review, a salary anomaly fund was created to correct the salary anomalies identified by deans on an annual basis. However, the process by which deans conduct their annual review is not transparent and there is no mechanism in place to appeal their decisions. Thus, while the annual salary reviews by deans allow for ongoing measurement of salary inequities, the lack of transparency means that these annual reviews are inadequate. The Faculty Association of the University of Waterloo therefore prefers to combine the annual reviews by deans with regular institution-wide reviews of salaries. The current institution-wide salary review is mandated to “investigate all cases where faculty salary inequities, including but not limited to gender-based inequities, may exist and recommend how such cases should be resolved using the Faculties' existing anomaly funds; review the processes by which salary anomalies are currently identified and resolved in each Faculty; establish a standardized university-wide process for the detection and resolution of all faculty salary anomalies that may arise in future, wherever they may occur” (Memorandum of Settlement between the University of Waterloo and the Faculty Association of the University of Waterloo, 2015: 1-2).

Queen's

Addressing gender-based salary anomalies was one of the key drivers behind the certification of the Queen's University Faculty Association (QUFA) in 1995. The first collective agreement included provisions for the creation of an anomalies side table to distribute money to correct for salary inequities based on gender and other factors within specified discipline groups. The anomalies side table process is administered by a committee comprised of two members representing the faculty association, two members representing the university administration, and a non-voting employer liaison. The process assigns increases to the salaries of individual faculty members whose salaries were anomalously low. Despite collective agreement provisions for the redress of gender-based salary inequities, the implementation of these provisions has not been without problems. There were delays in implementing the anomalies review process laid out in QUFA's 2008-11 collective agreement due to disagreement between the parties as to how anomalies were to be calculated. The disagreement was resolved in 2015, and increases to base pay will be distributed in 2016, primarily for inequities that exist among specified discipline groups. QUFA's last two collective agreements (2011-15 and 2015-19) have not included active anomalies funds, but the architecture of the anomalies review process has been preserved.

Key learnings from the university faculty salary review process

The gender equity salary anomaly review processes reviewed above highlight several important issues for consideration when it comes to addressing the gender wage gap.

First, there are advantages and disadvantages associated with across-the-board payments as a mechanism for correcting identified gender-based salary inequities (as were used at McMaster) and with targeted individual payments as the remedy (as were used at Western). On the one hand, making across the board payments to all female faculty members acknowledges and responds to the systemic nature of the gender wage gap. On the other hand, this approach fails to correct accurately for the reality that there are significant variations in the extent to which individual women's salaries deviate from the level predicted by a given model. Targeted payments thus have the advantage of allowing for a more equitable allocation of compensatory funds. However, this approach is much more complex and difficult to implement. Regardless of which approach is used to correct gender-based pay inequities, it is crucial that the funding for those corrections come from robust dedicated funding from central university administration budgets rather than being taken from existing departmental budgets. The latter approach not only limits the ability of salary inequities to be adequately addressed but also establishes a zero-sum process that engenders resentment among the winners and losers in the allocation of funds.

Second, the experience at the University of Waterloo with annual faculty-level reviews of salaries demonstrates the importance of building transparency into the salary review process to ensure that the identification and correction of inequities is undertaken in an adequate and equitable manner. It is also clear from each of the examples outlined above that it is important to ensure that there are opportunities for employee involvement in and/or oversight of the salary review process, either through a structure whereby the review is directed by a joint employer/faculty association committee, or by ensuring neutrality of the analysis by contracting with a mutually agreed upon third party to undertake the pay equity review. This requirement may be easier to achieve in a university setting where there is no shortage of employees with expertise in statistical analysis, but the principle of ensuring employee oversight and involvement in the salary anomaly review process is nonetheless more broadly relevant and applicable.

Third, it is important to note that salary anomalies reviews and their corresponding remedies are only able to correct existing gender pay inequities and cannot necessarily rectify the root causes of the gender wage gap or its persistence into the future – a reality that is aptly demonstrated by the persistence of the gender wage gap among faculty hired following the pay equity adjustments made following the 2005 study at Western University. As such, institution-wide salary anomalies reviews must be conducted on an ongoing basis if they are to serve as an adequate bulwark against gender-based salary inequities in a long-term and ongoing capacity.

Fourth and finally, it is notable that the successful implementation of salary reviews and anomalies funds were all achieved through collective bargaining and advocacy by faculty associations in their role as representatives of the collective interests of their members. The shared power and influence that can only be achieved through collective bargaining is crucial to the ability of workers in all sectors to pressure employers to make changes that will address gender-based pay inequities.

Non-salary measures

A range of non-salary based measures exist within some collective agreements and other policies to help counteract some of the factors identified above that contribute to the gender wage gap, including provisions that might help to ensure equity in the process of negotiating starting salaries as well as provisions related to parental leave, childcare, and the tenure clock. These measures may be relevant for workers in other sectors of employment.

An important tool for helping to **address lower starting salaries among women** is to ensure that recent hires have the opportunity to communicate with their faculty association prior to accepting the terms of their offer of employment. By ensuring that candidates for new positions have the opportunity to communicate with their faculty association (either as part of the recruitment process or once an offer of employment has been made), the association can provide them with accurate information about average starting salaries at the institution, which can help equip candidates or new hires as they enter into initial salary negotiations. Given that the evidence from several salary anomaly reviews and provincial level data suggest that women's lower starting salaries may be a significant contributing factor to perpetuating the gender wage gap among university faculty, collective agreement provisions requiring pre-hiring contact with the faculty association would have the potential to help address this gap.

Currently, collective agreement language to this effect exists at only five universities in the province. The strongest requirement is in the Brock University Faculty Association collective agreement, in which Article 19.02d states that "Candidates for probationary and tenured appointments shall be scheduled to visit the BUFA Office to meet with a representative of the Union prior to accepting an appointment." Other provisions require only that the option to contact the faculty association be communicated to new hires. These provisions include Article 19.06 of the University of Guelph Faculty Association collective agreement, which stipulates that "The University will provide all candidates who are interviewed with the contact information for the Association." The Lakehead University Faculty Association collective agreement requires, under Article 19.02.09, that "a copy of a statement supplied by the Association providing contact information and informing the candidate that he/she may approach the Association for information and conditions of employment" to be included with the letter of appointment provided to new hires. The Queen's University Faculty Association collective agreement requires that "any offer shall be accompanied by a copy of this Agreement, information on how the Association and its representatives can be contacted and any other materials which the Parties to this Agreement feel will be useful to a new Member" under Article 25.9.1b. Article 4.8 of the Ryerson Faculty Association requires that new hires be provided with "A link to the RFA website, and advice that they may contact the RFA, if they so choose." Despite the variation in existing provisions, facilitating pre-hiring contact with the faculty association has the potential to address the negative gender effects on salary that women experience as a result of lower negotiated starting salaries.

In addition to provisions pertaining to pre-hiring contact with the faculty association, faculty association collective agreements contain provisions that help to mitigate the potentially negative effects on salary of taking pregnancy, parental, or other caregiving leaves.

All faculty association collective agreements include provisions that provide for the topping up of salary beyond what is provided under EI during **pregnancy and parental leave** – provisions that make it easier for women to remain in their positions following the birth of a child. As a basic question of equity, these

kinds of provisions are important insofar as they provide financial supports that help women to remain in their chosen profession after becoming a parent. Additionally, the majority of collective agreements (21 of 28 OCUFA member associations) include provisions that allow pre-tenure faculty members who take a leave to extend their probationary appointment by a period of time commensurate to the length of their leave. In this way, those who take a leave are given the same effective amount of time to develop a research and publication record as those colleagues who do not take a leave. This kind of provision is a crucial step toward leveling the playing field and may be relevant in other sectors where performance over a set period of time is used as a criterion for career advancement.

Equally important are provisions relating to how the **allocation of merit pay** will be calculated in the years following a parental leave. Given that merit pay increases are allocated on the basis of performance within the past year(s), those who take a leave in a given year may be disadvantaged when it comes to merit pay calculations, since it is not possible to develop a robust record of publication while on pregnancy, parental, or other caregiving leave and the absence of publications over a given year would have a deleterious effect on the calculation of merit pay. At McMaster University, for example, the pregnancy and parental leave policy has recently been updated to clarify the method according to which merit pay awards will be calculated, and provides faculty members with the option to choose between two methods for the evaluation of research performance (an evaluation of the past three years [normally those prior to the leave], or an evaluation of the past calendar year alone). This provision helps to mitigate against decreases in merit pay resulting from a pause in research productivity that may occur when a faculty member is on leave. Moreover, given the observed potential for women's professional contributions to be evaluated differently than their male colleagues (Baker 2012), any collective agreement provisions or policies that ensure the fair and equitable allocation of merit pay will help to ensure that women are not disadvantaged when it comes to performance-based compensation.

Review of measures to address the gender wage gap

University faculty have identified and advocated for a range of important measures that help to address the gender wage gap. While these measures provide the structural basis for addressing gender-based pay inequities, there nonetheless remain challenges in achieving robust gender equality in practice. Based on the experience of university faculty in working to address the gender wage gap as outlined above, there are several promising directions the provincial government could consider as ways of moving forward to address and eliminate the gender wage gap. These directions are outlined below.

Expanding and providing financial support for the salary anomaly review process

The salary anomaly review processes that have been conducted at several Ontario universities have identified and corrected significant gender wage gaps among university faculty through statistical analysis of all employee salaries and the application of increases to women's base salaries – awarded either through across the board payments of the same amount or through targeted payments proportional to the magnitude of the individual salary anomaly. Regardless of the method used to distribute funds to correct for gender-based pay inequities, it is crucial that funding for those corrections come from robust dedicated funding from central university administration budgets.

The government could facilitate the expansion of the salary anomaly review process – both within the university sector and in other sectors of employment – through the establishment of a financial incentive for those workplaces that undertake such reviews. For example, provincial government funding could be made available to those employers who negotiate and implement a salary anomalies review and correction fund with their employees. Such a measure is not unprecedented – a pay equity assistance fund existed in the university sector throughout the 1990s to eliminate the gender wage gap created by the undervaluing of women's jobs. Although a discrepancy between the salaries of men and women persisted, the fund was rolled into the university basic operating grant funding in 2001-02 (Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities, 2009: 29).

Any government incentive for salary anomaly reviews must account for the fact that these reviews cannot be undertaken on a one-off basis and the task of addressing the gender wage gap assumed to be complete. As long as the root causes of the gender wage gap continue to exist, the gap itself will persist. As such, salary anomaly reviews must be conducted on a regular and ongoing basis if they are to serve as an adequate safeguard against gender-based salary inequities in a long-term and ongoing capacity.

Improving terms and conditions of employment for contract faculty

With women overrepresented among the ranks of contract faculty, improving the terms and conditions of contract academic work (including access to full-time academic positions) is important not only from the perspective of preserving the quality of academic jobs but also as a key component of the work that must be done to address the gender wage gap. OCUFA is working with member associations and other higher education stakeholders to work toward this goal.

Increasing access to collective bargaining

The ability of university faculty to reduce the gender wage gap over time can be attributable to their ability to negotiate provisions that served to address the gender wage gap through the collective bargaining process and with the support of their faculty associations. The Equal Pay Coalition (2015) notes that “unionization is one of the most effective tools to close the gender pay gap” (5). By adopting policy changes that facilitate access to collective bargaining, the provincial government provides workers with an important tool for tackling the gender wage gap.

Increasing access to collective bargaining supports the ability of workers to advocate for and implement measures that promote gender pay equity in ways that make sense in their particular workplace – for university faculty, this has meant the implementation of parental leave and tenure clock provisions and it provides the structure by which provisions for improved pre-hiring contact with the faculty association or more equitable calculations of merit pay can be achieved.

Addressing the roots of the gender wage gap

As noted above, the roots of the gender wage gap run much deeper than what goes on at the level of workplace policy and decision-making. Women’s lower wages are influenced by factors that derive from women’s greater degree of responsibility for childcare and other domestic responsibilities. Provincial government policy can help to support broader societal reorientations toward increased gender equality in two key ways: advocating for parental leave policies that normalize a more equitable distribution of childcare and domestic responsibilities and improving access to high-quality, affordable childcare.

Parental leave policies that reserve a portion of parental leave days for the father or award a bonus to couples who share parental leave equally between mother and father, as is the case in Sweden, have the potential to promote a more equal distribution of childcare and domestic responsibilities, and could contribute to greater equality among men and women in the home while also working to ensure that the career impact of parental leave is more equitably shared among women and men in the workplace. Given that Employment Insurance (EI) falls under federal jurisdiction, this is a measure the provincial government should raise in discussions with its federal counterparts. Within the realm of provincial policy jurisdiction, improving access to high quality, affordable childcare for all families in Ontario would help to ease the disproportionate burden borne by women for childcare and other domestic responsibilities.

References

Baker, Maureen. 2012. *Academic careers and the gender gap*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Campbell, Karen, Ruban Chelladurai, Regna Darnell, Paul Handford, John Koval, Sheila Macfie, and Jennifer Schroeder. 2005. "Report of the faculty pay equity committee." The University of Western Ontario. Accessed at: <https://uwofa.ca/@storage/files/documents/149/2005payequityreport.pdf>

Campbell, Karen, Audra Bowlus, Genese Warr-Leeper, Elizabeth Skarakis-Doyle, and Kim Baines. 2006. Implementation Committee for Gender Based Salary Adjustments (as identified in the Pay Equity Report, 2005): Final Report." University of Western Ontario. Accessed at: <https://uwofa.ca/@storage/files/documents/150/2005payequityimplementationreport.pdf>

Canadian Association of University Teachers. 2011. "The persistent gap: Understanding male-female salary differentials amongst Canadian academic staff." Ottawa: CAUT Equity Review.

Equal Pay Coalition. 2015. "Backgrounder to the Ontario Government's Gender Wage Gap Strategy Town Hall Meetings." Accessed at: <http://www.equalpaycoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/12-Steps-To-Close-The-Gender-pay-gap-by-2025-Campaign-Documents.pdf>

Field, Cynthia, Glen Jones, Grace Karram Stephenson, Sharon Li, and Christian Noumi. 2015. "Sessional Faculty in Ontario." Presentation to the OCAV Data Exchange Annual Meeting. November 5, 2015. Toronto.

Hildebrant, Kai and Edward J Czilli. 1990. "A Study of University of Windsor Faculty Salary Anomalies: A Report commissioned by the University of Windsor Anomalies Committee." University of Windsor.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell with Anne Machung. 1989. *The second shift*. New York: Viking.

McMaster University. 2015. "Pregnancy/Parental Leave Policy for Faculty and MUFA Librarians." Accessed at: http://www.mcmaster.ca/policy/faculty/Leaves/SPS_C4-Pregnancy-Parental_Leave-Faculty-MUFA_Librarians.pdf

Memorandum of Settlement between the University of Waterloo and the Faculty Association of the University of Waterloo. 2015. University of Waterloo. Accessed at: https://uwaterloo.ca/faculty-association/sites/ca.faculty-association/files/uploads/files/faculty_salary_settlement_2015-2018_0.pdf

Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities. 2009. "A Manual Governing the Distribution of Ontario Government Operating Grants to Ontario Universities and University-Related Institutions (Formula Manual)." Toronto: Government of Ontario.

Rajagopal, Indhu. 2002. *Hidden academics: Contract faculty in Canadian universities*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Sicular, Terry, James Davies, Ann Bigelow, Julie McMullin, and David Wardlaw. 2009. "The University of Western Ontario Gender-Based Salary Anomaly Study." University of Western Ontario. Accessed at: <https://uwofa.ca/@storage/files/documents/280/uwogenderpayequityreport2009.pdf>

Sicular, Terry, James Davies, Ann Bigelow, Alan Weedon, David Wardlaw. 2010. "Gender-Based Salary Anomaly Implementation Report." University of Western Ontario. Accessed at: <https://uwofa.ca/@storage/files/documents/416/2010marchuwogenderanomalyimplementationreport.pdf>

Wiggers, Richard Dominic. 2015. "A study of contract/non-full-time faculty at Ontario colleges and universities." Presentation to the OCAV Data Exchange Annual Meeting. November 5, 2015. Toronto.