



**Implementation Committee for Gender Based Salary Adjustments
(as identified in the Pay Equity Report, 2005)**

**Final Report
March 2006**

Implementation Committee for Gender Based Salary Adjustments (as identified in the Pay Equity Report, 2005) Final Report

Preamble:

The “Implementation Committee for Gender Based Salary Adjustments (as identified in the Pay Equity Report, 2005)”, hereinafter referred to as the Pay Equity Implementation (PEI) committee, was charged with recommending a salary correction to address gender-based differentials in faculty salaries at The University of Western Ontario (Western). The PEI committee was created by mutual agreement of the administration and UWOFA, because the 2005 Pay Equity Committee (PEC) report identified that women were, on average, paid less than men at Western. The Terms of Reference are given in Appendix A.

Committee analyses and recommendations are based on the data provided by the Office of Institutional Planning and Budget. The committee proceeded by consensus at every step. Data analyses were conducted using Stata® Statistical Software (StataCorp LP). The regression modeling methods used are consistent with those used currently by researchers studying gender-based salary differentials in the field of labour economics.

In addressing gender-based differentials with female disadvantage, the committee recommendation will lead to adjustment of women’s salaries by the amount that the model indicates is the gender-based differential for these women relative to what men in the same academic units with the same experience and the same relative performance evaluation would receive. This committee did not address individual salary variation other than that attributable to gender-based differentials.

Membership:

The committee included five members:

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Chair: | Martha Karen Campbell |
| UWOFA appointees: | Audra Bowlus Genese Warr-Leeper |
| Administrative appointees: | Elizabeth (Betsy) Skarakis-Doyle Kim Baines |

Additionally, two resource persons with experience analyzing Western salary data were identified: Allan Heinicke (UWOFA resource person) and Ruban Chelladurai (Administration resource person). These resources persons were available, at the call of the committee, to consult on technical issues.

Dates of Meetings:

November 15 2005, 1pm-2pm
November 22 2005, 4pm-5:30 pm
November 28 2005, 4:30pm-5:30 pm
December 6 2005, 3:30pm -5:00pm
December 20 2005, 2pm-5:00pm
January 3 2006, 10am-11:00am
January 9 2006, 10am-12:00pm (resource persons, AH and RC, in attendance)
January 13 2006, 1pm-4:00pm
January 20 2006, 1pm-4:00pm
February 20 2006, scheduled but cancelled awaiting updated data
March 6 2006, 1pm-3:30pm

Summary of Process Determined for Salary Adjustment:

We determined and extensively tested an algorithm for the distribution of funds. This algorithm will provide for salary adjustments on a sliding scale where the largest increments will go to those experiencing the largest gender-based anomaly in their salary.

Summarizing the “algorithm” for salary adjustment:

1. the “best” regression model was identified for this purpose (elaborated below)
2. the model was estimated separately for men and women (same variables but parameter estimates allowed to differ)
3. evaluate each woman’s salary for potential gender-based impact:
 - a. predict what her salary would be using the female regression model
 - b. predict what her salary would be using the male regression model
4. if the prediction under “3a” is less than the prediction under “3b”, the woman’s salary should be corrected by adding the difference because there is statistically compelling evidence that her salary would be higher if she were a man

The difference between the predictions under “3a” and “3b” reflects the systemic gender differential (if any) for this woman’s circumstances (experience, academic unit, PAI). The committee believes that adjustment based on the differential between two predicted salaries is more scientifically sound and appropriate than correction based on the actual salary (whether lower or higher than that predicted under “3a”). This is because the difference between the woman’s actual salary and that predicted under the female model (3a) reflects her individual variation. This variation is not captured by the model and, therefore, should not be corrected as it reflects salary determinants not captured by the variables in the model (e.g., market variations, salary adjustment for outside offers, the effect of parental leave etc).

The best regression model for this purpose:

The model is essentially the PEC model methodology refined in the following ways to yield more interpretable results.

Years of experience/employment:

We examined different “experience” specifications and concluded that the best experience variables to include were: years since first degree prior to employment at Western; years since highest degree prior to employment at Western; and years employed at Western. This model will better reflect the fact that some individuals arrive with post-doctoral experience and other arrive at Western as new (or not yet complete) PhD's. These refinements provided more interpretable results without sacrificing model fit.

Academic Unit:

The set of indicator variables representing academic units is intended to capture discipline-specific market forces. We considered different academic unit specifications since the PEC report had been criticized for the use of “Faculty” rather than “Department” indicator variables. After very careful examination at the level of department we concluded that, for most departments within a Faculty, the male-female salary differential was consistent and, given the small sample sizes in some departments when the faculty were stratified by gender, the best specification was indeed Faculty with a few exceptions. The departments of computer science, economics, and the combined departments of film and visual arts had a somewhat different gender-based differential than their home faculties and thus warranted separate consideration. Therefore, we constructed a hybrid “Department/Faculty” variable to allow for these departments to be treated separately and the remainder of the departments to be grouped according to faculty for statistical efficiency. We tested, and decided against, using the average departmental salary variable as in the original PEC model because this variable did not improve the fit of the model and the parameter values were not interpretable.

Single model with interactions vs two separate models:

We also considered and extensively tested the implications of fitting one model (with interactions of some variables with gender) versus fitting two separate regressions for men and women. We concluded the latter to be the best approach statistically. Further, we think the latter is the best approach from a peer-acceptability perspective because every woman on campus will know that her salary is being considered in comparison to men in the same Faculty, with the same experience.

Decomposition of the salary variances:

In keeping with contemporary methods used in the field of labour economics, we conducted additional analyses of our regression results to determine the proportion of the salary differential that could be attributed to differential compensation of men and women whose circumstances (experience, academic unit, PAI) are similar versus the proportion of the salary differential that is due to the fact that men may simply be more likely to be in higher paying circumstances.

Details of the final regression models:

Table 1 presents the final full regression model for all faculty on campus. The parameter representing female gender has a value of -2271.45 which illustrates that, after adjustment for experience, home unit and relative performance, women are paid \$2271.45 less than men, on average. **Table 2** and **Table 3** present the regression the model estimated separately for men & women (same variables but parameter estimates were allowed to differ).

Within our regression framework there are two main explanations for this male-female wage differential:

1. the composition of men and women in terms of age, rank, years of experience, faculty, etc. on the campus varies.
2. men and women may receive different “returns” or “payments” for these characteristics. That is, the income received for an additional year of experience may vary across men and women or faculties may, on average, pay men and women differently.

Male-female wage differentials caused by the first reason, differences in characteristics, are generally not thought to be the result of gender bias, unless promotion rates differ across the sexes or hiring rates differ across Faculties. However, gender differences in payments for various characteristics should not occur, all else equal, and when they are found are labeled as discrimination and form the basis for gender based salary anomalies.

Using statistical methods, we can further analyze our regression results and decompose the fraction of the average male-female wage differential that can be explained by the two factors using the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition method¹. **Table 4** presents the results of this analysis. The “differences in means” in Table 4 tell us that, on average, men are paid \$14,437 more than women on Western’s campus *prior* to adjustment for other factors. Decomposing the components we find that:

1. 85% of the wage differential can be explained by differences in average characteristics across men and women. In particular, men on Western’s campus have more experience, are more likely to be full professors, and are more likely to be in higher paying faculties such as Business, Engineering, Science and Medicine
2. 15% of the wage differential is explained by differences in the coefficients across the male and female regressions, that is, differences in the payments for various characteristics.

Looking at patterns in payments for characteristics, the committee notes the following general patterns in the decomposition results. In general, we find women on campus receive relatively higher payments for years of experience prior to UWO and rank at the Associate and Full Professor level than men. These factors, in particular the latter results

¹ Blinder, Alan S. (1973) “Wage discrimination: reduced form and structural variables,” *Journal of Human Resources*, 8:436-455. Oaxaca, Ronald L. (1973) “Male-female wage differentials in urban labor markets,” *International Economic Review*, 14:693-709.

for rank, bring the predicted salaries of men and women closer together but generally do not make up for the full differences found for the base category of assistant professors. With regard to years of experience at UWO the payments received by men and women are quite similar. Finally, men receive a slightly higher payment for relative performance. Given these results the lower average salaries for women stem from the fact that most Faculties on campus are found to pay women less than men on average albeit to widely varying degrees. For assistant professors this is true for all Faculties, with the exception of the Department of Computer Science within the Faculty of Science. For associate and full professors, the picture is more encouraging and the Departments of Film Studies and Visual Arts and the Faculties of FIMS, Health Sciences and Music, as well as Computer Science, are all units where women are not paid less than men on average.² Putting these two results together we find that the greatest male-female differences are found for assistant professors and full professors.

We note that for Business and Law, it was not possible for us to look at distributions between fields. This may have importance in interpreting salary differentials, particularly given that women were at particular disadvantage relative to men in those Faculties. We cannot exclude the possibility that some of this differential is attributable to differential representation of women in fields with lower salaries (e.g., marketing versus finance; family law versus corporate law). With the data given, we have not been able to make those distinctions.

² These calculations are computed as follows using the differences in coefficients from Table 4 (figures have been rounded to the nearest dollar value). The difference in the constant terms from the two regressions ($53691 - 48155 = 5536$) gives the predicted salary difference for men and women under the "reference category" conditions, that is in the Faculty of Social Science minus Economics (the reference category for academic unit), at the assistant professor rank (the reference category for rank), and for those with a relative PAI score of 0 and 0 years of experience. Since PAI scores of 0 are very uncommon, it is better to use a base group with a relative PAI score of 1. Given the higher payment for relative PAI scores for men, this increases the average male-female salary difference for assistant professors in the Faculty of Social Science (minus Economics) to \$6056 ($5536 + 520$). For assistant professors in other Faculties and Departments one must then add the difference in the payments for men and women in those units. For assistant professors only Computer Science with a payment difference of -7011 completely eliminates this male-female wage gap. For associate and full professors, the difference in the rank payments must be added to the figure for assistant professors (-3234 for associate professors and -2853 for full professors). In addition one should also add the differential effect of experience (i.e. 7 years * 31 = 217 for associate professors and 15 years * 31 = 465 for full professors). Thus, for these years of experience the average male-female salary difference for associate (full) professors in the Faculty of Social Science (minus Economics) is \$3039 (\$3668). Again, for other Faculties and Departments one must add the payment difference between males and females to these amounts to determine whether or not the salary difference is eliminated. For associate and full professors only Film Studies and Visual Arts, FIMS, Health Sciences, Music and Computer Science have payment differences that are negative and large enough to eliminate this gap.

Projected impact of applying the model and algorithm:

The regression parameter of - \$2271 is based on an aggregate of three situations:

1. situations in which a woman is paid less than a male peer would be
2. situations in which a man is paid less than a female peer would be
3. situations in which men and women are remunerated similarly

Situation 1 is much more common than situation 2, but both exist. We are charged with recommending a correction for situation “1” and to ensure that the correction is differential (that those who are compensated are those who are disadvantaged). Using the process outlined above on page 2 of this report, our analyses suggest a cost of \$643,062 to do this correction.

This recommended correction is differential and has the following characteristics:

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.

This is based only on correcting women’s salaries in settings where men with the same experience and relative performance would be paid more. However, there are situations (far fewer) in which men are underpaid relative to women. Under our mandate, we are not charged with adjustments in these situations but we note it for future attention.

Concluding Remarks

The analyses reported and remedies proposed are consistent with the mandate given in our Terms of Reference.

It is important to note that we are only correcting the current gender-based salary differentials with a female disadvantage. Our analyses do not attempt to address why these differentials occurred. Our committee has hypothesized that some of the reasons may include negotiated starting salaries (this hypothesis is supported by the large differential at the Assistant Professor level) and market adjustment differences (this hypothesis is supported by the differential at the Professor level). The actual causes are beyond the scope of our investigation but may warrant another committee to investigate prevention strategies.

Table 1: Full Regression Model of Impacts on Annual Salary. This model includes all UWOFA members and includes a parameter to reflect gender. The data are based on February 2006 salaries after the last anomalies correction.

| | Coef. | Std. Err. | T | P> t | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|--|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|----------------------|
| Female | -2271.45 | 830.32 | -2.74 | 0.006 | -3900.97 -641.93 |
| Relative performance | 11727.68 | 1852.26 | 6.33 | 0.000 | 8092.60 15362.76 |
| Years since first degree prior to UWO | 335.69 | 85.37 | 3.93 | 0.000 | 168.15 503.23 |
| Years since highest degree prior to UWO | 685.60 | 90.59 | 7.57 | 0.000 | 507.81 863.39 |
| Years at UWO | 915.66 | 56.19 | 16.30 | 0.000 | 805.40 1025.93 |
| Associate Professor | 8895.94 | 1012.48 | 8.79 | 0.000 | 6908.94 10882.93 |
| Professor | 20750.28 | 1396.78 | 14.86 | 0.000 | 18009.08 23491.47 |
| Film and Visual Arts | -7771.86 | 2590.86 | -3.00 | 0.003 | -12856.45 -2687.28 |
| Arts & Humanities minus Film & Visual Arts | -1466.62 | 1319.85 | -1.11 | 0.267 | -4056.84 1123.59 |
| Ivey Business School | 70243.8 | 1501.09 | 46.80 | 0.000 | 67297.90 73189.69 |
| Education | 9046.32 | 1998.24 | 4.53 | 0.000 | 5124.74 12967.89 |
| Engineering | 4317.32 | 1464.70 | 2.95 | 0.003 | 1442.83 7191.81 |
| FIMS | 2804.62 | 2200.08 | 1.27 | 0.203 | -1513.06 7122.29 |
| Health Sciences | 6884.713 | 1459.54 | 4.72 | 0.000 | 4020.35 9749.08 |
| Law | 11930.09 | 2153.68 | 5.54 | 0.000 | 7703.48 16156.71 |
| Music | -3687.852 | 2058.04 | -1.79 | 0.073 | -7726.78 351.07 |
| Computer Science | 20558.34 | 2152.14 | 9.55 | 0.000 | 16334.75 24781.93 |
| Science minus Computer Science | 1722.25 | 1182.35 | 1.46 | 0.146 | -598.12 4042.62 |
| Economics | 24017.81 | 2187.16 | 10.98 | 0.000 | 19725.50 28310.13 |
| Dentistry | 11051.15 | 2577.54 | 4.29 | 0.000 | 5992.70 16109.60 |
| Medicine | 1871.55 | 1282.33 | 1.46 | 0.145 | -645.05 4388.14 |
| Constant | 52309.66 | 2353.50 | 22.23 | 0.000 | 47690.83 56928.38 |

Note:

For academic unit, the reference category is “Social Science minus Economics” and the parameters attached to the other academic units reflect their comparison to the reference category. This was chosen as the reference category due to the size of the academic unit.

Table 2 Regression model for males

| Annsal | Coef. | Std. Err. | T | P> t | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|--|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|----------------------|
| Relative performance | 11747.83 | 2313.70 | 5.08 | 0.000 | 7204.89 16290.77 |
| Years since first degree prior to UWO | 285.95 | 124.93 | 2.29 | 0.022 | 40.65 531.25 |
| Years since highest degree prior to UWO | 718.23 | 126.50 | 5.68 | 0.000 | 469.84 966.62 |
| Years at UWO | 916.41 | 68.12 | 13.45 | 0.000 | 782.66 1050.17 |
| Associate Professor | 7936.26 | 1340.64 | 5.92 | 0.000 | 5303.92 10568.60 |
| Professor | 20047.77 | 1758.19 | 11.40 | 0.000 | 16595.58 23499.97 |
| Film and Visual Arts | -10089.04 | 4462.64 | -2.26 | 0.024 | -18851.41 -1326.68 |
| Arts & Humanities minus Film & Visual Arts | -1078.83 | 1780.50 | -0.61 | 0.545 | -4574.82 2417.17 |
| Ivey Business School | 70310.79 | 1874.13 | 37.52 | 0.000 | 66630.95 73990.62 |
| Education | 8768.30 | 2983.06 | 2.94 | 0.003 | 2911.08 14625.52 |
| Engineering | 3936.44 | 1767.23 | 2.23 | 0.026 | 466.49 7406.40 |
| FIMS | 982.38 | 3240.45 | 0.30 | 0.762 | -5380.22 7344.99 |
| Health Sciences | 4828.65 | 2250.51 | 2.15 | 0.032 | 409.79 9247.50 |
| Law | 13200.25 | 2774.88 | 4.76 | 0.000 | 7751.79 18648.71 |
| Music | -5050.25 | 2687.86 | -1.88 | 0.061 | -10327.86 227.35 |
| Computer Science | 19244.73 | 2597.69 | 7.41 | 0.000 | 14144.17 24345.28 |
| Science minus Computer Science | 1158.08 | 1474.97 | 0.79 | 0.433 | -1738.02 4054.19 |
| Economics | 23439.30 | 2588.89 | 9.05 | 0.000 | 18356.02 28522.58 |
| Dentistry | 11239.19 | 3136.41 | 3.58 | 0.000 | 5080.87 17397.51 |
| Medicine | 1556.76 | 1605.50 | 0.97 | 0.333 | -1595.63 4709.15 |
| Constant | 53690.98 | 3013.09 | 17.82 | 0.000 | 47774.80 59607.16 |

Note:

For academic unit, the reference category is “Social Science minus Economics”.

Table 3: Regression model for females

| Annsal | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | P> t | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|--|----------|-----------|-------|-------|----------------------|
| Relative performance | 11227.91 | 2773.16 | 4.05 | 0.000 | 5765.06 16690.75 |
| Years since first degree prior to UWO | 327.48 | 91.99 | 3.56 | 0.000 | 146.26 508.70 |
| Years since highest degree prior to UWO | 812.23 | 114.80 | 7.08 | 0.000 | 586.09 1038.36 |
| Years at UWO | 885.07 | 101.08 | 8.76 | 0.000 | 685.95 1084.18 |
| Associate Professor | 11170.11 | 1373.71 | 8.13 | 0.000 | 8464.05 13876.18 |
| Professor | 22900.56 | 2071.21 | 11.06 | 0.000 | 18820.48 26980.64 |
| Film and Visual Arts | -5462.56 | 2323.85 | -2.35 | 0.020 | -10040.30 -884.82 |
| Arts & Humanities minus Film & Visual Arts | -1691.88 | 1547.45 | -1.09 | 0.275 | -4740.20 1356.45 |
| Ivey Business School | 69444.72 | 2178.72 | 31.87 | 0.000 | 65152.86 73736.58 |
| Education | 10428.12 | 2037.36 | 5.12 | 0.000 | 6414.74 14441.51 |
| Engineering | 5352.03 | 2673.63 | 2.00 | 0.046 | 85.25 10618.81 |
| FIMS | 5970.81 | 2255.71 | 2.65 | 0.009 | 1527.30 10414.32 |
| Health Sciences | 9394.54 | 1504.16 | 6.25 | 0.000 | 6431.49 12357.58 |
| Law | 8621.11 | 2821.41 | 3.06 | 0.002 | 3063.22 14179.00 |
| Music | 271.68 | 2578.88 | 0.11 | 0.916 | -4808.44 5351.82 |
| Computer Science | 26256.62 | 3669.75 | 7.15 | 0.000 | 19027.59 33485.64 |
| Science minus Computer Science | 3652.34 | 1757.22 | 2.08 | 0.039 | 190.79 7113.89 |
| Economics | 24765.15 | 4265.27 | 5.81 | 0.000 | 16363.01 33167.29 |
| Dentistry | 7884.28 | 4172.73 | 1.89 | 0.060 | -335.58 16104.13 |
| Medicine | 2558.45 | 1862.22 | 1.37 | 0.171 | -1109.93 6226.83 |
| Constant | 48155.43 | 3228.61 | 14.92 | 0.000 | 41795.40 54515.45 |

Note:

For academic unit, the reference category is “Social Science minus Economics”.

Table 4
Decomposition of Gender Wage Gap at UWO

| Variables | Means of Variables and Difference (males-females) | | | Regression Coefficients and Difference (males-females) | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|-----------|------------|--|------------|------------|
| | Males | Females | Difference | Males | Females | Difference |
| Annual Salary | 103263.8 | 88826.37 | 14437.43 | | | |
| Relative Performance | 0.9983444 | 1.004517 | -0.0061726 | 11747.8300 | 11227.9100 | 519.9200 |
| Yrs since first degree prior UWO | 12.10519 | 13.4751 | -1.36991 | 285.9531 | 327.4793 | -41.5262 |
| Yrs since highest degree prior UWO | 4.412104 | 3.32567 | 1.086434 | 718.2302 | 812.2291 | -93.9989 |
| Yrs at UWO | 13.57781 | 8.011494 | 5.566316 | 916.4110 | 885.0656 | 31.3454 |
| Associate | 0.3299712 | 0.4137931 | -0.0838219 | 7936.2610 | 11170.1100 | -3233.8490 |
| Full Professor | 0.3804035 | 0.1417625 | 0.238641 | 20047.7700 | 22900.5600 | -2852.7900 |
| Film & Visual Arts | 0.0100865 | 0.0421456 | -0.0320591 | -10089.0400 | -5462.5600 | -4626.4800 |
| Arts Faculty minus Film & Visual Arts | 0.0907781 | 0.137931 | -0.0471529 | -1078.8250 | -1691.8760 | 613.0510 |
| Business | 0.0792507 | 0.0498084 | 0.0294423 | 70310.7900 | 69444.7200 | 866.0700 |
| Education | 0.0259366 | 0.0651341 | -0.0391975 | 8768.3010 | 10428.1200 | -1659.8190 |
| Engineering | 0.0979827 | 0.0306513 | 0.0673314 | 3936.4440 | 5352.0310 | -1415.5870 |
| FIMS | 0.0201729 | 0.045977 | -0.0258041 | 982.3847 | 5970.8070 | -4988.4223 |
| Health | 0.0475504 | 0.1762452 | -0.1286948 | 4828.6470 | 9394.5350 | -4565.8880 |
| Law | 0.0288184 | 0.0268199 | 0.0019985 | 13200.2500 | 8621.1110 | 4579.1390 |
| Music | 0.0317003 | 0.0344828 | -0.0027825 | -5050.2550 | 271.6880 | -5321.9430 |
| Computer Science | 0.0331412 | 0.0153257 | 0.0178155 | 19244.7300 | 26256.6200 | -7011.8900 |
| Science Faculty minus Comp Sci | 0.1786744 | 0.091954 | 0.0867204 | 1158.0820 | 3652.3360 | -2494.2540 |
| Economics | 0.0331412 | 0.0114943 | 0.0216469 | 23439.3000 | 24765.1500 | -1325.8500 |
| Dentistry | 0.0216138 | 0.0114943 | 0.0101195 | 11239.1900 | 7884.2750 | 3354.9150 |
| Medicine | 0.1325648 | 0.0766284 | 0.0559364 | 1556.7590 | 2558.4470 | -1001.6880 |
| Constant | 1 | 1 | 0 | 53690.9800 | 48155.4300 | 5535.5500 |

Notes:

- 1) Difference refers to male figures minus female figures.
- 2) Difference in the “means” reflects difference in the mean characteristics of male and female faculty.
- 3) Difference in the “regression coefficients” reflects difference in the “payments” received for each characteristic.
- 4) Further analyses applying the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition indicate that 85% of (male-female) salary difference is attributable to differences in the mean characteristics of male and female faculty; 15% of the difference in salaries is attributable to differences in payments for the characteristics.

Appendix A
**Implementation Committee for Gender Based Salary Adjustments
(as identified in the Pay Equity Report, 2005)**

Terms of Reference

Introduction

This document outlines the protocols mutually agreed to by The University of Western Ontario and the University of Western Ontario Faculty Association (hereinafter the “Parties”) for the establishment and operation of the Implementation Committee for the correction of gender based salary anomalies identified in the Report of the Pay Equity Committee of August, 2005. Based on the amount projected in the Pay Equity Report (August, 2005) as necessary to correct gender based salary anomalies, Administration has authorized available funds in the amount of \$508,070.00.

Purpose of the Implementation Committee

- 1) The purpose of the Implementation Committee is to determine appropriate methodology that shall be used to determine the distribution of funds to correct the gender-based salary anomalies identified in the report of the Pay Equity Committee dated August 2005 and make recommendations to the Provost with respect to the application of the algorithm for distribution to faculty members.
- 2) The Implementation Committee is not charged with redoing the work of the Pay Equity Committee.
- 3) By January 15, 2006, the committee shall determine and test an algorithm for the distribution of funds to correct gender based salary anomalies which provides for salary adjustments on a sliding scale such that the largest adjustments would go to those the committee determines exhibit the greatest gender-based anomalies in their salaries.
- 4) If, using the methodology used by the Pay Equity Committee, the Committee determines an amount greater than \$508,070.00 is required to correct gender-based anomalies to salaries existing following the 2005-06 Salary Anomaly adjustments, the Committee must submit a proposal for further funds to the Parties.
- 5) The Committee shall report findings and recommendations to the Provost by March 1, 2006³.

³ Due to timing of the arrival of the final data, a later completion date of March 15 was subsequently agreed to after discussion with the principal parties.

Composition and Structure

The Implementation Committee will be structured to include five faculty members, two of whom shall be selected by UWOFA and two of whom shall be selected by Administration. The Chair shall be agreed upon by the Parties. Each Party may name a Resource Person who may attend meetings at the invitation of the Committee.

The composition of this Committee shall be:

| | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Chairperson | Karen Campbell |
| UWOFA appointees | Audra Bowlus Genese Warr-Leeper |
| Resource Person | Allan Heinicke |
| Administration appointees | Betsy Skarakis-Doyle Kim Baines |
| Resource Person | Ruban Chelladurai |

Meeting Schedules and Protocols

1. The Committee will determine the dates and times of meetings.
2. The Committee will be responsible for recording the meetings to enable a report of findings and recommendations to be made to the Provost.

These terms of reference were approved by the Parties at London, on _____.

Jane Toswell, President
University of Western Ontario
Faculty Association

Alan Weedon, Vice Provost
University of Western Ontario
Administration