

The 2009-10 Performance-Based Anomaly Fund (PBAF) Process

The total value of the PBAF in 2009-10 was \$500,000. According to the Collective Agreement, in 2009-2010 the PBAF was to be allocated to two types of anomaly adjustments. First, monies from the PBAF were to be used to make salary adjustments to address gender-based salary anomalies. Once the gender-based anomaly salary adjustments were made, any remaining funds would be distributed as Performance-Based Anomaly Adjustments (see Clause 39 of the Article on Compensation and Benefits).

The Salary Anomaly Committee (SAC) determined that systematic gender-based salary anomalies existed for certain sub-groups of faculty, and it recommended salary adjustments to address these anomalies in the amount of \$109,526 for Tenured and Probationary faculty members, and \$17,844 for Limited Term faculty members. A description of the SAC's work and recommendations on gender-based anomalies can be found in the *Gender-Based Salary Anomaly Report*, November 9, 2009, and the *Gender-Based Salary Anomaly Implementation Report*, March, 2010.¹

After these amounts were subtracted from the PBAF, \$372,630 remained to be distributed as Performance Based Anomaly Adjustments.

With respect to the Performance-Based Anomaly Adjustments, 51 applications from Members and 82 additional nominations from Deans were received. The applications and nominations were reviewed by the SAC, which, in accordance with the Collective Agreement, consisted of two individuals appointed by UWOFA (Professors Ann Bigelow and Jim Davies), two individuals appointed by the Employer (Professor David Wardlaw, Dean, Faculty of Science, and Professor Alan Weedon, Vice-Provost Academic Planning, Policy and Faculty) and a chair jointly appointed by UWOFA and the Employer (Professor Terry Sicular).

Of the 132 applications and nominations, the SAC recommended 117 for a salary anomaly adjustment, and did not recommend an adjustment for 15. The amounts of the recommended adjustments ranged from \$700 to \$7,500 (the latter being the maximum amount allowed under the provisions of the Collective Agreement).

In order to arrive at its recommendations the SAC Committee met more than ten times and used the following process: For each applicant, each SAC member reviewed the application along with all accompanying material and the Dean's commentary. For each nominee, each SAC member reviewed the Dean's commentary and recommendation. The following information for each applicant/nominee was also available to each SAC member: Performance Assessment Indicator (PAI) values for each of the most recent four years, relative PAI for each of these past four years (i.e., PAI divided by the average PAI in the home academic unit), and information

¹ Copies of these reports can be found at:

[http://www.uwo.ca/pvp/facultyrelations/documentation/UWO%20Gender%20Pay%20Equity%20Report%20091103%20\(2\).pdf](http://www.uwo.ca/pvp/facultyrelations/documentation/UWO%20Gender%20Pay%20Equity%20Report%20091103%20(2).pdf)

and

<http://www.uwo.ca/pvp/facultyrelations/faculty/UWO%20Gender%20Anomaly%20Implementation%20Report%20March%202010%20public.pdf>

pertinent to experience and stage in career (e.g., years since first degree, years since highest degree, rank, years in rank, and years at UWO). Also available to the SAC members for each applicant/nominee were the value of actual 2009-10 base salary, the amounts of any stipends, and the salary projected by a stepwise regression analysis correlating the salaries of all Probationary and Tenured Bargaining Unit members with the following significant variables: Years in Full-time Faculty Position at UWO; Years since First Degree; Professorial Rank; Years at Rank; Average Relative PAI (average of relative PAI for the years 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009); Average Relative PAI times Years since Highest Degree; Average Relative PAI squared times Years since Highest Degree. Including the last two variables allowed the analysis to capture the cumulative and compounded effects on salary over time of career progress salary increments.

To avoid conflict of interest and to remove apprehension of bias, SAC members did not receive the data for, and were not involved in discussions or decisions regarding, applicants and nominees in their home academic units. The Dean of Science was not involved in discussions or decisions regarding applicants and nominees from the Faculty of Science.

Through discussion and consensus of all members of the committee, the SAC arrived at a recommendation for each applicant/nominee. The SAC then reviewed and finalized all of the recommended amounts to ensure that the aggregate total was consistent with the available funds. The SAC submitted its recommendations to the Provost, who accepted them in full.

Terry Sicular
Chair, 2009-10 Salary Anomaly Committee