University Anomaly Committee (UAC)

Procedures for identifying anomalies

- Each tenure-stream faculty member's salary is reviewed following the year in which they undergo a major personnel review. Major personnel reviews include fourth-year reviews, tenure and promotion reviews, promotion to full professor, and periodic multi-year reviews (PMYR).
- To identify salary anomalies, base salaries, minus any stipends, are considered. Base salaries reflect the faculty member's salary in the fall semester following the academic year in which they underwent a major personnel review.
- The committee compares each faculty member's salary to the average (mean) salary for an appropriate comparison group at UMass Boston. Comparison groups are based on faculty rank and discipline.
- Large departments (that is, those with five or more faculty in a particular rank) comprise their own comparison group.
- Smaller departments (that is, those with fewer than five faculty in a particular rank) are grouped together with departments that have similar salary structures. The committee uses national faculty salary data from the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR) to determine which academic disciplines have similar salary structures.
- An example can illustrate how comparison groups are formed. In fall 2018, the Sociology Department at UMass Boston employed 15 associate professors. In this case, the Sociology Department serves as its own comparison group for associate professors. An associate professor in the Sociology Department would have their salary compared to the mean salary for the other associate professors in the Sociology Department at UMass Boston.
- In contrast, the Chemistry Department at UMass Boston employed only three full professors in fall 2018. The Chemistry Department is too small to comprise its own comparison group for full professors. In this case, a full professor in the Chemistry Department would have their salary compared to the mean salary for full professors at UMass Boston in departments that have salary structures similar to chemistry. In this case, the comparison group is comprised of science disciplines (biology, chemistry, mathematics, physics, and environmental sciences).

Faculty salary comparison groups

Comparison group (based on comparable salary structures per CUPA-HR data)	UMass Boston departments/units included in the comparison group
Liberal arts	Africana Studies, American Studies, Applied Linguistics, Art, Asian Studies, Classics and Religious Studies, Communication, English, History, Latin American and Iberian Studies, Modern Languages, Performing Arts, Philosophy, Women's and Gender Studies
Social sciences	Anthropology, Economics, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology
Business/management	Accounting and Finance, Management, Marketing, Management Science and Information Systems

Health professions	Nursing, Exercise and Health Sciences
Public administration	Conflict Resolution, Human Security, and Global Governance; Gerontology; Public Policy
Sciences: natural, physical, environmental	Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics, Physics, School for the Environment
Engineering and computer science	Computer Science, Engineering
Education and human development	Counseling and School Psychology, Curriculum and Instruction, Leadership in Education, School for Global Inclusion and Social Development (SGISD)

Procedures for addressing anomalies

- The committee identifies the faculty members whose salary is lower than their comparison group. The committee then calculates the percentage of the salary gap for each case (percentage difference between comparison group average and the faculty member's salary).
- The goal is to reduce all salary gaps to the lowest level possible, given the available funds.
- Each year, the committee makes iterative adjustments to the amount of the total funds ($60,000) used to address the largest salary gaps and thereby bring everyone into a common range.
- Example: as noted below, among the faculty who underwent a major personnel review in AY 2016-17, salary gaps were as high as 17.6%. The committee allocated the available funds ($60,000) to bring all faculty down to salary gaps that were no larger than 6.5%. Ten faculty members received adjustments that year.
- Example: as noted below, among the faculty who underwent a major personnel review in AY 2017-18, salary gaps were as high as 14.7%. The committee allocated the available funds ($60,000) to bring all faculty down to salary gaps that were no larger than 5.6%. Sixteen faculty members received adjustments that year.
- Before issuing recommendations, the committee examines merit history data to determine whether salary gaps might be explained by performance reviews. Typically, the committee examines the previous six to eight years of merit review data to determine whether a pattern of consistently low merit exists. In rare instances when a pattern of consistently low merit is identified, the committee does not recommend a salary adjustment.

Note: similar procedures would be used to identify and address salary anomalies for librarians. The major difference is that for librarians, comparison groups would be formed based on job title (title of Librarian I, II, III, IV or V).

Underwent major personnel review in AY 2016-17	Underwent major personnel review in AY 2017-18
Total N=80	Total N=67
Faculty with salary lower than their group's average (N=47)	Faculty with salary lower than their group's average (N=38)
Adjustments recommended for N=10 with initial salary gaps ranging between 17.6% and 7.1%	Adjustments recommended for N=16 with initial salary gaps ranging between 14.7% and 5.8%
Salary gap <u>after</u> adjustments: no more than 6.5%	Salary gap <u>after</u> adjustments: no more than 5.6%
More funds could enable the process to reduce salary gaps even further	