

Washington University in St. Louis

Faculty Senate

May 3, 2010

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Mark S. Wrighton, *Chancellor*

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 pm.

2. The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of December 14, 2009 were approved.

3. Chancellor's Report

Mark S. Wrighton

Chancellor Wrighton thanked Andy Sobel for doing an outstanding job during his term as Chair of the Faculty Senate and Senate Council. He has done a great job at addressing important and timely issues relevant to the faculty and administration, and his service is greatly appreciated. Dr. William Clark, Secretary, was also thanked for his contributions to the affairs of the Faculty Senate and Senate Council.

This year's report is brief to allow time for review and discussion of the pay equity report that is on today's agenda, but it is useful to share a few highlights since we last met. It should be noted that the Faculty Senate Council has given rise to the Washington University Faculty Achievement Awards, which are awarded annually. This year's winners are Gary J. Miller, professor of political science in Arts & Sciences, who will receive the Arthur Holly Compton Faculty Achievement Award, and John Morris, professor of neurology in the School of Medicine, who will receive the Carl and Gerty Cori Faculty Achievement Award. They will receive their awards and give presentations of their scholarly work during a ceremony and celebration on December 4, 2010.

We have had a very good semester. We received a \$30 million gift from the Danforth Foundation for the John Danforth Center on Religion and Politics. We also received a gift for a new building for the School of Engineering and Applied Science. The groundbreaking ceremony for the new building, which will be named in honor of the late Preston M. Green, an alumnus of WUSTL, was held last Friday, April 30. The building will connect to the newly-constructed Stephen F. and Camilla T. Brauer Hall and is expected to be completed in December of 2011. Brauer Hall is nearly complete, and the building will be open to visitors on commencement day.

We've also received a gift from Alvin Siteman to establish a research fund for new ideas to support cancer. This fund earns approximately \$1 million per year, and the funds do not have to be spent annually. The purpose of the gift is to fund "good ideas" –seed money for innovative and creative research projects that may not have matured to the level necessary to attract federal funding.

In recent conversations with David Blasingame it is possible that by the end of the year, June 30, we will close with a record for contributions. It could go over \$200 million in cash gifts. Things look good on that front. There has been a lot of emphasis placed on student financial aid. All schools need that support.

On the medical campus we've seen the move into the BJC Institute of Health. An opening ceremony and celebration will be held either June 16 or 17.

The finance committee met just this morning, and approved a budget for next year. For the next fiscal year we believe we'll be able to manage with a small surplus.

Next year's incoming undergraduate class looks promising, with a talented group of students who have been admitted for the fall from a pool of 25,000 applicants. We intended to enroll a class of 1450 students; it looks like we may be slightly higher. We are still counting a few deposits that are coming in so it might be slightly higher. Right now we have over 1500 people who say they are coming, but we always watch out for the "summer melt", with some students admitted here and elsewhere declining to enroll. All in all, we will enjoy a great class next year.

There were no questions.

4. Faculty Senate Council Chair's Report

Andrew C. Sobel, *Chair, Faculty Senate*

Chair Andy Sobel provided a brief update of activities completed since the last meeting of the Faculty Senate. He thanked Jill Edwards, Nancy Berg, Bill Clark, and Jeff Lowell for their service to the Senate and Senate Council. He also acknowledged the services of the members leaving the Faculty Senate Council: Bill Bottom, Brad Stoner, Randy Jotte, and Eric Mumford.

As part of the process to increase transparency, the FSC received frequent briefings by the Provost on diversity issues. Other briefings and consultations were provided on the H1N1 virus, sustainability, summer programs, and undergraduate policies for academic integrity. Major initiatives included those on:

- Authorship policy - several briefings by Evan Kharasch, Vice Chancellor for Research, followed by a final report to the Faculty Senate in December;
- Proposition A – the Senate Council passed a resolution supporting the issue, and the Chair of FSC distributed a letter of support contemporaneously with other efforts on campus. The

proposition passed by a 2:1 margin, and Washington University's efforts, supported by the FSC, attracted additional voters to the polls.

- Gender pay equity - this was a major effort, and thanks were extended to co-chairs Shanta Pandey and Bob Pollak, committee members Kathleen Clark, Jeff Gill, Pauline Kim, Jody O'Sullivan, Ed Spitznagel, and Lynn McCloskey and Tao Zhang from the Provost's office. The final report will be delivered today.

Finally, a committee, co-chaired by Shirley Baker and Andy Sobel will address the complicated issue of public access to scholarly communication. This is a challenging issue, affecting scholarly publications that differ in style and intent across the schools of the university. Several other institutions have already established policies, and the NIH has specific requirements for the publication of work supported by them. The committee will present its findings and recommendations at a future Faculty Senate meeting.

5. Gender Pay Equity Report

Shanta Pandey, *Associate Prof., George Warren Brown School of Social Work*

Robert Pollak, *Robert E. Heinreich Distinguished Professor of Economics*

Joseph O'Sullivan, *Samuel C. Sachs Professor of Electrical Engineering*

The presentation was given by Jody O'Sullivan. He commented that he had "drawn the short straw" and was elected to give the report. The members of the committee were:

- Kathleen Clark School of Law
- Jeff Gill Arts & Sciences
- Pauline Kim School of Law
- Jody O'Sullivan School of Engineering
- Shanta Pandey co-chair, Social Work
- Robert Pollak co-chair, Arts & Sciences and Olin
- Ed Spitznagel Arts & Sciences

The report presented to the Faculty Senate is a summary of the final report that can be found on the Faculty Senate website and on the website of the Provost's office. The current study covers six schools on the Danforth Campus, and follows previous studies completed approximately every ten years under the umbrella of the Faculty Senate Council. The most recent of those reports completed in 2000 used traditional statistical methods and reported:

We conclude that for the Schools of Arts & Sciences, Art, Architecture, Business, Engineering and Applied Science, Law, and Social Work, our analyses give no statistically significant evidence of gender bias in the setting of salaries. (Final Report: April 12, 2000)

For the current report, the Committee refrained from reporting the significance level. This was because they studied the entire population, not a random sample. However, they did report residual values and Z scores.

Two analysis methods were used: 1) Gray methodology uses the male population to develop a salary prediction equation, applies the prediction to the female population and examines the difference;

2) The Oaxaca method uses the total population to develop a prediction equation and included gender as an independent variable, along with other variables.

For all analyses, the nine month salary data and logarithm of salary were the dependent variables. Models included discipline, rank, and time variables (years since degree, years at WU, years-squared), and for the current analysis two new variables were added that were not included in the 2000 analysis: endowed chair and underrepresented minority.

The total number of faculty studied was 635 (458 males; 177 females). Sixteen were excluded because they were current or prior deans, worked less than 50% effort, and for other special cases. Because Arts & Sciences represented the largest pool (381 total; 271 males and 110 female), the committee evaluated 44 different models in this group; then selected the six most useful models for studying the other five schools.

Professor O'Sullivan discussed in detail the results from all the analyses, reviewing small differences among findings for schools, but emphasized the general overall findings of the study, namely, the difference between female and male faculty salaries is negative for all schools and for all models, indicating that on average women are paid less than men. In percentage, the difference ranged from 0.7 to 6.7 percent; in dollars the range was \$507 - \$8,709. He emphasized the study was descriptive in nature, and did not address the cause of the differences.

On the basis of the study, the committee concluded:

- Women faculty are paid less than men
- The pattern persists over schools and over time using many models
- Many additional analyses (not reported) supported the basic findings
- The models say nothing about an individual's salary
- Pay equity is only one component of gender equity
- “The persistent pattern of gender differences in pay revealed by this study warrants further close attention as part of an on-going examination of University practices relating to diversity and gender equality.”

The committee recommended more frequent pay-equity studies in the future, attaining continuity of effort and institutional memory by appointing two or three members from the previous GPE committees, and improving the methodology in future studies.

Mark Wrighton thanked the committee for its efforts and commented that he, personally, was not that much into statistics, but the headline clearly is that women faculty are paid less than men.

He invited questions from the attendees. An inquiry was made about whether a gender pay equity was ongoing or planned for the medical school. Diana Gray responded that a study was ongoing and was being done by an outside consultant and included statistical analyses. She stated the study would be presented at a future Faculty Senate meeting.

Nancy Berg asked if the newer methods were used to assess the data from the earlier studies, and whether doing that could display a trend of changing values or a reduction in the standard errors. Jody responded the committee did not re-evaluate the older data; it would have been difficult to accomplish as well as interpret.

Martin Israel asked if there was an attempt to incorporate productivity measures into the assessment. Jody said they talked about it, but found it was very complicated. In the medical school, some measures of productivity (e.g., clinical reports for medicare) are encoded into the HR system, but the schools studied in the current report do not have access to appropriate coded information.

A question was raised about whether any studies addressed non-tenure track faculty. The response was no for the Danforth campus, but yes for the upcoming study from the medical school. Another member of the faculty suggested the difference may be due to productivity differences, and suggested this as a cause for the findings.

Bob Pollak commented that what comes through is how robust the finding is. Women faculty are paid less than men. But how the data is interpreted is very difficult. He reminded the audience that the study was a “snapshot” of the situation, and that we need to think more about the dynamics of the process. He mentioned that his discussions with Lee Epstein indicated that trying to incorporate a measure of productivity into the equation was singularly unsuccessful.

Ed Macias asked Lynn McCloskey if other universities have had success at measuring productivity. The response was that a study of 80 other places indicated that it is hard to do and results are hard to interpret. Another question asked if other universities are seeing the same thing, including similar changes over time. Jody O’Sullivan reminded the audience that the committee is not saying the differences are changing over time.

Diana Gray commented that the medical school outside consultant told them they can’t not use tests of statistical significance because one must always consider the larger universe of people-faculty who have exited, retentions, etc. Therefore statistical tests must be included or the findings will never stand up in court.

Ed Spitznagel replied that the Z scores included in the report could map directly onto tests of statistical significance.

Chancellor Wrighton was asked if there are plans to rectify the inequity. He stated he was not comfortable using the word “inequity”-- there is a difference, but we don’t know exactly how to characterize the differences. Ed Macias added that, at the suggestion of Chair Andy Sobel and the Faculty Senate Council, he will work with the deans and report back to the FSC in the fall. Ed agrees with the chancellor that the issue needs to be addressed, but he pointed out that it took more than a year for the committee to complete its study. It would seem logical to reduce the number of models in future studies. It needs to have alacrity as well as accuracy. Responding to a question about including non-tenure track faculty, Jody O’Sullivan responded that it depends upon whether we have enough numbers to make a valid assessment, and Ed Macias added that we have to keep in mind the time involved.

Bob Pollak added three comments on the statistical significance issue. First, one approach to the study would have been to draw a random sample of, say, 38 faculty in A&S for detail study, and try to determine if this group represented all faculty. The alternative is to embed this into a hypothetical universe, but this creates two problems. One is the type 1 vs. type 2 error dilemma. Type 1 is really bad (we find a man guilty and execute him, even though he’s innocent), vs the more benign type 2 error (we free a guilty man). So what’s the balance? 1:10, 1:20? In our case, we don’t want to wrongly conclude that Washington University pays women less than men if it doesn’t, versus wrongly concluding that it doesn’t. Finally, we have a lot of models and a lot of analyses over 6 schools. If you flipped a coin six times and it came up heads every time, this could be a random event, but most likely it’s not.

Bob was asked why not speak to the cause of the difference, and he replied that he was interested in doing just that in future studies. Andy Sobel reminded that although the study showed a robust finding of differences in pay, it did not say why there was a difference. Diana's question about productivity is valid but very complicated to address. That's why we are asking the Provost to talk to the deans of the schools. If we repeat the study periodically, we may see some movement.

Chancellor Wrighton thanked Jody O'Sullivan who has been involved in this important project for 15 years. He also reported that the School of Medicine will receive a report to its Executive Faculty and the Faculty Senate Council and the Provost will consider that report when it is issued.

6) Necrology Report

William W. Clark, *Secretary, Faculty Senate*

Secretary William Clark read the following names on the Necrology Report:

Raymond E. Callahan
H. Marvin Camel
Philip Rogers Dodge
David Felix
Leonard B. Gulbransen
Richard M. Hazelton
Ira J. Hirsh
Morris Kenton King
Marilyn Marie Kirk
Joseph C. Koster
Morris D. Marcus
Powell Niland
A. Edward Nussbaum
Lee Nelken Robins
Robert H. Salisbury
John A. Stern
Joyce Trebilcot
Teresa Jane Vietti
Merle T. Welshans

After the report was read, one of the Faculty Senate members requested the addition of Richard E. Norberg to the list.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:09 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

William W. Clark, Ph.D.
Secretary, Faculty Senate and Senate Council