

The USM College of Business “Equity Raise’ of 2006’ Report

Based on a recent count, there are about 50 faculty at USM in traditional AACSB fields. Of these, about 26.5% are female, and 73.5% are male (these numbers do not include those who held major administrative positions in 2005-2006 (i.e., Doty, Niroomand, Babin, Posey, and Carter) or faculty who are leaving USM before 2006-2007. During the College of Business Administrative Team’s raise determination meeting of 2006, Dean Harold Doty proclaimed that (1) all faculty compensated at below 80% of the relevant AACSB median level would receive a “market adjustment” raise, and (2) female faculty in the College would receive an “equity adjustment” because the College’s female faculty had been underpaid over the years. Regarding the latter initiative, there have not been any reports to come out of the CoB AT meeting suggesting that Doty presented statistical evidence to support his claim and the “equity” raises that emanated from the claim. This report fills that void.

As a starting point, each CoB faculty’s salary (2005-2006) is divided by the relevant AACSB median to form a ratio for comparison across gender.¹ As the first statistics below indicate, on average males were paid about 95% of the relevant AACSB median salary while females in the CoB were paid about 92% of the relevant median. The difference is not statistically significant. The second test indicates that the ratio of males in the CoB paid at 90% of the relevant AACSB median or above is statistically the same as the corresponding ratio for females in the CoB. The third test indicates that the ratio of males in the CoB paid below 85% of the relevant AACSB median salary is significantly greater than the corresponding ratio for female faculty in the CoB. (*Note also that CoB females are precluded from receiving “market adjustments” using Doty’s “below 80% of the AACSB median salary”*).

Means of [Salary/AACSB Median]			Ratio of Gender Group Above 89.9% of AACSB Median		
<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Difference</u>
0.9480	0.9211	0.0269	0.694	0.538	0.156
		[p>0.100]			[p>.100]

Ratio of Gender Group Below 85.0% of AACSB Median

<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Difference</u>
0.139	0.000	0.139
		[p=.078]

The *Goodness-of-Fit Analyses* below examine the ratio of females and males among the Top XX of CoB faculty, where faculty are ranked by the [Salary/AACSB Med Salary] ratio from largest to smallest. The expected representations are figured using the actual CoB representations above for males (73.5%) and females (26.5%). None of the Top XX explorations below suggest that females were/are underrepresented.

Goodness-of-Fit Analysis:

The Top 40 College Faculty (by Sal/AACSB Median)

	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Females	10.6	10
Males	29.4	30
		[p>.100]

Goodness-of-Fit Analysis:

The Top 32 College Faculty (by Sal/AACSB Median)

	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Females	8.48	7
Males	23.52	25
		[p>.100]

Goodness-of-Fit Analysis:
The Top 25 College Faculty (by Sal/AACSB Median)

	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Females	6.625	4
Males	18.375	21
[p>.100]		

Goodness-of-Fit Analysis:
The Top 20 College Faculty (by Sal/AACSB Median)

	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Females	5.3	4
Males	14.7	16
[p>.100]		

Given the analysis above, it seems that Doty's proclamation that female faculty in the CoB were/are underpaid may have been baseless.

ⁱ Faculty salaries are collected from the USM Library (2005-06 Budget Pages). AACSB salary information comes from the 2005-06 AACSB Salary Survey.