

STAFF SALARY EQUITY REVIEW REPORT (2024)

Acknowledgements

This report was initiated by the School of Public Health Human Resources (SPH HR) in collaboration with Biostatistical Design and Analysis Center (BDAC) in the Clinical and Translational Science Institute. We thank the following contributors for their valuable input, insights, and expertise in making this review possible.

- Laura Dawis, SPH Senior HR Consultant
- Michael Evans, Senior Biostatistician & Associate Director, BDAC
- Sonya Johnson, SPH Senior HR Business Partner & Data Analytics Lead
- Stacey Ripka, SPH Senior HR Consultant

Executive Summary

This report provides an analysis of SPH staff salary equity across key demographic groups, aligning with SPH's Strategic Plan for Antiracism. Understanding the need for a thorough statistical analysis in this review, SPH HR collaborated with Michael Evans, from Biostatistical Design and Analysis Center (BDAC). This review examines key demographic factors, including gender, race/ethnicity, disability, and veteran status, aiming to identify and address any pay disparities that may be present.

Our goal is to ensure that our compensation practices align with our commitment to fairness, transparency, and equity.

Key Findings

The analysis revealed consistent patterns of compensation across demographic groups, highlighting SPH's commitment to equitable pay practices:

- **Gender:** The adjusted mean Compa Ratios for male and female employees were similar across all divisions, indicating no significant differences that would suggest gender-based pay disparities.
- **Race/Ethnicity:** Compa-ratio levels for racial and ethnic groups, including American Indian/BIPOC and non-U.S. citizens, were comparable to those of White employees in all divisions. This suggests that salary allocation practices are free from bias.
- **Disability Status:** Employees with disabilities received pay that was similar to that of their non-disabled colleagues, reflecting SPH's commitment to valuing, accommodating, and supporting all staff.
- **Veteran Status:** Pay practices were similarly equitable among veteran and non-veteran employees.

Across all groups analyzed, p-values remained above the threshold for statistical significance, affirming that any minor differences in Compa Ratios were not statistically meaningful.

Conclusion

This initial salary equity review has given us important insights into our compensation practices. The findings reaffirm our commitment to equitable pay across different demographics, such as gender, race/ethnicity, disability status, and veteran status. Notably, the data shows no potential pay disparities, which should provide reassurance to our staff about our commitment to equitable compensation practices.

Future Steps: Reflections and Ongoing Commitment

This review, based on available data, serves as a starting point for future reviews. While this first review focused on demographic, compa-ratio and employment metrics, we intend to expand future analyses to include a broader range of variables and factors to ensure a more thorough evaluation. We plan to conduct these reviews each year to monitor our practices and make necessary adjustments. In the process, this will enrich our understanding of pay equity and help us identify any emerging disparities. By continuously refining our approach, SPH HR is committed to fostering an inclusive workplace and maintaining equitable practices that support our employees.

Statistical Report

Objective: To examine SPH staff salaries across the school and within each SPH division to evaluate any potential disparities in pay by gender, race/ethnicity, disability, or veteran status.

Data Criteria and Data Collection:

Data for this analysis was retrieved on April 5, 2024, from two automated reports.

- All Employees from the Human Resources Tracking and Reporting System (HRTS4)
- Employee Headcount and FTE Demographics from the Reporting Center (UM Analytics)

These reports were combined and organized in Excel, yielding a headcount of 364 part-time and full-time staff (working 0.25 to 40 standard hours weekly) from the Civil Service and Professional & Academic employee groups with active employment records as of April 4, 2024.

Divisions in this report include the Dean's Office and Administration, Biostatistics and Health Data Science, Health Policy & Management, Epidemiology and Community Health, and Environmental Health Sciences.

We included demographic groups—specifically gender, race/ethnicity, veteran status, and disability status—in the report, as these groups are used for Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action (EOAA) goal-setting by the University of Minnesota to support its commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Including these groups ensures that our analysis and findings align with established institutional practices.

Exclusions:

- Post-Doctoral Associates, Senior Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Teaching Specialist, Senior Fellow and Temporary/Casual job code classifications were excluded because they do not have a salary midpoint which is required for calculating a compa-ratio, a key data point for this analysis.
- Labor-Represented employees were excluded from this analysis because they have established pay schedules dependent on their bargaining unit contracts.
- Faculty members were excluded because there is a separate SPH collegiate process for reviewing faculty salary equity.

Methodology: The general approach to these analyses was to evaluate potential differences in compensation between these demographic groups while accounting for other factors expected to influence compensation, including job classification and years of experience. This approach was implemented using linear regression models. These models include compensation as the outcome measure, and job code classification, experience, division, demographic group as predictors of that outcome. In this way we attempt to compare compensation by demographic group while adjusting for the other characteristics. The results of this adjustment may be interpreted as: given two employees with the same job code, division, and experience, but different demographic group (e.g., one female and one male), do we find evidence of difference in their compensation?

Years of experience: The available data contained four measures of length of experience: time since hiring date, time since department entry, time since job code entry, and time since position entry. Because these four measures are positively correlated with each other (i.e., employees with more time since hiring tend to also have more time since department, job code entry, and position entry), they are capturing some of the same information about experience, and it is advantageous to include only the most informative measure or measures and avoid issues in the regression modeling caused by correlated predictors. To this end, a stepwise predictor selection procedure was used; the result was that years since hire and years since position entry were selected for inclusion.

INTERNAL

Job code classification: Among the 364 employees included in the analysis, there were 118 unique job codes, including 70 job codes containing exactly 1 employee. As a result, it was not feasible to estimate the effects of job classification on compensation from the data. However, the data does include the *Compa Ratio* for each employee, defined as the ratio of the employee's salary to the midpoint salary for their job code based on a thorough market comparison. This provides a measurement of each employee's salary relative to their job code, effectively accomplishing the same goal as regression adjustment for their job classification. Thus, we used the Compa Ratio as the outcome measure in our regression models going forward.

Model specification and reporting of results: For each demographic group of interest, a linear regression model of Compa Ratio was fitted, with years since hire, years since position entry, division, demographic group, and demographic group-by-division interaction included as predictors. The group-by-division interaction term allows for estimation of different group effects within each division. The results are summarized using the adjusted mean Compa Ratio in each group, both overall and within each division. These represent the predicted Compa Ratio for employees with average length of experience and are reported with 95% confidence intervals to indicate the precision of each estimate. Groups with fewer employees will tend to have wider confidence intervals for mean Compa Ratio, reflecting greater uncertainty of these estimates. In addition, each comparison of compensation between groups is formally tested, and the test results are reported using the p-value. The p-value, briefly, is the probability of observing a difference in compensation between demographic groups at least as large as what was observed in our data, calculated under the assumption that there is no actual relationship between the demographic group and compensation. A small p-value (a commonly used threshold is $p < 0.05$ or 5%) indicates that the data provides evidence to reject this assumption, i.e., that compensation does differ by demographic group.

Results:

Gender: Compa Ratios by gender are reported in Figure 1 and Table 1. Compa Ratios were similar between female and male staff, both overall (female: adjusted mean 0.98 (95% CI 0.97–0.99) vs. male: 0.97 (0.94–0.99), $p=0.39$) and within each division.

Race: Compa Ratios by race (Ethnicity IPEDS Calculation) are reported in Figure 2 and Table 2. Compa Ratios were similar between American Indian/BIPOC, Non-U.S. Citizens, Not Reported, and White staff, both overall (American Indian/BIPOC: 0.99 (0.96, 1.01), Non-U.S. Citizens: 0.97 (0.87–1.06), Not Reported: 0.99 (0.90–1.08), White: 0.97 (0.96–0.99), $p>0.7$ for all pairwise comparisons) and within each division.

Disability Status: Compa Ratios by disability status are reported in Figure 3 and Table 3. Compa Ratios were similar between staff without and with disability, both overall (no disability: 0.98 (0.97–0.99) vs. disability: 0.97 (0.94–1.00), $p=0.57$) and within each division.

Veteran Status: Compa Ratios by veteran status are reported in Figure 4 and Table 4. Compa Ratios were similar between non-veteran and veteran staff, both overall (non-veteran: 0.98 (0.97–0.99) vs. veteran: 1.02 (0.86–1.18), $p=0.59$) and within each division.

Conclusions: SPH staff compensation exhibited no systematic differences by employee gender, race, disability, or veteran status.