1. Task Force Members

   **Chairs:** Joyce Chen (Associate Professor, AEDE), Kristen Convery (Senior Director, University Marketing)

   **Members:** Heather Brod (Executive Director of Center for Faculty Advancement Mentoring and Engagement, College of Medicine), Emily Caldwell (Media Relations Manager, Office of the President), Cynthia Callahan (Associate Professor, English), Molly Driscoll (Organizational Leadership Effectiveness Consultant, Office of Human Resources), Tiyi Morris (Associate Professor African American and African Studies), Azuka MuMin (Senior Fellow, DEAI, American Alliance of Museums and Consultant, Inclusive Cultural and Community Engagement)

2. Charge: Develop recommendations on improving pay equity and pay equity appeal process. Includes consultation with University Staff Advisory Committee (USAC), University Senate, and Office of Human Resources (OHR)

3. Process/Activities
   
a. The task force has met six times during regular Council meetings. One meeting was held jointly with the University Staff Advisory Committee. Task force co-chairs also presented the mid-year report during the Council’s mid-year meeting with the President and Provost.

b. Individual task force members have sought opinions from researchers, faculty, staff and stakeholders including The Women’s Place, OHR, Faculty Senate, USAC, and the community (through Big Table conversations).

c. Co-chair Chen shared task force activities and findings with counterparts on the Syracuse University Committee on Faculty Gender Pay Equity.

d. The university is poised to be a leader in our community and nationally on equity with commitments to the Columbus Commitment for Achieving Pay Equity, through the Columbus Women’s Commission, President Drake’s 2020 Vision (Diversity and Inclusion).

4. Results/Findings
   
a. Reports from the Faculty Senate and academic research by task force members document a significant and persistent gender pay gap at Ohio State.


c. A review of documents from leading organizations focused on gender equity indicate clearly that pay equity and equal pay must be treated as distinct concepts requiring different approaches. “Equal pay” refers to men and women receiving the same pay for the same job, while “pay equity” refers to receiving the same pay for work of equal value. Within the context of OSU, equal pay should be understood to refer to disparities for the same position within units, while pay equity refers to disparities for equivalent positions across units.

d. A review of pay equity policies indicates that the burden of pursuing equitable pay falls on the individual faculty or staff member. Faculty must initiate a grievance process in order to receive a pay equity review, there isn’t a formal process for staff pursuing equitable pay, and overall university policies provide little guidance on the topic, making collaborating to find solutions difficult.

e. Moreover, unit leaders often lack the resources (funds, knowledge of institutional policy/process) to address pay equity issues and may be reluctant to acknowledge that inequities have arisen under their leadership, which may lead to and/or exacerbate conflict within units.

f. Pay equity appeals have strong potential to create animosity with supervisors and colleagues due to the requirement that equity adjustments be provided through the usual Annual Merit Compensation Process.

g. Implementation of Career Roadmap also has strong potential to create animosity with supervisors and colleagues, as individual concerns about position descriptions, titles, and salary bands can only be negotiated with the direct supervisor, and no clear guidelines have been given for how such concerns should be presented and addressed.

5. Next Steps

   We believe the work ahead lies in three areas: creating a commonly held definition for pay equity, developing a toolkit/resource guide in collaboration with USAC, and applying a gender lens to ongoing HR changes.

   a. **Defining Pay Equity/Total Rewards:** Additional collaboration is needed with other units (HR, USAC, University Senate) to answer the following questions: 1) What is included as pay (base salary, bonuses, paid time off, etc)? 2) Which populations are most in need of “equity”? (E.g. Which under-represented populations stand to benefit from work toward equity?), 3) To what extent will efforts to improve equal pay lead to progress on pay equity? PPCW anticipates that these questions will be partially addressed via the implementation of Career Roadmap and the external consultant’s study
commissioned by the Provost.

b. **Applying a Gender Lens to HR Changes**: PPCW members will maintain monthly check-ins with key constituents across the university regarding OHR plans with Career Roadmap and Workday to identify how these systems can support and promote pay equity, succession planning and progression for women and minoritized populations.

6. **Recommendations**

a. **We recommend that the University provide and socialize clear definitions about pay equity, pay equality and the role of gender.** This clarity and alignment allows all faculty and staff to be deliberate in the choice of language with respect to gender pay gaps. “Equal” should be utilized to denote comparisons of individuals with the same job, while “equity” should be utilized to denote work of equal value to the University.

b. **We recommend that the University undertake a thorough review of the pay equity appeal process** to identify how employee concerns about pay equity can be better supported by OHR and other units.
   
i. A pay equity “toolkit” should be developed to define the process for both faculty and staff members desiring to make a pay equity request or appeal (resources, information, and steps based on policy), and to identify common practices and the extent to which they align with existing university practices and policies.
   
ii. A similar toolkit should be developed to document best practices for managers/supervisors on how to process and make decisions regarding a pay equity request or appeal.
   
iii. The pay equity appeal process should be updated to minimize conflict between employees and supervisors and among colleagues within the same unit. For example, individuals could be permitted to submit pay equity appeals directly to HR, rather than supervisors, which would then trigger a unit-wide evaluation of pay equity to provide a degree of anonymity to the individual initiating the appeal.

c. **We recommend that the charge for the pay equity task force be extended through the implementation of Career Roadmap and for a minimum of one year.** This additional time with give the task force an opportunity to participate in ongoing discussions with OHR; to gather more information about how Career Roadmap will affect staff; and to learn about how Ohio State can benefit from the city-wide learnings of the Columbus Women’s Commission.