Questions for JDEC:

Questions for JDEC related to the consultant's report:
1. The data set provided by HR, that was used for statistical analysis of pay equity is from which year? The 389 observations are from which year?
   - April 2019.
2. In your cover letter, you indicate that Marcie Hawranik was referred to JDEC. Who referred Canadian Equity Consulting to the committee?
   - MRU and the JDEC conducted an open request for proposals for this report, but, unfortunately, the one submission that was received significantly exceeded the available budget, and as a result the search failed. HR had met with Marcie Hawranik at a conference where she discussed her work and after the search failed, as a group we decided to interview her and ultimately offered her the contract.
3. On page 2 of your letter, you indicate that more accurate institutional data is recommended. Can you please specify the inaccuracies you encountered? Also, what other information would have aided you to conduct more accurate analyses.
   - Upon further consideration, we don't think that "more accurate institutional data" is the clearest framing of the challenge. Without going into too much detail about the construction of the data set, the information that was provided to the consultant was challenging to appropriately configure in order to conduct the eventual final analysis. At the time (April 2019), a good faith effort was made to provide the data in the appropriate format, but after two years of work, it's clear now that a different configuration of the data would have been more effective. We are happy to speak to this in more detail at the upcoming Q&A session.
4. On page 2-3, you indicate that historical changes in coding was a barrier. Can you please identify all instances of these coding changes?
   - Since writing the first version of the cover letter which we sent on Jan 25, 2021, we have done further research to better understand the data issues that arose prior to the provision of the data in April 2019 to the consultant. There were no issues with data accuracy or quality, but rather the construction of the dataset, including the meaning of some codes in the data, were complex and ended up being partially misinterpreted by the consultant. We have learned from this experience, and going forward have put together a method for constructing a dataset which lends itself better to this type of analysis. (The 'historical changes to coding' referenced in the earlier cover letter refer to the migration from the 'old' grid to the 'new' grid; this data was not ultimately used by the consultant, as the final analysis was only on 'current' data, not historical data.)

5. Can you provide data/analysis on the gender and race discrepancy in initial placement on the MRU salary grid?

- The intersectional analysis was not the mandate of the study, per the MOU in the CA, given that MRU does not collect this data. The consultant's survey asked some questions about salary and included race in the demographic questions, but these questions were only connected to perceptions and were never combined with HR data on salary and so were not part of the regression analysis. The HR data only includes binary gender and age, but no intersectional data. Canadian employers are not allowed to require submission of this information, though they can offer opportunities for employees to self-disclose information about membership in BIPOC, LGBTQIA2S+, and other equity deserving groups.

6. What is the difference/discrepancy in pay between women who took maternity and/parental leave and men who did not take maternity and/ parental leave?
    - The dataset that was provided to the consultant did contain leave information, but this analysis was not performed. We believe this is an interesting question worthy of future study, and could potentially interact with the anomaly identification process that is in development.

7. Was there any analysis done on LAPP contribution that employees make? During parental leave, MRU does not contribute to LAPP so what is the discrepancy in retirement income for men who do not take parental leave and women who do take maternity and/ parental leave?
    - This analysis was not conducted, but is a great question.

8. Your analysis indicates a gendered pay discrepancy of at least $1,169 (based on inaccurate/incomplete data, as you pointed out in your report). What is the cumulative effect of this discrepancy (over an average 20-30 year career)? The compounding effect of this discrepancy is_____?
    - These results warrant more nuanced conversation and explanation. The difference is not the case for every female professor. The importance is that a general, on average, at a particular point in time, difference was identified. However, an anomaly identification process needs to follow up this preliminary analysis. The regression finding is not a starting difference, so compounding results are subsumed into this very general and broad difference that includes controls and faculty at all stages.