

What Faculty Need to Know about Salary Equity at UCSF

Faculty Salary Equity Reviews (FSER) have been conducted regularly at UCSF since 2015 by a faculty committee chaired by the vice provost of academic affairs and members of the academic affairs leaders from each school and representatives from the academic senate. The FSER committee reviews a campus-level compensation analysis as well as more detailed reports and action plans presented by each school, with particular attention to salary differences by gender and underrepresented minority (URM) status. Each year, the FSER committee refines the methodology used for analyses to better identify and understand salary imbalances¹ and inequities. The committee recognizes that school-level analyses and action plans are the most effective means to identify inequities within specific school structures.

“Salary equity is a critically important issue for both the University and our campus. It is important for me as chancellor to ensure salary equity for women and underrepresented groups.”

— Sam Hawgood,
MBBS, Chancellor

Main Findings from Faculty Salary Equity Reviews

Since the launch of the initiative in 2015, there have been findings of salary imbalance at the campus level following adjusted analysis using a logistic regression model. Additional analysis at the school level has shown that most of the salary imbalances can be attributed to market-competitive compensation which varies widely for different specialties and sub-specialties; in many cases, there is a predominance of women in the lower-paying specialties.

At present, campus data systems do not allow for specialty/sub-specialty identification. As a result this information is not included in the regression models for campus-level compensation analyses. This limitation contributes to findings of campus-level salary imbalances summarized below. Salary adjustments have been

made when more detailed school-level analyses have demonstrated inequities. **Between 2015 and 2022, the Faculty Salary Equity Reviews have resulted in a total of \$1.95M in salary adjustments.**

Campus-level Adjusted Analyses

	FY 2015	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2022
Findings for Women	<p>A statistically significant imbalance in salary (X+Y) with women receiving 3 percent lower salaries compared to men.</p> <p>Among those who received a clinical incentive (Z), a statistically significant imbalance in the Z amount with women receiving a 29 percent lower amount compared to men.</p> <p>No statistically significant difference by gender with regard to accelerated academic advancements.</p>	<p>A statistically significant imbalance in salary (X+Y) with women receiving 3 percent lower salaries compared to men.</p> <p>Among those who received a clinical incentive (Z), a statistically significant imbalance in the Z amount was found, with women receiving a 29 percent lower amount compared to men.</p> <p>No statistically significant difference by gender with regard to accelerated academic advancements</p>	<p>A statistically significant imbalance in salary (X+Y) with women receiving 3 percent lower salaries compared to men.</p> <p>Among those who received a clinical incentive (Z), a statistically significant imbalance in the Z amount was found, with women receiving a 30 percent lower amount compared to men.</p> <p>No statistically significant difference by gender with regard to accelerated academic advancements.</p>	<p>A statistically significant imbalance in salary (X+Y) with women receiving 4 percent lower salaries compared to men.</p> <p>Among those who received a clinical incentive (Z), a statistically significant imbalance in the Z amount was found, with women receiving a 35 percent lower amount compared to men</p> <p>No statistically significant difference by gender with regard to accelerated academic advancements.</p>
Findings for URM	<p>No evidence of an imbalance by URM status in salary (X+Y), amount of clinical incentives (Z), or in accelerated academic advancements.</p>	<p>A statistically significant imbalance in salary (X+Y) with URM faculty receiving 3 percent lower salaries than non-URM faculty</p> <p>No evidence of an imbalance by URM status in the amount of clinical incentives (Z), or in accelerated academic advancements.</p>	<p>A statistically significant imbalance in salary (X+Y) with URM faculty receiving 3 percent lower salaries than non-URM faculty</p> <p>No evidence of an imbalance by URM status in the amount of clinical incentives (Z), or in accelerated academic advancements.</p>	<p>A statistically significant imbalance in salary (X+Y) with URM faculty receiving 3 percent lower salaries than non-URM faculty.</p> <p>No evidence of an imbalance by URM status in the amount of clinical incentives (Z), or in accelerated academic advancements.</p>

¹The term “imbalance” rather than “inequity” is used when salary differences are attributable to legitimate non-discriminatory business practices of the University or campus unit.

Beginning with the FY 2018 FSER report, the committee compared actual faculty salaries to model-predicted salaries using department, faculty series, rank, step and doctorate type as predictor variables. Men are over-represented at the extreme end of above-predicted salary amounts and this finding (along with an over-representation of men within several high-paying specialties/subspecialties) also contributes to consistent gender-related differences in X+Y salary in campus-level analyses.

School-level Adjusted Analyses

	FY 2015	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2022
Findings for Women	On the basis of identified inequities, salary increases were made in the School of Medicine (a total of \$1.8M in salary (Y) adjustments were made affecting 174 female faculty in three departments).*	On the basis of an identified inequity, a salary increase was made for one female faculty member in the School of Nursing (\$12,000).*	On the basis of identified inequities, salary increases were made for two female faculty members in the School of Medicine (\$59,200 for one; \$25,100 for the other) and one female faculty member in the School of Nursing (\$29,700).*	On the basis of identified inequities, salary increases were made for one female faculty member in the School of Medicine (\$12,400) and one female faculty member in the School of Nursing (\$4,000).*	No salary inequities were identified by Schools of Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, or Pharmacy.
Findings for URM	On the basis of identified inequities, salary increases were made for 13 URM faculty members in the School of Medicine (\$89,820).*	On the basis of an identified inequity, a salary increase was made for one URM faculty member in the School of Nursing (\$12,000).*	On the basis of an identified inequity, a salary increase was made for one URM faculty member in the School of Medicine (\$25,100).*	No evidence of salary inequities by URM status were identified by Schools of Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing or Pharmacy.	No evidence of salary inequities by URM status were identified by Schools of Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, or Pharmacy.

*No inequities were identified in the other schools.

Where to Find Additional Information

If you have questions about faculty salary equity, you are encouraged to talk to your department chair and/or the vice or associate dean representative in your school.

School of Dentistry

George Taylor, DMD, MPH, DrPH, Associate Dean
George.Taylor@ucsf.edu

School of Nursing

Catherine Waters, RN, PhD, FAAN, Associate Dean
Catherine.Waters@ucsf.edu

School of Medicine

Paul Garcia, MD, Interim Vice Dean
Paul.Garcia@ucsf.edu

School of Pharmacy

Robin Corelli, PharmD, Associate Dean
Robin.Corelli@ucsf.edu

We are always looking to improve our process and welcome any feedback you may have. Please contact Vice Provost Brian.Aldredge@ucsf.edu with suggestions.