



University of California
San Francisco
advancing health worldwide

2015 UCSF Faculty Salary Equity Review (FSER) Report

Executive Summary

In 2012, UC President Yudof charged each campus to implement a faculty salary equity study. In response, Vice Provost of Academic Affairs Brian Alldredge convened a committee to conduct the present review. The committee included representation from all four Schools and from three Academic Senate committees, as well as the Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Outreach. The Committee developed the methods and analysis plan, conducted analyses, reviewed and interpreted findings, developed an action plan based on the findings, and wrote the present report.

The primary outcome variables included: both the base salary (X) and negotiated salary (Y); the presence of and salary from clinical incentives (Z); and the presence of accelerated academic advancements. Comparisons were made by underrepresented minority (URM) status and by gender. The analyses and results presented here use multiple regression to account for fundamental differences between faculty before making URM vs non-URM or female vs male comparisons. Covariates used in the regression analysis were: series, rank, step, doctorate type, and department.

The main findings from this 2014 UCSF Faculty Salary Equity Review include:

- **URM vs Non-URM.** No evidence of imbalance by URM status was found in salary (X+Y), the presence of and amount of clinical incentives (Z), nor in the presence of accelerated academic advancements.
- **Female vs Male.** A statistically significant imbalance in salary (X+Y) was found, with females receiving 3% lower salaries compared to males. There was not a statistically significant imbalance by gender in the presence of clinical incentives (Z). However, among those who received a Z, a statistically significant imbalance in the Z amount was found, with females receiving a lower (29%) Z compared to males. There was not a statistically significant difference by gender with regard to the presence of accelerated academic advancement.

It should be noted that the Committee used the term “imbalance” rather than “inequity” until such time as any salary differences between groups could not be explained by non-discriminatory legitimate business practices of the University or campus unit.

The Committee consensus was that local (school-level) implementation of action plans is the most effective way to identify any inequities within specific School structures. As such, the Committee recommends that the chancellor charge each dean with creating a school-specific action plan. These action plans must include a response to the campus-wide finding of salary imbalance by gender and must propose strategies to address inequities if found when school-specific analyses are conducted. School action plans will be due to the chancellor in July 2015.

I. Background

At the recommendation of the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD) in 2007, a system-wide review of University of California faculty salary for 2010-11 was conducted to identify any salary inequities based on gender and race/ethnicity. The review of nine UC campuses, excluding UCSF, found a significant gender inequity with lower salaries for female faculty, but did not find inequity based on race/ethnicity.¹ In October, 2012, President Yudof called for each UC campus to implement a faculty salary equity study. The study was to be overseen by a steering committee charged to determine the methodology for the analysis, to develop plans for reporting and addressing any pattern of salary imbalance based on race/ethnicity or gender - specifically “discriminatory salary differences” and to ensure that the findings are transparent and accessible to the campus. The UC San Francisco Committee was convened in November 2012 and the review plan that was submitted in January 2013 was approved by University of California Office of the President (UCOP) in consultation with the Academic Senate in August 2013. This Faculty Salary Equity Review (FSER) report summarizes the formation of the Committee and its activities, the methods, results, discussion of current findings, and plans for addressing any salary imbalances, if found. It should be noted that the Committee used the term “imbalance” rather than “inequity” until such time as any salary differences between groups could not be explained by non-discriminatory legitimate business practices of the University or campus unit. The Committee also identified data limitations encountered that may be addressed in the future to expand or improve ongoing evaluation of salary equity.

II. Committee

Chaired by the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, Brian Alldredge, the Committee included representation from all four Schools and from three Academic Senate committees as well as the Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Outreach (see Appendix A for full membership). Prior to developing the methodology, the Committee reviewed previous UCSF equity studies that had been conducted by schools and/or departments as well as other UC campus studies, a 2009-10 UC system wide analysis of pay equity (performed at UC Irvine), and published reports from the literature addressing faculty pay equity. Upon discussion and based on recommendations by UCOP, the decision was made to conduct the equity analysis at the campus level, using a single methodology.

III. Purpose

The purpose of the study was to determine the presence and size of imbalances in faculty salary and accelerated academic advancements by race/ethnicity and gender at the campus level.

IV. Methods

Population

UCSF has four health professions schools (Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, Pharmacy) with a total of 2,363 paid faculty as of July 1, 2014. Of these faculty, 7% are underrepresented minorities (URM) and 46% are women.

The Committee developed the following inclusion and exclusion criteria to allow a broad representation of faculty while ensuring meaningful salary comparisons.

¹ <http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/PayEquityReportAllPagesJune2011.pdf>

The inclusion criteria were:

- Faculty appointed in the Ladder Rank, In Residence, Clinical X, Health Science Clinical or Adjunct series at the Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor ranks
- Faculty who were appointed at least 75% time
- Faculty for whom the X, Y, and Z salary components (see Appendix B for salary definitions) could be individually identified.

The exclusion criteria were:

- Faculty paid less than 75% effort, because we could not be sure that we could validly annualize their salaries to 100%;
- Faculty paid partially or fully by an affiliate (e.g. Veterans Administration Medical Center, Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Gladstone Institute), because their salaries are not structured into X, Y, and Z components;
- Instructors, because this rank is not used uniformly across the campus.

Based on these criteria, the FSER population included 1,943 faculty, representing 82% of UCSF faculty.

Analysis Variables

- Dependent (outcome) variables:
 - Faculty salary (X + Y): Salary for the primary analysis was defined as the sum of components X (base salary) and Y (negotiated salary).
 - Presence of and faculty salary from the Z components for clinical incentives (BYZ)
 - The following Z components were excluded:
 - Administrative stipends, whether University of California Retirement Plan (UCRP) covered compensation (STP) or non-UCRP covered compensated (BYN) were excluded because they are not applied consistently for similar roles throughout the campus
 - Compensation from outside professional activities (BYK) was excluded because participation in these activities is voluntary and at the individual's discretion.
 - Acceleration: Ideally our analysis would assess academic advancement across faculty members' appointment history at UCSF. However, we do not have a reliable and complete dataset of appointment histories. Therefore, advancement was assessed by the presence or absence of an accelerated merit or promotion, using information from the 2012-13 and 2013-14 advancement cycles.
- Primary comparisons were race/ethnicity and gender: Race/ethnicity was recoded into a variable of underrepresented minority (URM) versus (vs) non-URM. URM was defined as those who identified as Black or African American, Hispanic, Native American/Alaskan Native, Filipino, or Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. Non-URM was defined as those who identified as White, Asian, or declined to state.² Gender was coded as female/male. Currently the only gender identity response options are "female" and "male" on the Personal Data Form which is completed at the time of hire.
- The following covariates were accounted for before making the primary comparisons:
 - Rank: Professor, Associate, Assistant
 - Step
 - Doctorate type: Clinical (e.g., MD), Research (e.g., PhD), Both (e.g., MD + PhD), and Other (see Appendix C for full list)
 - Series: Ladder rank, In Residence, Clinical X, HS Clinical, Adjunct
 - Schools: Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, or Pharmacy
 - Department

² <https://www.aamc.org/download/54278/data/urm.pdf>

Analysis Plan

Annual salary rates (X+Y) were obtained on July 1, 2014. Salary amounts (X+Y or Z) were adjusted to full-time status by dividing by the percent effort of appointment. Z payment data represents the total Z payments received between July 1, 2013-June 30, 2014. Salary amounts (X+Y or Z) were log transformed to reduce the influence of a very few high salaries and to provide interpretations in terms of percent differences in median salaries. Z payments were analyzed in two steps: first, the likelihood of receiving *any* Z payment and, second, if a Z payment was received, the amount. The primary analyses are the regression analyses described below.

Two types of multiple regression (adjusted) analyses were conducted to test for URM vs non-URM and female vs male imbalances: (1) Log transformed salary amounts (X+Y or Z, if present) were modeled using linear regression and (2) the presence of a Z payment or presence of an accelerated advancement was modeled with log-binomial regression. This latter method was used to generate the relative rate of Z payments or accelerations as this was considered more interpretable. Coefficients from the regression analyses were back transformed to obtain a ratio interpretation.

The results reported for each outcome include the unadjusted estimate of the relative ratio (RR) from the regression analysis for salary amounts, presence of a Z payment or acceleration and 95% confidence intervals (CI), and adjusted relative ratios (aRR) and 95% CI results. In the latter models adjustment was made for the list of covariates (see above). Because the acceleration data spanned two years and had two observations per faculty member, standard errors were corrected for repeated measurements.

The adjusted results were selected as the primary analysis because the committee felt that it was essential to account for fundamental differences between faculty before making URM vs non-URM or female vs male comparisons. For example, the decision was made to remove the impact of the preponderance of males in senior faculty ranks, with corresponding higher salaries, from the assessment of salary equity. Recognizing that adjustment for rank or step might hide imbalances brought upon by rapid advancement, accelerated advancement was also included as an outcome variable. We tested for heterogeneity across schools in the imbalance between men and women by including an interaction term of school by gender.

V. Results

Demographic description of URM vs non-URM and female vs male of the total UCSF faculty and the FSER population are shown in Table 1. The demographics of the FSER population are virtually identical to that of the total UCSF faculty.

Table 1
Demographic Descriptions

	FSER Population					UCSF Faculty				
	Totals	URM Status		Gender Status		Totals	URM Status		Gender Status	
	Total N	URM N (%)	Non-URM N (%)	Female N (%)	Male N (%)	Total N	URM N (%)	Non-URM N (%)	Female N (%)	Male N (%)
Campus	1,943	137 (7%)	1,806 (93%)	885 (46%)	1,058 (54%)	2,363	170 (7%)	2,193 (93%)	1,081 (46%)	1,282 (54%)
SOM	1,717	119 (7%)	1,598 (93%)	754 (44%)	963 (56%)	2021	138 (7%)	1,883 (93%)	894 (44%)	1,127 (56%)
SOD	73	5 (7%)	68 (93%)	31 (42%)	42 (58%)	155	11 (7%)	144 (93%)	65 (42%)	90 (58%)
SON	75	9 (12%)	66 (88%)	65 (87%)	10 (13%)	101	17 (17%)	84 (84%)	85 (84%)	16 (16%)
SOP	78	4 (5%)	74 (95%)	35 (45%)	43 (55%)	86	4 (5%)	82 (95%)	37 (43%)	49 (57%)

Salary and Acceleration by URM status

Both the unadjusted and adjusted analyses controlling for rank, step, doctorate, series, school, and department indicated no significant URM vs non-URM imbalance in X + Y salary (Table 2), the presence of a Z payment (Table 3), or the amount of a Z payment (Table 4). The X + Y aRR of median salaries was 1.0 (CI 0.97, 1.04), the presence of a Z payment aRR was 1.05 (CI 0.85, 1.29), and the Z payment aRR of median salaries was 1.10 (CI 0.74, 1.64). Analyses testing URM vs non-URM imbalance in acceleration found no significant difference between the groups in either the unadjusted or adjusted analyses; the aRR was 1.56 (CI 0.99, 2.47) (Table 5).

Based on these analyses, the Committee concluded that there were no URM vs non-URM imbalances in salary or acceleration.

Appendix D, Tables 1 – 16 provide unadjusted campus-level median salary (X+Y), presence of Z (proportion), median Z payment, if present, and presence of acceleration (proportion) by URM status, as well as these values and their ratios by URM status by rank, doctorate type, and series.

Table 2
URM/Non-URM X+Y Pay Ratio

	Ratio (RR)	Confidence Interval
Unadjusted	0.97	(0.91, 1.04)
Fully Adjusted	1.00	(0.97, 1.04)

Table 3

URM/Non-URM Presence of Z

	Ratio (RR)	Confidence Interval
Unadjusted	1.01	(0.77, 1.32)
Fully Adjusted	1.05	(0.85, 1.29)

Table 4

URM/Non-URM Z Pay Ratio

	Ratio (RR)	Confidence Interval
Unadjusted	0.85	(0.52, 1.39)
Fully Adjusted	1.10	(0.74, 1.64)

Table 5

URM/Non-URM Incidence of Acceleration Ratio

	Ratio (RR)	Confidence Interval
Unadjusted	1.58	(0.99, 2.54)
Fully Adjusted	1.56	(0.99, 2.47)

Salary and Acceleration by Gender Status

Both the unadjusted and the adjusted analyses controlling for rank, step, doctorate, series, school, and department indicated the presence of a statistically significant female vs male imbalance in X + Y salary (See Table 6). After adjustment, the aRR of median X + Y salaries was 0.97 (CI 0.95, 0.98), indicating that a small but statistically significant imbalance remained, with female salaries 3% lower than male salaries). The unadjusted analysis of the presence of a Z payment indicated a statistically significant female vs male imbalance; RR was 0.77 (CI 0.67, 0.89). However, it was no longer significant after covariate adjustment; aRR was 0.92 (CI 0.82, 1.02) (See Table 7). The Z payment analyses showed a statistically significant female vs male imbalance in both the unadjusted and adjusted analyses. The RR of median salaries was 0.54 (CI 0.42, 0.69) and after covariate adjustment the aRR was 0.71 (CI 0.57, 0.89) and remained statistically significant, showing a 29% lower Z payment for females than males (See Table 8). (see Appendix D Tables 5 - 8 for median salary levels and proportions receiving a Z payment and an acceleration). There were no statistically significant differences between females and males on acceleration in either the unadjusted or adjusted analyses; aRR was 1.01 (CI 0.73, 1.39) (See Table 9). Based on these analyses, the Committee concluded that there was a small female vs male imbalance in the X + Y salaries and a larger imbalance in the amount of Z payments, if present.

Appendix D, Tables 17 – 32 provide unadjusted campus-level median salary (X+Y), presence of Z (proportion), median Z payment, if present, and presence of acceleration (proportion) by gender status, as well as these values and their ratios by URM status by rank, doctorate type, and series.

Table 6

Female/Male X+Y Pay Ratio

	Ratio	Confidence Interval
Unadjusted	0.82	(0.79, 0.85)
Fully Adjusted	0.97	(0.95, 0.98)

Table 7

Female/Male Presence of Z

	Ratio	Confidence Interval
Unadjusted	0.77	(0.67, 0.89)
Fully Adjusted	0.92	(0.82, 1.02)

Table 8

Female/Male Z Pay Ratio

	Ratio	Confidence Interval
Unadjusted	0.54	(0.42, 0.69)
Fully Adjusted	0.71	(0.57, 0.89)

Table 9

Female/Male Incidence of Acceleration Ratio

	Ratio	Confidence Interval
Unadjusted	0.85	(0.63, 1.15)
Fully Adjusted	1.01	(0.73, 1.39)

Heterogeneity of Salary Differences Across Schools

Heterogeneity across schools was tested in the imbalance between men and women by including an interaction term of school by gender. The tests for heterogeneity for X+Y pay and Z payment amount were not statistically significant ($p=0.84$ and $p=0.11$, respectively) indicating that there was not evidence that the male/female imbalances differed by school.

Heterogeneity of Salary Differences Across Locations

There was interest in comparing salaries between various UCSF campus locations although this was not included in the charge to the Committee. Location was not included as a variable in the overall analyses of faculty equity for several reasons: the Committee was aware that site location may have been determined by individual preferences; and it is anticipated that substantial changes in the distribution of faculty and faculty activities at various campus locations over the coming years (e.g. related to the opening of a new hospital at our Mission Bay location in 2015) may affect salary differences by locations. Results are presented in Appendix E.

VI. Action Plan

Based on this campus-level analysis, the Committee believes that the most appropriate course of action involves a charge that each school address the gender imbalance in salary found in this report. Ultimately, the Committee believes that local (school-level) implementation of action plans would be the most effective way to address any imbalances that are identified at both the campus and school levels. As such, the Committee recommends that the chancellor charge each dean with creating a school-specific action plan. These action plans should take the following into consideration:

Each school will be provided the raw data from the 2014 data set used for the campus-wide analysis. We suggest that whenever possible schools analyze their data using the methodology described in this report. Analyzing data to generate “residuals”, which is the difference between the model-based prediction and the actual salary, may also be a useful way to identify individuals who are under- (or over-) paid based on the what would be predicted in the model based on department, rank, degree type, etc. Schools may also choose to analyze data at the level of departments and/or to include other factors that potentially could contribute to salary imbalance but are not included in this campus-wide report.

- If the school-level analysis finds an imbalance, the school must determine if the salary differences can be attributed to non-discriminatory legitimate business practices of the University or campus unit. At a minimum, each action plan should respond to the campus-wide finding of salary imbalance by gender.
- The school-specific action plans must include specific strategies to address inequities that are found. If the school-level analysis finds no evidence of inequity, the responding action plan needs to include a justification for this finding.
- The action plan must include specific timeframes for addressing inequities that are found.
- The school's action plan must be made transparent to the faculty in the school.
- The school's action plan is due July 2015.
- The schools will be provided with an updated data set in July of 2016.
- The schools will be expected to submit to the chancellor a progress report on their action plan by October 30, 2016.

School action plans will be submitted to the chancellor for review and approval. The chancellor may choose to convene a committee for comments and recommendations on the schools' plans.

VII. Limitations and Opportunities for Improvement

During the process of conducting the FSER analysis, the Committee identified several factors that, if addressed, could potentially improve future FSER analyses. The 2014 FSER population represented 82% of the campus faculty; ideally a larger proportion of the total faculty would be included in future analyses. Factors that would allow for more robust future analyses include:

- Increasing the uniformity in delineating salaries by X, Y, and Z components across all faculty, including those at the VAMC, and those paid by HHMI and Gladstone Institutes.
 - VAMC, HHMI, Gladstone Institutes faculty were not included in the present analysis because their salaries are not delineated into base (X), negotiated (Y) and bonus/incentive (Z) components. For future salary studies, we could explore methods for obtaining salary data from these affiliates and methodologies for converting that salary information into comparable X, Y, and Z components in order to allow appropriate comparisons by URM and gender status.
- Greater consistency in the application or use of the non-UCRP covered administrative stipends (BYN) and UCRP-covered administrative stipends (STP) across the campus
 - Because the payroll coding and use of administrative stipends are inconsistent on our campus, these salary components were excluded from analysis.
 - We suggest that a workgroup be convened to examine standardization in the use of the payroll codes for administrative stipends across schools and departments on the campus.
- Improved data on academic advancement over the course of a career for all faculty
 - The Committee was limited in its ability to evaluate any potential imbalances in academic advancement by the lack the historical data needed to do so. Using data from our online academic information system (Advance) we were able to evaluate accelerated advancements for faculty using two years of data (2012-13 and 2013-14). As we continue to use Advance to capture appointment and academic advancement history, we can make use of these data in future analyses.

- Ideally, we would have reliable data on the: 1) Date of the initial UCSF faculty appointment; 2) Rank/step upon initial UCSF faculty appointment; and 3) Date of terminal degree for each faculty member to permit more detailed analysis of academic progression. For each faculty member hired since the inception of Advance (October 2011), the system captures the date of initial UCSF faculty appointment and rank/step at initial appointment. However this information was not captured for the majority of faculty included in this report, who were hired before the inception of Advance. More consistent use of Advance for capturing these fields will result in more comprehensive data available in the future but will not address the absence of historical data.

VIII. Next Steps

With the submission of this report, the charge to this committee is complete. The chancellor may choose to convene a committee to provide comments and recommendations for the school-specific plans proposed in the Action Plans section of this report. Strategies for monitoring of action plans produced by the schools in response to the results of this FSER study will be determined by the chancellor. President Yudof's letter dated September 11, 2012 suggests that a subsequent FSER may be required in 2018. At that time, the chancellor may wish to reconvene or reconstitute a new FSER committee.

Appendix A. Committee Membership

The Faculty Salary Equity Review (FSER) Committee consisted of the following members:

Member Name	Administrative/Academic Titles
Brian Alldredge, PharmD, Chair	Vice Provost Academic Affairs Professor of Clinical Pharmacy
Shari Dworkin, PhD, MS	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (Effective July 2014) School of Nursing Professor of Social and Behavioral Sciences
Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, MPH	Vice Dean for Academic Affairs School of Medicine Professor of Pediatrics
Gordon Fung, MD, MPH, PhD	Representative, Academic Senate Committee on Equal Opportunity Health Sciences Clinical Professor of Medicine
David Glidden, PhD	Representative, Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel Professor of Epidemiology & Biostatistics In Residence
Wilson Hardcastle, MLIS	Academic Data Coordinator, Office of Academic Affairs
Thomas Kearney, PharmD	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs School of Pharmacy Professor of Clinical Pharmacy
Cynthia Lynch Leathers MBA	Assistant Vice Provost Academic Affairs
Catherine Lomen-Hoerth, MD, PhD	Professor of Clinical Neurology
Thomas Lowe, MD	Representative, Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare Associate Adjunct Professor of Psychiatry
Charles E. McCulloch, PhD	Professor, Epidemiology & Biostatistics
Christine Miaskowski, RN, PhD	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (Through June 2014) School of Nursing Professor of Physiological Nursing
Renee Navarro, MD, PharmD	Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Outreach Health Sciences Clinical Professor of Anesthesia & Perioperative Care
Peter Sargent, PhD	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs School of Dentistry Professor of Cell & Tissue Biology

Support in drafting the report provided by Sally Adams, PhD, RN, Specialist, Department of Pediatrics.

Appendix B. Faculty Salary Definitions³

Base Salary (X): Base salary (X) is the approved rate on one of the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP) Salary Scales associated with a faculty member's academic rank and step. Base salary is covered under the University of California Retirement Plan (UCRP). The HSCP Salary Scale to which a faculty member is assigned is based on clinical, teaching and research responsibilities.

Negotiated Salary (Y): Negotiated salary (Y) is optional University additional compensation. Faculty members may receive a negotiated amount of additional compensation. This component of pay is beyond the base salary and is not covered compensation for UCRP. This component of pay is typically negotiated annually.

Incentive/Bonus Compensation (Z): Incentive/bonus compensation (Z) is not covered compensation for UCRP. The Health Science Compensation Plan describes the manner in which faculty members within a department or School may earn incentive compensation beyond base and negotiated compensation.

³ Excerpted from the University of California Academic Personnel Manual section 670-18

Appendix C. Academic Degrees Included in Analysis

The following table indicates the degrees which appeared in the data set, and their categorization for purposes of analysis.

Clinical Doctorate Degrees	Research Doctorate Degrees	Other Degrees
BDS	DPTS	BA
DDS	DRPH	BS
DMD	DSC	CNM
DNP	EDD	MBA
DNS	PHD	MHS
DO	SCD	MMSC
DPT		MPH
DVM		MPT
MBBS		MS
MD		MSC
ND		MSN
OD		
PHAR (PharmD)		
PSYD		

These degree abbreviations are as they are coded in the UCOP Online Personnel Payroll System (OLPPS) and may not reflect the common or standard nomenclature. For the purposes of this analysis, the PhD was considered a Research Doctorate.

Appendix D. Descriptive Statistics (Tables 1-32)

Tables 1-16: URM status analyses: unadjusted campus-level median salary (X+Y), presence of Z (proportion), median Z payment, if present, and presence of acceleration (proportion) by URM status and these values and their ratios by rank, doctorate type, and series.

Table 1. Unadjusted Median Salary X+Y (\$1,000s) by URM Status

URM Status	Median X+Y	N
URM	197	137
Non-URM	198	1,806

Table 2. Unadjusted Presence of Z (Proportion) by URM Status

URM Status	Presence of Z	N
URM	0.30	137
Non-URM	0.30	1,806

Table 3. Unadjusted Median Z Pay, if Present, (\$1,000s) by URM Status

URM Status	Median Z	N
URM	28	41
Non-URM	30	536

Table 4. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration (Proportion) by URM Status

URM Status	Presence of Acceleration	N*
URM	0.07	274
Non-URM	0.04	3,612

*Note: N represents two year's data for each faculty, thus is double the N of faculty for each analysis

Table 5. Unadjusted Median X+Y (\$1,000s) Pay and Pay Ratios by URM by Rank

Rank	URM		Non-URM		URM/Non-URM Ratio
	Median	N	Median	N	
Assistant	164	51	165	597	0.99
Associate	193	31	190	430	1.02
Full	240	55	240	779	1.00

Table 6. Unadjusted Presence of Z (Proportion) and Ratios by URM by Rank

Rank	URM		Non-URM		URM/Non-URM Ratio
	Z	N	Z	N	
Assistant	0.35	51	0.30	597	1.17
Associate	0.23	31	0.35	430	0.66
Full	0.29	55	0.26	779	1.12

Table 7. Unadjusted Median Z Pay (\$1,000s) and Pay Ratios, if Present, by URM by Rank

Rank	URM		Non-URM		URM/Non-URM Ratio
	Median	N	Median	N	
Assistant	14	18	23	178	0.61
Associate	47	7	41	152	1.15
Full	31	16	34	206	0.91

Table 8. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration (Proportion) and Ratios by URM by Rank

Rank	URM		Non-URM		URM/Non-URM Ratio
	Accel	N	Accel	N	
Assistant	0.00	102	0.01	1,194	0.00
Associate	0.07	62	0.07	860	1.00
Full	0.13	110	0.05	1,558	2.6

*Note: N represents two year's data for each faculty, thus is double the N of faculty for each analysis

Table 9. Unadjusted Median X+Y (\$1,000s) and Pay Ratios by URM by Doctorate Type

Doctorate Type	URM		Non-URM		URM/Non-URM Ratio
	Median	N	Median	N	
Other	104	7	137	22	0.76
Research	139	31	150	488	0.93
Clinical	203	89	217	1,095	0.94
Both	232	10	214	201	1.08

Table 10. Presence of Z (Proportion) and Ratios by URM by Doctorate Type

Doctorate Type	URM		Non-URM		URM/Non-URM Ratio
	Z	N	Z	N	
Other	0.00	7	0.09	22	0.00
Research	0.06	31	0.05	488	1.20
Clinical	0.40	89	0.40	1,095	1.00
Both	0.30	10	0.37	201	0.81

Table 11. Unadjusted Median Z Pay (\$1,000s) and Pay Ratios, if Present, by URM by Doctorate Type

Doctorate Type	URM		Non-URM		URM/Non-URM Ratio
	Median	N	Median	N	
Other	-	0	25	2	-
Research	27	2	5	23	5.40
Clinical	23	36	30	437	0.77
Both	61	3	40	74	1.53

Table 12. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration (Proportion) and Ratios by URM by Doctorate Type

Doctorate Type	URM		Non-URM		URM/Non-URM Ratio
	Accel	N*	Accel	N*	
Other	0.07	14	0.05	44	1.40
Research	0.03	62	0.04	976	0.75
Clinical	0.07	178	0.04	2,190	1.75
Both	0.15	20	0.05	402	3.00

*Note: N represents two year's data for each faculty, thus is double the N of faculty for each analysis

Table 13. Unadjusted Median X+Y (\$1,000s) and Pay Ratios by URM by Series

Series	URM		Non-URM		URM/Non-URM Ratio
	Median	N	Median	N	
Adjunct	133	14	130	283	1.02
Clinical X	231	26	242	361	0.95
HS Clinical	184	52	191	506	0.96
In Residence	193	23	210	361	0.92
Ladder Rank	264	22	230	295	1.15

Table 14. Unadjusted Presence of Z (Proportion) and Ratios by URM by Series

Series	URM		Non-URM		URM/Non-URM Ratio
	Z	N	Z	N	
Adjunct	0.14	14	0.07	283	2.00
Clinical X	0.38	26	0.44	361	0.86
HS Clinical	0.37	52	0.43	506	0.86
In Residence	0.30	23	0.25	361	1.20
Ladder Rank	0.14	22	0.16	295	0.88

Table 15. Unadjusted Median Z Pay (\$1,000s) and Pay Ratios, if Present, by URM by Series

Series	URM		Non-URM		URM/Non-URM Ratio
	Median	N	Median	N	
Adjunct	44	2	14	21	3.14
Clinical X	62	10	37	159	1.68
HS Clinical	15	19	28	216	0.54
In Residence	40	7	35	92	1.14
Ladder Rank	9	3	27	48	0.33

Table 16. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration (Proportion) and Ratios by URM by Series

Series	URM		Non-URM		URM/Non-URM Ratio
	Accel	N	Accel	N	
Adjunct	0.00	28	0.01	566	0.00
Clinical X	0.10	52	0.05	722	2.00
HS Clinical	0.05	104	0.03	1,012	1.67
In Residence	0.09	46	0.04	722	2.25
Ladder Rank	0.09	44	0.07	590	1.29

Note: N represents two year's data for each faculty, thus is double the N of faculty for each analysis

Tables 17-32: Gender status analyses: unadjusted campus-level median salary (X+Y), presence of Z (proportion), median Z payment, if present, and presence of acceleration (proportion) by gender and these values and their ratios by rank, doctorate type, and series.

Table 17. Unadjusted Median Salary X+Y (\$1,000s) by Gender Status

Gender	Median X+Y	N
Female	180	885
Male	219	1,058

Table 18. Unadjusted Presence of Z (Proportion) by Gender Status

Gender	Presence of Z	N
Female	0.26	885
Male	0.33	1,058

Table 19. Unadjusted Median Z Pay, if Present, (\$1,000s) by Gender Status

Gender	Median Z	N
Female	23	226
Male	40	351

Table 20. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration (Proportion) by Gender Status

Gender	Accel	N*
Female	0.04	1,770
Male	0.05	2,116

* Note: N represents two year's data for each faculty, thus is double the N of faculty for each analysis

Table 21. Unadjusted Median X+Y (\$1,000s) Pay and Pay Ratios by Gender by Rank

Rank	Female		Male		Female/Male Ratio
	Median	N	Median	N	
Assistant	159	356	170	292	0.94
Associate	175	223	208	238	0.84
Full	211	306	256	528	0.82

Table 22. Unadjusted Presence of Z (Proportion) and Ratios by Gender by Rank

Rank	Female		Male		Female/Male Ratio
	Z	N	Z	N	
Assistant	0.29	356	0.31	292	0.94
Associate	0.27	223	0.42	238	0.64
Full	0.20	306	0.30	528	0.67

Table 23. Unadjusted Median Z (\$1,000s) and Pay Ratios, if Present, by Gender by Rank

Rank	Female		Male		Female/Male Ratio
	Median	N	Median	N	
Assistant	22	105	28	91	0.79
Associate	22	60	56	99	0.39
Full	25	61	37	161	0.68

Table 24. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration (Proportion) and Ratios by Gender by Rank

Rank	Female		Male		Female/Male Ratio
	Accel	N	Accel	N	
Assistant	0.00	712	0.01	584	0.00
Associate	0.07	446	0.07	476	1.00
Full	0.06	612	0.06	1,056	1.00

Table 25. Unadjusted Median X+Y (\$1,000s) Pay and Pay Ratios by Gender by Doctorate Type

Doctorate Type	Female		Male		Female/Male Ratio
	Median	N	Median	N	
Other	137	24	110	5	1.25
Research	145	271	157	248	0.92
Clinical	196	527	231	657	0.85
Both	187	63	224	148	0.83

Table 26. Unadjusted Presence of Z (Proportion) and Ratios by Gender by Doctorate Type

Doctorate Type	Female		Male		Female/Male Ratio
	Z	N	Z	N	
Other	0.04	24	0.20	5	0.20
Research	0.04	271	0.05	248	0.80
Clinical	0.36	527	0.43	657	0.84
Both	0.35	63	0.37	148	0.95

Table 27. Unadjusted Median Z Pay (\$1,000s) and Pay Ratios, if Present, by Gender by Doctorate Type

Doctorate Type	Female		Male		Female/Male Ratio
	Median	N	Median	N	
Other	1	1	49	1	0.02
Research	4	12	14	13	0.29
Clinical	23	191	40	282	0.58
Both	31	22	45	55	0.69

Table 28. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration (Proportion) and Pay Ratios by Gender by Doctorate Type

Doctorate Type	Female		Male		Female/Male Ratio
	Accel	N*	Accel	N*	
Other	0.06	48	0.00	10	0.00
Research	0.04	542	0.04	496	1.00
Clinical	0.04	1,054	0.05	1,314	0.80
Both	0.06	126	0.06	296	1.00

*Note: N represents two year's of data for each faculty, thus is double the N of faculty for each analysis

Table 29. Unadjusted Median X+Y (\$1,000s) Pay and Pay Ratios by Gender by Series

Series	Female		Male		Female/Male Ratio
	Median	N	Median	N	
Adjunct	129	173	131	124	0.98
Clinical X	221	159	260	228	0.85
HS Clinical	180	304	206	254	0.87
In Residence	190	143	222	241	0.86
Ladder Rank	196	106	255	211	0.77

Table 30. Unadjusted Presence of Z (Proportion) and Ratios by Gender by Series

Series	Female		Male		Female/Male Ratio
	Z	N	Z	N	
Adjunct	0.06	173	0.10	124	0.60
Clinical X	0.38	159	0.48	228	0.79
HS Clinical	0.38	304	0.48	254	0.79
In Residence	0.22	143	0.28	241	0.79
Ladder Rank	0.09	106	0.19	211	0.47

Table 31. Unadjusted Median Z Pay (\$1,000s) and Pay Ratios, if Present, by Gender by Series

Series	Female		Male		Female/Male Ratio
	Median	N	Median	N	
Adjunct	13	11	20	12	0.65
Clinical X	24	60	47	109	0.51
HS Clinical	21	114	36	121	0.58
In Residence	23	31	39	68	0.59
Ladder Rank	24	10	25	41	0.96

Table 32. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration (Proportion) and Ratios by Gender by Series

Series	Female		Male		Female/Male Ratio
	Accel	N*	Accel	N*	
Adjunct	0.01	346	0.02	248	0.50
Clinical X	0.05	318	0.05	456	1.00
HS Clinical	0.04	608	0.03	508	1.33
In Residence	0.04	286	0.05	482	0.80
Ladder Rank	0.08	212	0.07	422	1.14

Note: N represents two year's data for each faculty, thus is double the N of faculty for each analysis

Appendix E. Salary and Acceleration Comparisons Based on UCSF Location

There was interest in comparing salaries between various UCSF campus locations although this was not included in the charge to the Committee. Location was not included as a covariate in the overall analyses of faculty equity for several reasons: the Committee was aware that site location may have been determined by individual preferences; and it is anticipated that substantial changes in the distribution of faculty and faculty activities at various campus locations over the coming years (e.g. related to the opening of a new hospital at our Mission Bay location in 2015) may affect salary differences by locations. Analysis by UCSF location could be considered in the future following the shifts in faculty placement and activities to new locations.

The tables below give the adjusted analyses (controlling for gender, rank, step, doctorate, series, and department) comparing campus sites with respect to relative X + Y salary (Table 1), the presence of a Z payment (Table 2), the amount of a Z payment if present (Table 3), and the rate of accelerated advancements (Table 4). In each instance, sites are compared to the reference site of Parnassus.

Table 1. Adjusted Salary Ratio, X+Y, by Location

Parnassus	1.00	Reference
Mission Bay	0.93	(0.90, 0.97)
SFGH	0.96	(0.94, 0.99)
Laurel Heights	0.99	(0.94, 1.04)
Mount Zion	0.97	(0.93, 1.00)
China Basin	0.88	(0.82, 0.95)

Table 2. Adjusted Presence of Z Payment, by Location

Parnassus	1.00	Reference
Mission Bay	0.70	(0.49, 1.00)
SFGH	0.91	(0.79, 1.05)
Laurel Heights	0.43	(0.18, 1.04)
Mount Zion	0.73	(0.61, 0.88)
China Basin	0.85	(0.49, 1.48)

Table 3. Adjusted Salary Ratio, Z payment, if Present, by Location

Parnassus	1.00	Reference
Mission Bay	1.01	(0.58, 1.76)
SFGH	0.81	(0.61, 1.08)
Laurel Heights	2.13	(0.64, 7.13)
Mount Zion	1.07	(0.73, 1.57)
China Basin	1.39	(0.45, 4.36)

Table 4. Adjusted Presence of Acceleration by Location

Parnassus	1.00	Reference
Mission Bay	1.75	(0.98, 3.14)
SFGH	1.01	(0.62, 1.64)
Laurel Heights	2.14	(1.09, 4.20)
Mount Zion	1.37	(0.84, 2.26)
China Basin	0.63	(0.20, 2.01)