

## Report from the UCSF Faculty Salary Equity Review Committee (FSER) FY21-22

### Executive Summary

---

The charge of the Faculty Salary Equity Review (FSER) Committee is to identify and address salary inequity by gender and underrepresented minority (URM) status. Prior reports are available on the UCSF Faculty and Academic Affairs website (<http://tiny.ucsf.edu/salaryequity>).

Prior to reconvening the Committee, a campus level statistical analysis of salaries was conducted using a methodology consistent with analyses developed over the past five cycles of review (beginning with the FY14-15 salaries). The analysis considers scheduled X and Y salary components for the coming 2021-22 fiscal year, and actual distributions of clinical incentive payments (Z) over the prior fiscal year, 2020-2021. The campus level regression analysis adjusted for the following variables: academic department, academic series, rank, step, and doctorate type. Notably, specialty and subspecialty information is not available in campus level data systems, thus these variables could not be included in the regression model.

**Female/Male:** A statistically significant imbalance in salary (X+Y) was found, with females receiving 4% lower salaries compared to males (with a confidence interval from 5.5% less to 2.4% less). There was no statistically significant imbalance by gender in the presence of a clinical incentive (Z) payment. However, among those who received a Z payment, a statistically significant imbalance in the Z amount was found, with females receiving a lower (35%) Z compared to males. There were no statistically significant imbalances by gender in the presence of accelerated academic advancements.

#### **Female/Male Imbalances:**

##### X+Y Salaries

- Overall: Women 4% lower
  - Dentistry: Women 13% lower
  - Medicine: Women 4% lower
  - Nursing: Not statistically significant
  - Pharmacy: Not statistically significant
  - Clinical Science vs. Basic Science Departments: Women 4% lower for clinical science departments; not statistically significant for basic science departments.

##### Clinical compensation for those receiving clinical incentives (Z):

- Overall: Women 35% lower clinical Z payments (when present)
  - Dentistry: Women 85% lower (with wide confidence intervals)
  - Medicine: Women 34% lower
  - Nursing: Insufficient data
  - Pharmacy: Insufficient data

#### **URM/Non-URM Imbalances:**

##### X+Y Salaries

- Overall: URM 3% lower
  - Dentistry: Not statistically significant
  - Medicine: URM 3% lower
  - Nursing: Not statistically significant
  - Pharmacy: Not statistically significant
  - Clinical Science vs. Basic Science departments: URM 3% lower for clinical science departments, not statistically significant for basic science departments.

### Clinical compensation for those receiving clinical incentives (Z):

- Overall: Not statistically significant
  - Dentistry: Not statistically significant
  - Medicine: Not statistically significant
  - Nursing: Insufficient data
  - Pharmacy: Insufficient data

In addition to the above analyses, predicted salaries (X+Y) were calculated based on a model that included department, academic series, rank, step, and doctorate type. Residuals, defined as the ratio of the actual salary divided by the predicted salary, were generated for individuals. Men were overrepresented compared to women among those earning more than 140% of the model-predicted salary (“high outliers,” approximately the top 5%) and among those earning less than 75% of the model-predicted salary (“low outliers,” approximately the bottom 5%). When the high outliers were removed, the campus level finding of salary inequity by gender was no longer statistically significant. These data and results were distributed to each school for further analysis.

### **School Analyses**

The Committee reviewed and evaluated the salary equity analysis reports of each school. After extensive analysis at the department level and matched-pair analyses, no inequities were identified by the Schools of Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, or Pharmacy. Imbalances could not be identified as inequities when accounting for such granular factors as specialty/subspecialty, clinical compensation rates and practices, and demographic differences between groups with differing salary scales or compensation plans.

- The School of Dentistry identified imbalances in salary by gender. Subsequent department-level analyses were conducted and any differences were attributed to individualized methods of reimbursement. There were no overall differences in salary by URM status, and further examination of department-level imbalances found no inequities based on URM status.
- The School of Medicine has 28 different compensation plans and faculty compensation is set at the department level. Extensive analyses were conducted at the department level and accounted for additional variables such as specialty, subspecialty, unit and site compensation structures, and imbalances in gender or URM status among rank and field. Recognizing these distinctions, like-populations did not display salary inequities based on gender or URM status.
- The School of Nursing conducted a statistical analysis, and matched pair analysis for low outliers, high outliers, and all male and all URM faculty and found no inequity on the basis of gender or URM status. Differences were attributable to clinical practice rates, clinical activity, or individual grant productivity.
- Within the School of Pharmacy there were no statically significant findings for fully adjusted regression models concerning either gender or URM status. Matched pair analyses found no inequities related to gender or URM status, with differences attributable to legitimate business practices such as teaching awards, administrative roles, and receipt of grants.

### **Findings**

The Faculty Salary Equity Review Committee and the four schools have conducted five detailed salary equity reviews since its initial charge in 2013. The FSER methodology has revealed consistent gender and URM imbalances across serial analyses. Upon detailed examination, imbalances are attributed to factors such as rank and step, specialty, practice environment, market forces, leadership roles, and clinical or grant productivity. However, such factors may represent elements of systemic bias that reinforce imbalance, despite earnest legitimate business practices. As examples, women or URM faculty members are underrepresented in certain specialties with higher compensation, and individuals with competing obligations outside of work may not take on additional clinical or grant-writing responsibilities. The current FSER methodology has been critical in identifying and examining gender and URM

compensation differences but does not readily account for societal and other influences that affect faculty access to higher compensation opportunities.

UCSF PRIDE values are greatly enhanced by teaching and mentoring activities with broad impact on students, staff, and faculty. Teaching and mentoring are fundamental to our core missions at UCSF—shaping current and subsequent generations of faculty members, including individuals subject to gender and URM compensation imbalance. University service similarly advances UCSF PRIDE values and affords improvements to academic infrastructure including enhanced equity in access to opportunity and compensation. Incentivizing such mission critical activities within compensation plans may expand faculty access to compensation opportunities.

### **Recommendations**

The Committee recommendations include:

- Development of school- and department-level initiatives that broadly promote opportunities for additional or higher compensation equally among eligible faculty (i.e., raising awareness, transparency).
- As previously recommended by this committee, compensation plans should codify how negotiated Y salaries and incentive payments are determined.
- Ongoing examination of recruitment strategy to ensure equitable appointment of female and URM faculty members across all ranks. New male faculty appointments at the full professor outsize new female faculty appointments, though the reverse is true for new assistant rank appointments.
- Development of school- or department-level initiatives to develop compensation plan incentives for teaching and mentoring activities.
- Development of school- or department-level initiatives to similarly incentivize service related activities.
- Departments within individual schools consider similarly sharing their reports or their participation in the recurring Faculty Salary Equity Review to ensure that all faculty are aware of the deliberate intention to improve compensation equity and have the opportunity to participate or contribute.