Report from the UCSF Faculty Salary Equity Review Committee (FSER)
FY23-24

Executive Summary

The charge of the Faculty Salary Equity Review (FSER) Committee is to identify and address salary inequity by sex and underrepresented minority (URM) status. This campus-level report, the final reports from the Schools of Dentistry, Nursing, Pharmacy, and Medicine, and all prior FSER reports are available on the UCSF Faculty and Academic Affairs website at http://tiny.ucsf.edu/salaryequity.

Prior to reconvening the Committee in December 2023, a campus-level statistical analysis of salaries was conducted using a methodology consistent with analyses over the past six cycles of review (beginning with the FY14-15 FSER analysis and report). The analysis considers scheduled X and Y salary components for the coming 2023-24 fiscal year, and actual distributions of clinical incentive payments (Z) over the prior fiscal year, 2022-23. The campus-level regression analysis adjusted for the following variables: academic department, faculty series, rank, step, and doctorate type. Notably, specialty and sub-specialty information is not available in campus-level data systems, and therefore this important variable could not be included in the campus regression model. However, prior salary equity analyses have demonstrated that specialty and sub-specialty are significant drivers of sex-based salary imbalances. Thus, in order to determine whether salary imbalances based on sex represent inequities*, the FSER Committee relied on the more detailed analyses conducted at the school and department levels which could account for specialty/sub-specialty designation.

Without adjusting for specialty/sub-specialty within departments, the campus-level analysis found that females received 4% lower X+Y salaries compared to males, with a 95% confidence interval from 2% less to 5% less. This finding is similar to that reported in the FY22 FSER analysis. The FY24 analysis found no statistically significant difference in X+Y salary based on URM status.

With more detailed department-level analysis inclusive of specialty and sub-specialty, four (4) instances of salary inequity based on either sex or URM status were identified, and these salaries were increased retroactively to the beginning of the FY23-24 fiscal year.

The campus and school analyses found no imbalances or inequities in the incidence of accelerated advancements.

In addition to compensation imbalances based on specialty and sub-specialty, instances of compensation imbalance in either X+Y salary or Z payments by sex or URM status were found at the campus and school levels. Consistent with previous reviews, these imbalances are influenced by:

- Variation in clinical income resulting in an incentive (Z) payment,
- Compensation for leadership roles, and
- Variation in generation of extramural research funding to provide salary support.

Department and school-level analyses were provided and the FSER Committee consensus was that:

- There was equal opportunity for faculty to engage in clinical activity that resulted in a Z payment.
- Leadership roles since 2019 were offered after a broadly communicated search process.
- There was consistency with regard to salary determination within the relevant unit (e.g., Division or Department) based on extramural research funding and other factors identified above.

The Committee's observations and recommendations regarding these drivers of salary imbalance are addressed in Section V of this report. Notably, there are historical and societal factors that have led to compensation imbalances by gender and URM status that are driven by apparent "legitimate business

practices," but that nonetheless warrant active intervention to achieve true salary equity. Such interventions may include:

- Programs to provide salary incentives for extraordinary university and public service, educational, and mentoring activities;
- Programs to ensure proper representation of women and URM faculty in leadership positions that confer a compensation advantage (e.g., the Leadership Equity Advances Diversity (LEAD) program.

The FSER Committee recognizes and appreciates the progress that UCSF has made to identify and correct salary inequities and will continue to monitor the viability, effectiveness, and spread of programs that steer UCSF toward compensation parity for female and URM faculty.

The Committee uses the term "imbalance" rather than "inequity" until such time as any salary differences between groups cannot be explained by non-discriminatory legitimate business practices of the university or campus unit.

I. Background

The first UC systemwide Faculty Salary Equity Review (FSER) was conducted in 2013 following a mandate from then-UC President Mark Yudof. This action was in response to an Academic Senate report *Analysis of UC Pay Equity by Sex, and among Men, Ethnicity 2009-2010*. This analysis was exclusive of UCSF and the health sciences. In 2013, campuses were charged with creating a FSER Committee "to determine methodology for the analysis, develop plans for addressing and reporting any pattern of discriminatory salary difference based on gender and/or race/ethnicity (if found), and ensure that any findings are transparent and accessible to the campus." UCSF issued its first FSER report in January 2015 covering FY 2013-14, and convened annually through FY 2019, when the Committee recommended conducting future analyses every other year.

The four UCSF professional schools have continued their work to assess and address inequities in faculty salaries by underrepresented minority status (URM, as defined by the Office of Diversity and Outreach) and by sex (female, male)[1]. The charge from the chancellor to the UCSF Faculty Salary Equity Review Committee is to review the reports submitted by the schools and provide recommendations based on these reports; and if needed, consider changes to the analytic methodology to improve future analyses. The roster of members of the Faculty Salary Equity Review Committee for 2023-24 is attached as Appendix A. Information on salary adjustments made in prior years can be found in the faculty salary equity reports on the Faculty and Academic Affairs website (http://tiny.ucsf.edu/salaryequity).

II. Methodology

The faculty population subject to this review include appointees in the five series (Ladder Rank, Professor In Residence, Professor of Clinical X, Adjunct Professor, and Health Sciences Clinical Professor) at 75% time or greater (for confidence in annualization comparison), excluding those at the Instructor rank (temporary appointments that are not used consistently across the campus) and excluding those whose salaries are set or delivered in whole or in part externally by an affiliated institution (these include the VA Medical Center, Howard Hughes Medical Institute, and the Gladstone Institute).

Compensation components in this review include the scheduled X+Y salaries for the current fiscal year (FY23-24) and the clinical compensation (Z) distributed over the prior fiscal year (FY22-23). Faculty with a hire date after the beginning FY22-23 were excluded from the Z analysis. Data on academic advancement and administrative stipends were also collected and distributed for additional analysis. A table of the data elements and their sources is attached as Appendix B.

The following demographic values were collected from campus-wide data systems as available: school, department, series, rank, step, degree (classified into clinical doctorates, research doctorates, and other degrees), sex (as self-identified in UC Path and rolled up into the classifications male, female, and unknown—which includes declined to state), and URM status.[2] Also considered for comparison was the classification of basic science departments and not-basic science departments.[3] Data were collected regarding the history of accelerated promotion and advancements for the subject population.

---

[1] Future reviews will consider gender categories as expressed in the UC Gender Recognition and Lived Name Policy, which include man, woman, and nonbinary.

[2] As defined by the Office of Diversity and Outreach, the working definition of an underrepresented minority (URM) at UCSF is someone whose racial or ethnic makeup is from one of the following: African American/Black, Filipino, Hmong, Vietnamese, Hispanic/Latinx, Native American/Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races when one or more of those are from the preceding racial categories. Hmong is not an explicit option in UC Path at this time.

[3] Basic science departments are: SOM: Anatomy, Biochemistry & Biophysics, Cellular & Molecular Pharmacology, Microbiology & Immunology; SOP: Bioengineering & Therapeutic Science, Pharmaceutical Chemistry; SOD: Cell & Tissue Biology. While all other departments may include basic science work they are considered clinical or "not basic science" departments.

The committee conducted a campus-level analysis of faculty salaries adjusting for the following variables: series, rank, step, type of doctorate(s), and department/school. Salary imbalances[4] by sex and URM status were identified.

There are known limitations to the information available from campus data systems that may impact salary analyses, such as: the absence of specialty and sub-specialty designations, identifying certain types of leaves of absence, and the use of hire date as a proxy for appointment to the faculty title. Sex and ethnicity values are self-selected and rely on active input from individuals to be entered into UC Path. Location data for a ZSFG comparative analysis relied upon a campus or primary practice location being entered into the Campus Locator System (CLS), which does not always occur during onboarding. However, for this FSER cycle the schools made a concentrated effort to make these data as complete and accurate as possible for their populations.

While there are limitations to the availability campus-level data elements, the analysis can inform the committee and the schools where to investigate sources of imbalance and identify and address any specific inequities discovered.

Each cycle the committee strives to improve the methodology for identifying salary imbalances and inequities based on sex or URM status. Building on the experience of the past three cycles, the committee recognizes that outlier values may skew the comparisons of average or median salaries even adjusting for the available variables. To aid the analysis, a campus-level residuals analysis was conducted to identify salary "outliers"—i.e., those whose salaries differed substantially from a model-predicted salary that included variables for series, rank, step, type of doctorate(s), and department/school. Predicted salaries (X+Y) were calculated based on a model accounting for these variables. Residuals, defined as the ratio of the actual salary divided by the predicted salary, were generated for individuals and provided to the schools for further analysis.

"High outliers" and "low outliers" were defined as follows

- High outliers are defined as having a salary greater than 140% of that predicted by the model
- Low outliers are defined as having a salary less than 75% of that predicted by the model.

The committee requested that the schools provide specific review of the high and low outliers using a matched-pair analysis.

Units (i.e., departments or divisions) of 50 or more faculty were charged with conducting a statistical analysis for overall salary imbalance in X+Y and clinical Z compensation by gender and by URM status. When imbalances were identified, the units were requested to provide additional data and/or analyses to assess whether the imbalances represent inequities. Units of less than 50 faculty were encouraged, but not required, to conduct additional statistical analysis as appropriate.

---

[4] The Committee uses the term "imbalance" rather than "inequity" until such time as any salary differences between groups cannot be explained by non-discriminatory legitimate business practices of the university or campus unit.

III. Campus Level Findings

Four schools, 38 departments.
Total faculty under review: 3,070.

Female (N)	Female (%)	Male (N)	Male (%)	Unknown Sex (N)	Unknown Sex (%)
1,580	51%	1,316	43%	174	6%

Non-URM (N)	Non-URM (%)	URM (N)	URM (%)	Unknown URM (N)	Unknown URM (%)
2,565	84%	434	14%	71	2%

The campus-level statistical analyses included adjustment for the following variables: faculty series, rank, step, type of doctorate(s), and school/department. Specialty/subspecialty information is not available in campus data systems and could not be included in the campus-level regression analysis.

Sex

Sex-based imbalances in X+Y payment ratios were identified at the campus level. Overall, females are estimated to receive 96% that of males (4% less median salary) with a 95% confidence interval from 5% less to 2% less. This finding is similar to that reported in the FY2022 FSER analysis.

Table 1. Adjusted Female/Male X+Y payment ratios

Adjusted ratios	Ratio	Confidence interval
Overall	0.96	(0.95, 0.98)
By School		
Dentistry	0.91	(0.82, 1.00)
Medicine	0.96	(0.95, 0.98)
Nursing	1.03	(0.90, 1.17)
Pharmacy	1.01	(0.89, 1.14)
Department Type		
Basic Science	1.04	(0.97, 1.12)
Clinical	0.96	(0.94, 0.97)

No sex-based imbalance in the presence of a clinical incentive Z payment was identified.

Among faculty who received a Z payment, a statistically significant imbalance in the Z amount was identified, with females receiving a lower (75%) Z compared to males.

Table 2. Adjusted Female/Male ratios in amount of a Z payment (if >0)

Adjusted ratios	Ratio	Confidence interval
Overall	0.75	(0.67, 0.84)
By School		
Dentistry	0.12	(0.04, 0.37)
Medicine	0.75	(0.68, 0.85)
Nursing	-	Insufficient data
Pharmacy	-	Insufficient data

There were no statistically significant imbalances by sex in accelerated academic advancements.

URM Status

URM status imbalances in X+Y payment ratios were not statistically significant. Overall, URM faculty received 99% that of non-URM faculty (1% less median salary) with a confidence interval from 3% less to 1% more.

Table 3. Adjusted URM/non-URM X+Y payment ratios

Adjusted ratios	Ratio	Confidence interval
Overall	0.99	(0.97, 1.01)
By School		
Dentistry	1.02	(0.88, 1.18)
Medicine	0.99	(0.97, 1.01)
Nursing	0.99	(0.89, 1.10)
Pharmacy	0.96	(0.85, 1.08)
Department Type		
Basic Science	0.95	(0.84, 1.07)
Clinical	0.99	(0.97, 1.01)

No imbalance in the presence or amount of a clinical incentive Z payment was identified based on URM/non-URM status.

No imbalance in accelerated advancement was identified based on URM/non-URM status.

Salaries for UCSF faculty based at Zuckerberg San Francisco General (ZSFG)

The School of Medicine conducted a statistical analysis comparing the salaries for faculty primarily practicing at a ZSFG location to those practicing at non-ZSFG campuses. Overall, the median X+Y compensation for faculty based at ZSFG was 3% lower than the median X+Y compensation for non-ZSFG faculty members. Four departments had significant site-based differences in X+Y compensation with the median X+Y compensation for faculty based at ZSFG ranging from 5% lower to 56% higher. Sex-based differences in the likelihood of receiving a Z payment and Z payment amounts were identified when comparing ZSFG to non-ZSFG faculty members. Given these differences in compensation by site, the vice deans for faculty and academic affairs, department chairs, and administrative leaders will work together to promote compensation equity for ZSFG-based faculty. See the full School of Medicine 2024 FSER Report for more information.

IV. Key Findings from the School-Level Analyses

Each of the four schools conducted an in-depth review and analysis and provided reports of their findings and their action plans to ensure faculty salary equity. These reports were accepted by the committee and are linked below. All reports are available in the *Salary Equity* section of the Faculty and Academic Affairs website at http://tiny.ucsf.edu/salaryequity.

As a result of the analyses within the schools, salary equity adjustments were made for four individuals:, two from the School of Medicine and two from the School of Pharmacy.

School	Sex	URM	Adjustment	Reason
Medicine	Female	Non	+$6,468 Y	Adjustment made using information that was not available at the time of salary setting
Medicine	Male	URM	+$17,280 Z	Increased guaranteed clinical Z adjustment for peer consistency
Pharmacy	Female	Non	+$4,500 Y	Adjustment for parity to comparable service and teaching awards
Pharmacy	Female	URM	+$5,000 Y	Adjustment for parity to comparable teaching administration roles

The salary adjustments were made retroactively to the start of the 2023-24 fiscal year.

Consistent with the past three FSER review investigations, four primary factors contributed to salary imbalances:

1. **Specialty and subspecialty**
   Within clinical departments, there are a range of specialty and subspecialty practices with vastly different clinical compensation and market rates. However, given that specialty and subspecialty information for individual faculty is not available in campus data systems they are not accounted for in the campus-level analysis. When specialty and subspecialty were considered at department or divisional levels, the imbalances based on sex or URM status are resolved.

   While choice of specialty practice is generally considered self-selecting, the committee recognizes that in the health sciences there is an occupational gender segregation that influences the imbalance of salaries among the sexes across disciplines. This is addressed in the observational discussion section of this report.

2. **Diversity in clinical income/hours**
   Clinical faculty often have the opportunity to take on additional clinical work, which can supplement their scheduled income. The decision to take on additional clinical work is considered a self-selecting practice. Over the history of the FSER reviews the committee has seen and appreciated efforts by the departments to ensure that the opportunities for extra clinical work are communicated effectively and offered equitably. While this is a choice made by individual faculty, the committee notes that there remains gendered societal pressure for family care and female faculty may choose to take on additional shifts at a lower rate than their male counterparts. This is addressed in the observational discussion section of this report.

3. **Compensation for leadership roles**
   The FSER committee has consistently recommended that opportunities for leadership positions be communicated effectively and equitably offered and requested that the schools report how these positions are searched and filled. Over the history of the Faculty Salary Equity Review, the committee has noted the policies and programs adopted by the schools and departments to provide equitable access to leadership positions. While many leadership roles are compensated as a Z payment, in some instances the compensation is included in the negotiated Y salary amount. These differences in payment structure can lead to differences in salary equity analyses.

4. **Exceptional grant productivity**
   Negotiated (Y) compensation may be impacted by research/grant productivity and extramural funding. Extramural funding for research/scholarly activity can vary by faculty series, by discipline, and at the individual faculty level. Historically, such variation has not been considered a salary inequity as long as compensation is handled in a consistent manner within a department or division.

Key findings of each school are highlighted here:

A. School of Dentistry ([report link](#))
Total faculty under review: 69
Number of departments: 4
High outliers: 3
Low outliers: 2
Adjustments made: None

Female (N)	Female (%)	Male (N)	Male (%)	Unknown Sex (N)	Unknown Sex (%)
36	52%	30	43%	3	4%

Non-URM (N)	Non-URM (%)	URM (N)	URM (%)	Unknown URM (N)	Unknown URM (%)
59	86%	8	12%	2	3%

- **Findings related to Sex**

The adjusted analyses did not find a statistically significant imbalance in X+Y salary between female and male faculty members. After controlling for series, rank, step, degree type, and department, the adjusted X+Y salary of the male faculty was 102% (or 2% more) that of the adjusted X+Y salary of the female faculty (Confidence Interval (0.98, 1.1), $p = 0.760$). The statistically significant difference in female to male X+Y salary found in the 2022 FSER is no longer present.

The adjusted female-to-male odds ratio in the amount of Z payment was 0.27, 95% CI (0.099, 0.74), meaning that female faculty received 73% less amount of Z payment than males, which was statistically significant ($p = 0.0131$). The interpretation of this finding is moderated by the recognition that there is intersectionality among sex, specialty, the source of Z payments (administrative roles and or clinically generated revenue), and faculty choice in electing Z or Y payments for clinically generated revenue.

The analysis did not find a statistically significant imbalance in accelerated advancement between female and male faculty members.

- **Findings related to URM status**

The adjusted analyses did not find a statistically significant imbalance in X+Y salary between URM and Non-URM faculty members. After controlling for series, rank, step, degree type, and department, the adjusted X+Y salary of the URM faculty was 103% (or 3% more) that of the adjusted X+Y salary of the Non-URM faculty (Confidence Interval (0.86, 1.24), $p = 0.722$).

The adjusted odds ratio for URM to non-URM faculty for the amount of Z payment was 0.87, 95% CI (0.24, 3.13), meaning that URM faculty received 13% less amount of Z payments than non-URM faculty, and this was not statistically significant ($p = 0.818$).

The analysis did not find a statistically significant imbalance in accelerated advancement between URM and Non-URM faculty members.

- **High outlier analysis**

For the three faculty members with X+Y salaries above the predicted statistical model, the individual analyses identified one individual in a clinical specialty with high market-based compensation set outside

the School of Dentistry, while the other two have significant research funding portfolios contributing to the greater salary. These instances were not considered inequities.

- **Low outlier analysis**

For the two faculty members with X+Y salaries below the predicted statistical model, one individual is a non-specialist based within a surgical specialty department where the surgical faculty have higher market-based compensation. The other faculty member's Y component is limited by a lower percent effort and lack of clinical revenue or grant funding.

Selected items from the action plan
- Review the eligibility process for administrative roles to ensure equal opportunity for female and URM faculty and ensure equitable payments for similar roles across departments.
- Communicate eligibility and criteria for accelerated advancements to all faculty and department leadership.
- Make the department compensation plans, descriptive of how Y and Z payments are calculated, easily available to all faculty.
- Require consistent methodology for implementing for determining clinical incentive payments across all four departments.

B. School of Medicine (report link)
Total faculty under review: 2,850[5]
Number of departments: 27[6]
High outliers: 120
Low outliers: 157
Adjustments made: 2

Female (N)	Female (%)	Male (N)	Male (%)	Unknown Sex (N)	Unknown Sex (%)
1,439	50%	1,247	44%	164	6%

Non-URM (N)	Non-URM (%)	URM (N)	URM (%)	Unknown URM (N)	Unknown URM (%)
2,382	84%	399	14%	69	2%

- **Findings related to Sex**

After adjusting for series, rank, step, degree type, and department, the adjusted median X+Y salary for female faculty was 4% lower than the adjusted median X+Y salary of the male faculty. This analysis did not adjust for specialty or productivity and performance metrics.

Analyzing each department separately, three of 23 departments had statistically significant differences in X+Y compensation based on sex and the median X+Y compensation was 4-22% lower for females than males.

When the data were analyzed for each department, four departments had significant sex-based differences in the amount of Z payments received. For these departments, the median amount of Z payments for females was 32-80% less than the amount received by males.

Departments with statistically significant differences by sex were asked to provide additional analysis, which included additional variables such as site, subspecialty designation, and K award status and/or data correction. After the additional analyses there were no statistically significant sex-based differences in compensation that required correction.

---

[5] The School of Medicine detailed analysis included 10 more faculty than originally identified in the campus review.
[6] Five basic science departments were analyzed as one unit.

The analysis did not find a statistically significant imbalance in accelerated advancement between female and male faculty members.

- **Findings related to URM status**

The adjusted analyses did not find a statistically significant imbalance in X+Y salary between URM and Non-URM faculty members.

When the data were analyzed for each department, three departments had statistically significant URM-based differences in X+Y compensation. The median X+Y compensation for URM faculty ranged from 19% lower to 31% higher than Non-URM faculty. The departments with statistically significant differences by URM status were asked to provide additional analyses, which included variables such as site, subspecialty designation, and K award status and/or data corrections. After the additional analyses there were no statistically significant differences in compensation based on URM status that required correction.

No departments had differences in the amount of Z payment based on URM status.

The analysis did not find a statistically significant imbalance in accelerated advancement between URM and Non-URM faculty members.

- **High outlier analysis**

There were 120 faculty members identified as having an X+Y or Z salary above the predicted statistical model. One third (33%) of high outliers work in clinical subspecialties associated with high market-based compensation. Seventeen percent of high outliers hold a leadership role that contributes to their compensation. Among the high outliers for whom a leadership role contributes to compensation, 82% were appointed through a search process.

Based on the departmental analyses, using information that was not available at the time of salary setting, one department increased the salary of a female non-URM faculty who was identified as a low outlier by $6,468.

- **Low outlier analysis**

There were 157 faculty members identified as having an X+Y or Z salary below the predicted statistical model. Consistent with previous years' FSER findings, the main factors that contribute to low outlier salaries were limited funding sources to support salary (72% of low outliers) and low market-based compensation for subspecialty, including non-physician subspecialties (21% of low outliers).

One department increased a newly-hired faculty (male, URM) member's guaranteed Z payment by $17,280 to bring the total compensation in line with peers.

Selected items from the action plan:

- **Inequities in Additional Compensation (Z)**

  To address significant differences in presence of a Z-payment by sex across different departments, we plan to share best practices from departments that have resolved previous differences through refinement of incentive plans, including incentives for activities that are critical to our mission and commonly done by women, but are unpaid (e.g., mentoring, committee work), as one way of mitigating statistically significant sex-based inequities in Z payments.
- **Occupational Gender Segregation in Academic Medicine**

  National data demonstrates occupational gender segregation in academic medicine. While sex differences in X+Y compensation at UCSF appear to be due to decisions to enter higher-paid clinical specialties/subspecialties, it is inadequate to accept this as a fact, rather than an opportunity. Since UCSF often recruits from our outstanding GME programs, the vice dean for

faculty & academic affairs will work with the vice dean for education and departments with persistent differences to support equitable female representation in the higher-paid specialty fellowship programs.

- **Intersectionality:** The analysis revealed indications of compensation disparities between URM female faculty compared to non-URM males. The School plans to perform more nuanced intersectional analysis for the upcoming FY26 review.
- **Explorations of other potential compensation inequities:** For several years, the SOM has periodically monitored endowed chair assignment by sex and URM status. During the non-FSER review year, the Vice Deans for Faculty & Academic Affairs and Administration & Finance will conduct a thorough examination of how endowed chair positions are allocated across departments, including the decision-making process. In addition, since the Dean's Office requires approval for >10% salary increases, we plan to scrutinize such increases for any biases related to sex-, URM-, and site to ensure equitable compensation practices.

C. School of Nursing (report link)
Total faculty under review: 91
Number of departments: 4
High outliers: 3
Low outliers: 5
Adjustments made: None

Female (N)	Female (%)	Male (N)	Male (%)	Unknown Sex (N)	Unknown Sex (%)
76	84%	10	11%	5	5%

Non-URM (N)	Non-URM (%)	URM (N)	URM (%)	Unknown URM (N)	Unknown URM (%)
74	81%	17	19%	0	0%

The School notes the small sample size for analysis.

- **Findings related to Sex**

The adjusted analyses did not find a statistically significant imbalance in X+Y salary between female and male faculty members. After controlling for series, rank, step, degree type, and department, the adjusted X+Y salary of the male faculty was 98.1% (or 1.9% less) that of the adjusted X+Y salary of the female faculty (Confidence Interval (0.899, 1.070), $p = 0.66$).

The adjusted analyses did not find a statistically significant imbalance in Z salary between female and male faculty members.

Matched pair analysis revealed the differences in salaries were primarily in the Y component and attributed to clinical income, research productivity, or startup package.

The analysis did not find a statistically significant imbalance in accelerated advancement between female and male faculty members.

- **Findings related to URM status**

The adjusted analyses did not find a statistically significant imbalance in X+Y salary between URM and Non-URM faculty members. After controlling for series, rank, step, degree type, and department, the adjusted X+Y salary of the URM faculty was 107.3% (or 7.3% less) that of the adjusted X+Y salary of the Non-URM faculty (Confidence Interval (0.996, 1.155), $p = 0.06$).

Matched pair analysis revealed the differences in salaries were primarily in the Y component and attributed to clinical income, research funding, startup package, departmental support, and/or institutional initiatives.

The analysis did not find a statistically significant imbalance in accelerated advancement between URM and Non-URM ale faculty members.

- **High outlier analysis**

For the three faculty members (all female, non-URM) with X+Y salaries above the predicted statistical model, a matched pair analysis identified the differences in salaries were in the Y-component and attributed primarily to research funding. For the 11 faculty with a clinical Z component higher than the predicted model, all received this income for additional clinical work.

- **Low outlier analysis**

For the five faculty members (all female, non-URM) with X+Y salaries below the predicted statistical model, a matched pair analysis identified the differences in salaries were in the Y-component and attributed to the departmental support/startup package.

For those with a Z component less than the predicted model, all seven had their clinical teaching assignments apportioned to the Y component.

Selected items from the action plan
- Continue to refine the annual salary setting guidelines with input from the Nursing Faculty Council, and broadly disseminate the guidelines to the faculty in a timely manner for the annual renewal process to ensure equity, transparency, accountability, accessibility, and clear communication.
- Initiated four years ago, continue to negotiate the standard market rate clinical fee schedule for faculty members practicing across various healthcare delivery systems.
- Continue to offer the annual schoolwide Faculty Development Series (initiated two years ago) that includes information about salary structure, salary setting and negotiation, annual APU review process, Health Sciences Compensation Plan, advancement pathways, and academic review.
- Update and evaluate SID, a School of Nursing eLearning technology intranet that contains self-paced, faculty development education modules about faculty compensation and advancement policies and procedures (developed four years ago).
- Continue adherence to the schoolwide administrative stipend guidelines to ensure consistent and equitable compensation among academic appointees providing administrative service and leadership.
- Regularly review and modify guidelines to remedy salary, Z-payment, acceleration, and administrative stipend imbalances when such imbalances exist.
- Continue to ensure appointments to leadership positions are the result of an internal or national search, and leadership positions are advertised broadly to maximize access to leadership opportunities for all faculty members.

D. School of Pharmacy (report link)

Total faculty under review: 70
Number of departments: 3
High outliers: 5
Low outliers: 1
Adjustments made: 2

Female (N)	Female (%)	Male (N)	Male (%)	Unknown Sex (N)	Unknown Sex (%)
35	50%	32	46%	3	4%

Non-URM (N)	Non-URM (%)	URM (N)	URM (%)	Unknown URM (N)	Unknown URM (%)
57	81%	13	19%	0	0%

- **Findings related to Sex**

The adjusted analyses did not find a statistically significant imbalance in X+Y salary between female and male faculty members. After controlling for series, rank, step, degree type, and department, the adjusted X+Y salary ratio of the male faculty was 102% (or 2% higher) that of the adjusted X+Y salary of the female faculty but this difference was statistically insignificant (95% Confidence Interval (CI), 0.96-1.08, $p = 0.6$).

The adjusted analyses did not find a statistically significant imbalance in Z salary between female and male faculty members (two-tailed, t-test $p = 0.18$).

Matched pair analysis explained the imbalances to be primarily related to differences in research funding, administrative responsibilities, and teaching awards.

The analysis did not find a statistically significant imbalance in accelerated advancement between female and male faculty members (two-tailed, t-test $p = 0.38$).

- **Findings related to URM status**

The adjusted analyses did not find a statistically significant imbalance in X+Y salary between URM and Non-URM faculty members. After controlling for series, rank, step, degree type, and department, the adjusted URM X+Y salary ratio was 99% (or 1% less) that of the adjusted X+Y salary of the Non-URM faculty (95% CI, 0.94-1.105, $p = 0.82$).

The adjusted analyses did not find a statistically significant imbalance in Z salary between female and male faculty members (two-tailed, t-test $p = 0.74$) .

Matched pair analysis showed the majority of differences in salaries to be attributed to extramural research funding, administrative responsibilities, and teaching awards. One department adjusted the Y salaries for two faculty members (both female, URM) as identifiable inequities based on sex or URM status.

The analysis did not find a statistically significant imbalance in accelerated advancement between URM and Non-URM faculty members (two-tailed, t-test $p = 0.38$).

- **High outlier analysis**

There were no faculty members identified as having an X+Y salary above the predicted statistical model. Five faculty members were identified as having a Z component higher than the predicted model: three of those receive clinical Z-payments for service to UCSF Health and academic stipends for administrative leadership roles, two faculty members receive clinical Z-payments for leadership roles in the UCSF Medication Outcomes Center.

- **Low outlier analysis**

There was one faculty member (male, non-URM) identified as having an X+Y salary below the predicted statistical model. This individual holds dual doctoral degrees (MD/PhD) but does not engage in clinical practice. This faculty member functions as other research doctorate faculty in the department and their salary is consistent with the predicted level for that population.

There were no faculty identified as having a Z payment lower than the predicted model.

Selected items from the action plan
- Distribute results of the 2024 Faculty Salary Equity Review to all departments and present findings at the June 2024 full faculty meeting.
- Monitor X+Y salaries and Z payments for equity based on sex and URM status for new hires and during annual reviews with department chairs.

- Continued employment of transparent and defensible processes for determining the negotiable Y component of faculty salaries. This includes:
  - Ensuring that equity is maintained among faculty at the same series, rank, and step when adjustments are made to Y salaries.
  - Consider exceptional contributions to other pillars of the University mission (e.g., teaching and service) when determining Y salaries In addition to research funding and receipt of major honors/awards.
- Maintain efforts to promote equitable opportunities for school and departmental leadership roles associated with Z-payments.
- Monitor accelerated advancements for equity across the school; review and revise accelerated advancement guidelines for 2024-2025.

V. Observations and Recommendations

Previous Faculty Salary Equity Reviews have found small yet statistically significant imbalances in compensation based on sex at the campus level. These imbalances, identified through serial analyses of campus-wide personnel data systems, have been further scrutinized at the school and departmental levels. These more detailed analyses have included information not available through campus data systems (e.g., clinical specialty and subspecialty, clinical productivity, leadership roles), and have identified individual inequities which have been addressed through salary adjustments. While such factors may explain salary imbalances, it is important to consider that they may also perpetuate systemic biases, thereby undermining efforts towards salary equity. While our FSER efforts cannot directly address broader societal and market pressures influencing faculty salaries, some of these challenges warrant attention and consideration of action by the Committee in the future:

1. Compensation range among specialties and sub-specialties

As highlighted in the School of Medicine's report, there exists a significant disparity in clinical compensation and market-driven salaries across specialties and sub-specialties. Gender and ethnicity imbalances within certain fields can lead to salary imbalances based on sex and URM status. The persistent "gender segregation" in health sciences specialties poses a challenge for academic institutions.[7] Like other employers, UCSF salary setting practices often consider national salary averages and compensation levels for different specialties. Efforts to address equity in academic recruitment include embedding experienced equity advisors within faculty search committees. The School of Medicine also plans to explore opportunities to enhance female representation in higher-paid specialty fellowship programs. Initiatives to support equity related to differences among specialties are reported by the UCSF Schools of Dentistry and Nursing.

2. Gender imbalance in opportunities for additional clinical income

The Committee acknowledges a gender imbalance in opportunities to increase clinical productivity beyond baseline expectations, often due to the disproportionate burden of family care on female faculty. Known as the "motherhood penalty," this phenomenon underscores the need for proactive measures to promote gender balance in clinical income.[8] There are efforts among UCSF schools to address gendered salary imbalances including clinical equity initiatives in the School of Dentistry and non-clinical

---

[7] See *When a Specialty Becomes "Women's Work": Trends in and Implications of Specialty Gender Segregation in Medicine,* Pelley, Elaine MD; Carnes, Molly MD, MS, Academic Medicine 2020 Oct; 95(10): 1499–1506.

[8] See also the work from professor Claudia Goldin, recipient of the Nobel Prize in economics for her investigation and analysis of women in the labor market. One such paper appeared in the NBER (National Bureau of Economic Research). Collaborator Sari Pekkala Kerr provides a summary here.

(mentoring, service, scholarship) incentive programs in some School of Medicine departments (see point 4 below).

3. **Gender and URM imbalance for leadership roles**

The Committee acknowledges an imbalance in both gender and URM status among leadership roles that confer a salary advantage. The campus is taking efforts to address these imbalances, including launching initiatives such as the Leadership Equity Advances Diversity (LEAD) program, facilitated by the Office of Diversity and Outreach.

4. **Differences in faculty compensation within specialties are often driven by extramural income and clinical productivity.**

Multiple FSER analyses have found that salary imbalances are often influenced by individual variation in extramural research support and/or clinical productivity. While these are critically important areas of faculty work, UCSF faculty also contribute to the mission areas of teaching, mentoring, and University/public service, which may not be differentially compensated on a workload basis. The committee advocates for exploring alternative approaches to funding and compensation that include metric-based salary incentives for contributions in these mission-critical areas of faculty work; for example, the development of a relative value unit (RVU) approach to compensation for teaching, mentoring, and University/public service. Establishing compensation programs detached from direct funding sources would signify a paradigm shift in how UCSF values and compensates academic contributions.

Several departments within UCSF have pioneered programs compensating essential activities; as one example, the Department of Neurology's Teaching EVU (Education Value Unit) Compensation Hub (NTEACH) offers incentives for certain teaching and mentoring activities.

5. **Recommendation for examination of accelerated advancements**

The Committee recommends a thorough examination of accelerated advancements, including adjustments for multi-year accelerations. A campus-wide review of advancement opportunities, including criteria and communication regarding accelerated advancement, is advised to ensure equity across departments and divisions and equity related to sex and URM status.

6. **Recommendation for exploration of intersectional data analysis and granularity within the URM groups**

As possible, the Committee recommends that the next review cycle include statistical analyses examining ethnicity subgroups and intersections among race and gender (e.g., differences between Black and Latinx faculty, or among racial/ethnic groupings within the female population).

7. **Compliance with the new UC Gender Recognition and Lived Name (GRLN) policy**

The next FSER analysis will be expanded to include non-binary in accordance with the new UC Gender Recognition and Lived Name (GRLN) policy.

Appendix A. Faculty Salary Equity Review Committee Roster.

Brian Alldredge, PharmD, Chair	Vice Provost-Academic Affairs
Xu Chen, PhD	Representative, Academic Senate Committee on Equal Opportunity (EQOP)
Robin Corelli, PharmD	Vice Dean of Academic Affairs, School of Pharmacy
Dave Glidden, PhD, MS	Representative, Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)
Cathra Halabi, MD	Consultant, UCSF Weill Institute for Neurosciences
Wilson Hardcastle, MLIS	Office of Faculty and Academic Affairs, Academic Data Coordinator
Emerald Light, MBA	Assistant Vice Provost-Academic Affairs
Christina Mangurian, MD, MAS	Vice Dean for Faculty & Academic Affairs, School of Medicine
Irené Merry	Office of Faculty and Academic Affairs, Strategic Initiatives Program Manager
Sunita Mutha, MD, FACP	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Faculty Development, School of Dentistry
Renee Navarro, MD, PharmD	Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Outreach
Megha Parekh, MD	Representative, Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW)
Catherine Waters, RN, PhD, FAAN	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, School of Nursing

Appendix B. Faculty Salary Equity Data Sources.

Population Data:

Elements	Source
• UCSF Employee ID • UC Path Employee ID • School • Academic Department • Series • Rank • Step, • Appointment % • URM Status • Sex	Advance, VPAA Academic Roster Report
• Degrees	DEG_DEGREE value from HITACHI_AHVZCDEG_DEG
• Location	Building Code from HITACHI_AHVZCCLS_CLS_R
• Hire Date	LAST_HIRE_DT value from HCM_ODS_PS_JOB

Compensation Data:

Elements	Source
• Scheduled Annualized X and Y Salaries	Academic HR Compensation Report (PeopleSoft)
• Clinical Income	MyReports, Distribution of Payroll Expense (DPE), Earn code HZC
• Stipends	MyReports, Distribution of Payroll Expense (DPE), Earn codes HZA and STP

Other Data:

Elements	Source
• Accelerated merits and promotions	Advance Packet Review Report
• Leave of Absence	as available, from HCM_ODS_PS_ZUC_JOB_R_RW, Action="LOA"