UCSF SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY FACULTY SALARY EQUITY REVIEW (FSER) REPORT FISCAL YEAR 2024

Background

The Faculty Salary Equity Review (FSER) is conducted every two years to determine whether there are salary differences by sex and underrepresented minority (URM) status within the School of Dentistry.

Since the last FSER, the School of Dentistry has taken the following actions:

1. Increased the Department of Preventive and Restorative Sciences APU from a salary scale of 2 to 3 to reverse a longstanding change implemented during a time of severe budget austerity that contributed to faculty salary disparity with other departments.
2. Implemented efforts to ensure consistent data and processes across departments for calculating clinical incentive payments.
3. Harmonized stipend payments for administrative roles across departments.
4. Implemented matched pair review for all requests for salary increases of ≥10% to assess for and prevent salary inequities by sex or URM status within the department.
5. Review salaries of new hires to proactively assess for impact on salary inequities while being attentive to market forces.

It is important to know that each of the four departments has its own compensation plan. Thus, faculty are paid on different scales and each department uses varying approaches to set compensation. All departments adjust compensation based on available sources of funding for faculty salaries. Some departments use clinical incentive payments as a significantly larger component of annual compensation than others due to differences in the nature of the clinical work. Market-competitive compensation varies widely for different specialties and nationally, females are overrepresented in specialties with lower salaries. As a result, department-specific analysis of compensation is essential to identify and address salary equity issues.

Methods and Analysis Plan

The analysis of the School of Dentistry data followed the analysis plan of the UCSF campus Faculty Salary Equity Review (FSER) process. Data specific to the School of Dentistry were provided by the Office of Faculty and Academic Affairs, UCSF Human Resources. The timeframe for X+Y salary data was FY 2023-2024, FY2022-2023 for clinical compensation (Z payments)[1], and July 1, 2014, to June 30, 2023, for academic advancement data.

The outcomes of interest included:

- X+Y salary was log-transformed to a symmetric distribution.
- Since only some faculty members received a Z payment, Z payment was evaluated in two ways: log-transformed Z payment and whether a faculty member received any Z payment.
- Advancement was recorded as 0,1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 merits and/or promotions a faculty member received between 2014 and 2023.
- Accelerated advancement was evaluated as whether a faculty member received any accelerated advancement between 2014 and 2023.

[1] Data Sets Reviewed: Salary (X+Y) Data: FY23 (January 1, 2023 - December 31, 2023)
Clinical incentives (Z) payments provided in FY23 (January 1, 2023 - December 31, 2023)

The comparison variables included: 1) Sex: coded as female or male, 2) Underrepresented minority (URM) vs. non-URM where URM is defined as those who identified as Black or African American, Hispanic, Native American/Alaskan Native, Filipino, or Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and non-URM was defined as those who identified as White, Asian, or declined to state.

Covariates included in regression models included: 1) series (Ladder Rank, In Residence, Clinical X, HS Clinical, or Adjunct), 2) rank (Professor, Associate, or Assistant), 3) step (1 through 9), 4) doctorate type (Clinical, Research, Combination or Other degree), 5) department (Cell & Tissue Biology (CTB), Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery (OMS), Orofacial Sciences (OFS), and Preventive & Restorative Dental Sciences (PRDS).

X+Y salary: (log-transformed) was analyzed using linear regression models to compare salaries between females and males and between URM and non-URM faculty, where the five covariates were included as fixed effects to explore potential differences by series, rank, step, degree type, and department.

Z payments: were compared by sex and URM status in two models: a linear model on the amount of the Z payment (log-transformed) and a logistic regression model on whether or not a faculty member received a Z payment. The five covariates were included as fixed effects in both models. When there were few subjects with a response, no covariates were included in the model.

Advancements: were compared by sex and URM status in two models: a cumulative logit model on merits and/or promotions (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 merits and/or promotions) received between 2014 and 2023, and a logistic regression model on whether or not a faculty member had any accelerated advancements. The five covariates were included as fixed effects in both models. When there were few subjects with a response, no covariates were included in the model.

URM and non-URM Matched Pairs: Because of the small number of URM faculty in the School of Dentistry, matched pair analyses were conducted for the eight URM faculty members within their own department to examine possible imbalances between matched URM and non-URM pairs. The URM and non-URM pairs were matched on series, rank, step, degree type, and department. When there was no match found, pairs were matched on series, rank and step only.

Identification of low- and high-outlier faculty: The expected amount of X+Y salary was computed based on the campus-wide model with series, rank, step, degree type, series, sex, URM status, and department. This estimate was compared to the actual X+Y salary a faculty member was paid. Following the campus-wide rule, a faculty member was identified as a low-outlier if the actual X+Y salary was less than 75% of the expected X+Y salary based on models and as high-paid if the actual X+Y salary was more than 140% of the expected X+Y salary based on models. Additional matched pair analysis was performed for faculty members with X+Y payment below 75% or 1.4 standard deviations below the model predicted salary as identified by the campus-wide analysis, matched to faculty members whose salaries were neither substantially higher nor lower than their predicted salaries. The matching in those analyses was primarily based on rank, step, and department.

School Level Findings

The School of Dentistry had 70 faculty who met the inclusion criteria for analysis of FY24 salary: at least 75% paid appointment at UCSF in any of the five faculty series (Ladder Rank, In Residence, Clinical X, Adjunct, and Health Sciences). Demographic data for sex was available for 67 faculty (51% female, 44% male) with three declining to state. Eleven percent of faculty identified as URM, 86% as non-URM, and two did not state. See Appendix.

X+Y Salary

Sex: Unadjusted analysis found the odds ratio in X+Y salary for females to males was 0.77, 95% CI (0.66, 0.90), and was statically significant (p=0.001). After adjusting for series, rank, step, degree type, and academic department, the odds ratio for females to males was 0.98, 95% CI (0.87, 1.11), meaning that female faculty were paid 2% less than male faculty, and this difference was not statistically significant (p=0.760). The statistically significant difference in female to male X+Y salary found in the 2022 FSER is no longer present.

URM status: Unadjusted analysis found the odds ratio in X+Y salary by URM to non-URM status was 0.84, 95% CI (0.65, 1.08), and not statistically significant (p=0.176). After adjusting for series, rank, step, degree type, and academic department, the odds ratio for URM to non-URM odds ratio was 1.03, 95% CI (0.86, 1.24), meaning URM faculty were paid 3% more than non-URM faculty, and this was not a statistically significant difference (p=0.722).

Z Payments

Sex: Seventy-one percent of male faculty and 53% of female faculty received a Z payment. The unadjusted odds ratio of female faculty having a Z payment was 0.46, 95% CI (0.16, 1.29) compared to male faculty, meaning the odds of a female faculty having a Z payment were 54% lower than that for male faculty. This was not statistically significant (p=0.1353). The adjusted odds ratio was 0.49, 95% CI (.011, 2.26), and was also not statistically significant (p=0.3549). The median amount of Z payment for females was lower than for men ($3,333 compared to $14,167). 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.

URM status: Seventy-five percent of URM faculty members and 58% of non-URM faculty received a Z payment. The unadjusted odds ratio for URM faculty having a Z payment was 2.14 compared with non-URM faculty 95% CI (0.39, 11.87) and was not statistically significant (p=0.377). The median amount of Z payment for URM faculty was higher than for non-URM faculty ($12,000 compared to $5,000). 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 interpretation of this finding is moderated by the recognition that there is intersectionality among URM status, 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.

Advancements

Sex: Unadjusted analysis did not find significant differences (p=0.885) in the odds ratio of female to male for merits and/or promotions (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 times) received between 2014 and 2023 (odds ratio 0.94), 95% CI (0.39, 2.23). After adjusting for series, rank, step, degree type,

and academic department, the odds ratio was 2.64, 95% CI (0.70, 9.95), and was not statistically significant (p=0.147). This analysis has limitations because of several considerations that are not included in the analysis (e.g., rank when hired and date of hire or duration of faculty appointment).

URM status: Unadjusted analyses did not find a significant difference p=0.719) in merits and/or promotions (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 times) received between 2014 and 2023 by URM status (odds ratio 0.795), 95% CI (0.22, 2.82). After adjusting for series, rank, step, degree type, and academic department the odds ratio, the odds ratio was 1.27, 95% CI (0.22, 2.82), and not statistically significant (p=0.781). The small sample size precluded additional analyses.

Accelerated Advancement

Sex: Twenty-eight percent of women and 45% of men had at least one accelerated advancement between 2014 and 2023. Because of the small number of faculty having an accelerated advancement, only unadjusted analyses were considered. This analysis did not find a statistically significant difference in having an accelerated advancement by sex (p=0.202).

URM status: Thirteen percent of URM faculty and 38% of non-URM faculty had at least one accelerated advancement between 2014 and 2023. The unadjusted analysis did not find a statistically significant difference in having at least one accelerated advancement by URM status (p= 0.244). The small sample size precluded additional analysis.

Salary outliers

Campus analysis to calculate predicted salary (X+Y) was based on department, faculty series, rank, step, and doctorate type. Individuals whose salaries were 140% or more than the predicted salary (1.6 standard deviations) were designated high salary outliers. Individuals defined at 75% or less of predicated salary (1.6 standard deviations) were designated low salary outliers. A total of five outliers were identified; none were URM and 80% were male.

High salary outliers

Three faculty were identified as high-salary outliers using campus definitions. One individual works in a clinical specialty with high market-based compensation that is set outside the School of Dentistry. The remaining two both have robust funding portfolios and high steps that contribute to their increased compensation.

Low salary outliers

Two faculty were identified as low-salary outliers using campus definitions. One individual is a non-specialist based within a surgical specialty department where faculty have high market-based compensation. The other is a faculty whose salary is limited due to lower full-time equivalent effort and lack of clinical revenue or grant funding.

Department Level Findings

Cell and Tissue Biology (CTB)

Of the 11 faculty in the review set, 36% percent of faculty are female, 55% are male and 9% declined to state a sex. There are no URM faculty and all are in the Ladder Rank series. The median X+Y salary for female faculty was slightly higher than that for male ($203,500 compared to $200,900). The unadjusted odds ratio for X+Y salary for a female to male faculty was 1.20, 95% CI (0.82, 1.75), and the difference was not statistically significant (p=0.3142).

Because of the small sample size, matched pair analyses were conducted where female faculty were matched to male faculty based on series, rank, step, and degree type. If no match was found for a female faculty member, a male faculty in a different rank or step was matched. Four cases of differences were found in which female faculty had a higher Y salary than their male counterparts. In three cases, the department confirmed that the higher Y salary reflected individual decisions about salary allocation and reflected a higher level of research funding. In the fourth case, the higher Y salary for the female faculty reflected a higher step than the matched male faculty. There were no salary outliers in the department.

The unadjusted odds ratio of having Z payments for females to males was 0.33, 95% CI (0.123, 8.69), and was not statistically significant (p=0.4596). The unadjusted odds ratio for the amount of Z payment for females to male was 0.94, 95% CI (0.047, 18.94), and was not statistically significant (p=0.9385).

No female faculty and 50% of male faculty received an accelerated advancement between 2014 and 2023. Small numbers precluded additional analyses.

Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery (OMFS)

Of the 11 faculty in the review set, 18% are female and 82% are male. Nine percent identify as URM. Nine percent of faculty are in the Ladder Rank series, and the remaining 91% are in the HS Clinical series. The median X+Y salary for female faculty was lower than for males ($311,220 compared with $357,266). The unadjusted odds ratio for X+Y salary for female to male faculty was 0.93, 95% CI (0.53, 1.64), and was not statistically significant (p=0.7853). The unadjusted odds ratio for X+Y salary for URM faculty compared to non-URM faculty was 1.10 95% CI (0.51, 2.34) and not statistically significant (p=0.7856)

Because of the small sample size, matched pair analyses were conducted where female faculty were matched to male faculty and URM faculty were matched to non-URM faculty based on series, rank, step, degree type, and sex. One case was found in which non-URM female faculty earned a higher Y salary than a matched non-URM male because of specialty surgical training. One case was found in which a non-URM female faculty had a lower Y due to fewer advancements and, therefore, lower step than the matched non-URM male faculty, which was explained by a difference in the number of years of employment.

Fifty percent of female faculty received a Z payment compared with 78% of male faculty. The Z payment for female faculty was lower than the male faculty (median of $2,500 compared with $68,350). The Z payment for female faculty was for administrative roles while that for male faculty was clinical incentive payment. URM faculty received a slightly higher Z than non-URM faculty ($68,231 compared with $60,850) for clinical incentive payments. Small numbers precluded other analyses.

There was no difference in academic advancements among female and male and URM and non-URM matched pairs. Fifty percent of female faculty and 44% of male faculty received an accelerated advancement between 2014 and 2023.

There was one salary outlier in the department (below 75% of the model-predicted salary) who was a non-URM male. Consultation with the department chair confirmed that this salary difference was attributed to the individual having a non-surgical background in a surgical specialty department.

Oral Facial Sciences (OFS)

Of the 19 faculty in the review set, 68% are female and 32% are male among the 19 individuals. Five percent identify as URM and 95% are non-URM. Twenty-six percent of faculty are in Ladder Rank and Clinical X series each, 42% in HS Clinical and 5% in Adjunct series. The median X+Y salary for female faculty was lower than for males ($223,963 compared with $239,266). The adjusted odds ratio for X+Y salary for female to male faculty was 0.93, 95% CI (0.53, 1.64), meaning women had 7% lower X+Y salary and were not statistically significant (p=0.7853). The median X+Y salary was lower for URM faculty compared to non-URM faculty ($217,800 compared with $232,440) but did not consider differences in series, rank, step, degree type, and sex. Because of the small sample size, a matched pair analysis was conducted to match URM faculty to non-URM faculty. This analysis found URM faculty had a higher X+Y compared with non-URM faculty. Upon consultation with the department chair, this was found to be explained by higher steps, different series, and levels of grant funding for URM faculty. There was one high salary outlier in the department that reflected market-based compensation set outside the School of Dentistry.

Sixty-one percent of female faculty and 83% of male faculty received Z payments. The median Z payment for women was lower than that for male faculty ($3,333 compared to $28,962). The Z payment for female faculty reflected administrative roles and or lower amounts for clinical incentive payments than male faculty. The unadjusted odd ratio of female to male for any Z payment was 0.32 and was not statistically significant (p=0.369). The unadjusted odds ratio for the amount of Z payment for females to males was 0.40, 95% CI (0.11, 1.38), and was not statistically significant (p=0.1210). The median Z payment for URM faculty was lower than non-URM faculty ($14,362 compared to $18,333). The small sample size precluded additional analyses.

The unadjusted odds for any advancement for females compared to males was 1.09 and was not statistically different (p=0.9244). Thirty-one percent of female faculty and 50% of male faculty received an accelerated advancement. The unadjusted odds ratio for accelerated advancement for female to male was 0.44, 95% CI (0.06, 3.24), and was not statistically significant (p =0.6169).

Preventive and Restorative Dental Sciences (PRDS)
Of the 29 faculty in the review set, 58% are female, 35% of the faculty are male, and 7% declined to state among the 29 individuals. Twenty-one percent are URM, 76% are non-URM, and 3% did not state. Thirty-one percent of faculty are in Ladder Rank series, 7% each are In Residence and Clinical X, 41% are HS Clinical, and 14% are in the Adjunct series. The median X+Y salary for female faculty was lower than for males ($176,356 compared with $227,250). The adjusted odds ratio for X+Y salary for female to male faculty was 0.95, 95% CI (0.79, 1.13), meaning women had 5% lower X+Y salary, and this was not statistically significant (p=0.5104). The median X+Y salary was lower for URM faculty compared to non-URM faculty ($173,078 compared with $192,850). The adjusted odds ratio for X+Y salary for URM to non-URM faculty was 0.89, 95% CI (0.75, 1.06), meaning URM faculty had 11% lower X+Y salary, and this was not statistically significant (p=0.1622). There were two high-salary outliers based on high grant productivity and one low-salary outlier based on lower full-time equivalent effort and lack of clinical revenue or grant funding.

Fifty-three percent of female faculty and 70% of male faculty received a Z payment. The median Z payment for female faculty was lower than for males ($5,000 compared with $10,000). The adjusted odds ratio for any Z payment for female to male faculty was 0.89, 95% CI (0.035, 22.51), and was not statistically significant (p=0.9400). The adjusted odds ratio for the amount of Z payment for female to male faculty was 0.28, 95% CI (0.044, 1.72), and was not statistically

significant (p=0.1295). Sixty-seven percent of URM faculty and 55% of non-URM faculty received any Z payment. The median Z payment for URM faculty was higher than for non-URM faculty ($7,500 compared to $5,000). The unadjusted odds ratio for any Z payment for URM to non-URM faculty was 1.67, 95% CI (0.23, 12.14), and was not statistically significant (p=0.6015). The unadjusted odds ratio for the amount of Z payment for URM faculty to non-URM faculty was 0.43, 95% CI (0.09, 2.11), and was not statistically significant (p=0.2752).

The unadjusted odds ratio of advancement for female faculty to male was 0.72, 95% CI (0.17, 3.10), and was not statistically significant (p=0.6428). The unadjusted odds ratio of advancement for URM faculty to non-URM faculty was 0.87, 95% CI (0.17, 4.5), and was not statistically significant (p=0.8638). Twenty-nine percent of female and 40% of male faculty received an accelerated promotion between 2014 and 2023. Seventeen percent of URM faculty and 55% of non-URM faculty received an accelerated promotion during this same period. The unadjusted odds ratio for accelerated advancements for female to male faculty was 0.63, 95% CI (0.12, 3.22), and was not statistically significant (p=0.6831). The unadjusted odds ratio for accelerated advancement for URM to non-URM faculty was 0.35, 95% CI (0.03, 3.55), and was not statistically significant (p=0.6296).

Because of the small sample size of URM faculty, matched pair analyses were conducted to explore differences in X+Y salary between URM and non-URM faculty and identified six matched pairs based on their series, rank, step, degree type, and sex. If no match was found based on all the criteria, pairs were matched on at least one of the following: series, rank and step. Consultation with the department chair resulted in a reasonable explanation for each of the differences in the matched pair analyses. Three cases were URM females with a higher Y salary than matched non-URM females. In each case the difference was explained by the URM female either having significant grant funding, being a clinician, or having greater clinical productivity than the non-URM female. The fourth case was a URM female with a lower Y than a matched non-URM female due to lower clinical productivity. The fifth case was a male URM faculty with a lower Y salary than a matched male non-URM faculty due to a difference in series and clinical productivity. The final case was a URM male with a higher Y salary than a non-URM male in the same rank due to a higher step.

Summary

Compared with the last FSER, there were no statistically significant differences in X+Y salary by sex or URM status across all departments. Departmental differences in X+Y salary had reasonable explanations including market-based compensation and or clinical and or grant funding productivity between matched faculty.

While not statistically significant, female and URM faculty were less likely to have any Z payment, and when a Z payment was present, it was a lower level of payment. The interpretation of this finding is moderated by the recognition that there is intersectionality among sex, URM status, 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. Small sample sizes limited additional analyses. While improved from the last FSER, some inconsistencies remain in the amount of Z payments for administrative and leadership roles across departments. There is a need to monitor both opportunity for and amount of administrative Z payments for URM and female faculty.

While there were no statistically significant differences in advancements among departments, female and URM faculty were less likely to have accelerated promotions. There is a need to monitor equitable opportunities for acceleration for URM and female faculty.

Action Plan

The following action plan has been approved by the Dean's office based on the current FSER findings:

1. Ensure the final FSER report is shared across all departments.
2. Review the process for eligibility for roles associated with administrative stipends to ensure equal opportunity for female and URM faculty as well as ensuring equitable payments for similar roles across departments.
3. Ensure all faculty and department leaders have access to information about eligibility for accelerated advancements.
4. Make compensation plans, which describe how Y and Z payments are calculated, easily available to all departmental faculty.
5. Ensure consistency methodology used across all four departments in implementing for determining clinical incentive payments.

Appendix

Table 1: Characteristics of faculty members in the School of Dentistry

	Sex			URM Status			Overall
	Female	Male	Decline to state	URM	Non-URM	Unknown	
Overall	36 (51.43%)	31 (44.29%)	3 (4.29%)	8 (11.43%)	60 (85.71%)	2 (2.86%)	70
Series							
Ladder rank	11 (30.56%)	13 (41.94%)	2 (66.67%)	2 (25.00%)	22 (36.67%)	2 (100.00%)	26 (37.14%)
In residence	1 (2.78%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (33.33%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (3.33%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (2.86%)
Clinical X	5 (13.89%)	2 (6.45%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (12.50%)	6 (10.00%)	0 (0.00%)	7 (10.00%)
HS clinical	15 (41.67%)	15 (48.39%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (37.50%)	27 (45.00%)	0 (0.00%)	30 (42.86%)
Adjunct	4 (11.11%)	1 (3.23%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (25.00%)	3 (5.00%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (7.14%)
Rank							
Assistant	11 (30.56%)	7 (22.58%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (25.00%)	15 (25.00%)	1 (50.00%)	18 (25.71%)
Associate	9 (25.00%)	6 (19.35%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (50.00%)	11 (18.33%)	0 (0.00%)	15 (21.43%)
Full	16 (44.44%)	18 (58.06%)	3 (100.00%)	2 (25.00%)	34 (56.67%)	1 (50.00%)	37 (52.86%)
Step							
1	10 (27.78%)	5 (16.13%)	3 (100.00%)	4 (50.00%)	13 (21.67%)	1 (50.00%)	18 (25.71%)
2	10 (27.78%)	6 (19.35%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (12.50%)	15 (25.00%)	0 (0.00%)	16 (22.86%)
3	9 (25.00%)	4 (12.90%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (12.50%)	11 (18.33%)	1 (50.00%)	13 (18.57%)
4	4 (11.11%)	7 (22.58%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (12.50%)	10 (16.67%)	0 (0.00%)	11 (15.71%)
5	0 (0.00%)	2 (6.45%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (12.50%)	1 (1.67%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (2.86%)
6	1 (2.78%)	1 (3.23%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (3.33%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (2.86%)
7	0 (0.00%)	3 (9.68%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (5.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (4.29%)
8	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
9	0 (0.00%)	2 (6.45%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (3.33%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (2.86%)
A/S	2 (5.56%)	1 (3.23%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (5.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (4.29%)
Degree type							
Clinical	23 (63.89%)	16 (51.61%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (50.00%)	35 (58.33%)	0 (0.00%)	39 (55.71%)
Research	7 (19.44%)	8 (25.81%)	2 (66.67%)	2 (25.00%)	14 (23.33%)	1 (50.00%)	17 (24.29%)
Combination	6 (16.67%)	7 (22.58%)	1 (33.33%)	2 (25.00%)	11 (18.33%)	1 (50.00%)	14 (20.00%)
Department							
CTB	4 (11.11%)	6 (19.35%)	1 (33.33%)	0 (0.00%)	10 (16.67%)	1 (50.00%)	11 (15.71%)
OMFS	2 (5.56%)	9 (29.03%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (12.50%)	10 (16.67%)	0 (0.00%)	11 (15.71%)
OFS	13 (36.11%)	6 (19.35%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (12.50%)	18 (30.00%)	0 (0.00%)	19 (27.14%)
PRDS	17 (47.22%)	10 (32.26%)	2 (66.67%)	6 (75.00%)	22 (36.67%)	1 (50.00%)	29 (41.43%)
Dep type							
Basic Sci	4 (11.11%)	6 (19.35%)	1 (33.33%)	0 (0.00%)	10 (16.67%)	1 (50.00%)	11 (15.71%)
Non basic Sci	32 (88.89%)	25 (80.65%)	2 (66.67%)	8 (100.00%)	50 (83.33%)	1 (50.00%)	59 (84.29%)

X+Y salary							
Mean ± SD	209,063 ± 59,204	278,050 ± 99,268	179,267 ± 17,628	201,665 ± 69,231	244,281 ± 87,713	189,830 ± 19,559	237,762 ± 85,550
Median	199,830	254,750	176,000	181,378	220,000	189,830	217,800
Z payment							
Mean ± SD	8,632 ± 13,060	65,063 ± 87,064	3,750 ± 7,500	15,891 ± 22,051	35,713 ± 68,797	7,500 ± 10,607	32,642 ± 64,476
Median	3,333	14,167	0	12,000	5,000	7,500	5,000
>0	19 (52.78%)	22 (70.97%)	1 (33.33%)	6 (75.00%)	35 (58.33%)	1 (50.00%)	42 (60.00%)
Advancement							
0	7 (19.44%)	3 (9.68%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	9 (15.00%)	1 (50.00%)	10 (14.29%)
1	1 (2.78%)	3 (9.68%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (25.00%)	2 (3.33%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (5.71%)
2	6 (16.67%)	5 (16.13%)	1 (33.33%)	1 (12.50%)	11 (18.33%)	0 (0.00%)	12 (17.14%)
3	12 (33.33%)	11 (35.48%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (50.00%)	19 (31.67%)	0 (0.00%)	23 (32.86%)
4	5 (13.89%)	8 (25.81%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	13 (21.67%)	0 (0.00%)	13 (18.57%)
5	5 (13.89%)	1 (3.23%)	2 (66.67%)	1 (12.50%)	6 (10.00%)	1 (50.00%)	8 (11.43%)
Accelerated Advancement							
Yes	10 (27.78%)	14 (45.16%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (12.50%)	23 (38.33%)	0 (0.00%)	24 (34.29%)