# Faculty Salary Review for the School of Pharmacy <br> 2022 

## Background:

Since 2014 UCSF has undertaken a campus wide analysis of faculty salaries, noted as the Faculty Salary Equity Review (FSER), to determine evidence of inequities in faculty salaries for underrepresented minorities (URMs) or by gender (male vs female).

In response, the School of Pharmacy has performed and conducted a gender equity analysis of School of Pharmacy faculty salaries to determine if any imbalances existed at the School or department levels in 4 annual report cycles, 2015-2019.

The 4 previous SOP reports were reviewed and approved by the Campus-level Faculty Salary Equity Committee with the conclusion that no gender inequities existed (all imbalances were explained by non-discriminatory and legitimate business practices).

The following recommendations which have been adopted as the School's guiding principles subsequent to the faculty salary equity reviews and noted as the Action Items from the FY19 FSER Report:

- The School of Pharmacy should continue to engage in future faculty salary analyses to highlight trends and gender comparisons based on new faculty recruits, turnover and retention pressures for existing faculty, and impact on constraints and ability to acquire extramural grant funding.
- Each Department should continue to employ transparent and well-reasoned processes for determining the negotiable Y component of faculty salaries.
- The Departments should strive for effective and fair criteria for accelerations in academic advancement, considering the impact on UCSF's competiveness and our ability to recruit and retain our outstanding faculty.
- The School should continue to strive for consistency in salary negotiations between Departments for faculty in similar series and emphasis (clinical or research). In addition, it is recommended that all faculty be apprised of leadership opportunities at the School and Department level to optimize their academic advancement and have equitable access to augmented funding via $Z$ payments.
- The Departments must also ensure equity is maintained among similar faculty when adjustments are made to $Y$ salaries.


## Methods:

- The dataset of faculty salary data for the School of Pharmacy was provided by the campus Office of Academic Affairs. Inclusion criteria for the analysis was consistent with previous
reports to involve all paid faculty in any of the 5 series at $75 \%$ effort or greater. It included the following data elements.

1. Annualized $X+Y$ scheduled pay rates for 2021-2022 after the new HSCP faculty salary scale went into effect on $10 / 1 / 2021$
2. Degree classification - Clinical Doctorate, Research Doctorate, Combination Doctorate, other Degree
3. Series, Rank, Step
4. Gender and ethnicity
5. Z payments $7 / 1 / 20$ to $6 / 30 / 21$
6. Advancement history with merits, promotions, and accelerations

## 7. Academic Department

- The dataset was further segregated by department to provide an unadjusted analysis of salary and acceleration variables by gender. The data was tabulated by rank, series, gender, median $X+Y$ pay , median y pay, average years since doctorate, calculated female/male ratios for pay with a comparison of 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018 pay ratios. A statistical analysis on adjusted variables was performed by the campus and the school. This included a fully adjusted regression (with steps, degree type, department, gender, URM status, rank and series) for log $X+Y$ \& Y pay at the school and department level. The campus also provided a residuals analysis and flagged individual faculty salaries ( $X+Y$ pay) that were either less than $75 \%$ or more than $140 \%$ of predicted. In addition a contingency table analysis of gender, URM status, degree classification, series, rank and step was performed by Department.
- If an imbalance of $4 \%$ or greater was detected by median $Y$ pay ratios, then a matched pair/set analysis was conducted on the basis of rank, series, step, and department.
- The Department-level datasets with salary data were provided to each Department Chair and an explanatory response for any potential imbalances was requested. Department Chairs were also surveyed regarding their faculty salary setting processes.
- The URM faculty identified were profiled by series, rank, step, department, and doctorate type. An imbalance was assessed based on a comparison of co-variants. If an imbalance was identified, a clarification and justification for the negotiated salary was requested of the Department.
- The Dean's Office of Academic Affairs analyzed and compared the trends between the datasets since 2015.
- Z payments were itemized by individual faculty and included amounts and reasons for payment.
- Abbreviations for Departments and School-wide are as follows: Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences (BTS); Clinical Pharmacy (CP); Pharmaceutical Chemistry (PC); School of Pharmacy (SOP)


## Department Faculty Salary Setting Processes

The Department Chairs were surveyed about their outreach efforts or meetings with individual faculty to discuss Y salary levels for FY 2021-2022. The responses varied to include the following by Department: BTS: The Department Chair met with every faculty member to discuss salaries. In reality these (faculty salaries) are set before the meeting, but could be altered based on the discussion; PC: The Department Chair met with and/or exchanged multiple emails with every faculty member at Ladder rank and In Residence; CP: At the Department's annual Peer Review Committee meeting, where all paid faculty are present, the Chair provides guidance to faculty regarding the opportunity to negotiate their $Y$ salary, and, if so, that they could reach out to the Chair. Typically, there are a few faculty that meet with the Chair one-on-one.

The other variable was the decision by each Department to either reduce the $Y$ salary (reduce $Y$ ) to cover the increased $X+X^{\prime}$ when the new HSCP salary scale was implemented in October, 2021 or maintain the $Y$ salary ( $Y$ firm) throughout the FY. Two Departments, BTS and PC, opted for reduce the $Y$, and CP opted for a $Y$ firm approach. BTS chose their reduce $Y$ option to cover unfunded $X+X^{\prime}$ salary increases; while PC based the decision to provide a consistent salary throughout the year.

During CP Department meetings, the Chair was transparent with the Department finances, sharing the impact of the non-funded HSCP Faculty Salary Program, in which CP has implemented the program without a reduction in the $Y$ salary levels to cover the $X+X^{\prime}$ salary component. This was possible with contributions from the Department's reserve funds.

It should be noted that 2 Departments, BTS and PC, have new Department Chairs and that the current BTS Department Chair assumed the position after the faculty salary negotiations for FY 20212022, and this was the first faculty salary setting cycle for the PC Department Chair.

## Demographics of Faculty

Number of Faculty by Department and Gender

| Department | Female | Male | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BTS | 8 | 10 | 18 |
| CP | 27 | 5 | 32 |
| PC | 5 | 19 | 24 |
| Total | 40 <br> $(54 \%)$ | 34 <br> $(46 \%)$ | 74 |

## Series of Faculty by Department

| Department | Ladder <br> rank | Clinical X | In <br> Residence | HS <br> Clinical | Adjunct | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BTS | 17 |  | 1 |  |  | 18 |
| CP | 1 | 19 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 32 |
| PC | 20 |  | 4 |  |  | 24 |
| Total | 38 <br> $(51 \%)$ | 19 <br> $(25.6 \%)$ | 7 <br> $(9.4 \%)$ | 7 <br> $(9.4 \%)$ | $3(4 \%)$ | 74 |

## Rank of Faculty by Department

| Department | Full | Associate | Assistant | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BTS | 17 | 1 |  | 18 |
| CP | 19 | 5 | 8 | 32 |
| PC | 21 | 3 |  | 24 |
| Total | 57 <br> $(77 \%)$ | 9 <br> $(12 \%)$ | 8 <br> $(11 \%)$ | 74 |

## Executive Summary:

## Conclusion:

There were no statistically significant differences in $X+Y$ pay between female and male and URM faculty when adjusted for degree type, rank, step, and series. Residual and matched pair analysis supported a finding of no inequities. All gender imbalances (female- and male-preferences) at the Department-level were explained by non-discriminatory legitimate business practices.

Consistent with previous years, the salary trajectories with rising ranks are distinct between clinical and research based faculty. Early career clinical pharmacy faculty receive augmented Y salaries to meet marketplace professional salary levels for practicing pharmacists in which the $Y$ salary component diminishes with rising ranks as the $X$ and $X$ ' salary components reach parity with the market place. Research-based faculty Y salary tends to peak at the associate professor rank commensurate with their grantsmanship and tends to decline at the full professor rank.

In 2021 there was an increase in the $Y$ salary as a percent of the total salary for 2 of the Departments, PC and CP, while there was a slight decline in the other Department, BTS. Noteworthy is that this marked a reversal in the trend where there had been a decline in the $Y$ salary component since 2012 in which the School and Departments provided funding to offset the shifting $Y$ salary components to meet $X$ and $X^{\prime}$ requirements of the increased HSCP scale levels. The School of Pharmacy and Departments have not implemented a faculty salary freeze over the past 2 FYs thereby allowing an increase in net total salaries for faculty with merits and promotions effective over this time period.

The determinants for Y negotiated salaries are varied for each Department and by the emphasis either on a clinical or research based series. For clinical-based series, Clinical X or HS Clinical, a new hire may command a higher $Y$ salary commensurate with a lower step in rank as a recruitment incentive. As these faculty progress in step and rank, the proportion of the $Y$ salary tends to diminish in part to accommodate the requirements in HSCP scale increases, whereas research-based faculty , in the Ladder rank, and In Residence series, have $Y$ salaries linked to their extramural grantsmanship. However, in all series, other external variables may contribute to the determination of a $Y$ salary. These have been identified by the Departments as follows: teaching, administrative and service contributions to the Department, School, and Campus; sources of funding (e.g. grants, service contracts); retention incentives; size and scope of laboratory and research program; dual clinical and research activities; participation in a non-SOP Compensation Plan; and generation of extramural support. The Department must also ensure equity is maintained among similar faculty when adjustments are made to Y salaries. Other external factors may dictate the Y salary levels, including faculty being based in an ORU or in a school leadership position (Vice Dean, Department Chair ), in which the Department Chair is not involved nor responsible for the salary negotiation, or having transferred from another school on campus.

## Main findings at the School level:

Median X \& Y: The Median X + Y pay was higher for males than females on a School-wide level. However, the Median $X+Y$ pay was higher for females in 2 Departments, CP and BTS. There were gender imbalances in faculty salaries for the School of Pharmacy based on a School-wide unadjusted analysis on Median $X+Y$ pay which demonstrated a male preference at the full professor rank for the HS Clinical and In Residence series. The imbalance in the HS Clinical series was attributed to a comparator of 1 senior male faculty with a Y salary component augmenting their total X \& Y salary levels based on a long-standing leadership position and operational administrative responsibilities in the HS Clinical series. At the full professor rank for In Residence series there was a comparator of 2 males and 3 females representing all 3 Departments and 1 male faculty whose $Y$ salary was negotiated outside of the Department within an ORU.

There were gender imbalances in faculty salaries for the School of Pharmacy based on a School-wide unadjusted analysis on Median $X+Y$ pay which demonstrated a female preference at the full professor ranks for the Clinical $X$ and Ladder rank series, and associate professor rank for the Ladder rank series. The imbalance for full professors in the Clinical $X$ series is attributed to higher proportion and number of females (10) at higher steps (steps 1-8) compared to 2 males at steps 2 and 3 . At the associate professor rank for the Ladder rank series there was a comparator of 1 female and 1 male and each were form different Departments. At the full professor rank for the Ladder rank series the imbalances varied by Department whereas PC had a male preference, BTS had a female preference and CP had 1 female faculty in this series.

All other series and ranks were closely balanced by gender with ratios at 1.00 to 1.01. The trends were consistent with the previous year analysis. There were 2 CP faculty identified in the residual analysis as $140 \%$ above the predicted salary values. Both were female faculty, one at assistant professor rank in the Adjunct series, and the other at full professor rank in the Clinical $X$ series. There were no male comparators for the faculty member in the Adjunct series and her $Y$ salary was comparable to other faculty at the same rank and the $\mathrm{X}+\mathrm{X}^{\prime}$ salary level for scale 3 exceeded the predicted salary in the residual analysis. The other high residual for a $Z$ payment was justified based on her administrative role as Director of the Medication Outcomes Center. There was 1 male faculty identified in the residual analysis as less than $75 \%$ of the predicted salary values. This faculty member is an associate professor in the Ladder rank series with a combination degree, MD plus PhD, which impacted the predicted salary as per the predictive model. However, this faculty does not engage in a clinical service, is a basic researcher, and his salary level is equitable with 2 other research faculty members at the same rank.

Median Y: There were gender imbalances in faculty salaries for the School of Pharmacy based on a School-wide unadjusted analysis on Median Y pay which demonstrated a male preference at the associate and full professor ranks in the Clinical $X$ series, and full professor rank in the HS Clinical series, Ladder rank and in the In Residence series. At the associate professor rank in the Clinical X series there was 1 male comparator with 2 female faculty. One female (URM) faculty and the one Faculty Salary Equity Review for the UCSF School of Pharmacy 2022
male faculty, both at step 1, received an equivalent $Y$ negotiated salary in the matched pair set. The other female faculty was at step 2 and received a reduced $Y$ negotiated salary but higher total salary. At the full professor rank in the Clinical X series, it is a varied mix with a male (non-URM) and female (URM) faculty who have identical Y negotiated salaries, while a female (URM) faculty has the highest Y negotiated salary. A matched pair analysis of faculty within similar steps revealed that all imbalances were explained by either recruitment incentives, teaching awards, operational administrative responsibilities, providing salary offset with extramural funding, and by achieving equity in total pay, $\mathrm{X}+\mathrm{X}^{\prime}+\mathrm{Y}$. In the HS Clinical series, the imbalance was attributed to a comparator of 1 senior male faculty with a leadership position and operational administrative responsibilities. At the full professor rank in the In Residence series, there was a comparator of 2 males with 3 females representing all 3 Departments and 1 male faculty whose $Y$ salary was negotiated outside of the Department within an ORU. In one Department the female faculty member had a higher $Y$ salary based on successful grantsmanship. At the full professor rank in the Ladder rank series, the imbalance was at the threshold of $4 \%$ and there was the highest number of comparators based on gender (11 female vs 24 males) representing all 3 Departments but with the predominance between 2 Departments (PC and BTS), in which both had a female preference. All Y salaries were predominately based on successful grantsmanship and a matched pair analysis by step at the Department level did not reveal any inequities.

There was a female preference at the associate professor rank in the Ladder rank series. There was 1 comparator female and male faculty from 2 different Departments (BTS \& PC), therefore unable to assess an inequity.

Z payments: On a School-wide level, there was a greater probability of women to receive a Z payment, which was provided predominately for administrative stipends (Chair, Vice Dean, Associate Dean, Vice Chair, ORU stipend, Director of the Medication Outcome Center, Director of research centers (CRSI, HIVE, Genes, Environmental \& Health) and Directors of Graduate Student and PharmD Experiential Programs), as well as for a few clinical services (Infectious Disease Pager). Note that all Z payments were adherent to the SOP Z stipend policy.

Accelerations: There was a female preference for accelerations for the Clinical X, HS Clinical, and In Residence series. However, there was a school-wide male preference for Ladder rank series with a female preference in one Department, BTS.

## Main findings at the Department level:

- The Department of Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences (BTS) had a female preference in both unadjusted Median $X+Y$ pay and $Y$ pay at the full professor rank in the Ladder rank series. The imbalance was explained in part by 2 senior male faculty who had no $Y$ salaries due to a lack of grant income. Excluding those 2 faculty members from the analysis would have switched the imbalance to a male preference. The 3 matched pair sets revealed that the female comparators had higher $Y$ salaries which were based on grantsmanship. Note that
there were expectations that faculty cover a large percentage of their salaries with generally 70-80\% coverage by grants.
- The Department of Clinical Pharmacy (CP) had male-preference imbalances for unadjusted Median Y pay and Median X + Y pay for the full professor rank in the HS Clinical Series which was attributed to 1 male senior faculty in a long-standing leadership position associated with substantial administrative responsibilities. One female (URM) faculty and the one male faculty, both at step 1, received an equivalent $Y$ negotiated salary in the matched pair set. The other female faculty was at step 2 and received a reduced $Y$ negotiated salary but higher total salary. At the full professor rank in the Clinical $X$ series, it is a varied mix with a male (nonURM) and female (URM) faculty who have identical Y negotiated salaries, while a female (URM) faculty has the highest $Y$ negotiated salary. A matched pair analysis of faculty within similar steps revealed that all imbalances were explained by either outstanding teaching awards, operational administrative responsibilities, clinical services, and by achieving equity in total pay, $\mathrm{X}+\mathrm{X}^{\prime}+\mathrm{Y}$.
- The Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry (PC) had male-preference imbalances for unadjusted Median $X+Y$ pay and $Y$ pay for full professor rank in the Ladder rank series. There was a female preference for Median $Y$ pay at the full professor rank in the Ladder rank series. The differences were attributed to the ability to meet the Department's compensation goal for acquiring extramural grant-based revenue support as well as the requirement to fund $Y$ salaries from their grants. It was noted that the one female faculty who didn't receive a $Y$ salary was due to a lack of grant income and focus on teaching and curriculum. The Department supported her $X+X^{\prime}$ pay and it was supplemented by a $Z$ stipend. It was noted that 2 faculty, full professors, step 6 in the Ladder ranks series, the male and female faculty received the same $Y$ salary. The faculty member, an associate professor in the Ladder rank series, identified as a Low residual received a $Y$ salary consistent the Department's compensation plan and comparable to 2 other faculty at the associate professor rank. Note that the Department has continued to use the same Department compensation formula as previous years and was included as an appendix in the 2017 School of Pharmacy Faculty Salary Equity Review report.


## Strategies for Action Plan

We have an agreement between the Department Chairs to standardize the salary setting for the basic science faculty. The goal will be to strive for consistency between Departments and, therefore, among similar research focused faculty throughout the SOP. The Dean's office has implemented a pre-approval process for accelerations (an Accelerated Advancement Guidelines and Form) that provides all SOP faculty a list of qualifying criteria, examples of activities that would warrant an acceleration, campus-level guidelines, and an opportunity to prepare a statement summarizing their
accomplishments to justify an acceleration. The completed form is routed to the Department Chair and ultimately to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs for approval. The goal of this process is to enhance awareness among faculty about accelerations, as well as provide consistency in approach among all Departments.

Results:

## ADJUSTED SCHOOL-LEVEL ANALYSIS

Note: Fully adjusted gender analysis specific for the School of Pharmacy generated by the statistician for the UCSF campus Faculty Salary Equity Committee.

Female/Male log X + Y Pay Ratio-SOP
Ratio Confidence Interval

Fully Adjusted
0.97
(0.86, 1.09)

Note: Fully adjusted URM analysis specific for the School of Pharmacy generated by the statistician for the UCSF campus Faculty Salary Equity Committee.

URM/non-URM log X + Y Pay Ratio-SOP
Ratio Confidence Interval

Fully Adjusted $\quad 1.00$
$(0.87,1.15)$

Conclusions: There were no statically significant findings for fully adjusted regression models concerning gender and URM X plus $Y$ pay at the School-level for 2021. Note that $Z$ payments in the School of Pharmacy do not include clinical revenues and there was insufficient data for an analysis.

URM faculty: Seven of the URM faculty are in the Department of Clinical Pharmacy, while 6 are female; 6 are in the Clinical $X$ series, with 3 at the rank of full Professor, one at the associate and 2 at the assistant rank. Of these, 5 are clinical doctors (of Pharmacy) and 1 has a research doctorate. The 1 male is an assistant professor in the Clinical X series and has a combination doctorate. One other is a new hire and in the HS Clinical series and at the assistant rank. One URM faculty member serves a significant and distinctive role as the Vice Dean for the School and operates out of the Dean's Office. Another URM faculty has a higher $Y$ salary in a matched pair which was based on a recruitment incentive, extramural grants to offset her salary, and assuming an operational administrative role. Two URM faculty had a lower Y salary in a matched pair set due to a non-URM comparator who was the recipient of several significant teaching awards (which was the basis for an augmented $Y$ salary). The other URM faculty had equivalent $Y$ negotiated salaries as other non-URM hires at the assistant and associate professor ranks.

One URM faculty is in the Department of Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences and is identified as a high outlier based on rank and step with all other faculty in the School. This is a full professor, step 6 in the Ladder ranks series and unique as the only physician and combination doctorate and a participant in a non-SOP Compensation Plan at a higher scale 4. The other URM faculty member in the BTS Depart is also a male at the full professor rank in the Ladder rank series who had a lower $Y$ negotiated salary in a matched pair set based on grantsmanship.

The final URM is in the Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry and is a full professor, step 2 in Ladder rank series. His Y salary was higher than 2 non-URM comparators in the matched pair set.

| Department of Clinical Pharmacy ( $\mathrm{N}=32$ ) [URM = 7] |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female/Male log X + Y Pay Ratio-CP |  |  |
|  | Ratio | Confidence Interval |
| Fully Adjusted | 1.04 | $(0.93,1.17)$ |
| URM/non-URM $\log \mathbf{X}+\mathrm{Y}$ Pay Ratio-CP |  |  |
|  | Ratio | Confidence Interval |
| Fully Adjusted | 0.95 | (0.85, 1.06) |

Department of Bioengineering \& Therapeutic Sciences ( $\mathrm{N}=18$ ) [URM = 2]

Female/Male log X + Y Pay Ratio-BTS
Ratio Confidence Interval

| Fully Adjusted | 1.08 | (0.81, 1.44) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| URM/non-URM log X + Y Pay Ratio-BTS |  |  |
|  | Ratio | Confidence Interval |
| Fully Adjusted | 1.06 | (0.70, 1.62) |

## Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry ( $\mathrm{N}=24$ ) [URM = 1]

Female/Male log X + Y Pay Ratio-PC
Ratio Confidence Interval

Fully Adjusted $\quad 0.86 \quad(0.67,1.10)$

URM/non-URM $\log \mathbf{X}+\mathrm{Y}$ Pay Ratio-PC
Ratio Confidence Interval

Fully Adjusted
0.81
(0.52, 1.27)

Conclusions: There were no statically significant findings for fully adjusted regression models concerning gender and URM X plus Y pay at the Department-level for 2021.

## Comparison of X plus Y pay by Gender and Department

## School-wide

FY 2022 scheduled X+Y Pay

|  | Female |  | Male |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\mathbf{X + Y}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{X + Y}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ |
| Mean | $\$ 205,158$ | 40 | $\$ 237,033$ | 34 |
| Median | $\$ 197,075$ |  | $\$ 212,255$ |  |
| Std Dev | $\$ 47,805$ |  | $\$ 66,346$ |  |
| Range | $\$ 139,200-357,000$ |  | $\$ 151,700-375,000$ |  |

## Results for BTS

FY 2022 scheduled X+Y Pay

|  | Female |  | Male |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{X + Y}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{X + Y}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ |
| Mean | $\$ 255,875$ | 8 | $\$ 263,340$ | 10 |
| Median | $\$ 242,500$ |  | $\$ 231,500$ |  |
| Std Dev | $\$ 54,262$ |  | $\$ 75,016$ |  |
| Range | $\$ 188,000-357,000$ |  | $\$ 187,100-375,000$ |  |

Results for Clinical Pharmacy
FY 2022 scheduled X+Y Pay

|  | Female |  | Male |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\mathbf{X + Y}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{X}+\mathbf{Y}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ |
| Mean | $\$ 190,261$ | 27 | $\$ 181,300$ | 5 |
| Median | $\$ 186,800$ |  | $\$ 184,800$ |  |
| Std Dev | $\$ 38,150$ |  | $\$ 22,812$ |  |
| Range | $\$ 139,200-271,400$ |  | $\$ 151,700-212,800$ |  |

Results for Pharmaceutical Chemistry
FY 2022 scheduled X+Y Pay

|  | Female |  | Male |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\mathbf{X + Y}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{X + Y}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ |
| Mean | $\$ 204,456$ | 5 | $\$ 237,856$ | 19 |
| Median | $\$ 205,210$ |  | $\$ 209,400$ |  |
| Std Dev | $\$ 35,128$ |  | $\$ 64,099$ |  |
| Range | $\$ 155,800-255,000$ |  | $\$ 160,300-350,500$ |  |

Box-Whisker plot for comparison of Departments for distribution of X plus Y pay by gender.

Total $(X+y)$ Salary by Department and Gender


School of Pharmacy
Comparison of 2021 Faculty Salaries (X+Y) by Gender, Rank, and Step
(eff 10/01/2021)


Outliers: One is a full professor, step 6 and unique as the only physician and combination doctorate and participated in a non-SOP Compensation Plan at a higher scale 4. The other is a full professor, $A / S$, with over 50 years as a faculty member.

## Comparisons and trends in negotiated Y pay

| Negotiated Y Salary by Gender, school and Department |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FEMALE |  |  |  | MALE |  |  |  |
|  | Median | Average | Minimum | Maximum | Median | Average | Minimum | Maximum |
| SOP | 28,760 | 28,598 | 0 | 84,800 | 35,692 | 38,434 | 0 | 142,200 |
| BTS | 48,500 | 45,512 | 900 | 84,800 | 44,200 | 53,590 | 0 | 142,200 |
| CP | 25,700 | 23,398 | 2,500 | 55,200 | 30,400 | 29,440 | 23,100 | 38,700 |
| PC | 34,500 | 29,616 | 0 | 43,510 | 32,200 | 32,825 | 0 | 50,010 |
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Box-Whisker plot for comparison of Departments for distribution of $Y$ pay by gender.

Negotiated (Y) Salary by Department and Gender


## Median Negotiated (Y) Salary by Department and Rank

80


## Median Negotiated (Y) Salary by Series and Rank



## Trends of the proportion of negotiated $Y$ salaries



## UNADJUSTED SCHOOL-LEVEL ANALYSIS

Note: the left sided columns include data from October, 2021 and the right sided column includes comparative data from July 2015.

## Table 1. Unadjusted Median Pay and Pay Ratios by Gender by Series and Rank

School of Pharmacy's FSER Report 2021
Table 1 Unadjusted Median Pay and Pay Ratios by Gender by Series and Rank (eff 10/01/2021)

|  | Female |  |  |  | Male |  |  |  | 2021 Female/ Male Ratio (X+Y) | 2021 <br> Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio (Y) | 2018 <br> Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio <br> (X+Y) | 2018 <br> Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio (Y) | 2017 <br> Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio <br> (X+Y) | 2017 <br> Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio (Y) | 2016 Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio <br> (X+Y) | 2016 <br> Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio (Y) | 2015 Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio <br> (X+Y) | 2015 <br> Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio (Y) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Series Rank | Median $X+Y$ | Median Y | N | Years Since <br> Doctorate | Median $X+Y$ | Median Y | N | Years Since Doctorate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjunct |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant | 139 | 30 | 2 | 6.50 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Associate |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Full | 203 | 3 | 1 | 32.00 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.09 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 |


| Assistant | 152 | 30 | 3 | 10.00 | 152 | 30 | 1 | 6.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.93 | 0.96 | 0.99 | 0.95 | 1.01 | 0.91 | 1.07 | 0.92 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Associate | 161 | 30 | 2 | 9.00 | 160 | 32 | 1 | 10.00 | 1.01 | 0.95 | 1.01 | 1.19 | 0.99 | 1.18 | 1.01 | 1.29 | 0.97 | 0.76 |
| Full | 198 | 19 | 10 | 25.30 | 191 | 23 | 2 | 18.50 | 1.04 | 0.82 | 1.01 | 1.13 | 0.99 | 2.61 | 0.98 | 0.38 | 0.92 | 1.01 |

HS Clinical

| Assistant | 154 | 32 | 2 | 7.50 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Associate | 175 | 27 | 2 | 29.50 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.14 | 1.93 | 1.08 | 1.81 |
| Full | 198 | 10 | 2 | 25.50 | 213 | 39 | 1 | 49.00 | 0.93 | 0.26 | 0.85 | 0.38 | 0.87 | 0.52 | 0.81 | 0.06 | 0.79 | 0.14 |

In Residence

| Assistant |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Associate |  |  | 0 |  | 170 | 34 | 2 | 11.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  | 1.11 | 2.07 | 0.99 | 1.05 | 0.97 | 0.88 |
| Full | 188 | 15 | 3 | 26.33 | 210 | 42 | 2 | 21.00 | 0.90 | 0.34 | 0.95 | 0.47 | 0.95 | 0.17 | 1.21 | 0.81 | 1.21 | 1.69 |
| Ladder Rank |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant | 156 | 35 | 1 | 7.00 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.08 | 1.31 | 1.00 | 0.98 |
| Associate | 212 | 70 | 1 | 16.00 | 160 | 32 | 1 | 5.00 | 1.32 | 2.19 | 1.02 | 0.91 | 0.88 | 0.58 | 0.85 | 0.00 | 0.85 | 0.89 |
| Full | 245 | 39 | 11 | 27.91 | 232 | 40 | 24 | 26.54 | 1.06 | 0.96 | 0.87 | 1.17 | 0.81 | 1.23 | 0.79 | 1.17 | 0.75 | 0.73 |

Tables 2-11: Gender status analyses: unadjusted school-level median slary ( $X+Y$ ), presence of $Z$ (proportion), median $Z$ payemnt, if present, and presence of acceleration (proportion)by geneder and tehse valuses and their ratios by rank, doctorate type and series.
Table 2. Unadjusted Presence of Z (Proportion) by Gender Status

|  | July 2021 |  | July 2018 |  | July 2017 |  | July 2016 |  | July 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Presence of $\overline{2}$ | N | Presence of 2 | N | Presence of Z | N | Presence of Z | N | Presence of Z | N |
| Female | 0.53 | 40 | 0.46 | 37 | 0.35 | 34 | 0.33 | 39 | 0.38 | 39 |
| Male | 0.38 | 37 | 0.32 | 41 | 0.33 | 42 | 0.22 | 46 | 0.29 | 48 |

Table 3. Unadjusted Median Z Pay, if Present by Gender Status

|  | July 2021 |  | July 2018 |  | July 2017 |  | July 2016 |  | July 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Median Z | N | Median Z | N | Median Z | N | Median Z | N | Median Z | N |
| Female | 5 | 21 | 5 | 17 | 8 | 12 | 4 | 13 | 5 | 15 |
| Male | 8 | 14 | 4 | 13 | 6 | 14 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 14 |

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

|  | July 2021 |  | July 2018 |  | July 2017 |  | July 2016 |  | July 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Accel | N | Accel | N | Accel | N | Accel | $\mathrm{N}^{*}$ | Accel | $\mathrm{N}^{*}$ |
| Female | 0.16 | 105 | 0.14 | 50 | 0.15 | 46 | 0.08 | 78 | 0.08 | 78 |
| Male | 0.12 | 98 | 0.15 | 59 | 0.13 | 61 | 0.08 | 92 | 0.10 | 96 |

*Note: 2015 and 2016 N represents two year's data for each faculty, thus is double the N of faculty for each analysis
Table 5. Unadjusted Presence of Z (Proportion) and Ratios by Gender by Rank

|  | Female |  | Male |  | 2021 Female/Male Ratio | 2018 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2017 Female/Male Ratio | 2016 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2015 <br> Female/Male Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank | Z | N | Z | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant | 0.38 | 8 | 0.00 | 1 |  | 1.67 | 1.00 |  | 0.00 |
| Associate | 0.40 | 5 | 0.14 | 7 |  | 4.20 | 3.43 | 2.67 | 2.27 |
| Full | 0.59 | 27 | 0.45 | 29 | 1.31 | 1.22 | 0.85 | 1.27 | 1.20 |

Table 6. Unadjusted Median Z and Pay Ratios, if Present, by Gender by Rank

|  | Female |  | Male |  | 2021 Female/Male Ratio | $2018$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2017 Female/Male Ratio | $2016$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2015 <br> Female/Male Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank | Median | N | Median | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant | 3 | 3 |  | 0 |  | 0.09 | 0.12 |  | 0.00 |
| Associate | 3 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 10.00 | 1.80 | 2.89 | 3.75 |
| Full | 7 | 16 | 8 | 13 | 0.81 | 1.50 | 2.01 | 1.00 | 0.80 |

Table 7. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration and Ratios by Gender by Rank

|  | Female |  | Male |  | 2021 Female/Male Ratio | 2018 Female/Male Ratio | 2017 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2016 Female/Male Ratio* | 2015 Female/Male Ratio* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank | Accel | N | Accel | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant | 0.17 | 12 | 0.00 | 5 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Associate | 0.10 | 10 | 0.08 | 13 | 1.30 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Full | 0.31 | 42 | 0.31 | 36 | 1.01 | 1.06 | 1.35 | 1.36 | 0.93 |

*Note: 2015 and 2016 Ratio represents two year's data for each faculty, thus is double the $N$ of faculty for each analysis
Table 8. Unadjusted Presence of Z (Proportion) and Ratios by Gender by Doctorate Type

|  | Female |  | Male |  | 2021 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2018 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2017 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2016 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2015 <br> Female/Male <br> Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Doctorate Type | Z | N | Z | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| None |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Research | 0.39 | 18 | 0.24 | 29 | 1.61 | 1.59 | 1.03 | 1.83 | 1.68 |
| Clinical | 0.55 | 20 | 0.50 | 4 | 1.10 | 0.84 | 0.93 | 1.01 | 0.96 |
| Combinaton |  | 2 | 0.25 | 4 | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Table 9. Unadjusted Median Z Pay and Pay Ratios, if present, by Gender by Doctorate Type

|  | Female |  | Male |  | 2021 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2018 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2017 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2016 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2015 <br> Female/Male Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Doctorate Type | Median | N | Median | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| None |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Research | 10 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 2.00 | 0.45 | 0.60 | 2.00 | 0.45 |
| Clinical | 3 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.25 | 0.75 | 0.75 |
| Combinaton |  | 0 | 20 | 1 | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Table 10. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration (Proportion) and Ratios by Gender by Doctorate Type

|  | Female |  | Male |  | 2021Female/MaleRatio | 2018 Female/Male Ratio | 2017 <br> Female/Male Ratio | $\begin{gathered} 2016 \\ \text { Female/Male } \end{gathered}$Ratio* | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 2015 \\ \begin{array}{c} \text { Female/Male } \\ \text { Ratio* } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Doctorate Type | Accel | N | Accel | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| None |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Research | 0.26 | 47 | 0.20 | 79 | 1.30 | 1.46 | 1.64 | 1.83 | 1.57 |
| Clinical | 0.19 | 52 | 0.33 | 9 | 0.58 |  |  | 0.58 | 0.23 |
| Combinaton | 0.17 | 6 | 0.30 | 10 | 0.57 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

*Note: 2015 and 2016 Ratio represents two year's data for each faculty, thus is double the N of faculty for each analysis

Table 11. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration (Proportion) and Ratios by Gender by Series

|  | Female |  | Male |  | $\begin{gathered} 2021 \\ \text { Female/Male } \\ \text { Ratio } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Female/Male } \\ \text { Ratio } \end{gathered}$ | 2017 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2016 <br> Female/Male Ratio ${ }^{*}$ | 2015 <br> Female/Male Ratio* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Series | Accel | N | Accel | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjunct |  | 6 | 0.00 | 2 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Clinical X | 0.24 | 41 | 0.18 | 11 | 1.33 |  |  | 0.69 | 0.26 |
| HS Clinical | 0.14 | 14 | 0.50 | 2 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| In Residence | 0.17 | 12 | 0.07 | 15 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Ladder Rank | 0.28 | 32 | 0.26 | 68 | 1.08 | 1.88 | 2.20 | 1.89 | 1.62 |

*Note: 2015 and 2016 Ratio represents two year's data for each faculty, thus is double the $N$ of faculty for each analysis

## UNADJUSTED DEPARTMENT-LEVEL ANALYSIS

Note that ratios less than 1 indicate a male preference and greater than indicate a female preference. Note that " 0 " indicates lack of a gender comparator.

## BIOENGINEERING \& THERAPEUTIC SCIENCES

## Table 1 (BTS). Unadjusted Median Pay ( $\$ 1,000$ s) and Pay Ratios by Gender by Series and Rank

| Department of Bioengineering \& Therapeutic Sciences FSER Report Oct 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 1 Unadjusted Median Pay and Pay Ratios by Gender by Series and Rank |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Female |  |  |  |  | Male |  |  |  |  | Median $X+Y$ <br>  <br> Female | 2021Female/MaleRatio |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Female/M } \\ \text { ale } \\ \text { Ratio } \\ (X+Y) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2018 Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio <br> Y | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { Female/ } \\ \text { Male } \\ \text { Ratio } \\ (X+Y) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2017 <br> Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio (Y) | $2016$ <br> Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio <br> (X+Y) | 2016 <br> Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio (Y) | 2015 <br> Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio <br> (X+Y) | 2015 <br> Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio (Y) |
| Series <br> Rank | Median <br> $X+Y$ | Median Y | N | Average Years Since Doctorate | URM | Median <br> $X+Y$ | Median Y | N | Average Years Since Doctorate | URM |  | MedianY <br>  <br> Female | $X+Y$ | $Y$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjunct |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Associate |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Full |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Clinical X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Associate |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Full |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HS Clinical |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Associate |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Full |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| In Residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Associate |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Full | 188 | 1 | 1 | 24.00 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 188 | 1 | \#VALUE! | \#VALUE! | 0.81 | 0.24 | 0.79 | 0.19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ladder Rank |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1.14 | 1.44 | 1.00 | 0.91 |
| Associate | 212 | 70 | 1 | 16.00 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 212 | 70 | \#VALUE! | \#VALUE! | 1.05 | 1.15 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.84 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Full | 255 | 49 | 6 | 24.50 | 0 | 232 | 44 | 10 | 20.00 | 2 | 239 | 47 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 0.84 | 1.22 | 0.81 | 1.41 | 0.82 | 2.14 | 0.72 | 1.22 |

Table 1 A: BTS Matched Pairs on $X+Y$ salaries, and URM status

| URM Status | $\nabla$ | Gender | $\checkmark$ - | Academic Department | App | Series | $\checkmark$ - | Rank/Step | $\checkmark$ | Female | Male | $X$ Pay (based on $100 \%$ app . | Y Pay (based on $100 \%$ app . |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Matched Pair set 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non URM |  | M |  | Bioengineering \& Therapeutic Sciences | 1.0000 | Ladder Rank |  | Full-1 |  |  | 230,000.00 | 150,200.00 | 79,800.00 |
| Non URM |  | M |  | Bioengineering \& Therapeutic Sciences | 1.0000 | Ladder Rank |  | Full-1 |  |  | 215,000.00 | 150,200.00 | 64,800.00 |
| Non URM |  | M |  | Bioengineering \& Therapeutic Sciences | 1.0000 | Ladder Rank |  | Full-1 |  |  | 230,000.00 | 150,200.00 | 79,800.00 |
| URM |  | M |  | Bioengineering \& Therapeutic Sciences | 1.0000 | Ladder Rank |  | Full-1 |  |  | 190,000.00 | 150,200.00 | 39,800.00 |
| Non URM |  | F |  | Bioengineering \& Therapeutic Sciences | '1.0000 | Ladder Rank |  | Full-1 |  | 235,000.00 |  | 150,200.00 | 84,800.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Matched Pair set 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non URM |  | M |  | Bioengineering \& Therapeutic Sciences | '1.0000 | Ladder Rank |  | Full - 4 |  |  | 233,000.00 | 187,100.00 | 45,900.00 |
| Non URM |  | F |  | Bioengineering \& Therapeutic Sciences | '1.0000 | Ladder Rank |  | Full - 4 |  | 235,000.00 |  | 187,100.00 | 47,900.00 |
| Non URM |  | M |  | Bioengineering \& Therapeutic Sciences | 1.0000 | Ladder Rank |  | Full - 4 |  |  | 187,100.00 | 187,100.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Matched Pairs set 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non URM |  | F |  | Bioengineering \& Therapeutic Sciences | 1.0000 | Ladder Rank |  | Full - 5 |  | 250,000.00 |  | 200,900.00 | 49,100.00 |
| Non URM |  | M |  | Bioengineering \& Therapeutic Sciences | '1.0000 | Ladder Rank |  | Full - 5 |  |  | 242,000.00 | 200,900.00 | 41,100.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outlier |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| URM |  | M |  | Bioengineering \& Therapeutic Sciences | 1.0000 | Ladder Rank |  | Full - 6 |  |  | 375,000.00 | 232,800.00 | 142,200.00 |

Tables 2-11: Gender status analyses: unadjusted department-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 2. Unadjusted Presence of Z (Proportion) by Gender Status

|  | July 2021 |  | July 2018 |  | July 2017 |  | July 2016 |  | July 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Presence of $Z$ | N | Presence of 2 | N | Presence of Z | N | Presence of Z | N | esence of | N |
| Female | 0.38 | 8 | 0.71 | 8 | 0.57 | 7 | 0.50 | 8 | 0.63 | 8 |
| Male | 0.50 | 10 | 0.18 | 10 | 0.25 | 12 | 0.14 | 14 | 0.13 | 15 |

Table 3. Unadjusted Median Z Pay, if Present by Gender Status

|  | July 2021 |  | July 2018 |  | July 2017 |  | July 2016 |  | July 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Median Z | N | Median Z | N | Median Z | N | Median Z | N | Median Z | N |
| Female | 15 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 16 | 4 | 13 | 4 | 15 | 5 |
| Male | 11 | 5 | 11 | 5 | 19 | 3 | 11 | 2 | 19 | 2 |

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

|  | July 2021 |  | July 2018 |  | July 2017 |  | July 2016 |  | July 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Accel | N | Accel | N | Accel | N | Accel | N* | Accel | $\mathrm{N}^{*}$ |
| Female | 0.38 | 21.00 | 0.56 | 9 | 0.56 | 9 | 0.31 | 16 | 0.31 | 16 |
| Male | 0.37 | 27.00 | 0.29 | 17 | 0.21 | 19 | 0.14 | 28 | 0.17 | 30 |

Table 5. Unadjusted Presence of Z (Proportion) and Ratios by Gender by Rank


Table 6. Unadjusted Median Z and Pay Ratios, if Present, by Gender by Rank

| Rank | Female |  | Male |  | 2021 <br> Female/Male <br> Ratio | 2018 Female/Male Ratio | 2017 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2016 Female/Male Ratio | Female/ Male Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Median | N | Median | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Associate |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Full | 15 | 3 | 11 | 5 | 1.36 | 1.36 | 0.83 | 0.66 | 0.79 |

Table 7. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration and Ratios by Gender by Rank

| Rank | Female |  | Male |  | $2021$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2018 Female/Male Ratio | 2017 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2016 Female/Male Ratio* | Femalel <br> Male <br> Ratio* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Accel | N | Accel | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant | 0.00 | 2 | 0.25 | 4 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Associate | 0.00 | 4 | 0.20 | 10 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Full | 0.53 | 15 | 0.58 | 12 | 1 | 0.00 | 2.86 | 2.68 | 2.86 |

Table 8. Unadjusted Presence of Z (Proportion) and Ratios by Gender by Doctorate Type

|  | Female |  | Male |  | 2021 <br> Female/Male <br> Ratio | $2018$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | $2017$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2016 <br> Female/Male Ratio | Femalel Male Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Doctorate Type | Z | N | Z | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| None |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Research | 0.38 | 8.00 | 0.44 | 9.00 | 0.84 | 3.57 | 2.10 | 3.25 | 4.38 |
| Clinical |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Both |  | 0 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Table 9. Unadjusted Median Z Pay and Pay Ratios, if present, by Gender by Doctorate Type

|  | Female |  | Male |  | $\begin{gathered} 2021 \\ \text { Female/Male } \\ \text { Ratio } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $2018$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { Female/Male } \\ \text { Ratio } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 2016 \\ \text { Female/Male } \\ \text { Ratio } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 2015 <br> Femalel Male Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Doctorate Type | Median | N | Median | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| None |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Research | 15 | 3 | 11 | 4 | 1.32 | 0.79 | 0.83 | 1.16 | 0.79 |
| Clinical |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Both |  | 0 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Table 10. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration (Proportion) and Pay Ratios by Gender by Doctorate Type

|  | Female |  | Male |  | 2021 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2018 Female/Male Ratio | 2017 <br> Female/Male <br> Ratio | 2016 <br> Female/Male Ratio* | Femalel Male Ratio* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Doctorate Type | Accel | N | Accel | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| None |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Research | 0.38 | 21 | 0.29 | 24 | 1.31 | 2.78 | 3.33 | 2.71 | 2.19 |
| Clinical |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Both |  | 0 | 1.00 | 3 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |

*Note: 2015 and 2016 Ratio represents two year's data for each faculty, thus is double the N of faculty for each analysis

Table 11. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration (Proportion) and Ratios by Gender by Series

|  | Female |  | Male |  | 2021 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2018 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2017 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2016 <br> Female/Male Ratio* | Femalel Male Ratio* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Series | Accel | N | Accel | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjunct |  | 1 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Clinical X |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| HS Clinical |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| In Residence |  | 1 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Ladder Rank | 0.43 | 21.00 | 0.41 | 27.00 | 1.05 | 1.78 | 2.81 | 2.14 | 1.71 |

Faculty Salary Equity Review for the UCSF School of Pharmacy 2022

## DEPARTMENT OF CLINICAL PHARMACY (CP)

Table 1 (CP). Unadjusted Median Pay (\$1,000s) and Pay Ratios by Gender by Series and Rank

Department of Clinical Pharmacy's FSER Report Oct 2021
Table 1 Unadjusted Median Pay and Pay Ratios by Gender by Series and Rank

|  | Female |  |  |  |  | Male |  |  |  |  | Median $X+Y$ <br>  <br> Female | MedianY <br>  <br> Female | 2021Female/MaleRatio |  | 2018Female/MaleRatio$(X+Y)$ | 2018 <br> Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio <br> (Y) | 2017Female/MaleRatio$(X+Y)$ | 2017 <br> Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio (Y) | 2016Female/MaleRatio$(X+Y)$ | $\begin{gathered} 2016 \\ \text { Female/ } \\ \text { Male } \\ \text { Ratio (Y) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2015Female/MaleRatio$(X+Y)$ | $\begin{gathered} 2015 \\ \text { Female/ } \\ \text { Male } \\ \text { Ratio (Y) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Series <br> Rank | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ X+Y \end{gathered}$ | Median Y | N | Average Years Since Doctorate | URM | Median $X+Y$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ y \end{gathered}$ | N | Average Years Since Doctorate | URM |  |  | $X+Y$ | $\gamma$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjunct |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant | 139 | 30 | 2 | 6.50 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 139 | 30 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Associate |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | \#REF! | \#REF! | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Full | 203 | 3 | 1 | 32.00 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 180 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Clinical $X$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant | 152 | 30 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 152 | 30 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 152 | 30 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.95 | 1.01 | 0.91 | 1.07 | 0.92 |
| Associate | 161 | 30 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 160 | 32 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 160 | 31 | 1.01 | 0.95 | 1.01 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 1.18 | 1.01 | 1.29 | 0.97 | 0.76 |
| Full | 198 | 19 | 10 | 25.5 | 3 | 191 | 23 | 2 | 18.5 | 0 | 195 | 21 | 1.04 | 0.82 | 1.04 | 0.82 | 0.99 | 2.61 | 0.98 | 0.38 | 0.92 | 1.01 |
| HS Clinical |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant | 154 | 32 | 2 | 7.50 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 0.00 |  | 154 | 32 | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Associate | 175 | 27 | 2 | 29.50 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0.00 |  | 175 | 27 | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |  | 1.14 | 1.93 | 1.08 | 1.81 |
| Full | 198 | 10 | 2 | 25.50 | 0 | 213 | 39 | 1 | 49.00 | 0 | 211 | 10 | 0.93 | 0.26 | 0.93 | 0.26 | 0.87 | 0.52 | 0.81 | 0.06 | 0.79 | 0.14 |
| In Residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Associate |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Full | 227 | 15 | 2 | 27.50 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 227 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ladder Rank |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Associate |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Full | 245 | 12 | 1 | 30.00 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 245 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 1 A: CP Matched Pairs on X + Y salaries, URM status, and high residuals


Tables 2-11: Gender status analyses: unadjusted department-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 2. Unadjusted Presence of $Z$ (Proportion) by Gender Status

|  | July 2021 |  | July 2018 |  | July 2017 |  | July 2016 |  | July 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Presence of 2 | N | Presence of 2 | N | Presence of Z | N | Presence of Z | N | esence of | N |
| Female | 0.62 | 26 | 0.62 | 26 | 0.32 | 22 | 0.31 | 26 | 0.31 | 26 |
| Male | 0.40 | 5 | 0.40 | 5 | 0.18 | 11 | 0.31 | 13 | 0.36 | 14 |

Table 3. Unadjusted Median Z Pay, if Present by Gender Status

|  | July 2021 |  | July 2018 |  | July 2017 |  | July 2016 |  | July 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Median Z | N | Median Z | N | Median Z | N | Median Z | N | Median Z | N |
| Female | 3 | 16 | 3 | 16 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 8 |
| Male | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 |

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

|  | July 2021 |  | July 2018 |  | July 2017 |  | July 2016 |  | July 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Accel | N | Accel | N | Accel | N | Accel | N* | Accel | N* |
| Female | 0.14 | 56.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.06 | 32 | 0.02 | 52 | 0.02 | 52 |
| Male | 0.17 | 12.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 15 | 0.04 | 26 | 0.11 | 28 |

*Note: 2015 and 2016 N represents two year's data for each faculty, thus is double the N of faculty for each analysis
Table 5. Unadjusted Presence of Z (Proportion) and Ratios by Gender by Rank

|  | Female |  | Male |  | 2021 <br> Female/Male Ratio | $2018$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | $2017$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2016 <br> Female/Male Ratio | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 2015 \\ \text { Femalel } \\ \text { Male } \\ \text { Ratio } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank | Z | N | Z | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant | 0.50 | 6 | 0.00 | 1 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Associate | 0.50 | 4 | \#REF! | 1 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.25 | 1.67 |
| Full | 0.69 | 16 | 0.67 | 3 | 1.04 | 0.66 | 0.54 | 0.96 | 0.82 |

Table 6. Unadjusted Median Z and Pay Ratios, if Present, by Gender by Rank


Table 7. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration and Ratios by Gender by Rank

|  | Female |  | Male |  | $\begin{gathered} 2021 \\ \text { Female/Male } \\ \text { Ratio } \end{gathered}$ | $2018$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2017 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2016 <br> Female/Male Ratio* | 2015 <br> Femalel Male Ratio* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank | Accel | N | Accel | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant | 0.22 | 9.00 | 0.00 | 3.00 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Associate | 0.09 | 11.00 | 0.00 | 3.00 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Full | 0.15 | 33.00 | 0.33 | 6.00 | 0.45 |  |  | 0.41 | 0.16 |

Table 8. Unadjusted Presence of Z (Proportion) and Ratios by Gender by Doctorate Type

|  | Female |  | Male |  | 2021Female/MaleRatio | 2018 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2017 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2016 <br> Female/Male <br> Ratio | Femalel Male Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Doctorate Type | Z | N | Z | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | \#DIV/0! | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Research | 0.40 | 5 | \#DIV/0! | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Clinical | 0.67 | 21 | 0.67 | 3 | 1.00 | 0.84 | 0.93 | 1.01 | 0.96 |
| Both | 0.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 2 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Table 9. Unadjusted Median Z Pay and Pay Ratios, if present, by Gender by Doctorate Type


Table 10. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration (Proportion) and Pay Ratios by Gender by Doctorate Type

|  | Female |  | Male |  | $2021$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2018 Female/Male Ratio | 2017 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2016 <br> Female/Male Ratio* | Femalel Male Ratio* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Doctorate Type | Accel | N | Accel | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 0.00 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Research | 0.00 | 10 | 0.00 | 0 |  |  | 1.64 | 1.83 | 0.00 |
| Clinical | 0.16 | 43 | 0.25 | 8 | 0.65 |  |  | 0.58 | 0.23 |
| Both | 0.25 | 4 | 0.00 | 4 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Table 11. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration (Proportion) and Ratios by Gender by Series

| Series | Female |  | Male |  | 2021 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2018 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2017 <br> Female/Male Ratio | $2016$ <br> Female/Male Ratio ${ }^{*}$ | Femalel Male Ratio* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Accel | N | Accel | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjunct | 0.00 | 5 | 0.00 | 1 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Clinical X | 0.21 | 34 | 0.22 | 9 | 0.93 |  |  | 0.69 | 0.26 |
| HS Clinical | 0.09 | 11 | 0.00 | 2 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| In Residence | 0.00 | 5 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Ladder Rank | 0.00 | 2 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## DEPARTMENT OF PHARMACEUTICAL CHEMISTRY (PC)

Table 1 (PC). Unadjusted Median Pay $(\$ 1,000$ s) and Pay Ratios by Gender by Series and Rank
Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry's FSER Report Oct 2021
Table 1 Unadjusted Median Pay and Pay Ratios by Gender by Series and Rank

|  | Female |  |  |  |  | Male |  |  |  |  | Median <br> $X+Y$ <br>  <br> Female | MedianY <br>  <br> Female | 2021 <br> Female/Male <br> Ratio |  | 2018 <br> Female/ $/$ <br> Male <br> Ratio <br> $(X+Y)$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline 2018 \\ \text { Female/ } \\ \text { Male } \\ \text { Ratio (Y) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 2017Female/MaleRatio$(X+Y)$ | 2017 <br> Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio (Y) | 2016 <br> Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio <br> $(X+Y)$ | 2016 <br> Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio (Y) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 2015 \\ \text { Female/ } \\ \text { Male } \\ \text { Ratio } \\ (X+Y) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2015 \\ \text { Female/ } \\ \text { Male } \\ \text { Ratio (Y) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Series Rank | Median $X+Y$ | Median <br> Y | N | Average Years Since Doctorate | URM | Median <br> $X+Y$ | Median Y | N | Average <br> Years Since <br> Doctorate | URM |  |  | $X+Y$ | Y |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjunct |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Associate |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Full |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 |



| HSClinical |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assistant |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Associate |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Full |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| In Residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Associate |  |  | 0 |  | 170 | 34 | 2 | 11.00 |  | 170 | 34 |  |  |  |  | 1.18 | 2.72 | 1.08 | 1.44 | 1.08 | 1.20 |
| Full |  |  | 0 |  | 210 | 42 | 3 | 21.00 |  | 210 | 42 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.01 | 1.29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ladder Rank |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant | 156 | 35 | 1 | 7.00 |  |  |  |  |  | 156 | 35 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Associate |  |  |  |  | 160 | 32 | 1 | 5.00 |  | 160 | 32 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 0.56 | 0.83 | 0 | 0.85 | 0 | 0.85 | 0 |
| Full | 205 | 35 | 4 | 28.50 | 233 | 30 | 14 | 22.50 | 1 | 214 | 31 | 0.88 | 1.17 | 0.86 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.60 | 0.68 | 0.57 | 0.70 | 0.61 |

Table 1 A: PC Matched Pairs on $X+Y$ salaries, and low residual

| URM Status | $\checkmark$ | Gender |  | Academic Department | $\square$ | App ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | Series | $\square$ | Rank/Step | $\checkmark$ | Female - | $\square$ Male | X Pay (based on $100 \%$ app . | Y Pay (based on $100 \% \mathrm{app}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Matched Pairs set 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non URM |  | M |  | Pharmaceutical Chemistry |  | 1.0000 L | Ladder Rank |  | Full - 2 |  |  | 184,000.00 | 161,700.00 | 22,300.00 |
| URM |  | M |  | Pharmaceutical Chemistry |  | 1.0000 L | Ladder Rank |  | Full -2 |  |  | 204,000.00 | 161,700.00 | 42,300.00 |
| Non URM |  | M |  | Pharmaceutical Chemistry |  | 1.0000 L | Ladder Rank |  | Full -2 |  |  | 207,710.00 | 161,700.00 | 46,010.00 |
| Non URM |  | M |  | Pharmaceutical Chemistry |  | 1.0000 L | Ladder Rank |  | Full -2 |  |  | 203,210.00 | 161,700.00 | 41,510.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Matched Pairs set 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non URM |  | F |  | Pharmaceutical Chemistry |  | '1.0000 | Ladder Rank |  | Full - 3 |  | 205,370.00 |  | 174,100.00 | 31,270.00 |
| Non URM |  | M |  | Pharmaceutical Chemistry |  | 1.0000 L | Ladder Rank |  | Full - 3 |  |  | 219,000.00 | 174,100.00 | 44,900.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Matched Pairs set 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non URM |  | M |  | Pharmaceutical Chemistry |  | 1.0000 | Ladder Rank |  | Full - 4 |  |  | 209,400.00 | 187,100.00 | 22,300.00 |
| Non URM |  | F |  | Pharmaceutical Chemistry |  | 1.0000 L | Ladder Rank |  | Full - 5 |  | 200,900.00 |  | 200,900.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Residual |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non URM |  | M |  | Pharmaceutical Chemistry |  | 1.0000 L | Ladder Rank |  | Associate-1 |  |  | 160,300.00 | 128,100.00 | 32,200.00 |
| Non URM |  | M |  | Pharmaceutical Chemistry |  | 1.00001 | In Residence |  | Associate-1 |  |  | 165,393.00 | 128,100.00 | 37,293.00 |
| Non URM |  | M |  | Pharmaceutical Chemistry |  | 1.00001 | In Residence |  | Associate-2 |  |  | 175,000.00 | 145,000.00 | 30,000.00 |

Tables 2-11: Gender status analyses: unadjusted department-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 2. Unadjusted Presence of Z (Proportion) by Gender Status

|  | July 2021 |  | July 2018 |  | July 2017 |  | July 2016 |  | July 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Presence of 2 | N | Presence of 2 | N | Presence of Z | N | Presence of Z | N | esence of | N |
| Female | 0.40 | 5 | 0.40 | 5 | 0.20 | 5 | 0.20 | 5 | 0.40 | 5 |
| Male | 0.37 | 19 | 0.37 | 19 | 0.37 | 19 | 0.21 | 19 | 0.37 | 19 |

Table 3. Unadjusted Median Z Pay, if Present by Gender Status

|  | July 2021 |  | July 2018 |  | July 2017 |  | July 2016 |  | July 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Median Z | N | Median Z | N | Median Z | N | Median Z | N | Median Z | N |
| Female | 5 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 7 | 2 |
| Male | 6 | 7 | 28 | 6 | 25 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 25 | 7 |

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

|  | July 2021 |  | July 2018 |  | July 2017 |  | July 2016 |  | July 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Accel | N |  |  | Accel | N | Accel | N* | Accel | $\mathrm{N}^{*}$ |
| Female | 0.22 | 9 | 0.00 | 6 | 0.00 | 5 | 0.00 | 10 | 0.00 | 10 |
| Male | 0.18 | 44 | 0.14 | 28 | 0.15 | 27 | 0.05 | 38 | 0.05 | 38 |

Table 5. Unadjusted Presence of Z (Proportion) and Ratios by Gender by Rank

| Rank | Female |  | Male |  | $2021$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | $2018$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | $2017$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | $2016$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | $2015$ <br> Female/ Male Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Z | N | Z | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Associate | 0.00 | 0 | 0.33 | 3 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.75 |
| Full | 0.25 | 4 | 0.31 | 16 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.75 |


| Table 6. Unadjusted Median Z and Pay Ratios, if Present, by Gender by Rank |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Female |  | Male |  | 2021 <br> Female/Male Ratio | $2018$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | $2017$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2016 Female/Male Ratio | Female/ Male Ratio |
| Rank | Median | N | Median | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Associate |  | 0 | 38 | 1 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.57 |
| Full | 5 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 0.85 | 5277.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.11 |

Table 7. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration and Ratios by Gender by Rank

| Rank | Female |  | Male |  | 2021 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2018 <br> Female/Male <br> Ratio | 2017 <br> Female/Male <br> Ratio | 2016 <br> Female/Male <br> Ratio* | Female/ <br> Male <br> Ratio* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Accel | N | Accel | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assistant | 0.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 7 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Associate | 0.00 | 1 | 0.09 | 11 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Full | 0.29 | 7 | 0.27 | 26 | 1.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

*Note: 2015 and 2016 Ratio represents two year's data for each faculty, thus is double the N of faculty for each analysis

Table 8. Unadjusted Presence of Z (Proportion) and Ratios by Gender by Doctorate Type


Table 9. Unadjusted Median Z Pay and Pay Ratios, if present, by Gender by Doctorate Type

| Doctorate Type | Female |  | Male |  | $2021$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | $2018$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2017 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2016 <br> Female/Male Ratio | Female/ Male Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Median | N | Median | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| None |  | 2 |  | 7 |  | 0.81 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Research | 5 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 0.81 | 0.27 | 0.40 | 2.86 | 0.28 |
| Clinical |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Both |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Table 10. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration (Proportion) and Pay Ratios by Gender by Doctorate Type

|  | Female |  | Male |  | 2021 <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2018 <br> Female/Male Ratio | $2017$ <br> Female/Male Ratio | 2016 <br> Female/Male Ratio* | Female/ Male Ratio* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Doctorate Type | Accel | N | Accel | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| None |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Research | 0.22 | 9 | 0.20 | 44 | 1.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Clinical |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Both |  | 0 | 0.00 | 1 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Table 11. Unadjusted Presence of Acceleration (Proportion) and Ratios by Gender by Series

|  | Female |  | Male |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 2021 \\ \text { Female/Male } \\ \text { Ratio } \end{array}$ | 2018 Female/Male <br> Ratio |  | 2016 Female/Male Ratio* | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Female } \\ & \text { Male } \\ & \text { Ratio* } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Series | Accel | N | Accel | N |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjunct | 0.00 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Clinical X | \#DIV/0! | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| HS Clinical | \#DIV/0! | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| In Residence | 0.33 | 3 | 0.08 | 13 | 4.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Ladder Rank | 0.17 | 6 | 0.25 | 32 | 0.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

