

## Report from the UCSF Faculty Salary Equity Review Committee (FSER) July 2018

### Executive Summary

---

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

At the request of Chancellor Hawgood, the FSER Committee was reconvened in December 2017 with the following charges:

1. Review the action plans submitted by the Schools and provide the Chancellor with recommendations based on these reports.
2. If needed, consider changes to the methodology and/or data capture for the salary equity analysis with the goal of improving future analyses.

Prior to reconvening the Committee, a campus-level analysis of salaries was conducted using a methodology similar to that described in the January 2015 FSER [report](#). The main findings were:

**Female/Male:** A statistically significant imbalance in salary (X+Y) was found, with females receiving 3% lower salaries compared to males. There was no statistically significant imbalance by gender in the presence of a clinical incentive (Z) payment. However, among those who received a Z payment, a statistically significant imbalance in the Z amount was found, with females receiving a lower (29%) Z compared to males. There were no statistically significant imbalances by gender in the presence of accelerated academic advancements.

**URM/Non-URM:** A statistically significant imbalance in salary (X+Y) was found, with URM faculty receiving 3% lower salaries compared to non-URM faculty. No statistically significant imbalances by URM status were found in the presence of or amount of clinical incentives (Z), nor in the presence of accelerated academic advancements.

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

Charge 1: The Committee reviewed and evaluated the action plans of each school. No salary inequities were identified by the School of Dentistry and the School of Pharmacy. On the basis of identified inequities, upward salary adjustments were made for two female faculty members in the School of Medicine (\$59,200 for one; \$25,100 for the other) and one female faculty member in the School of Nursing (\$29,700). Salary adjustments were made retroactive to 07/01/17.

Based upon review of the action plans, the Committee makes the following observations and recommendations:

- There is a lower proportion of women than men among those with high outlier salaries based on a model prediction. Among these high outliers, fewer women than men were identified as having a leadership role that contributed to their salary.
- There is a higher proportion of women than men in lower paying sub-specialty areas.
- For future salary equity analyses:
  - High outliers: schools/departments will be expected to report on leadership positions that contribute to salary, including a description of any search process that led to the individual being appointed to the leadership role. Matched pair analyses will be required for those who do not have a leadership position that contributes to salary.
  - Low outliers: schools/departments will be expected to conduct matched pair analyses for all individuals in this group.
  - For departments/divisions of 50 or more faculty, a statistical analyses of X+Y and Z compensation will be expected to assess salary imbalance by gender and URM status.
- Schools are required to develop guidelines for stipends paid for administrative roles. Effective 7/1/19, new administrative stipends will be paid as Z payments and not as a component of the annually negotiated salary (Y) amount.
- Leadership roles (defined as those roles that contribute to high outlier salaries) should be made following a national search, a broadly communicated internal UCSF search or some other process that is well-documented.
- When the schools provide specific actions they plan to take for the following year, the Committee will expect the schools to report on progress made when the next action plan is produced.

Charge 2: Per the UCSF Office of Diversity and Outreach definitions, faculty who self-identify as Vietnamese will be included among URM faculty for future FSER analyses. If/when UC employment forms allow for self-identification of Hmong faculty, they will also be included among URM faculty.

The Committee also reaffirms the importance of regular ongoing salary equity analyses and monitoring.