

## UC SAN FRANCISCO 2014 FACULTY SALARY EQUITY REVIEW JANUARY 2016 FOLLOW UP REPORT

### Executive Summary

In January 2015, Chancellor Hawgood received and approved a campus-wide 2014 faculty salary equity review. The review was conducted by a joint Academic Senate-Administration Steering Committee (“FSER” or the “Committee”), and the [full report](#) was made available to faculty. Deans of the four professional schools were asked by the Chancellor to address any faculty salary imbalances or inequities that may exist and to report school findings and action plans by July 2015.

At the request of Chancellor Hawgood, the FSER Committee was reconvened in October 2015 with the following charges:

- Provide review and comment on each of the School action plans.
- Provide recommendations to the Chancellor regarding the terms of a UCSF program to provide discretionary salary adjustments. This discretionary salary program was the second component of UC President Janet Napolitano’s 2015-16 salary program for academic appointees.

The Committee reviewed and investigated the Action Plans of each school. Based upon review of the action plans, the Committee makes the following observations and recommendations:

- Determination of whether salary imbalances are “justified by legitimate non-discriminatory business practices” has subjective inputs. Bias may influence whether or not schools/departments identify salary inequities that warrant correction.
- In some instances no salary inequities were found; however, it was notable that this may have been because there were very few or no URM faculty or no women/men faculty in a particular school, department, or division.
- Achievement of statistical significance should not be the sole indicator that might prompt additional evaluation and action related to salary equity, i.e. schools/departments may identify specific inequities that warrant correction despite no statistically significant findings. When investigating imbalances the Committee recommends more detailed analysis (e.g. matched pair salary analysis) to determine if findings represent an “imbalance” or an “inequity.”
- Primary justifications used by some Schools/Departments to explain salary imbalances were the differences between faculty in terms of grant and/or clinical productivity. It is important that other academic endeavors such as teaching, mentoring, and service activities also be considered in the determination of Y salary amounts.

To facilitate the establishment and maintenance of equitable pay at UCSF, the Committee recommends that school/department compensation plans be made explicit regarding the determination of negotiated (Y) salary amounts, and regarding the eligibility for and determination of Z payments. In addition, schools/departments should ensure equal opportunity for activities that link to Y and Z salary payments (e.g., clinical and administrative opportunities).

No salary inequities were found in the Schools of Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy. Regarding the UCSF discretionary salary program, the Committee recommends the following:

- School of Dentistry: no discretionary salary adjustments.
- School of Nursing: no discretionary salary adjustments.
- School of Pharmacy: no discretionary salary adjustments.
- School of Medicine: A total of \$1.577M in Y salary adjustments have already been made in FY16 and were applied to 96 faculty in the Department of Medicine (\$857K) and 35 faculty in the Department of Pediatrics (\$720K); an additional \$217K in Y salary adjustments should be made retroactive to July 1, 2015 for 39 faculty in the Department of Medicine and one faculty member in the Department of Neurology. In addition, the Committee recommends that the Department of Medicine conduct further analysis on a remaining gender-based imbalance of \$299,000 in Y salary no later than March 31, 2016.

The Committee reaffirms that for subsequent campus-level FSER reports that school-level action plans be developed. The Committee further reaffirms the importance of ensuring that all schools make their FSER action plans transparent to all faculty and emphasizes that salary inequities addressed as part of the discretionary salary program must not reappear in subsequent years.