



University of California  
San Francisco  
*advancing health worldwide*

## UC San Francisco 2014 Faculty Salary Equity Review January 2015

### Executive Summary

In 2012, UC President Yudof charged each campus to implement a faculty salary equity study. In response, Vice Provost of Academic Affairs Brian Alldredge convened a committee to conduct the present review. The committee included representation from all four Schools and from three Academic Senate committees, as well as the Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Outreach. The Committee developed the methods and analysis plan, conducted analyses, reviewed and interpreted findings, developed an action plan based on the findings, and wrote the present report.

The primary outcome variables included: both the base salary (X) and negotiated salary (Y); the presence of and salary from clinical incentives (Z); and the presence of accelerated academic advancements. Comparisons were made by underrepresented minority (URM) status and by gender. The analyses and results presented here use multiple regression to account for fundamental differences between faculty before making URM vs non-URM or female vs male comparisons. Covariates used in the regression analysis were: series, rank, step, doctorate type, and department.

The main findings from this 2014 UCSF Faculty Salary Equity Review include:

- **URM vs Non-URM.** No evidence of imbalance by URM status was found in salary (X+Y), the presence of and amount of clinical incentives (Z), nor in the presence of accelerated academic advancements.
- **Female vs Male.** A statistically significant imbalance in salary (X+Y) was found, with females receiving 3% lower salaries compared to males. There was not a statistically significant imbalance by gender in the presence of clinical incentives (Z). However, among those who received a Z, a statistically significant imbalance in the Z amount was found, with females receiving a lower (29%) Z compared to males. There was not a statistically significant difference by gender with regard to the presence of accelerated academic advancement.

It should be noted that the Committee used the term “imbalance” rather than “inequity” until such time as any salary differences between groups could not be explained by non-discriminatory legitimate business practices of the University or campus unit.

The Committee consensus was that local (school-level) implementation of action plans is the most effective way to identify any inequities within specific School structures. As such, the Committee recommends that the chancellor charge each dean with creating a school-specific action plan. These action plans must include a response to the campus-wide finding of salary imbalance by gender and must propose strategies to address inequities if found when school-specific analyses are conducted. School action plans will be due to the chancellor in July 2015.