2022 UCSF SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY FACULTY SALARY EQUITY REVIEW (FSER) REPORT For 2021 to 2022: Updated revisions

George W. Taylor, DMD, DrPH
Jing Cheng, PhD

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose: To examine the potential imbalances or inequities in faculty salaries and academic advancements by underrepresented minority status (URM) and gender within the School of Dentistry. The time-frames of data for this analysis were FY 2021-2022 for X+Y salary, FY2020-2021 for clinical compensation (Z payments)[1], and July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2021 for advancement data.

Major Findings:

X+Y Salary at the School Level:
Gender: Unadjusted and/or adjusted analyses found significant differences in X+Y salary by gender.

URM status: Unadjusted and adjusted analyses did not find significant difference in X+Y salary by URM status. Matched pair analyses suggest reasonable explanation of the differences for URM faculty with salaries lower than their matched non-URM counterparts.

X+Y Salary at the Department Level:
The analyses generally suggest differences in X+Y salaries had reasonable explanations for all departments. Some faculty who were identified as being lower paid than model-predicted values received Z payments that, if considered in the total salary, would have prevented them from being in the lower paid X+Y group. Differences in scale among faculty accounted for some differences in X+Y between matched faculty in some departments. Meetings with the department chairs provided further insight into the explanations for differences identified. While statistically significant in only 2 departments (OMFS and PRDS) in the unadjusted analyses, the female to male X+Y salary ratio point estimates were lower for females for 3 departments (OMFS, OFS, and PRDS) and for 2 departments (OFS and PRDS) in the adjusted analyses while 2 departments had sample sizes too small to perform adjusted analyses. One department (CTB) had not much difference in the female/male salary ratio in the adjusted analysis (ratio=1.097). These findings must be considered with caution because of the different choices faculty select in using Z or Y payments for clinically generated revenue. This could have an impact on the X+Y salary differences. The faculty members' selection of Z or Y payments for clinically-generated revenue was not considered in this analysis.

The URM to non-URM salary ratios' unadjusted point estimates were generally noticeably lower for URM faculty (0.87 in OMFS and 0.77 in PRDS) and approximately equivalent (0.99) in OFS. Discussion with the department chairs regarding these findings provided reasonable explanations for the differences in female/male and URM/non-URM faculty salary differences that were noted.

Z Payments at the School Level

[1] Data Sets Reviewed: Salary (X+Y) Data: FY20 (July 1, 2020- June 30, 2021)
Clinical incentives (Z) payments provided in FY18 (July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018)

Gender: Unadjusted odds ratio for female faculty having a Z payment (n=6) was 0.48, (95% CI 0.16, 1.44; P=.19), compared to male faculty, meaning the odds for a female faculty having a Z payment were 52% lower than that for male faculty. The female/male ratio in amount of Z payment is 0.18, meaning the female received 82% less Z payment than male (p=0.0059). This finding suggests potential room for further balancing female faculty Z payments. However, again, this finding must be considered with caution because of the different choices faculty select in electing Z or Y payments for clinically-generated revenue.

URM status: Unadjusted analyses did not find significant differences in the amount of Z payments by URM status (ratio 0.6170, p=0.5394). The odds ratio of having a Z payment for URM faculty was 1.2121 (or 21% higher than for non-URM faculty). Four of 11 URM faculty members had a Z payment) (Table 6a).

Z Payments at the Department Level

The major findings regarding Z payments were the inconsistency in the way Z payments are used for compensation and the tendency for female Z payments to be lower or non-existent.

Stipends at the School Level

The unadjusted and adjusted analyses for the amount of stipend and odds ratios for having any stipend payments found no significant differences by gender or by URM status.

Advancements (non-accelerated) at the School Level

Gender: Unadjusted analysis found statistically significant differences in merits and/or promotions (0, 1, 2, and 3 times) received between 2014 and 2020 by gender (ratio 1.9476, p=0.0344). The significance disappeared in adjusted analysis (ratio 1.1133, p=0.8033). This analysis has limitations because of several considerations that may vary and are not included in the analysis (e.g. rank when hired and date of hire or duration of faculty appointment).

URM status: Unadjusted analyses estimated a statistically significant difference in merits and/or promotions (0, 1, 2, and 3 times) received between 2014 and 2020 by URM status, with URM faculty having 370% higher odds of any advancement. The difference in the adjusted analysis was not statistically significant (odds ratio 0.8958, p=0.8609). While that difference is not statistically significant, the sample size is relatively small for URM faculty receiving merits/promotions and there is a tendency for URM faculty to receive fewer merits/promotions than non-URM faculty in the adjusted analyses.

Accelerated Advancement at the School Level

Gender: The unadjusted analyses did not find a statistically significant difference in having an accelerated advancement between 2014 and 2020 by gender.

URM status: The unadjusted analysis did not find a statistically significant difference in having an accelerated advancement between 2014 and 2020 by URM status, with 2 URM faculty members having an accelerated advancement during that time-period. However, unlike the female/male comparison of similar proportions of female and male faculty having accelerated advancements 27.3% for female and 22.73% for male faculty, the proportion of URM faculty having accelerated advancements was half the proportion of non-URM faculty having accelerated advancements (13.3% and 27.7 % respectively).

Advancements at the Department Level

There were no statistically significant differences in advancement within departments.

ACTION PLANS

- Enact the plan completed in 2021 to standardize the process for providing stipends school-wide. The plan includes an annual letter that includes duties associated with the stipend and compensation amount with an appointment period of one year.
- Review the method for determining Y and Z income within each department compensation plan and work towards establishing consistency across the school. The approach for achieving this is as follows:
    - Collect methodology for each department and synthesize to identify differences across department
    - Present methods, by department, and proposal to harmonize across departments with Dean for revision and approval
    - Present recommendations to department chairs with timeline for implementation
    - Dean's office to monitor implementation annually
- Monitor persistence of patterns, while generally not statistically significant, and yet noticeable, regarding differences in advancement between URM and non-URM faculty and salary differences over time for female and URM faculty as compared to male and non-URM faculty, respectively.

ANALYSES

Analysis Plan: The analysis of the School of Dentistry (SOD) data followed the analysis plan of the overall UCSF 2021 Faculty Salary Equity Review (FSER) process. The data specific to the SOD were provided by Office of Academic Affairs, UCSF Human Resources, including FY 21-22 X+Y salary and FY 20-21 Clinical Compensation (Z payment), and advancements between 2014 and 2021.

The outcomes of interest included:

1) X+Y salary was log transformed to a symmetric distribution;
2) Since a relatively small number of faculty members received a Z payment, Z payment was evaluated in two ways: log transformed Z payment and whether or not a faculty member received any Z payment. Analysis of Z payments were not performed for departments where the sample size was too small.
3) Advancement was recoded as 0,1 2, or 3 merits and/or promotions a faculty member received between 2014 and 2020;
4) Accelerated advancement was evaluated as whether or not a faculty member received any accelerated advancement between 2014 and 2020.

The comparison variables included:

1) Gender: coded as female or male;
2) Underrepresented minority (URM) vs. non-URM: where URM was 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 were included in regression models were:

1) Series: Ladder rank, In Residence, Clinical X, HS Clinical, or Adjunct;
2) Rank: Professor, Associate, or Assistant;
3) Step: 1-9;
4) Doctorate type: Clinical, Research, Combination or Other degree; and

5) Department: Cell & Tissue Biology (CTB), Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery (OMFS), Orofacial Sciences (OFS), and Preventive & Restorative Dental Sciences (PRDS).

Primary Methods of Analysis at the School Level:

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 gender 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 gender and URM status in two models: a cumulative logit model on merits and/or promotions (0, 1, 2, and 3 merits and/or promotions) received between 2014 and 2020, 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 are few subjects with a response, no covariates were included in the model.

Secondary Analyses at the School Level:
URM and non-URM Matched Pairs*:* Because of the small number of URM faculty in the SOD, matched pair analyses were conducted for the 15 URM faculty members within their departments 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 paid faculty*:* The expected amount of X+Y salary was computed based on the campus-wide model with series, rank, step, degree type, series, gender, 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 low paid if the actual X+Y salary is less than 75% of the expected X+Y salary based on models, and as high paid if the actual X+Y salary is 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 campus-wide analysis, matched to faculty members whose salaries were neither substantially higher nor lower that their predicted salaries. The matching in those analyses was primarily based on rank, step and department.

Results at the School Level

Descriptive Statistics Table 1 shows characteristics of faculty members at SOD. The SOD had 80 faculty members who were greater than or equal to 75% time, following the definition used within the broader campus analysis. Thirty six (45%) were female and 44 (55%) were male. Fifteen (18.75%) were URM and 65 (81.25%) were non-URM.

Table 1: Characteristics of faculty members at SOD with 75% effort or greater

	Gender		URM Status		Overall
	Female	Male	URM	Non-URM	
Overall	36 (45.00%)	44 (55.00%)	15 (18.75%)	65 (81.25%)	80
Series					
Ladder rank	15 (41.67%)	22 (50.00%)	4 (26.67%)	33 (50.77%)	37 (46.25%)
In resident	2 (5.56%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (3.08%)	2 (2.50%)
Clinical X	4 (11.11%)	3 (6.82%)	0 (0.00%)	7 (10.77%)	7 (8.75%)
HS clinical	12 (33.33%)	16 (36.36%)	9 (60.00%)	19 (29.23%)	28 (35.00%)
Adjunct	3 (8.33%)	3 (6.82%)	2 (13.33%)	4 (6.15%)	6 (7.50%)
Rank					
Assistant	13 (36.11%)	15 (34.09%)	10 (66.67%)	18 (27.69%)	28 (35.00%)
Associate	8 (22.22%)	4 (9.09%)	2 (13.33%)	10 (15.38%)	12 (15.00%)
Full	15 (41.67%)	25 (56.82%)	3 (20.00%)	37 (56.92%)	40 (50.00%)
Step					
1	5 (13.89%)	3 (6.82%)	0 (0.00%)	8 (12.31%)	8 (10.00%)
2	4 (11.11%)	6 (13.64%)	2 (13.33%)	8 (12.31%)	10 (12.50%)
3	10 (27.78%)	12 (27.27%)	5 (33.33%)	17 (26.15%)	22 (27.50%)
4	10 (27.78%)	7 (15.91%)	4 (26.67%)	13 (20.00%)	17 (21.25%)
5	2 (5.56%)	5 (11.36%)	2 (13.33%)	5 (7.69%)	7 (8.75%)
6	2 (5.56%)	3 (6.82%)	2 (13.33%)	3 (4.62%)	5 (6.25%)
7	0 (0.00%)	3 (6.82%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (4.62%)	3 (3.75%)
8	0 (0.00%)	2 (4.55%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (3.08%)	2 (2.50%)
9	2 (5.56%)	2 (4.55%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (6.15%)	4 (5.00%)
A/S	1 (2.78%)	1 (2.27%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (3.08%)	2 (2.50%)
Degree type					
Clinical	18 (50.00%)	20 (45.45%)	9 (60.00%)	29 (44.62%)	38 (47.50%)
Research	11 (30.56%)	10 (22.73%)	2 (13.33%)	19 (29.23%)	21 (26.25%)
Combination	7 (19.44%)	14 (31.82%)	4 (26.67%)	17 (26.15%)	21 (26.25%)
Department					
CTB	6 (16.67%)	7 (15.91%)	0 (0.00%)	13 (20.00%)	13 (16.25%)
OMFS	3 (8.33%)	9 (20.45%)	3 (20.00%)	9 (13.85%)	12 (15.00%)
OFS	13 (36.11%)	12 (27.27%)	4 (26.67%)	21 (32.31%)	25 (31.25%)
PRDS	14 (38.89%)	16 (36.36%)	8 (53.33%)	22 (33.85%)	30 (37.50%)
X+Y salary					
Mean ± SD	191,966 ± 52,993	253,354 ± 86,630	200,476 ± 81,183	232,176 ± 78,393	226,157 ± 79,392
Median	180,000	246,600	180,000	203,435	202,803
Z payment					
Mean ± SD	4,311 ± 15,185	28,037 ± 54,895	13,349 ± 32,516	18,286 ± 45,706	17,360 ± 43,399
Median	0	0	5,000	0	0
>0	6 (16.67%)	13 (29.55%)	4 (26.67%)	15 (23.08%)	19 (23.75%)
Stipend					
Mean ± SD	3,823 ± 7,748	5,636 ± 9,803	4,794 ± 9,242	4,933 ± 7,704	4,820 ± 8,929
Median	0	0	0	0	0
>0	10 (27.78%)	16 (36.36%)	5 (33.33%)	21 (32.31%)	26 (32.50%)
Advancement					
0	4 (11.11%)	8 (18.18%)	3 (20.00%)	9 (13.85%)	12 (15.00%)
1	10 (27.78%)	9 (20.45%)	6 (40.00%)	13 (20.00%)	19 (23.75%)
2	10 (27.78%)	14 (31.82%)	4 (26.67%)	20 (30.77%)	24 (30.00%)
3	7 (19.44%)	13 (29.55%)	2 (13.33%)	18 (27.69%)	20 (25.00%)
4	5 (13.89%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (7.69%)	5 (6.25%)
Accelerated Advancement					
Yes	10 (27.78%)	10 (22.73%)	2 (13.33%)	18 (27.69%)	20 (25.00%)

X+Y Salary

Both the unadjusted and adjusted analyses identified significant differences in X+Y salary by gender (Table 2). The unadjusted female/male ratio of X+Y salary was 0.7750 with 95% CI (0.6729, 0.8925). After adjustment for series, rank, step, degree type and department, the female/male ratio of X+Y salary was 0.8265, meaning that females' X+Y was 82.65% that of males (7.35% less) after controlling for the other variables. The difference was statistically significant (p=0.0006) with 95% CI (76.94%, 92.72%).

Table 2: Female/Male X+Y Salary Ratio

	Female/Male Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	0.7750	(0.6729, 0.8925)	0.0006
Adjusted	0.8265	(0.7694, 0.9272)	0.0006

Both the unadjusted and adjusted analyses did not find significant difference in X+Y salary by URM status (Table 3). The unadjusted URM/non-URM ratio of X+Y salary was 0.8430 with 95% CI (0.6976, 1.0187). After adjustment for series, rank, step, degree type and department, the URM/Non-URM ratio of X+Y salary was 0.9712, meaning that URM faculty made 97.12% of non-URM faculty (i.e. 2.88% less). However, the difference was not statistically significant (p=0.6716) with 95% CI (84.68%, 111.39%).

Table 3: URM/Non-URM X+Y Salary Ratio

	URM/non-URM Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	0.8430	(0.6976, 1.0187)	0.0764
Adjusted	0.9712	(0.8468, 1.1139)	0.6716

There were statistically significant differences in X+Y salary by rank, step and department after full adjustment (Table 4). Specifically, assistant professors made statistically significant less X+Y salary than associate and full professors (p=0.0020 and p=0.0002 respectively). PRDS faculty made statistically significantly less X+Y salary than OMFS and OFS faculty (p<0.0001 and p=0.0001 respectively), and CTB faculty made statistically significantly less X+Y salary than OMFS faculty also (p=0.0003). It should be noted that PRDS uses lower scales than CTB, OMFS and OFS and market forces affect differences between OMFS and the other departments.

Table 4: Significant X+Y Salary Ratios by Series, Rank and Department

	Ratio	95% CI	P value
Rank			
Assistant/Associate	0.7857	(0.6767, 0.9123)	0.0020
Assistant/Full	0.7513	(0.6502, 0.8680)	0.0002
Department			
PRDS/OMFS	0.5816	(0.4956, 0.6826)	<0.0001
PRDS/OFS	0.7751	(0.6841, 0.8782)	0.0001
CTB/OMFS	0.6588	(0.5299, 0.8190)	0.0003

Z Payment

Thirteen of the 44 male faculty members (29.55%) and 6 of the 36 female faculty members (16.67%) received a Z (Table 1) payment. Only unadjusted analyses were conducted due to the small number of faculty members who received Z payment. Table 5a shows significant difference in the amount of Z payment (p=0.0059) but no significant difference in odds of having

any Z payment by gender (p=0.1869). The unadjusted female/male ratio of Z payment was 0.1806, meaning that female faculty made 18.06% of male faculty (i.e. 81.94% less) Z payments with 95% CI (0.0574, 0.5686). The unadjusted odds ratio for female faculty having any Z payment was 0.4769 compared to male faculty, 95% CI (0.1576, 1.4428).

Table 5a: Female/Male Z Payment Ratio and Odds Ratio for Any Z Payment

	Amount of Z Payment			Having any Z Payment		
	Female/Male Ratio	95% CI	P value	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	0.1806	(0.0574, 0.5686)	0.0059	0.4769	(0.1576, 1.4428)	0.1869

Four of the 15 URM faculty members (26.67%) and 15 of the 65 non-URM faculty members (23.08%) received a Z payment (Table 1). Only unadjusted analyses were conducted because a small number of faculty members received Z payments. Table 5b shows no significant difference in the amount of Z payment (p=0.5394) and odds having a Z payment (p=0.7694) by URM status. The unadjusted URM/non-URM ratio of Z payment was 0.6170, meaning that URM faculty made 61.70% of non-URM (i.e. 38.30% less) Z payments with 95% CI (0.1213, 3.1387). The unadjusted odds ratio for URM faculty having a Z payment was 1.2121 when compared to non-URM faculty, 95% CI (0.3297, 4.4556).

Table 5b: URM/non-URM Z Payment Ratio and Odds Ratio for Any Z Payment

	Amount of Z Payment			Having any Z Payment		
	URM/non-URM Ratio	95% CI	P value	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	0.6170	(0.1213, 3.1387)	0.5394	1.2121	(0.3297, 4.4556)	0.7694

There were no significant differences in Z payment by series, rank, step, and department.

Stipend

Sixteen of the 44 male faculty members (36.36%) and 10 of the 36 female faculty members (27.78%) received a stipend payment. Table 6a shows non-significant difference in the amount of stipend payment (p=0.5763) and in odds of having any stipend payment by gender (p=0.4183). The unadjusted female/male ratio of stipend payment was 0.8678, meaning that female faculty made 86.78% of male faculty (i.e. 13.22% less) stipend payments with 95% CI (0.5174, 1.4551). The unadjusted odds ratio for female faculty having any stipend payment was 0.6731 compared to male faculty, 95% CI (0.2555, 1.7729). Adjusted analyses show similar non-significant difference in the amount of stipend payment (p=0.6862) and in odds of having any stipend payment by gender (p=0.4006).

Table 6a: Female/Male Stipend Payment Ratio and Odds Ratio for Any Stipend Payment

	Amount of Stipend Payment			Having any Stipend Payment		
	Female/Male Ratio	95% CI	P value	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	0.8678	(0.5174, 1.4551)	0.5763	0.6731	(0.2555, 1.7729)	0.4183
Adjusted	0.8932	(0.4977, 1.6027)	0.6862	0.6012	(0.1810, 1.9971)	0.4006

Five of the 15 URM faculty members (33.33%) and 21 of the 65 non-URM faculty members (32.31%) received a stipend payment (Table 6b). Table 6b shows no significant difference in the amount of stipend payment (p=0.8502) and in odds having a stipend payment (p=0.9393) by URM status. The unadjusted URM/non-URM ratio of stipend payment was 0.8502, meaning that URM faculty made 85.02% of non-URM (i.e. 14.98% less) stipend payments with 95% CI (0.4489, 1.6104). The unadjusted odds ratio for URM faculty having a stipend payment was 1.0476 when compared to non-URM faculty, 95% CI (0.3119, 3.5186). Adjusted analyses show similar non-significant difference in the amount of stipend payment (p=0.6745) and in odds of having any stipend payment by URM status (p=0.8087).

Table 6b: URM/non-URM Stipend Payment Ratio and Odds Ratio for Any Stipend Payment

	Amount of Stipend Payment			Having any Stipend Payment		
	URM/non-URM Ratio	95% CI	P value	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	0.8502	(0.4489, 1.6104)	0.6049	1.0476	(0.3119, 3.5186)	0.9393
Adjusted	0.8692	(0.4327, 1.7461)	0.6745	0.8350	(0.1900, 3.6696)	0.8087

There were no significant differences in stipend payment by series, rank, degree, and department.

Advancement

Ten of the 36 female faculty members (27.78%) and 9 of the 44 male faculty members (20.45%) had one merit/promotion, 10 females (27.78%) and 14 males (31.82%) had two merits/promotions, 7 females (19.44%) and 13 males (29.55%) had three merits/promotions, and 5 females (13.89%) and no males had four merits/promotions between 2014 and 2020. Unadjusted analyses found statistically significant difference in merits and/or promotions (0, 1, 2, 3, and 4 times) received between 2014 and 2020 by gender, but adjusted analyses did not find statistically significant difference in merits and/or promotions by gender (Table 7). Females had 1.9476 unadjusted odds ratio and 1.1133 adjusted odds ratio of having one or more merit/promotion than males. The unadjusted gender difference was statistically significant (p=0.0344) but the significance disappeared after adjusting for series, rank, step, degree type, and department (p=0.8033).

Table 7: Female vs. Male Odds Ratio for Advancement

	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	1.9476	(1.0508, 3.6098)	0.0344
Adjusted	1.1133	(0.4753, 2.6079)	0.8033

Six of the 15 URM faculty members (40.00%) and 13 of the 65 non-URM faculty members (20.00%) had one merit/promotion, 4 URM faculty (26.67%) and 20 non-URM faculty members (30.77%) had two merits/promotions, 2 URM faculty (13.33%) and 18 non-URM faculty member (27.69%) had three merits/promotions, and 5 non-URM faculty member (7.69%) had four merits/promotions between 2014 and 2020. The unadjusted analysis shows a statistically significant difference (p=0.0041) in merits and/or promotions (0, 1, 2, 3 or 4 times) received between 2014 and 2020 by URM status (Table 8). The odds ratio was 3.7025 for URM faculty having one or more merits/promotions compared to non-URM faculty with 95% CI (1.5196, 9.0214) in the unadjusted analyses. However, while the odds changed to be lower for URM faculty in the adjusted analysis, the difference was no longer significant (p=0.8609) after adjusting for series, rank, series, degree type, and department.

Table 8: URM vs. non-URM Odds Ratio for Advancement

	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	3.7025	(1.5196, 9.0214)	0.0043
Adjusted	0.8958	(0.2592, 3.0961)	0.8609

Accelerated Advancement

Ten out of the 36 female faculty members (27.78%) and 10 out of the 44 male faculty members (22.73%) had at least one accelerated advancement between 2014 and 2020. Because of the small number of faculty having an accelerated advancement, only unadjusted analyses were considered. The unadjusted analyses did not find statistically significant difference in having an accelerated advancement between 2014 and 2020 by gender (Table 10). Females had 1.3075 unadjusted odds ratio of having an accelerated advancement compared to males. However, the gender difference was not statistically significant (p=0.7232).

Table 10: Accelerated Advancement by Gender between 2014 and 2020

	Female	Male	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P value
Accelerated advancement (unadjusted)	10 (27.78%)	10 (22.73%)	1.3075	(0.2913, 5.8695)	0.7232

Two of the 15 URM faculty members (13.33%) and 18 out of the 65 non-URM faculty members (27.69%) had one accelerated advancement between 2014 and 2020. The unadjusted analysis did not find a statistically significant difference in having an accelerated advancement between 2014 and 2020 by URM status (Table 11, p=0.4431). However, the percent of non-URM faculty members who had an accelerated advancement was two times greater than the URM faculty (27.69% vs 13.33%).

Table 11: Accelerated Advancement by URM status between 2014 and 2020

	URM	Non-URM	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P value
Accelerated advancement (unadjusted)	2 (13.33%)	18 (27.69%)	0.4275	(0.0476, 3.8370)	0.4431

Identifying faculty with X + Y salaries more than 1.5 standard errors from predicted pay as estimated by the regression model

Previous years' Campus faculty salary equity reviews have requested identifying faculty members with X+Y salaries that are more than 1.5 standard errors greater than (high outliers) or less than 75% of their predicted pay low outliers) as estimated by the regression models used for these analyses. These faculty members are listed in Table 13. For this report, there were no further specific analyses performed using only the faculty listed in Table 13.

Table 13: Listing of faculty members with X + Y salaries identified as outliers

Outliers	URM Status	Gender	Rank	Series	Step	Department	X+Y Pay	Predicted Pay
Low	Non URM	F	Assistant	HS Clinical	3	OMFS	145,700	251,730
	URM	F	Assistant	HS Clinical	3	OMFS	145,700	251,730
	Non URMa	M	Full	Ladder	2	OFS	161,700	237,582
	Non URMc	F	Full	Clinical X	3	OFS	188,603	262,487
	Non URM	M	Assistant	HS Clinical	3	PRDS	120,000	165,445
High								
	Non URM	M	Full	Ladder	8	PRDS	294,200	200,724
	Non URMaa	M	Full	Ladder	7	OFS	499,285	326,407
	Non URMbb	M	Full	Ladder	5	OFS	470,000	267,643

HIGH SALARY OUTLIERS

For faculty with salary much higher than the expected salary rate (the high salary outliers), each of the schools were requested to address the following questions:

1. Is the home department in control of setting this individual's salary?
    a. If not, who sets the individual's salary? (name and/or role)

2. Does holding a "leadership position" contribute to this compensation?
    a. If yes, what is the leadership role?
    b. If yes, was this leadership position a searched position?

For the School of Dentistry there were 4 high outliers.

Cell and Tissue Biology did not have any high salary outliers

Oral Facial Sciences high salary outliers

Non-URMaa

1. Is the home department in control of setting this individual's salary? A qualified yes due to his practice being in derm/path where they earn high salaries. His salary is high for OFS but not for the Dermatology/Pathology department.

2. Does holding a “leadership position” contribute to this compensation? He is division chair for the Division of Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology, Oral Radiology and vice chair of OFS as of 1/1/22.
    c. If yes, what is the leadership role?
    d. If yes, was this leadership position a searched position? This not related to current chair who has been in her position since 2014 (RJ has been division chair since early 2000).

Non-URMbb

1. Is the home department in control of setting this individual’s salary? NO, this person has had 3 leadership appointments including, division chief of oral facial sciences in the SOD, division chief for genetics in the SOM, and also director of the Institute of Human Genetics.

2. Does holding a “leadership position” contribute to this compensation? YES, this person is division chief of genetics and Institute of human genetics
    a. If yes, what is the leadership role? see above
    b. If yes, was this leadership position a searched position? Unknown, because the positions are in the SOM

Oral and Maxillo-facial Surgery (OMFS) did not have any high salary outliers

Preventive and Restorative Dental Sciences (PRDS)

Non_URM

1. Is the home department in control of setting this individual’s salary? Yes. The faculty member’s grants cover his X’ (salary + benefits) and Y. The faculty member’s funding covers 15% of X and associated benefits. More specifically, about $135k of the salary is supported by his NIH R01 grants.
    a. If not, who sets the individual’s salary? (name and/or role) NA.

2. Does holding a “leadership position” contribute to this compensation? NO. The faculty member does not hold a leadership position.
    a. If yes, what is the leadership role? NA
    b. If yes, was this leadership position a searched position? NA

LOW SALARY OUTLIERS

Matched pair analysis for faculty members with X+Y payment below 75% of the model-predicted salary (Table 14)

Matched pair analysis was performed for faculty members with X+Y payment below 75% of the model-predicted salary (the low salary outliers), identified by Campus-wide analysis, matched to faculty members whose salaries were neither substantially higher nor lower than their predicted salaries. The matching was primarily based on rank, step and department. There were some

pairs with multiple faculty members matched to the faculty members below 75% of the model-predicted salary. When there were no faculty found in the same department, a faculty member from a different department was selected.

Cell and Tissue Biology (CTB)

There were no low salary outliers in the department.

Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery (OMFS)

Low Outliers in OMFS: The faculty members below 75% of the model-predicted salary include both a non-URM and a URM female HS Clinical Assistant Professor, Step 3 in OMFS ($145,700) who are matched with one non-URM male HS Clinical Assistant Professor Step 3 ($257,500) in the same department. The lower paid female faculty members (non-URM and URM) earned $111,800 less than the matched non-URM faculty member.

The non-URM male HS Clinical Assistant Professor Step 3 ($257,500) who is in the same department is an oral and maxillo-facial surgeon with a cranio-facial fellowship who attended dental and medical school. He is the department's cranio-facial surgeon.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: The 2 female 2 faculty members who are low outliers are general dentists who do not practice oral and maxillofacial surgery, thus their revenue generated cannot support a larger salary. Additionally, they provide care for patients with special needs that is a service provided by the department that operates at a financial loss to the department. These two faculty members' salaries are supported by affiliations with Laguna Honda hospital and the UCSF Medical Center. Market forces and limitations in patient care revenue explain the differences in the X+Y salaries.

Action step recommendations: The explanations are reasonable and no action steps are indicated.

Oral Facial Sciences (OFS)

Pair 3 (in OFS' matched-pair analysis table) : The faculty member below 75% of the model-predicted salary is a non-URM female Clinical X Full Professor Step 3 in OFS ($188,603; non-URMc in the table)) and matched with a non-URM female Clinical X Full Professor Step 1 ($202,803; non-URMd) in the same department. The lower paid faculty member (non URMc) earned $14,200 less than the matched non-URMd faculty

Reason for the difference in X+Y: Non-URM faculty is a pediatric specialist, with a productive faculty practice with operating room activity. In the past Non-URMd funded her research from clinical revenue, which she is now taking as salary. The faculty member who is a low outlier is an orthodontist and full professor. Her salary is below 75% of the model-predicted salary

because her Y was not sufficient to result in a salary at or above the model-predicted salary. The Y was based on clinical or research revenue generated.

Pair 4 (in OFS' matched-pair analysis table): The faculty member below 75% of the model-predicted salary is a non-URM male Ladder rank Full Professor Step 2 in OFS ($161,700; Non-URMa) and matched with one non-URM female Ladder rank Full Professor Step 4 ($207,400; Non-URMb) in the same department. The lower paid faculty member (non-URMa) earned $45,700 less than the matched non-URMb ()faculty member.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: The higher paid faculty has a higher step (Step 4) and received a Y due to grant funding, and being hired with a high start-up package; Non-URMa had only 1 shared R01 where Non-URMb has multiple R01s.

Preventive and Restorative Dental Sciences (PRDS)

Pair 3: The faculty member below 75% of the model-predicted salary is a non-URM HS Clinical Assistant Professor Step 3 ($120,000) in PRDS who was matched with one URM HS Clinical Assistant Professor Step 3 ($137,800) in the same department. The lower paid faculty member who is an outlier earned $17,800 less than the matched faculty member.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: The URM faculty member with whom the faculty member who is a low outlier was matched is a student group practice leader (GPL) and in that role receives a Y and a BYN: BYN=$5000 Y=$35K. His X and X'=$97,600. All GPLs receive the same BYN and Y. GPLs apply and are selected for those positions. The dean's office pays for the BYN + Y + X'. The department, PRDS, covers X. GPL's are not eligible for a Z payment.

The low outlier is a new HS Clinical Assistant Professor who is a prosthodontist. In PRDS the salary for prosthodontists was the same regardless of other credentials or charcteristics. His department, PRDS, pays X + X' and Y which brings his salary to $120,000 per year. This is guaranteed for first two years while the faculty member develops his/her faculty practice. PRDS also sponsors the visa and is covering the faculty member's faculty practice overhead (5% dean's tax +20% dept tax + overhead for the first 2 yrs).

Recommended action: The chair's explanation is reasonable and no action is indicated.

Continued on the next page

Table 14: Matched pairs for faculty X+Y paid <75% (low outliers) of the predicted payment identified by campus-wide analysis

URM Status	Gender	Series	Rank	Step	Degree	Dept	X	Y	X+Y	Z	Difference in X+Y
Non URM	F	HS Clin	Assist	3	Clinical	OMFS	145,700	0	145,700	2,099	
Non URM	M	HS Clin	Assist	3	Clinical	OMFS	145,700	111,800	257,500	121,215	-111,800
URM	F	HS Clin	Assist	3	Clinical	OMFS	145,700	0	145,700	0	
Non URM	M	HS Clin	Assist	3	Clinical	OMFS	145,700	111,800	257,500	121,215	-111,800
Non URM	F	Clinic X	Full	3	Clinical	OFS	174,100	14,503	188,603	0	
Non URM	F	Clinic X	Full	1	Combin	OFS	150,200	52,603	202,803	75,025	-14,200
Non URM	M	Ladder	Full	2	Combin	OFS	161,700	0	161,700	0	
Non URM	F	Ladder	Full	4	Combin	OFS	187,100	20,300	207,400	0	-45,700
Non URM	M	HS Clin	Assist	3	Clinical	PRDS	106,000	14,000	120,000	0	
URM	M	HS Clin	Assist	3	Combin	PRDS	106,000	31,800	137,800	72,734	-17,800

Department Level Analyses

Cell and Tissue Biology (CTB)

CTB: There are 6 female and 7 male faculty in CTB, with no faculty who are URM. Except for one adjunct faculty member, all faculty are ladder rank. There were only one female faculty and one male faculty who received a Z payment, and one female faculty and two male faculty who had an accelerated advancement. Females had slightly higher X+Y payment than males but the difference was not significantly different (Table 15). The advancement actions were also not significantly different between females and males (Table 16).

Because of the small sample size, matched pair analyses were conducted, where 5 female faculty were matched with male faculty based on their 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 (Table 17).

Pair 1: The female assistant ladder rank professor in step 4 earned $ 254 more X+Y than the matched male assistant ladder rank professor in step 4. The female faculty had two advancements between 2014 and 2020 and the male faculty had one advancement. Both of them earned a research degree. Both the female and male faculty are non-URM.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: the female faculty member had a higher Y component ($52,200 vs $51,947) due to a higher level of research funding.
Reason for the difference in advancement: The female faculty member has been a member of the faculty longer than the male faculty member. Both have started packets for promotion next year.
Action recommended for differences: the explanations are reasonable and no action is indicated.

Pair 2: The female associate ladder rank professor in step 3 earned $ 130 more X+Y than the matched male full ladder rank professor in step 1. The female faculty member had four advancements while the male faculty member had three advancements between 2014 and 2020. They both earned a research degree. Both the female and male faculty are non-URM.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: the female faculty member had a higher Y component for her salary ($61,900) than the male faculty ($53,170) due to more research grant funding.
Reason for the difference in advancement: the difference in Y is explained by difference in grant portfolio where the female faculty member has a larger grant portfolio than the male faculty member.
Action recommended for differences: the explanations are reasonable and no action is indicated for differences in salary or advancements.

Pair 3: The female full ladder rank professor in step 1 earned $40,570 less X+Y than the matched male full ladder rank professor in step 1. The female faculty had one advancement while the male faculty had three advancements between 2014 and 2020. Both faculty earned a research degree. Both the female and male faculty are non-URM.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: the female faculty member had a lower Y component for her salary ($12,600) than the male faculty ($50,230) due to less grant funding and the female faculty member has chosen to have a lower Y or no Y to be able to apply those funds towards her research laboratory.

Reason for the difference in advancement: The male faculty member has been on faculty longer than the female and has had greater research productivity.
Action recommended: The explanations are reasonable and no action is indicated.

Pair 4: The female full ladder rank professor in step 9 earned $19,800 more X+Y than the matched male full ladder rank professor in step 6. The female faculty had three advancements while the male faculty had one advancement. The female faculty earned a research degree and the male faculty earned research and clinical degrees. Both the female and male faculty are non-URM.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: the female faculty member is in step 9 with a higher X component ($273,000) than the male faculty member (step 6, X component $216,200). The female faculty had no Y component for her salary while the male faculty had a Y component of $37,000 generated from research grant funding.
Reason for the difference in number of advancements: the female faculty member has been on faculty much longer than the male faculty member and is department chair.
Reason for difference in Y: the female faculty member is has chosen not to have a Y payment and instead to apply those funds back into her laboratory.
Action recommended: the explanations are reasonable and no action is indicated.

Pair 5: The female full ladder rank professor in the Above the Scale (A/S) step earned $62,800 more X+Y than the matched male full ladder rank professor in step 6. The female faculty had two advancements and the male faculty had one advancement between 2014 and 2020. The female faculty earned a research degree and the male faculty earned research and clinical degrees. Both the female and male faculty are non-URM.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: the female faculty was in A/S step while the male faculty was in step 6.

Reason for the difference in number of advancements: The male joined faculty several years after the female faculty member and chose to defer his advancement to strengthen his portfolio. He recently had an advancement this year.
Actions recommended: The explanations are reasonable and no actions are indicated.

Table 15: Characteristics of faculty at CTB

	Gender		URM Status		Overall
	Female	Male	URM	Non-URM	
Overall	6 (46.15%)	7 (53.85%)	0 (0.00%)	13 (100.00%)	13
Series					
Ladder rank	6 (100.00%)	6 (85.71%)	0 (0.00%)	12 (92.31%)	12 (92.31%)
In resident	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Clinical X	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
HS clinical	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Adjunct	0 (0.00%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	1 (7.69%)
Rank					
Assistant	1 (16.67%)	2 (28.57%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (23.08%)	3 (23.08%)
Associate	2 (33.33%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	2 (15.38%)
Full	3 (50.00%)	5 (71.43%)	0 (0.00%)	8 (61.54%)	8 (61.54%)

	Gender		URM Status		Overall
	Female	Male	URM	Non-URM	
Step					
1	1 (16.67%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	2 (15.38%)
2	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
3	1 (16.67%)	3 (42.86%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (30.77%)	4 (30.77%)
4	2 (33.33%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (23.08%)	3 (23.08%)
5	0 (0.00%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	1 (7.69%)
6	0 (0.00%)	1 (14.29%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	1 (7.69%)
7	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
8	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
9	1 (16.67%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	1 (7.69%)
A/S	1 (16.67%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (7.69%)	1 (7.69%)
Degree type					
Clinical	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Research	6 (100.00%)	5 (71.43%)	0 (0.00%)	11 (84.62%)	11 (84.62%)
Combination	0 (0.00%)	2 (28.57%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (15.38%)	2 (15.38%)
Other	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
X+Y salary					
Mean ± SD	225,760 ± 66,267	204,260 ± 49,233	-	213,218 ± 55,150	213,218 ± 55,150
Median	203,500	200,900	-	202,135	202,135
Z payment					
Mean ± SD	1,167 ± 2,858	5,685 ± 15,040	-	3,599 ± 11,045	3,599 ± 11,045
Median	0	0	-	0	0
>0	1 (16.67%)	1 (14.29%)	-	2 (15.38%)	2 (15.38%)
Advancement					
0	0 (0.00%)	1 (14.29%)	-	1 (3.33%)	1 (3.33%)
1	1 (16.67%)	2 (28.57%)	-	3 (10.00%)	3 (10.00%)
2	2 (33.33%)	1 (14.29%)	-	3 (20.00%)	6 (20.00%)
3	1 (16.67%)	3 (42.86%)		4 (40.00%)	12 (40.00%)
4	2 (33.33%)	0 (0.00%)		2 (26.67%)	8 (26.67%)
Accelerated Advancement	1 (6.25%)	2 (14.29%)	-	3 (10.00%)	3 (10.00%)

Table 16: Unadjusted Female/Male X+Y Salary Ratio and Advancement Odds Ratio for CTB

	Female/Male Ratio	95% CI	P value
X+Y	1.0972	(0.7749, 1.5536)	0.5655
Advancement*	-	-	0.4130

* Not able to calculate an odds ratio for Advancement because there were no female faculty members who did not have an advancement.

Continued on next page

Table 17: CTB Matched Pair X+Y, Advancement and Accelerated Advancement

Pair	URM Status	Gender	Series	Rank	Step	Degree	X	Y	X+Y	Z	# Adv	# Accl	Difference in X+Y
1	Non URM	F	Ladder	Assist	4	Research	121,300	52,200	173,500	7,000	2	0	254
	Non URM	M	Ladder	Assist	4	Research	121,300	51,947	173,247	0	1	0	
2	Non URM	F	Ladder	Assoc	3	Research	141,600	61,900	203,500	0	4	0	130
	Non URM	M	Ladder	Full	1	Research	150,200	53,170	203,370	0	3	0	
3	Non URM	F	Ladder	Full	1	Research	150,200	12,600	162,800	0	1	0	-40,570
	Non URM	M	Ladder	Full	1	Research	150,200	53,170	203,370	0	3	0	
4	Non URM	F	Ladder	Full	9	Research	273,000	0	273,000	0	3	2	19,800
	Non URM	M	Ladder	Full	6	Combin	216,200	37,000	253,200	0	1	0	
5	Non URM	F	Ladder	Full	A/S	Research	316,000	0	316,000	0	2	0	62,800
	Non URM	M	Ladder	Full	6	Combin	216,200	37,000	253,200	0	1	0	

Continued on next page

Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery (OMFS)

OMFS: There are 3 female and 9 male faculty, with 3 URM and 9 non-URM faculty in OMFS (Table 18). One female faculty and four male faculty, one URM faculty and four non-URM faculty received Z payments. The female faculty members' Z payment was noticeably lower than the male faculty members' Z payments. The URM faculty member received higher Z payment than the non-URM's Z payment (Table 21). One female faculty and three male faculty, and one URM faculty and three non-URM faculty received at least one accelerated advancement (Table 18). Except for one ladder rank faculty, all faculty are in the HS clinical professor series. Females received significantly lower unadjusted X+Y payment (salary ratio) than males (54% less, p=0.0004) (Table 19), but there was no statistically significant difference in unadjusted X+Y payment (salary ratio) by URM status (Table 20)

Because of the small sample size, matched pair analyses were conducted, where 2 female faculty members were matched with 2 male faculty members, and three URM faculty were matched with non-URM faculty based on their series, rank, step, degree type, and gender (Table 21).

Pair 1: The female assistant HS clinical professor in step 3 earned $ 111,800 less X+Y than the matched male assistant HS clinical professor in step 3. The female and male faculty each had one advancement between 2014 and 2020. They both earned clinical degrees and are non URM.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: The female member is a general dentist who do not practice oral and maxillofacial surgery, thus her revenue generated cannot support a larger salary. Additionally, she provides care for patients with special needs, a service provided by the department that operates at a financial loss to the department. The female faculty member's salary is supported by affiliations with Laguna Honda hospital and the UCSF Medical Center. Market forces and limitations in patient care revenue explain the differences in the X+Y salaries.

Action step recommendations: The explanations are reasonable and no action steps are indicated.

Pair 2: The female associate HS clinical professor in step 3 earned $ 65,000 less X+Y than the matched male assistant HS clinical professor in step 4. The female faculty had three advancements and male faculty had two advancements between 2014 and 2020. They both earned clinical degrees and are non URM.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: the female faculty member had a higher X component than the male faculty due to higher rank, but the female faculty had a much lower Y salary component ($80,300 vs 186,900) due to differences in clinical revenue generated. Also, 80% of the female faculty member's effort is funded by the dean's office. She teaches and practices with the General Practice Residents with the oncology group and in the UCSF Medical Center. Due to the low revenue generated it is not sufficient to generate a Z payment from the practice.

Reason for the difference in advancement: The male faculty member just recently joined the department, and has been in the department for a considerably shorter period of time than the female faculty member.

Action step recommendations: The explanations are reasonable and no action steps are indicated.

Pair 3: The female URM assistant HS clinical professor in step 3 earned $111,800 less X+Y than the matched male non-URM assistant HS clinical professor in step 3. Both the female URM faculty and the non URM faculty had one advancement. Both members of this pair earned clinical degrees.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: the URM female faculty member did not have a Y component for her salary due to limitations in practice revenue generation and market dynamics associated with being a general dentist instead of an oral and maxillo-facial surgeon.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: The female member is a general dentist who do not practice oral and maxillofacial surgery, thus her revenue generated cannot support a larger salary. Additionally, she provides care for patients with special needs, a service provided by the department that operates at a financial loss to the department. The female faculty member's salary is supported by affiliations with Laguna Honda hospital and the UCSF Medical Center. Market forces and limitations in patient care revenue explain the differences in the X+Y salaries.

Action step recommendations: The explanations are reasonable and no action steps are indicated.

Pair 4: The URM assistant HS clinical professor in step 2 earned $5,000 less X+Y than the matched non-URM assistant HS Clinical professor in step 4. The URM faculty had no advancements between 2014 and 2020, and the non-URM faculty had 2 advancements. Both faculty members earned clinical degrees.

The reason for the difference in X+Y: the URM faculty member had a lower X component than the non-URM faculty due to the difference in step, but the URM faculty had a higher Y salary component ($186,900) than the non-URM faculty ($176,100) due to differences in clinical revenue generated and the department chair's negotiations with Highland Hospital in hiring the URM faculty member.

The reason for the difference in advancement: The URM faculty member was hired in 2021 while the non-URM faculty member has been on faculty for a sufficiently longer period of time to have had two advancements.

Action step recommendations: The explanations are reasonable and no action steps are indicated.

Pair 5: The male URM assistant HS clinical professor in step 4 earned $10,000 more X+Y than the matched male non-URM assistant HS clinical professor in step 4. The URM faculty had three advancements, one of which was an accelerated advancement, and the non-URM faculty had 2 advancements, one of which was accelerated, between 2014 and 2020. They both earned clinical degrees.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: the URM faculty member had a higher Y component ($186,000 vs. 176,100) than the non-URM faculty due to market forces dictating the need for the Y to successfully recruit the URM faculty member.

Action step recommendations: The explanations are reasonable and no action steps are indicated.

Table 18: Characteristics of faculty in OMFS

	Gender		URM Status		Overall
	Female	Male	URM	Non-URM	
Overall	3 (25.00%)	9 (75.00%)	3 (25.00%)	9 (75.00%)	12
Series					
Ladder rank	0 (0.00%)	1 (11.11%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (11.11%)	1 (8.33%)
In resident	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Clinical X	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
HS clinical	3 (100.00%)	8 (88.89%)	3 (100.00%)	8 (88.89%)	11 (91.67%)
Adjunct	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Rank					
Assistant	2 (66.67%)	7 (77.78%)	3 (100.00%)	6 (66.67%)	9 (75.00%)
Associate	1 (33.33%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (11.11%)	1 (8.33%)
Full	0 (0.00%)	2 (22.22%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (22.22%)	2 (16.67%)
Step					
1	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
2	0 (0.00%)	4 (44.44%)	1 (33.33%)	3 (33.33%)	4 (33.33%)
3	3 (100.00%)	2 (22.22%)	1 (33.33%)	4 (44.44%)	5 (41.67%)
4	0 (0.00%)	2 (22.22%)	1 (33.33%)	1 (11.11%)	2 (16.67%)
5	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
6	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
7	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
8	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
A/S	0 (0.00%)	1 (11.11%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (11.11%)	1 (8.33%)
Degree type					
Clinical	3 (100.00%)	8 (88.89%)	3 (100.00%)	8 (88.89%)	11 (91.67%)
Research	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Combination	0 (0.00%)	1 (11.11%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (11.11%)	1 (8.33%)
Other	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
X+Y salary					
Mean ± SD	183,800 ± 65,991	328,833 ± 32,688	270,233 ± 108,110	300,022 ± 70,012	292,575 ± 76,625
Median	145,700	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000
Z payment					
Mean ± SD	670 ± 1,212	39,510 ± 53,502	36,533 ± 63,277	27,566 ± 47,570	29,807 ± 48,890
Median	0	0	0	0	0
>0	1 (33.33%)	4 (44.44%)	1 (33.33%)	4 (44.44%)	5 (41.67%)
Advancement					
0	0 (0.00%)	4 (44.44%)	1 (33.33%)	3 (33.33%)	4 (33.33%)
1	2 (66.67%)	1 (11.11%)	1 (33.33%)	2 (22.22%)	3 (25.00%)
2	0 (0.00%)	2 (22.22%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (22.22%)	2 (16.67%)
3	1 (33.33%)	2 (22.22%)	1 (33.33%)	2 (22.22%)	3 (25.00%)
Accelerated Advancement	1 (33.33%)	3 (33.33%)	1 (33.33%)	3 (33.33%)	4 (33.33%)

Table 19: Female/Male X+Y Salary Ratio

	Female/Male Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	0.5399	(0.4155, 0.7017)	0.0004

Table 20: URM/non-URM X+Y Salary Ratio

	URM/non-URM Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	0.8689	(0.5284, 1.4289)	0.5433

Continued on next page

Table 21: OMFS Matched Pair X+Y, Advancement and Accelerated Advancement

Pair	URM Status	Gender	Series	Rank	Step	Degree	X	Y	X+Y	Z	# Adv	# Accl	Difference in X+Y
1	Non URM	F	HS Clin	Assist	3	Clinical	145,700	0	145,700	2,099	1	0	-111,800
	Non URM	M	HS Clin	Assist	3	Clinical	145,700	111,800	257,500	121,215	1	0	
2	Non URM	F	HS Clin	Assoc	3	Clinical	179,700	80,300	260,000	0	3	1	-65,000
	Non URM	M	HS Clin	Assist	2	Clinical	138,100	186,900	325,000	0	2	1	
3	URM	F	HS Clin	Assist	3	Clinical	145,700	0	145,700	0	1	0	-111,800
	Non URM	M	HS Clin	Assist	3	Clinical	145,700	111,800	257,500	121,215	1	0	
4	URM	M	HS Clin	Assist	2	Clinical	138,100	186,900	325,000	0	0	0	-5,000
	Non URM	M	HS Clin	Assist	4	Clinical	153,900	176,100	330,000	97,458	2	1	
5	**URM**	**M**	**HS Clin**	**Assist**	**4**	**Clinical**	**153,900**	**186,100**	**340,000**	**109599**	**3**	**1**	**10,000**
	Non URM	**M**	**HS Clin**	**Assist**	**4**	**Clinical**	**153,900**	**176,100**	**330,000**	**97458**	**2**	**1**	

Continued on next page

Oral Facial Sciences (OFS)

OFS: There are 13 female and 12 male faculty, and 4 URM and 21 non-URM faculty in OFS.
Female faculty had lower adjusted X+Y salary than male faculty (Salary Ratio=0.89, Table 23) that was not significantly different from male faculty.
URM faculty had similar unadjusted X+Y salary than non-URM faculty (Salary Ratio=0.99, Table 24), and the difference was not statistically significant (Table 24).
The unadjusted odds for any advancement for females was not significantly different than male faculty (OR=0.67, Table 25). Five female and four male non-URM faculty received one accelerated advancement (Table 27a).
URM faculty had smaller unadjusted odds than non-URM faculty for any advancement (OR=0.17, Table 26), but the differences were not statistically significant. One URM faculty and eight non-URM faculty received accelerated advancements.
One female and four male faculty, and one URM faculty and four non-URM faculty received Z payments (Table 22).

Because of the small sample size, matched pair analyses were also conducted (Table 28) , where the 4 URM faculty were matched with non-URM faculty based on their series, rank, step, degree type and gender. If no match was found based on all the criteria, a faculty member was matched as closely as possible.

Pair 1: The male URM HS Clinical associate professor in step 4 earned $50,045 more X+Y than the matched male non-URM Clinical X associate professor in step 4. The URM faculty had no advancement between 2014 and 2020 while the non-URM faculty had three advancements. The URM faculty earned clinical degree and the non-URM faculty earned clinical and research degrees. Both faculty are male.

> Reason for the difference in X+Y: the URM faculty had a higher Y salary component than the non-URM faculty ($114,900 vs $64,895). This person was hired as program director of the pediatric dentistry residency; market forces influenced the higher Y when the URM faculty member was hired in 2020.
>
> Reason for the difference in advancement: The URM faculty member was hired in June 2020 and thus did not have the opportunity for an advancement between 2014 and 2020. The non-URM faculty member changed series from ladder rank to clinical x due to lack of research productivity. The non-URM faculty member's next advancement is proposed for July 22 as Full Professor in the HS series step 2.
>
> Recommended action: The chair's explanation is reasonable and no action is indicated.

Pair 2: The female URM ladder rank full professor in step 6 earned $1,245 less X+Y than the matched female non-URM ladder rank full professor in step 6. Both faculty are female, had two advancements between 2014 and 2020, and earned clinical and research degrees.
Reason for the difference in X+Y: the URM faculty had a lower Y salary component than the non-URM faculty ($75,805 vs $77,050).

The basis of the Y component of their salary is research. For example, in 20-21 30% effort for the non-URM faculty member came from grants

Reason for the difference in Y: The difference is due to the non-URM being OFS chair, and having more grants.

Recommended action: The chair's explanation is reasonable and no action is indicated.

Pair 3: The male URM ladder rank assistant professor in step 3 earned $27,500 more X+Y than the matched male non-URM ladder rank assistant professor in step 4. The URM faculty had one advancement between 2014 and 2020 while the non-URM faculty had two advancements. Both faculty are male and earned clinical and research degrees.
Reason for the difference in X+Y: the URM faculty had a lower X salary component than the non-URM faculty ($114,800 vs. 121,300) due to a lower step, but had a higher Y salary component than the non-URM faculty ($94,200 vs $60,200).

Also, the URM faculty member received $6,473 for a Z payment while the non-URM faculty member did not receive a Z payment.

Reasons for difference in Y payments, advancements, and z payments:

> The URM faculty member is an oral pathologist, has a K23, is a recent hire, and generates revenue from grants and oral pathology practice.
>
> The non-URM faculty member requested a "stop the clock" twice due to 1) tragic life event (their spouse passed away in 2015, and they became a single parent; and 2) This person remarried several years later and the couple had a baby in May 2020 during COVID.
>
> The Orthodontics APU did not generate a Z in 2020 (due to large losses in 2020 when clinics were closed for 3 months), although generated Z payment revenue in 2021 (the non-URM faculty member received a Z for for FY 20-21).

Recommended action: The chair's explanation is reasonable and no action is indicated.

Pair 4: The female URM HS Clinical assistant professor in step 2 earned $19,452 more X+Y than the matched female non-URM HS Clinical assistant professor in step 4. The URM faculty had no advancement between 2014 and 2020 while the non-URM faculty had two advancements. Both faculty members are female and earned clinical degrees.

> Reason for the difference in X+Y: the URM faculty had a lower X salary component than the non-URM faculty ($108,800 vs. 121,300) due to a lower step, but had a higher Y salary component than the non-URM faculty ($71,200 vs $39,275). The difference in the Y salary is due to the URM faculty member being a pediatric dentist with a faculty practice that includes operating room activity. Additionally, she was hired in August 2020 as part of a HRSA grant that covers part of her salary. The non-URM faculty member had 2 maternity leaves in the past 3 years (including a 6-month leave starting in March 2021) that prevented her from generating a larger Y, and the periodontal faculty's APU is very small (mainly 2 faculty in faculty practice, making it difficult for the APU to cover any salary differential).

Recommended action: The chair's explanation is reasonable and no action is indicated.

Table 22: Characteristics of faculty in OFS

	Gender		URM Status		Overall
	Female	Male	URM	Non-URM	
Overall	13 (52.00%)	12 (48.00%)	4 (16.00%)	21 (84.00%)	25
Series					
Ladder rank	6 (46.15%)	7 (58.33%)	2 (50.00%)	11 (52.38%)	13 (52.00%)
In resident	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Clinical X	3 (23.08%)	2 (16.67%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (23.81%)	5 (20.00%)
HS clinical	3 (23.08%)	3 (25.00%)	2 (50.00%)	4 (19.05%)	6 (24.00%)
Adjunct	1 (7.69%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (4.00%)
Rank					
Assistant	4 (30.77%)	3 (25.00%)	2 (50.00%)	5 (23.81%)	7 (28.00%)
Associate	3 (23.08%)	3 (25.00%)	1 (25.00%)	5 (23.81%)	6 (24.00%)
Full	6 (46.15%)	6 (50.00%)	1 (25.00%)	11 (52.38%)	12 (48.00%)
Step					
1	2 (15.38%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (9.52%)	2 (8.00%)
2	1 (7.69%)	2 (16.67%)	1 (25.00%)	2 (9.52%)	3 (12.00%)
3	3 (23.08%)	2 (16.67%)	1 (25.00%)	4 (19.05%)	5 (20.00%)
4	4 (30.77%)	4 (33.33%)	1 (25.00%)	7 (33.33%)	8 (32.00%)
5	0 (0.00%)	1 (8.33%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.76%)	1 (4.00%)
6	2 (15.38%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (25.00%)	1 (4.76%)	2 (8.00%)
7	0 (0.00%)	2 (16.67%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (9.52%)	2 (8.00%)
8	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (8.00%)
9	1 (7.69%)	1 (8.33%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (9.52%)	0 (0.00%)
Degree type					
Clinical	7 (53.85%)	5 (41.67%)	2 (50.00%)	10 (47.62%)	12 (48.00%)
Research	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Combination	6 (46.15%)	7 (58.33%)	2 (50.00%)	11 (52.38%)	13 (52.00%)
Other	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
X+Y salary					
Mean ± SD	215,441 ± 51,826	279,680 ± 109,478	236,501 ± 51,126	248,138 ± 95,270	246,276 ± 88,934
Median	202,803	252,500	237,000	214,995	214,995
Z payment					
Mean ± SD	5,771 ± 20,808	26,475 ± 61,671	1,618 ± 3,227	18,393 ± 49,361	15,709 ± 45,510
Median	0	0	0	0	0
>0	1 (7.69%)	4 (33.33%)	1 (25.00%)	4 (19.05%)	5 (20.00%)
Advancement					
0	3 (23.08%)	2 (16.67%)	2 (50.00%)	3 (14.29%)	5 (20.00%)
1	4(30.77%)	3 (25.00%)	1 (25.00%)	6 (28.57%)	7 (28.00%)
2	4 (30.77%)	5 (41.67%)	1 (45.00%)	8 (38.10%)	9 (36.00%)
3	2 (15.38%)	2 (16.67%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (19.05%)	4 (16.00%)
Accelerated Advancement	5 (38.46%)	4 (33.33%)	1 (25.00%)	8 (38.10%)	9 (36.00%)

Table 23: Female/Male X+Y Salary Ratio

	Female/Male Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	0.7979	(0.6189, 1.0285)	0.0788
Adjusted	0.8948	(0.7310, 1.0954)	0.1936

Table 24 URM/non-URM X+Y Salary Ratio

	URM/non-URM Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	0.9934	(0.6857, 1.4391)	0.9707

Table 25: Female vs. Male Odds Ratio for Advancement

	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	0.6667	(0.0909, 4.8876)	1.000

Table 26: URM vs. non-URM Odds Ratio for Advancement

	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	0.1667	(0.0165, 1.6788)	0.1664

Table 27a: Accelerated Advancement by Gender between 2014 and 2020

	Female	Male	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P value
Accelerated advancement	5 (38.46%)	4 (33.33%)	1.2500	(0.2425, 6.4433)	1.0000

Table 27b: Accelerated Advancement by URM status between 2014 and 2020

	URM	Non-URM	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P value
Accelerated advancement	1 (25.00%)	8 (38.10%)	0.5417	(0.0478, 6.1435)	1.0000

Continued on next page

Table 28: OFS URM and non-URM Matched Pair X+Y, Advancement and Accelerated Advancement

Pair	URM Status	Gender	Series	Rank	Step	Degree	X	Y	X+Y	Z	# Adv	# Accl	Difference in X+Y
1	URM	M	HS Clinic	Assoc	4	Clinical	150,100	114,900	265,000	0	0	0	50,045
	Non URM	M	Clin X	Assoc	4	Combin	150,100	64,895	214,955	0	3	0	
2	URM	F	Ladder	Full	6	Combin	216,200	75,805	292,005	0	2	1	-1,245
	Non URM	F	Ladder	Full	6	Combin	216,200	77,050	293,250	0	2	1	
3	URM	M	Ladder	Assist	3	Combin	114,800	94,200	209,000	6,473	1	0	27,500
	Non URM	M	Ladder	Assist	4	Combin	121,300	60,200	181,500	0	2	0	
4	URM	F	HS Clinic	Assist	2	Clinical	108,800	71,200	180,000	0	0	0	19,425
	Non URM	F	HS Clinic	Assist	4	Clinical	121,300	39,275	160,575	0	2	1	

Preventive and Restorative Dental Sciences (PRDS)

PRDS: There are 14 female and 16 male faculty, and 8 URM and 22 non-URM faculty in PRDS (Table 29).

Females had lower mean X+Y salary than males. The unadjusted female to male X+Y salary ratios were significantly different from 1.0 (p=0.0157, Table 30), but the adjusted female to male X+Y ratio, while was not significant (p=0.0648), was still noteworthy. The URM faculty had lower mean X+Y salary. The unadjusted URM/non-URM X+Y salary ratios were statistically different from 1.0 (p=0.0253, Table 31), but adjusted URM/non-URM X+Y ratio was not statistically different (p=0.1988).

Three females and four males, and two URM faculty and five non-URM faculty received Z payments. Females had lower odds for receiving any Z payment (OR=0.82) than males, but the odds ratio was not statistically significant (Table 32a). The female to male unadjusted Z payment ratio was significantly and markedly below 1.0 at 0.13 (Table 32a). URM faculty had higher odds for receiving any Z payment (OR=1.13) than non-URM faculty, but the odds ratio was not statistically significant. The URM to non-URM unadjusted Z payment ratio was below 1.0 at 0.46 (Table 32b), but the ratio was not statistically significant.

Females did not have significantly different odds for any advancement than males (unadjusted, OR=0.87) (Table 33). All the 8 URM faculty (100%) and 91% non-URM faculty received at least one advancement with no significant difference between URM and non-URM faculty (p=1.000, Table 34).

Four female non-URM faculty and one male non-URM faculty received at least one accelerated advancement. Females had greater but insignificantly different odds for accelerated advancement (OR=5.33, Table 35). No URM faculty member had an accelerated advancement (Table 36).

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 (Table 37). Eight URM faculty were matched with non-URM faculty based on their series, rank, step, degree type and gender. If no match was found based on all the criteria, a URM faculty member was matched as closely as possible.

Pair 1: The female URM assistant Ladder rank professor in step 4 earned $7,800 more X+Y than the matched female non-URM assistant in residence professor in step 4. The URM faculty had two advancements between 2014 and 2020 while the non-URM faculty had one advancement. Both faculty members are female and earned a clinical degree. The URM faculty also has a research doctorate. (need to correct error in the dataset).

Reason for the difference in X+Y: The URM faculty had a lower Y component than the non-URM faculty ($35,700 vs. $43,500) due to grant funded Y differences the non-URM faculty member had more grants and grant funding and could negotiate a higher Y). Research faculty are required to fund Y from grants.

Additionally, the URM faculty member was awarded a large grant in 2019. However, due to the salary freeze in FY20, as mandated by the Chancellor, was not able to negotiate a higher salary (Y).

Recommended action: The chair's explanation is reasonable and no action is indicated.

Pair 2: The female URM assistant adjunct professor in step 5 earned $25,100 less X+Y than the matched female non-URM assistant HS Clinical professor in step 4. The URM faculty had one advancement between 2014 and 2020 while the non-URM faculty had two advancements. The non-URM faculty earned a clinical doctorate and the URM earned a research doctorate degree. Reason for the difference in X+Y: The URM faculty had a higher X component than the non-URM faculty ($118,100 vs. 112,000) due to a higher step, but had a lower Y component ($500 vs. 31,700) due to the non-URM being a student Group Practice Leader (GPL). GPL's receive a Y of $35,000 and BYN is $5,00. because she is a GPL.

Reason for the difference in advancement is due to the faculty member who is non-URM being on faculty longer than the URM faculty member.

Recommended action: The chair's explanation is reasonable and no action is indicated.

Pair 3: The male URM adjunct assistant professor in step 3 earned $12,000 less X+Y than the matched male non-URM HS clinical assistant professor in step 3. The URM faculty member had two advancements and the non-URM faculty had no advancements between 2014 and 2020. The URM faculty earned a research degree while the non-URM faculty earned a clinical degree. He receives ~5% salary support from department-state funding, supports about 95% of his salary from eight various research funds. He has been unable to support a higher Y. He has recently received a promotion.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: The URM faculty had a lower Y component ($2,000 vs. 14,000).

Reason for the difference in Y: The non-URM faculty member is a prosthodontist and there is a need, due to market forces, to hire prosthodontists at a level that gives the SOD an opportunity to retain them. The $120,000 (guaranteed salary for first two years) is still very low for a prosthodontist. The prosthodontists spend 20% of their time in faculty practice generating clinical revenue and 80% time teaching. The department retains the revenue during the two-year guaranteed salary period.

Pair 4: The female URM HS clinical associate professor in step 3 earned $ 55,760 less X+Y than the matched female non-URM in resident associate professor in step 3. The URM faculty member had three advancements and the non-URM faculty had four advancements between 2014 and 2020. The URM faculty earned a clinical degree while the non-URM faculty earned a research degree.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: The URM faculty had a lower X component than the non-URM faculty ($95,840 vs. 130,700) due to being in APU1 while the non-URM faculty is in APU2. The URM faculty member also had a lower Y component ($25,200 vs. 46,100).

Reason for difference in Y: The non-URM faculty member has been at UC longer than the URM faculty member and is able to negotiate a higher Y due to grant funding. The non-URM faculty member has a 100% appointment.

The URM faculty member does not have a faculty practice and is therefore APU 1. Additionally, The URM faculty member has chosen to have an 80% appointment.

Reason for the difference in advancement: The URM faculty member has not been on faculty as long as the the non-URM faculty and is eligible for a merit July 1, 2023.

Recommended action: The chair's explanation is reasonable and no action is indicated.

Pair 5: The male URM HS Clinical full professor in step 6 earned $ 29,300 more X+Y than the matched male non-URM HS clinical full professor in step 5. The URM faculty had one advancement and the non-URM faculty had two advancements between 2014 and 2020. Both faculty earned a clinical degree.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: The URM faculty had a higher X component than the non-URM ($199,600 vs. 185,400) due to a higher step, and a higher Y component ($94,700 vs. 79,600) due to to greater administrative responsibility (dept chair (URM) versus program director (non-URM)). The non-RM faculty member's Y is funded by clinical revenue.

The reason for the difference in the X component is due to the difference step. The URM faculty member has been in the UC system longer than the non-URM.

Reason for the difference in advancement: The URM faculty member deferred advancement once.

Recommended action: The chair's explanation is reasonable and no action is indicated.

Pair 6: The female URM HS clinical assistant professor in step 3 earned $6,100 less X+Y than the matched female non-URM HS clinical assistant professor in step 3. The URM faculty had one advancement and the non-URM faculty had two advancements between 2014 and 2020. Both the URM faculty and the non-URM faculty earned a clinical degree.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: The URM faculty had a lower X component than the non-URM faculty ($102,600 vs. 112,000) due to the URM faculty member being in APU1 (because of not being in the faculty practice) and the non-URM faculty member being in APU2. The URM faculty member had a slightly higher Y component ($35,000 vs. 31,700) due to a portion of the non-URM faculty member's Y needed to cover a merit increase in salary.

Reason for the difference in advancement: The non-URM faculty member has more years of service and hence has had more opportunity for advancement.

Pair 7: The non-URM faculty member is an HS Clinical Assistant Professor Step 3 ($120,000; who was matched with one URM HS Clinical Assistant Professor Step 3 ($137,800; in the same department. The non-URM faculty member earned $17,800 less than the matched URM faculty member.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: The URM faculty member with whom the non-URM faculty is matched is a student group practice leader (GPL) and in that role receives a Y and a BYN: BYN=$5000; Y=$35K and an X and X'=$97,600. All GPLs receive the same BYN and Y. GPLs are selected via an application process for those positions. The dean's office pays for the BYN + Y + X'. The department, PRDS, covers X. GPL's are not eligible for a Z payment.

The non-URM faculty member is a new HS Clinical Assistant Professor who is a prosthodontist. His department, PRDS, pays X + X' and Y which brings his salary to $120,000 per year. This is guaranteed for first two years while the faculty member develops his/her faculty practice. PRDS

also sponsors the visa and is covering the faculty member's faculty practice overhead (5% dean's tax +20% dept tax + overhead for the first 2 yrs).

Recommended action: The chair's explanation is reasonable and no action is indicated.

Pair 8: The male URM ladder rank full professor in step 5 earned $103,600 less X+Y than the matched male non-URM ladder rank full professor in step 6. The URM faculty had two advancements and the non-URM faculty had three advancements between 2014 and 2020. The URM faculty earned clinical and research degrees, and the non-URM faculty earned a research degree.

Reason for the difference in X+Y: The URM faculty had a lower X component than the non-URM faculty ($185,400 vs. 199,600) due to a lower step because of previously deferring the next advancement, The URM faculty member had no Y component ($0 vs. 89,400).

Recommended action: The chair's explanation is reasonable and no action is indicated.

Table 29: Characteristics of faculty in PRDS

	Gender		URM Status		Overall
	Female	Male	URM	Non-URM	
Overall	14 (46.67%)	16 (53.33%)	8 (26.67%)	22 (73.33%)	30
Series					
Ladder rank	3 (21.43%)	8 (50.00%)	2 (25.00%)	9 (40.91%)	11 (36.67%)
In resident	2 (14.29%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (9.09%)	2 (6.67%)
Clinical X	1 (7.14%)	1 (6.25%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (9.09%)	2 (6.67%)
HS clinical	6 (42.86%)	5 (31.25%)	4 (50.00%)	13 (31.28%)	11 (36.67%)
Adjunct	2 (14.29%)	2 (12.50%)	2 (25.00%)	2 (9.09%)	4 (13.33%)
Rank					
Assistant	6 (42.86%)	3 (18.75%)	5 (62.50%)	4 (18.18%)	9 (30.00%)
Associate	2 (14.29%)	1 (6.25%)	1 (12.50%)	2 (9.09%)	3 (10.00%)
Full	6 (42.86%)	12 (75.00%)	2 (25.00%)	16 (72.73%)	18 (60.00%)
Step					
1	2 (14.29%)	2 (12.50%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (18.18%)	4 (13.33%)
2	3 (21.43%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (13.64%)	3 (10.00%)
3	3 (21.43%)	5 (31.25%)	3 (37.50%)	5 (22.73%)	8 (26.67%)
4	4 (28.57%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (25.00%)	2 (9.09%)	4 (13.33%)
5	2 (14.29%)	3 (18.75%)	2 (25.00%)	3 (13.64%)	5 (16.67%)
6	0 (0.00%)	2 (12.50%)	1 (12.50%)	1 (4.55%)	2 (6.67%)
7	0 (0.00%)	1 (6.25%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.55%)	1 (3.33%)
8	0 (0.00%)	2 (12.50%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (9.09%)	2 (6.67%)
9	0 (0.00%)	1 (6.25%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (4.55%)	1 (3.33%)
Degree type					
Clinical	8 (57.14%)	7 (43.75%)	4 (50.00%)	11 (50.00%)	15 (50.00%)
Research	5 (35.71%)	5 (31.25%)	2 (25.00%)	8 (36.36%)	5 (16.67%)
Combination	1 (7.14%)	4 (25.00%)	2 (25.00%)	3 (13.64%)	10 (33.33%)
Other	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
X+Y salary					
Mean ± SD	159,849 ± 26,972	212,631 ± 65,715	156,305 ± 60,538	199,525 ± 52,745	187,999 ± 57,246
Median	162,750	198,500	137,700	185,400	180,870

Z payment Mean ± SD Median >0	5,075 ± 14,402 0 3 (21.43%)	32,534 ± 62,423 0 4 (25.00%)	10,520 ± 25,454 0 2 (25.00%)	23,065 ± 54,036 0 5 (22.73%)	19,720 ± 47,985 0 7 (23.33%)
Advancement 0 1 2 3 4	 1 (6.25%) 3 (18.75%) 5 (31.25%) 3 (18.75%) 4 (25.00%)	 1 (5.88%) 3 (17.65%) 6 (35.29%) 7 (41.18%) 0 (0.00%)	 0 (0.00%) 4 (44.44%) 4 (44.44%) 1 (11.11%) 0 (0.00%)	 2 (8.33%) 2 (8.33%) 7 (29.17%) 9 (37.50%) 4 (16.67%)	 2 (6.06%) 6 (18.18%) 11 (33.33%) 10 (30.30%) 4 (12.12%)
Accelerated Advancement	4 (28.57%)	1 (6.25%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (22.73%)	5 (16.67%)

Table 30: Female/Male X+Y Salary Ratio

	Female/Male Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	0.7779	(0.6370, 0.9501)	0.0157
Adjusted	0.8703	(0.7500, 1.0100)	0.0648

Table 31: URM/non-URM X+Y Salary Ratio

	URM/non-URM Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	0.7679	(0.6107, 0.9655)	0.0253
Adjusted	0.9078	(0.7774, 1.060)	0.1988

Table 32a: Female/Male Z Payment Ratio and Odds Ratio for Any Z Payment

	Amount of Z Payment			Having any Z Payment		
	Female/Male Ratio	95% CI	P value	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	0.1254	(0.0266, 0.5924)	0.0185	0.8182	(0.1376, 4.8658)	0.8193

Table 32b: URM/non-URM Z Payment Ratio and Odds Ratio for Any Z Payment

	Amount of Z Payment			Having any Z Payment		
	URM/non-URM Ratio	95% CI	P value	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	0.4605	(0.0232, 9.1458)	0.5344	1.1333	(0.1720, 7.4685)	1.0000

Table 33: Female vs. Male Odds Ratio for any Advancement

	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	0.8667	(0.0492, 15.2905)	1.000

Table 34: URM vs. non-URM Odds Ratio for any Advancement

	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	-	-	1.000

Table 35: Accelerated Advancement Odds Ratio by Gender between 2014 and 2020

	Female	Male	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	4 (25.00%)	1 (7.14%)	5.3333	(0.5264, 54.0541)	0.1748

Table 36: Accelerated Advancement Odds Ratio by URM status between 2014 and 2020

	URM	Non-URM	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P value
Unadjusted	0 (0.00%)	5 (22.73%)	0	-	0.2900

Continued on next page

Table 37: PRDS URM and non URM Matched Pair X+Y, Advancement and Accelerated Advancement

Pair	URM Status	Gender	Series	Rank	Step	Degree	X	Y	X+Y	Z	# Adv	# Accl	Difference in X+Y
1	URM	F	Ladder	Assist	4	Clinical	112,000	35,700	147,700	0	2	0	7,800
	Non URM	F	In Res	Assist	4	Clinical	112,000	43,500	155,500	0	1	0	
2	URM	F	Adjunct	Assist	5	Research	118,100	500	118,600	0	1	0	-25,100
	Non URM	F	HS Clin	Assist	4	Research	112,000	31,700	143,700	0	2	0	
3	URM	M	Adjunct	Assist	3	Research	106,000	2,000	108,000	0	2	0	-12,000
	Non URM	M	HS Clin	Assist	3	Clinical	106,000	14,000	120,000	0	0	0	
4	URM	F	HS Clin	Assoc	3	Clinical	95,840	25,200	121,040	0	3	0	-55,760
	Non URM	F	In Res	Assoc	3	Research	130,700	46,100	176,800	0	4	0	
5	URM	M	HS Clin	Full	6	Clinical	199,600	94,700	294,300	0	1	0	29,300
	Non URM	M	HS Clin	Full	5	Clinical	185,400	79,600	265,000	176,194	2	0	
6	URM	F	HS Clin	Assist	3	Combin	102,600	35,000	137,600	11,429	1	0	-6,100
	Non URM	F	HS Clin	Assist	3	Clinical	112,000	31,700	143,700	0	2	0	
7	URM	M	HS Clin	Assist	3	Combin	106,000	31,800	137,800	72,734	1	0	17,800
	Non URM	M	HS Clin	Assist	3	Clinical	106,000	14,000	120,000	0	0	0	
8	URM	M	Ladder	Full	5	Combin	185,400	0	185,400	0	2	0	-103,600
	Non URM	M	Ladder	Full	6	Research	199,600	89,400	289,000	0	3	2	

Discussion, Conclusions and Action Plan

Please refer to the Executive Summary for the discussion, conclusions and action plan for this report.