

University of California, San Francisco – School of Nursing Faculty Salary Equity Review 2022 Report

Catherine Waters
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Purpose

The purpose of the UCSF School of Nursing (SON) Faculty Salary Equity Review (FSER) analysis was to determine the presence and size of imbalance in faculty salary (X+Y), clinical Z-payment, administrative stipend, and accelerated advancement by gender identification and underrepresented minority (URM) status. Data for this review were from the period of July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021 for X+Y salary, July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021 for clinical Z-payment and administrative stipend, and July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2021 for accelerated advancement.

Methodology

Analysis of the UCSF SON data followed the UCSF FSER Committee's guidelines. The UCSF Office of Faculty and Academic Affairs and Human Resources provided data for SON faculty members appointed at 75% or greater full-time equivalent. The SON has four departments: Community Health Systems, Family Health Care Nursing, Physiological Nursing, and Social and Behavioral Sciences, which includes the Institute for Health and Aging. Because of the small size of the SON faculty, only a school-level analysis was conducted.

Gender identification was coded as female, male, or unidentified. Race/ethnicity was recoded as URM or non-URM. Per the UCSF campus definition, URM refers to the following racial/ethnic groups: Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino/Latinx, American Indian/Alaska Native, Filipino/Filipinx, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, or Vietnamese. All other racial/ethnic groups are classified as non-URM.

X+Y salaries were annualized to full-time status by dividing by the percent effort of appointment and then log transformed to reduce the possible influence of a very few high salaries, and to interpret results in terms of percent differences in median salaries. Although there were no extreme salaries in the SON data, log-transformed data were used in the SON analyses to be comparable to the UCSF FSER campus analysis.

Multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to test for imbalance in the log-transformed X+Y salary between URM and non-URM faculty members or between female and male faculty members. Coefficients from the regression analyses were back-transformed to obtain a ratio interpretation. The results are reported with unadjusted and adjusted estimates of the relative ratio with 95% confidence intervals (CI). Covariables included in the adjusted models were step, rank (Assistant, Associate, or Full), degree type (Research Doctorate, Clinical Doctorate, or Other), series (Ladder/In Residence, Clinical X/HS Clinical, or Adjunct), and department (Community Health Systems, Family Health Care Nursing, Physiological Nursing, or Social and Behavioral Sciences).

Residual analyses were conducted to determine the difference between actual X+Y salary and X+Y salary predicted by the statistical model. Low outliers were actual X+Y salaries lower than

75% of the predicted X+Y salary (standardized residual < 1.5). High outliers were actual X+Y salaries higher than 140% of the predicted X+Y salary (standardized residual > 1.5).

Matched pairs analyses in X+Y salary were conducted for all nine male faculty members and matched female faculty members, and for all 19 URM faculty members and matched non-URM faculty members. Pairs were matched on series, rank, step, and APU level (1, 2, or 3).

Presence of any clinical Z-payment, administrative stipend, and accelerated advancement, coded as *yes* or *no*, was compared between male and female faculty members or between URM and non-URM faculty members, using the Chi-square test of proportions and Fisher's exact test. Group sample sizes were too small to warrant adjusted analyses through logistic regression.

Amount of median clinical Z-payment and administrative stipend is reported by gender identification and URM status. Residual analyses were conducted to determine the difference between actual clinical Z-payment and clinical Z-payment predicted by the statistical model.

Statistical significance for all analyses was set at $p \leq .05$, two-tailed. Data were analyzed using R v4.1.0.

Findings

Following a description of the characteristics of the SON faculty, results are presented by gender identification and URM status for X+Y salary, clinical Z-payment, administrative stipend, and accelerated advancement. Finally, results of the residual analyses for X+Y salary and clinical Z-payment are presented.

Overall, step and rank were highly significant, with X+Y salary increasing as step and rank increased. The only other significant variable was being a faculty member in the Community Health Systems department, which had a higher X+Y salary than the reference of Family Health Care Nursing department (ratio 1.105, 95% CI: 1.024, 1.193; $p = 0.01$).

Characteristics of the School of Nursing Faculty

The SON had 92 faculty members (see Appendix A). Seventy-eight (84.8%) faculty members were listed as female, 9 (9.8%) as male, and 5 (5.4%) as unidentified. Nineteen (20.7%) faculty members were categorized as URM, and 73 (79.3%) as non-URM.

For gender identification, the proportion of the faculty at Full Professor rank was, from highest to lowest: males (33.3%, $n = 3$), females (25.6%, $n = 20$), and gender unidentified (60%, $n = 3$). The proportion of the faculty with research doctorates was, from highest to lowest: gender unidentified (80.0%, $n = 4$), males (77.8%, $n = 7$), and females (66.7%, $n = 52$).

For URM status, a lower proportion of non-URM faculty members was at the Full Professor rank (23.3%, $n = 17$) compared to URM faculty members (47.4%, $n = 9$). The proportion of faculty with research doctorates was higher in the URM faculty (79.0%, $n = 15$) compared to the non-URM faculty (65.8%, $n = 48$).

Gender Comparison in Compensation and Accelerated Advancement

X+Y Salary. The unadjusted and adjusted analyses, controlling for step, rank, degree type, series, and department, did not indicate a statistically significant imbalance in X+Y salary between male and female faculty members (see Table 1). The unadjusted male-to-female ratio of X+Y salary was 0.918 (95% CI: 0.767, 1.099), $p = .35$.

Table 1. *Male-to-Female X+Y Salary Ratio*

	Ratio	95% Confidence Interval
Male-to-Female		
Unadjusted	0.918	(0.767, 1.099)
Adjusted	0.979	(0.886, 1.081)
Unidentified-to-Female		
Unadjusted	0.837	(0.662, 1.060)
Adjusted	0.936	(0.886, 1.075)

After controlling for step, rank, degree type, series, and department, the adjusted ratio of X+Y salary was 0.979 (95% CI: 0.886, 1.081). The results indicate the adjusted X+Y salary of the male faculty was 97.9% (or 2.1% less) that of the adjusted X+Y salary of the female faculty, but the difference was not statistically significant ($p = .67$). The result is a flip of previous years (see Table 2). However, we note the small sample sizes (total and percentage of male faculty members).

Table 2. *Adjusted Male-to-Female X+Y Salary Ratio (2015-2022)*

	Report Year				
	2015 ($n = 75$)	2017 ($n = 86$)	2018 ($n = 92$)	2019 ($n = 96$)	2022 ($n = 92$)
Ratio	0.97	0.96	0.93	0.94	1.02
95% CI	(0.89, 1.05)	(0.88, 1.04)	(0.84, 1.03)	(0.85, 1.05)	(0.89, 1.08)

The median X+Y salary was \$149,350 for the female faculty, \$137,732 for the male faculty, and \$114,539 for the gender unidentified faculty. See Appendix B for median X+Y salaries and salary ratios by gender identification in rank, degree type, series, and department.

The small percentage of male faculty members (9.8%, $n = 9$) did not provide sufficient power to detect a statistically significant difference in X+Y salary between male and female faculty members unless the effect is large, and even less so for gender unidentified faculty members (5.4%, $n = 5$).

Of the nine matched pairs, eight cases were exact matches; one case was a close match (see Appendix C). The matched pairs analyses indicate five male faculty members earned a lower X+Y salary compared to matched female counterparts; the salary gap amounts were \$6,926, \$8,021, \$9,939, \$25,104, and \$35,283. Four male faculty members earned a higher X+Y

salary as compared to matched female counterparts; the salary gap amounts were \$10,725, \$25,164, \$25,350, and \$74,880. The salary gaps were in the Y-salary or APU level, and were attributed to differences in clinical activity or grant productivity.

Clinical Z-Payment. Three of the nine male faculty members received a Z-payment (33.3%, *Md* = \$15,679). Twenty-six of the 78 female faculty members received a Z-payment (33.3%, *Md* = \$11,993), and one of the five gender unidentified faculty members received a Z-payment (20.0%, \$10,520). The difference in the proportion of Z-payment between male and female faculty members was not statistically significant (two-tailed, Fisher’s exact $p = 1.000$). See Appendix D for the presence of Z-payment proportions and median Z-payment amounts by gender identification in rank, degree type, series, and department.

Administrative Stipend. One gender unidentified faculty member received a stipend of \$11,651; no male faculty members received a stipend; and nine female faculty members received stipends (8 of these 9 faculty members received \$10,000, and one received \$6,667). A Fisher’s exact test for presence of stipend was not significant ($p = .45$), although very likely to be underpowered.

Accelerated Advancement. One of the nine male faculty members (11.1%), one of the five gender unidentified faculty members (20.0%), and 20 of the 78 female faculty members (25.6%) had an accelerated advancement. The difference in the proportion of accelerated advancement between male and female faculty members was not statistically significant (two-tailed, Fisher’s exact $p = 0.77$). See Appendix E for the presence of acceleration proportions by gender identification in rank, degree type, series, and department.

Underrepresented Minority Comparison in Compensation and Accelerated Advancement

X+Y Salary. The unadjusted and adjusted analyses, controlling for step, rank, degree type, series and department, did not indicate a statistically significant imbalance in X+Y salary between URM and non-URM faculty members (see Table 3). The unadjusted URM-to-non-URM ratio of X+Y salary was 0.919 (95% *CI*: 0.805, 1.048), $p = .20$.

Table 3. *URM-to-Non-URM X+Y Salary Ratio*

URM-to-Non-URM	Ratio	95% Confidence Interval
Unadjusted	0.919	(0.805, 1.048)
Adjusted	1.021	(0.948, 1.100)

After controlling for step, rank, degree type, series, and department, the adjusted ratio of X+Y salary was 1.021 (95% *CI*: 0.948, 1.100). The results indicate the adjusted X+Y salary of the URM faculty was 102.1% (or 2.1% more) that of the adjusted X+Y salary of the non-URM faculty, but the difference was not statistically significant ($p = .58$). This review’s result is similar to the previous faculty salary equity review’s result (see Table 4). We note the small sample sizes (total and percentage of URM faculty members).

Table 4. *Adjusted URM-to-Non-URM X+Y Salary Ratio (2015-2022)*

	Report Year				
	2015 (n = 75)	2017 (n = 86)	2018 (n = 92)	2019 (n = 96)	2022 (n = 92)
Ratio	0.93	0.96	0.99	1.02	1.02
95% CI	(0.86, 1.01)	(0.86, 1.03)	(0.92, 1.07)	(0.94, 1.10)	(0.95, 1.10)

The median X+Y salary was \$133,282 for the URM faculty and \$150,200 for the non-URM faculty. See Appendix F for the median X+Y salaries and salary ratios by URM status in rank, degree type, series, and department.

The small percentage of URM faculty members (20.7%, $n = 19$) did not provide sufficient power to detect a statistically significant difference in X+Y salary between URM and non-URM faculty members unless the effect is large.

Of the 19 matched pairs, 18 cases were exact matches; one case was a close match (see Appendix G). The matched pairs analyses indicate six URM faculty members earned a lower X+Y salary compared to matched non-URM counterparts; the salary gap amounts were \$11,163, \$11,620, \$20,604, \$23,687, \$33,420, and \$35,283. Thirteen URM faculty members earned a higher X+Y salary as compared to matched non-URM counterparts; the salary gap amounts ranged from \$721 to \$44,857. The salary gaps were in the Y-salary or APU level, and were attributed to differences in clinical activity or grant productivity.

Clinical Z Payment. Four of the 19 URM faculty members received a Z-payment (21.1%, $Md = \$16,152$). Twenty-six of the 73 non-URM faculty members received a Z-payment (35.6%, $Md = \$11,091$). The difference in the proportion of Z-payment between URM and non-URM faculty members was not statistically significant (two-tailed, Fisher’s exact $p = .49$). See Appendix H for the presence of Z-payment proportions and median Z-payment amounts by URM status in rank, degree type, series, and department.

Administrative Stipend. One (5.3%) URM faculty member and nine (12.3%) non-URM faculty members received stipends. The amount of the one URM faculty member’s stipend and seven of the nine non-URM faculty members’ stipends was \$10,000. The amounts of the other non-URM faculty members’ stipends were \$6,667 and \$11,651. A Fisher’s exact test for presence of stipend was not significant ($p = .68$), although very likely to be underpowered.

Accelerated Advancement. Three of the 19 URM faculty members (15.7%) had an accelerated advancement. Nineteen of the 73 non-URM faculty members (26.0%) had an accelerated advancement. The difference in the proportion of accelerated advancement between URM and non-URM faculty members was not statistically significant (two-tailed, Fisher’s exact $p = .55$). See Appendix I for the presence of acceleration proportions by URM status in rank, degree type, series, and department.

X+Y Salary and Clinical-Z Payment Outliers

Based on step, rank, degree type, series, and department, results of the campus residual analyses indicate six faculty members' X+Y salaries were below the predicted model, one faculty member's X+Y salary was above the predicted model, and one faculty member's clinical Z-payment was below the predicted model.

All but one (a URM female) of the six faculty members with a lower-than-predicted X+Y salary were non-URM females (see Appendix J). Five of the faculty members were in the HS Clinical series and one faculty member was in the Clinical X series. To examine the differences between actual and predicted X+Y salaries of the outliers, matched pairs analyses, matched on series, rank, step and APU, were conducted (see Appendix K). Of the six matched pairs, five were exact matches, and one was a close match. The matched pairs analyses indicate two of the lower-than-predicted X+Y salaries were higher than their matches by amounts of \$11,600 and \$5,704. Four of the lower-than-predicted X+Y salaries were lower than their matches by amounts of \$9,877, \$14,248, and \$18,396 ($n = 2$). The salary gaps were attributed to differences in clinical activity.

The one faculty member with a higher (\$199,301) than predicted X+Y salary (\$129,405) was a non-URM female at Full rank in the Adjunct series with high grant productivity. The difference between the actual X+Y salary and the X+Y salary predicted by the statistical model was \$69,896.

The one faculty member with a lower (\$500) than predicted clinical Z-payment (\$7,376) was a non-URM female at Full rank in the HS Clinical series with low clinical activity, as compared to similar faculty members who had higher clinical activity.

Limitations

A limitation of this analysis was the relatively small total sample size of the SON faculty ($n = 92$). The small percentage of male faculty members (9.8%, $n = 9$), gender unidentified faculty members (5.4%, $n = 5$), or URM faculty members (20.7%, $n = 19$) did not provide much power to detect statistically significant ($p \leq .05$) differences between male and female faculty members or between URM and non-URM faculty members, unless the effects were relatively large.

Summary and Conclusion

After adjusting for series, rank, step, degree type, and department, there was a lack of statistical evidence of an imbalance in X+Y salary, clinical Z-payment, administrative stipend, and accelerated advancement between female and male faculty members or between URM and non-URM faculty members. Matched pairs analyses indicated when there were X+Y salary gaps between female and male faculty members or URM and non-URM faculty members, the differences were attributed to clinical activity or grant productivity. This was the case also for lower- and higher-than-predicted X+Y salaries. Although not statistically significant for gender difference, there was a flip in the adjusted female-to-male X+Y salary ratio this year, compared to previous years where the salary ratio was higher for the male faculty. For the second consecutive review, the adjusted URM-to-non-URM X+Y salary ratio was greater for the URM faculty compared to the non-URM faculty, although the difference was not statistically significant.

Action Plan

- Refine the annual salary setting guidance with input from the Nursing Faculty Council, and broadly disseminate the guidelines to the faculty in a timely manner for the annual renewal process to ensure equity, transparency, accountability, accessibility, and clear communication (see Appendix L).
- Initiated three years ago, continue the quality improvement process for salary determination of new faculty hires by fortifying the schoolwide standard procedure.
- Initiated two years ago, continue to negotiate the standard market rate clinical fee schedule for faculty members practicing across various healthcare delivery systems.
- Initiated this past year, continue to offer the annual schoolwide, multiple-sessions *Faculty Development Series* that includes information about salary structure, salary setting and negotiation, annual APU review process, Health Sciences Compensation Plan, advancement pathways, and academic review.
- Developed two years ago, update and evaluate *SID*, a SON's intranet that contains self-paced, faculty development education modules about faculty compensation and advancement policies and procedures, using eLearning technology.
- Reinforce adherence to the schoolwide administrative stipend guidelines to ensure consistent and equitable compensation among academic appointees providing administrative service and leadership.
- Regularly review and modify guidelines to remedy salary, Z-payment, acceleration, and administrative stipend imbalances when such imbalances exist.
- Ensure appointments to leadership positions are the result of an internal or national search, and leadership positions are advertised broadly to maximize access to leadership opportunities for all faculty members.
- Monitor and track the school and campus diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives in the context of state and national nursing faculty population and salary statistics and benchmarks.

Acknowledgments

The UCSF SON Office of Academic Affairs is grateful to Dr. Thomas Hoffmann who replicated the campus-level methodology for the school-level analysis, and to the SON Dean's Council who commented on this report and contributed to the Action Plan. The SON Dean's Council includes the Dean, Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, Department Chairs, Program Directors, and Faculty Council Chair.

Appendices

- Appendix A: Characteristics of the UCSF School of Nursing Faculty
- Appendix B: Median X+Y Salary and Salary Ratio in Rank, Degree Type, Series, and Department by Gender Identification
- Appendix C: Matched Pairs Analyses in X+Y Salary for the Male Faculty
- Appendix D: Presence of Clinical Z-Payment Proportion in Rank, Degree Type, Series, and Department by Gender Identification
Median Clinical Z-Payment in Rank, Degree Type, Series, and Department by Gender Identification
- Appendix E: Presence of Acceleration Proportion in Rank, Degree Type, Series, and Department by Gender Identification
- Appendix F: Median X+Y Salary and Salary Ratio in Rank, Degree Type, Series, and Department by Underrepresented Minority Status
- Appendix G: Matched Pairs Analyses in X+Y Salary by Underrepresented Minority Status
- Appendix H: Presence of Clinical Z-Payment Proportion in Rank, Degree Type, Series, and Department by Underrepresented Minority Status
Median Clinical Z-Payment in Rank, Degree Type, Series, and Department by Underrepresented Minority Status
- Appendix I: Presence of Acceleration Proportion in Rank, Degree Type, Series, and Department by Underrepresented Minority Status
- Appendix J: X+Y Salaries Below the Predicted Model
- Appendix K: Matched Pairs Analyses for X+Y Salaries Below the Predicted Model
- Appendix L: Fiscal Year 2021-2022 Faculty Salary Setting Guidance

Appendix A

Characteristics of the UCSF School of Nursing Faculty (July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021)

Rank by Gender Identification

		Gender		
		Female (n = 78)	Male (n = 9)	Unidentified (n = 5)
Rank	Assistant	34 (43.6%)	2 (22.2%)	2 (40.0%)
	Associate	24 (30.8%)	4 (44.4%)	0 (0.0%)
	Full	20 (25.6%)	3 (33.3%)	3 (60.0%)

Type of Degree by Gender Identification

		Gender		
		Female (n = 78)	Male (n = 9)	Unidentified (n = 5)
Degree	Clinical Doctorate	8 (10.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)
	Other Degree	18 (23.1%)	2 (22.2%)	0 (00.0%)
	Research Doctorate	52 (66.7%)	7 (77.8%)	4 (80.0%)

Rank by Underrepresented Minority (URM) Status

		URM Status	
		Non-URM (n = 73)	URM (n = 19)
Rank	Assistant	33 (45.2%)	5 (26.3%)
	Associate	23 (31.5%)	5 (26.3%)
	Full	17 (23.3%)	9 (47.4%)

Type of Degree by Underrepresented Minority (URM) Status

		URM Status	
		Non-URM (n = 73)	URM (n = 19)
Degree	Clinical Doctorate	7 (9.6%)	2 (10.5%)
	Other Degree	18 (24.7%)	2 (10.5%)
	Research Doctorate	48 (65.8%)	15 (79.0)

Appendix B

Median X+Y Salary and Salary Ratio in Rank, Degree Type, Series, and Department by Gender Identification (n = 92)

		Gender						
		Female (n = 78)		Male (n = 9)		Unidentified (n = 5)		
		n	Median X+Y (\$)	n	Median X+Y (\$)	n	Median X+Y (\$)	Female-to-Male Salary Ratio
Rank	Associate	24	138,500	4	150,866	0	---	0.918
	Assistant	34	187,100	2	172,825	2	167,929	1.08
	Full	20	117,700	3	108,150	3	109,400	1.09
Degree	Clinical Doctorate	8	155,800	0	---	1	150,200	---
	Other Degree	18	135,197	2	194,475	0	---	0.695
	Research Doctorate	52	161,200	7	128,814	4	111,970	1.25
Series	Clinical X/HS Clinical	33	138,500	3	183,950	1	150,200	0.753
	Ladder/In- Residence	30	170,600	5	137,732	1	185,658	1.24
	Adjunct	15	144,904	1	119,800	3	109,400	1.21
Department	Community Health Systems	23	138,500	5	164,000	1	150,200	0.845
	Family Health Care Nursing	26	145,450	1	108,150	0	---	1.34
	Physiological Nursing	13	164,500	1	137,732	0	---	1.19
	Social & Behavioral Sciences	16	168,062	2	140,750	4	111,970	1.19

Appendix C

Matched Pairs Analyses in X+Y Salary for the Male Faculty (*n* = 9)

Case	Gender	Series	Rank	Step	X (\$)	Y (\$)	X+Y (\$)	Gap (\$)
1	Male	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	100,400		100,400	-8,021
	Female	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100		92,100	
	Female	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100		92,100	
	Female	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100	41,182	133,282	
	Female	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100	24,100	116,200	
	Female Mean						108,421	
2	Male	Ladder	Assistant	3	106,000	22,814	128,814	+10,725
	Female	Ladder	Assistant	3	106,000	1,429	107,429	
	Female	Ladder	Assistant	3	97,100	31,649	128,749	
	Female Mean						118,089	
3	Male	Ladder	Assistant	3	97,100	11,050	108,150	-9,939
	Female	Ladder	Assistant	3	106,000	1,429	107,429	
	Female	Ladder	Assistant	3	97,100	31,649	128,749	
	Female Mean						118,089	
4	Male	Adjunct	Associate	3	119,800		119,800	-25,104
	Female	Adjunct	Associate	3	130,700	14,204	144,904	
5	Male	HS Clinical	Associate	3	130,700	74,300	205,000	+74,880
	Female	HS Clinical	Associate	3	127,440		127,440	
	Female	HS Clinical	Associate	3	130,700	2,100	132,800	
	Female Mean						130,120	
6*	Male	In	Associate	2	134,700	29,300	164,000	+25,164
	Female	Residence	Associate	2	124,300	19,281	143,581	
	Female	Ladder	Associate	2	134,700	17,600	152,300	
	Female	Ladder	Associate	2	124,300		124,300	
	Female	Ladder	Associate	2	124,300	10,862	135,162	
	Female Mean						138,836	
7	Male	Ladder	Associate	1	128,100	9,632	137,732	-6,926
	Female	Ladder	Associate	1	128,100	6,200	136,800	
	Female	Ladder	Associate	1	118,200	15,600	152,515	
	Female Mean						144,658	
8	Male	HS Clinical	Full	2	161,700	22,250	183,950	+25,350
	Female	HS Clinical	Full	2	149,300		149,300	
	Female	HS Clinical	Full	2	161,700		161,700	
	Female	HS Clinical	Full	2	161,700		161,700	
	Female	HS Clinical	Full	2	161,700		161,700	
	Female Mean						158,600	

Case	Gender	Series	Rank	Step	X (\$)	Y (\$)	X+Y (\$)	Gap (\$)
9	Male	Ladder	Full	2	161,700		161,700	-35,283
	Female	Ladder	Full	2	161,700	15,000	176,700	
	Female	Ladder	Full	2	161,700	68,600	230,300	
	Female	Ladder	Full	2	161,700	22,250	183,950	
	Female Mean						196,983	

*Not an exact match.

Appendix D

Presence of Clinical Z-Payment Proportion in Rank, Degree Type, Series, and Department by Gender Identification (*n* = 92)

		Gender					
		Female (<i>n</i> = 78)		Male (<i>n</i> = 9)		Unidentified (<i>n</i> = 5)	
		Z-Presence		Z-Presence		Z-Presence	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Rank	Associate	24	45.8	4	25.0	0	---
	Assistant	34	47.1	2	50.0	2	50.0
	Full	20	40.0	3	33.3	3	0.0
Degree	Clinical Doctorate	8	62.5	0	---	1	100.0
	Other Degree	18	66.7	2	100.0	0	---
	Research Doctorate	52	34.6	7	14.3	4	0.0
Series	Clinical X/HS Clinical	33	63.6	3	100.0	1	100.0
	Ladder/In- Residence	30	40.0	5	0.0	1	0.0
	Adjunct	15	13.3	1	0.0	3	0.0
Department	Community Health Systems	23	60.9	5	60.0	1	100.0
	Family Health Care Nursing	26	46.2	1	0.0	0	---
	Physiological Nursing	13	30.8	1	0.0	0	---
	Social & Behavioral Sciences	16	31.2	2	0.0	4	0.0

**Median Clinical Z-Payment in Rank, Degree Type, Series, and Department
by Gender Identification (n = 92)**

		Gender					
		Female (n = 78)		Male (n = 9)		Unidentified (n = 5)	
		n	Median Z (\$)	n	Median Z (\$)	n	Median Z (\$)
Rank	Associate	11	10,697	1	46,300	0	---
	Assistant	16	10,000	1	15,679	1	22,171
	Full	8	19,864	1	9,760	0	---
Degree	Clinical Doctorate	5	12,500	0	---	1	22,171
	Other Degree	12	19,613	2	30,989	0	---
	Research Doctorate	18	10,000	1	9,760	0	---
Series	Clinical X/HS Clinical	21	15,690	3	15,679	1	22,171
	Ladder/In- Residence	12	10,000	0	---	0	---
	Adjunct	2	11,250	0	---	0	---
Department	Community Health Systems	14	10,742	3	15,679	1	22,171
	Family Health Care Nursing	12	13,193	0	---	0	---
	Physiological Nursing	4	5,833	0	---	0	---
	Social & Behavioral Sciences	5	10,000	0	---	0	---

Appendix E

Presence of Acceleration Proportion in Rank, Degree Type, Series, and Department by Gender Identification (*n* = 92)

		Gender					
		Female		Male		Unidentified	
		Presence of Acceleration		Presence of Acceleration		Presence of Acceleration	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Rank	Associate	24	29.2	4	25.0	0	---
	Assistant	34	38.2	2	0.0	2	0.0
	Full	20	0.0	3	0.0	3	33.3
Degree	Clinical Doctorate	8	0.0	0	---	1	0.0
	Other Degree	18	11.1	2	0.0	0	---
	Research Doctorate	52	34.6	7	14.3	4	25.0
Series	Clinical X/HS Clinical	33	9.1	3	0.0	1	0.0
	Ladder/In-Residence	30	43.3	5	20.0	1	0.0
	Adjunct	15	26.7	1	0.0	3	33.3
Department	Community Health Systems	23	34.8	5	20.0	1	0.0
	Family Health Care Nursing	26	23.1	1	0.0	0	---
	Physiological Nursing	13	7.7	1	0.0	0	---
	Social & Behavioral Sciences	16	31.2	2	0.0	4	25.0

Appendix F

Median X+Y Salary and Salary Ratio in Rank, Degree Type, Series and Department by Underrepresented Minority Status (*n* = 92)

		URM (<i>n</i> = 19)		Non-URM (<i>n</i> = 73)		URM-to-non-URM Salary Ratio
		<i>n</i>	Median X+Y (\$)	<i>n</i>	Median X+Y (\$)	
Rank	Associate	5	152,300	23	137,732	1.11
	Assistant	5	185,658	33	184,100	1.01
	Full	9	118,700	17	113,300	1.05
Degree	Clinical Doctorate	2	166,540	7	150,200	1.11
	Other Degree	2	120,240	18	137,097	0.88
	Research Doctorate	15	133,282	48	161,200	0.83
Series	Clinical X/HS Clinical	5	132,800	32	145,450	0.91
	Ladder/In-Residence	10	147,940	26	177,075	0.84
	Adjunct	4	153,306	15	121,884	1.26
Department	Community Health Systems	5	133,282	24	144,737	0.92
	Family Health Care Nursing	5	118,700	22	154,650	0.77
	Physiological Nursing	3	138,600	11	172,700	0.80
	Social & Behavioral Sciences	6	169,884	16	139,952	1.21

Note. URM = Underrepresented minority.

Appendix G

Matched Pairs Analyses in X+Y Salary for the Underrepresented Minority Faculty (n = 19)

Case	URM Status	Series	Rank	Step	X (\$)	Y (\$)	X+Y (\$)	Gap (\$)
1	URM	Adjunct	Assistant	3	97,100	6,276	103,376	-11,163
	Non-URM	Adjunct	Assistant	3	106,000	8,539	114,539	
2	URM	Adjunct	Assistant	3	97,100	31,144	128,544	+14,005
	Non-URM	Adjunct	Assistant	3	106,000	8,539	114,539	
3	URM	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100	24,100	116,200	+21,333
	Non-URM	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	100,400		100,400	
	Non-URM	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100		92,100	
	Non-URM	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100		92,100	
	Non-URM Mean						94,867	
4	URM	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100	41,182	133,282	+38,415
	Non-URM	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	100,400		100,400	
	Non-URM	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100		92,100	
	Non-URM	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100		92,100	
	Non-URM Mean						94,867	
5	URM	HS Clinical	Assistant	3	95,400	6,480	101,880	-23,687
	Non-URM	HS Clinical	Assistant	3	106,000	7,300	113,300	
	Non-URM	HS Clinical	Assistant	3	106,000		106,000	
	Non-URM	HS Clinical	Assistant	3	114,800	42,600	157,400	
	Non-URM Mean						125,567	
6	URM	Ladder	Assistant	3	106,000	22,814	128,814	+21,385
	Non-URM	Ladder	Assistant	3	106,000	1,429	107,429	
7	URM	Ladder	Assistant	3	97,100	11,050	108,150	+721
	Non-URM	Ladder	Assistant	3	106,000	1,429	107,429	
8	URM	Ladder	Assistant	3	97,100	31,649	128,749	+21,320
	Non-URM	Ladder	Assistant	3	106,000	1,429	107,429	
9	URM	Ladder	Assistant	4	112,000	6,700	118,700	+5,400
	Non-URM	Ladder	Assistant	4	112,000	1,300	113,300	
10	URM	Adjunct	Associate	2	124,300	53,768	178,068	+4,184
	Non-URM	Adjunct	Associate	2	134,700	39,184	173,884	
11	URM	HS Clinical	Associate	3	130,700	2,100	132,800	-33,420
	Non-URM	HS Clinical	Associate	3	127,440		127,440	
	Non-URM	HS Clinical	Associate	3	130,700	74,300	205,000	
	Non-URM Mean						166,220	
12*	URM	In Residence	Associate	2	134,700	29,300	164,000	+34,269
	Non-URM	Ladder	Associate	2	124,300		124,300	
	Non-URM	Ladder	Associate	2	124,300	10,862	135,162	

Case	URM Status	Series	Rank	Step	X (\$)	Y (\$)	X+Y (\$)	Gap (\$)
	Non-URM Mean						129,731	
(13)	URM	Ladder	Associate	2	124,300	19,281	143,581	+13,850
	Non-URM	Ladder	Associate	2	124,300	10,862	135,162	
	Non-URM	Ladder	Associate	2	124,300		124,300	
	Non-URM Mean						129,731	
14	URM	Ladder	Associate	2	134,700	17,600	152,300	+22,569
	Non-URM	Ladder	Associate	2	124,300		124,300	
	Non-URM	Ladder	Associate	2	124,300	10,862	135,162	
	Non-URM Mean						129,731	
15*	URM	Adjunct	Full	2	161,700	55,180	216,880	+19,897
	Non-URM	Ladder	Full	2	161,700	68,600	230,300	
	Non-URM	Ladder	Full	2	161,700	15,000	176,700	
	Non-URM	Ladder	Full	2	161,700	22,250	183,950	
	Non-URM Mean						196,983	
16	URM	HS Clinical	Full	1	138,600		138,600	-11,620
	Non-URM	HS Clinical	Full	1	150,200		150,200	
17*	URM	Ladder	Full	1	138,600	47,058	185,658	+44,857
	Non-URM	Adjunct	Full	1	150,200	9,800	160,000	
	Non-URM	Adjunct	Full	1	117,810	3,791	121,601	
	Non-URM Mean						140,801	
18	URM	Ladder	Full	2	161,700		161,700	-35,283
	Non-URM	Ladder	Full	2	161,700	68,600	230,300	
	Non-URM	Ladder	Full	2	161,700	15,000	176,700	
	Non-URM	Ladder	Full	2	161,700	22,250	183,950	
	Non-URM Mean						196,983	
19	URM	Ladder	Full	5	200,900		200,900	-20,604
	Non-URM	Ladder	Full	5	200,900	4,100	205,000	
	Non-URM	Ladder	Full	5	209,900	37,107	238,007	
	Non-URM Mean						221,504	

*Not an exact match.

Appendix H

Presence of Clinical Z-Payment Proportion and Ratio in Rank, Degree Type, Series, and Department by Underrepresented Minority Status (*n* = 92)

		URM (<i>n</i> = 19)		Non-URM (<i>n</i> = 73)	
		Z-Presence		Z-Presence	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Rank	Associate	5	0.0	23	47.8
	Assistant	5	40.0	33	24.2
	Full	9	22.2	17	41.2
Degree	Clinical Doctorate	2	50.0	7	71.4
	Other Degree	2	100.0	18	66.7
	Research Doctorate	15	6.7	48	18.8
Series	Clinical X/HS Clinical	5	60.0	32	68.8
	Ladder/In-Residence	10	0.0	26	15.4
	Adjunct	4	25.0	15	0.0
Department	Community Health Systems	5	20.0	24	62.5
	Family Health Care Nursing	5	20.0	22	40.9
	Physiological Nursing	3	33.3	11	9.1
	Social & Behavioral Sciences	6	16.7	16	6.2

Note. URM = Underrepresented minority.

**Median Clinical Z-Payment in Rank, Degree Type, Series, and Department
by Underrepresented Minority Status (*n* = 92)**

		URM (<i>n</i> = 19)		Non-URM (<i>n</i> = 73)	
		<i>n</i>	Median Z	<i>n</i>	Median Z
Rank	Associate	5	0	23	0
	Assistant	5	0	33	0
	Full	9	0	17	0
Degree	Clinical Doctorate	2	6,250	7	4,320
	Other Degree	2	11,985	18	13,582
	Research Doctorate	15	0	48	0
Series	Clinical X/HS Clinical	5	4,167	32	8,247
	Ladder/In-Residence	10	0	26	0
	Adjunct	4	0	15	0
Department	Community Health Systems	5	0	24	8,247
	Family Health Care Nursing	5	0	22	0
	Physiological Nursing	3	0	11	0
	Social & Behavioral Sciences	6	0	16	0

Note. URM = Underrepresented minority.

Appendix I

Presence of Acceleration Proportion in Rank, Degree Type, Series, and Department by Underrepresented Minority Status (*n* = 92)

Variable	Value	URM		Non-URM	
		<i>n</i>	Presence of Acceleration %	<i>n</i>	Presence of Acceleration %
Rank	Associate	5	20.0	23	30.4
	Assistant	5	20.0	33	36.4
	Full	9	11.1	17	0.0
Degree	Clinical Doctorate	2	0.0	7	0.0
	Other Degree	2	0.0	18	11.1
	Research Doctorate	15	20.0	48	35.4
Series	Clinical X/HS Clinical	5	0.0	32	9.4
	Ladder/In-Residence	10	20.0	26	46.2
	Adjunct	4	25.0	15	26.7
Department	Community Health Systems	5	40.0	24	29.2
	Family Health Care Nursing	5	0.0	22	27.3
	Physiological Nursing	3	0.0	11	9.1
	Social & Behavioral Sciences	6	16.7	16	31.2

Note. URM = Underrepresented minority.

Appendix J

X+Y Salaries Below the Predicted Model (*n* = 6)

Outlier	Gender, URM Status	Actual X+Y (\$)	Predicted X+Y (\$)	Difference (\$)
1	Female, Non-URM	150,200	217,038	-66,838
2	Female, Non-URM	121,300	165,848	- 44,548
3	Female, Non-URM	92,100	126,038	- 33,938
4	Female, Non-URM	92,100	126,038	-33,938
5	Female, URM	116,200	173,162	-56,962
6	Female, Non-URM	141,600	192,699	- 51,099

Note. URM = Underrepresented minority. Standardized residual < 1.5

Appendix K

Matched Pairs Analyses for X+Y Salaries Below the Predicted Model (*n* = 6)

Outlier	Name	Series	Rank	Step	X (\$)	Y (\$)	X+Y (\$)	Gap (\$)
1	Outlier	HS Clinical	Full	1	150,200		150,200	+11,600
	Match	HS Clinical	Full	1	138,600		138,600	
2	Outlier	HS Clinical	Assistant	4	121,300		121,300	-14,248
	Match	HS Clinical	Assistant	4	112,000	23,548	135,548	
3	Outlier	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100		92,100	-18,396
	Match	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100	41,182	133,282	
	Match	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	100,400		100,400	
	Match	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100		92,100	
	Match	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100	24,100	116,200	
	Match Mean						110,496	
4	Outlier	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100		92,100	-18,396
	Match	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100	41,182	133,282	
	Match	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	100,400		100,400	
	Match	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100		92,100	
	Match	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100	24,100	116,200	
	Match Mean						110,496	
5	Outlier	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100	24,100	116,200	+5,704
	Match	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100	41,182	133,282	
	Match	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	100,400		100,400	
	Match	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100		92,100	
	Match	HS Clinical	Assistant	2	92,100		92,100	
	Match Mean						110,496	
6*	Outlier	Clinical X	Associate	3	141,600		141,600	-9,877
	Match	HS Clinical	Associate	3	130,700	74,300	205,000	
	Match	HS Clinical	Associate	3	127,440		127,440	
	Match	HS Clinical	Associate	3	130,700	2,100	132,800	
	Match Mean						155,080	

*Not an exact match.

Appendix L

Fiscal Year 2021-2022 Faculty Salary Setting Guidance

Goal:

- Adopt a salary-setting approach that reflects our School's values, supports our faculty, is responsive to our ongoing financial uncertainties and challenges, and supports our recovery.
- Salary setting is critically important to promote equity across multiple dimensions:
 - Equitable pay among faculty based on fair administration of the SON's Health Sciences Compensation Plan (Comp Plan) without bias due to gender, race/ethnicity or other characteristics;
 - Consideration of systemwide salary guidelines with the goal of maintaining consistent principles across the SON departments and faculty series, ranks and steps; and
 - Recognition of advancement actions and other valued accomplishments.

Plan:

- Eliminate the faculty salary freeze that went into effect on July 1, 2020.
 - Effective July 1, 2021, departments can adjust Y and Z components to recognize available funding and activities valued, per the SON Comp Plan.
 - Retroactive adjustments for FY2020-21 are not allowed.
- Per longstanding practice, renegotiation of total compensation is not allowed after the effective July 1, 2021 date.
 - Any change to total compensation requires Dean's Office approval and a PeopleConnect ticket to Human Resources.
 - Mid-year renegotiation of Y is permitted only in unusual circumstances and requires Vice Provost for Academic Affairs approval.
- Per longstanding practice, an increase in fixed compensation (X+Y) that is at or exceeds 10% requires Dean's Office approval.
- For faculty members whose X+Y was held flat in FY 2020-21 and who would have received an increase in Y under typical circumstances, implement the expected increase in Y in FY 2021-22, effective July 1, 2021. Retroactive adjustments for Y in FY 2020-21, however, are not allowed.
- Departments should review all faculty salaries and make appropriate adjustments to address inequities and to ensure that new imbalances or inequities are not created.
- Departments must submit the final written descriptions of the method used to adjust faculty compensation to the Dean's Office for review to ensure a reasonable level of consistency across departments. The description of the overall salary increase should be quantified (if possible) and include how the increase was influenced by the following considerations: (1) honoring previous written commitments, or (2) other adjustments to maintain or improve equity.
- Departments must communicate the FY 2021-22 faculty salary setting guidance with their faculty by June 30, 2021.

Table 1. Common Scenarios

Scenario	Implementation Guidance
Faculty member receives a merit or promotion in FY 2021-22	FY 2021-22 X+Y can increase if consistent with department’s usual practices and SON Comp Plan
There are changes in the faculty member’s extramural funding, administrative roles, and/or clinical responsibilities in FY 2021-22	FY 2021-22 X+Y can be increased or decreased if renegotiation is consistent with the department’s usual practices and SON Comp Plan
Faculty member negotiates an increase to X+Y with the department chair	FY 2021-22 X+Y can be increased if renegotiation is consistent with department’s usual practices and SON Comp Plan
Significant equity issue is identified that impacts an individual faculty member.	

Process and Timeline:

- Faculty (through Committee on Faculty Welfare and SON Faculty Council) provided feedback on FY 2020-21 faculty salary freeze process. (December 2020)
- Department chairs provide feedback on the FY 2021-22 *Salary Setting Guidance* with the Dean’s Office (June 1, 2021).
 - Department chairs clarify with departmental faculty where the SON has flexibility and what decisions are not flexible (refer to the *Plan* section and *Table 1. Common Scenarios* in this Guidance)
- Dean’s Office shares Final FY 2021-22 *Salary Setting Guidance* with the Faculty via email. (June 2021)
 - Announcements will be made via schoolwide newsletters, department meetings, and individual faculty member meetings with department chairs.
 - PowerPoint presentation will be provided to departments to share with departmental faculty and posted on SID: the SON New Faculty Orientation & Internal Faculty Development CLE [website](#).
- SON Dean’s Office will analyze faculty compensation as a part of the Faculty Salary Equity Review through the VPAA Office. (Fall 2021)

Procedure:

- Department chairs submit the final written descriptions of salary changes to the Dean’s Office for review. The Dean’s Office may suggest modifications to ensure consistency and equity across the SON.
- Human Resources’ deadline for departments to provide renewal information in the Renewal Tool if they want letters to be generated by HR is June 4, 2021.

Faculty Salary Program 2021-22 (Effective October 1, 2021)

On May 14, 2021, UC President Drake [announced](#) that the academic salary scales will increase by a general range adjustment of 3%*, effective October 1, 2021 for faculty in the academic series.

- On October 1, 2021, faculty members whose salaries are limited to X will have their salary adjusted upward, consistent with UC Office of the President October 1, 2021 published academic salary scales for their rank and step.
- On October 1, 2021, faculty members whose salaries have both X and a negotiated Y component, X will be adjusted upward, consistent with UC Office of the President October 1, 2021 published academic salary scales for their rank and step. On October 1, 2021, Human Resources will automatically adjust the Y so that total compensation is unchanged. Total salary increase may occur if Y is reduced to 0.

*The precise amount of adjustments will vary due to rounding. Scales composed of ranges will be incremented in a similar fashion. Salary scales will be published on the UCOP website (<https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/compensation/index.html>) as they become available.