



Faculty Salary Equity Review (FSER)

School of Pharmacy Summary Report

Period covered: July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018

Submitted 2019-05-21

Author: Thomas E. Kearney, PharmD, DABAT, FAACT

1. Highlights of adjusted analyses by Gender

There were no statistically significant differences in X + Y pay between female and male faculty. All gender imbalances (female- and male- preferences) at the Department-level were explained by non-discriminatory legitimate business practices based on a matched-pair analysis and explanatory response from the Department.

There was a school-wide male preference for Median X + Y unadjusted salaries, but a female preference in 2 of 3 Departments. The school-wide male preference was primarily attributed to the proportion of senior male faculty at the Full Professor and Above Scale ranks and their X salary component.

2. Highlights of adjusted analyses by URM status

There were no statistically significant differences in X + Y pay between URM and non-URM faculty. All URM imbalances at the Department-level were explained by non-discriminatory legitimate business practices based on a matched-pair analysis and explanatory response from the Department.

3. Findings/salary adjustments made

No salary adjustments were warranted or of concern.

The salary trajectories varied between clinical and research faculty. Clinical faculty had higher Y salaries at the Assistant rank which then diminished with the Associate and Professor ranks to meet market parity for recruitment. Whereas research faculty had Y salaries that peaked at the Associate rank which was commensurate with grantsmanship.

The determinants of Y salaries were varied by multiple external variables: teaching, administrative and service contributions, sources of funding, retention incentives, scope of research programs, and generation of extramural grant support.

4. Summary of salary analyses for low and high outliers (e.g., justification for salary differences)”

High Outliers: There were 2 female faculty in the Adjunct series at the Professor rank identified. Both had Y salaries commensurate with teaching responsibilities and grant funding.

Low Outliers: There was 1 male faculty in the Ladder Rank series at the Assistant Professor rank identified. He has a combination degree, MD + PhD, and functions as a basic researcher & does not engage in a clinical service. His salary was equitable with 2 other research faculty at the same rank and in the same Department.

5. Action items for coming year from school

The following are the School of Pharmacy guiding principles adopted for future reviews:

- The School of Pharmacy should continue to engage in future faculty salary analyses to highlight trends and gender comparisons based on new faculty recruits, turnover and retention pressures for existing faculty, and impact on constraints and ability to acquire extramural grant funding.
- Each Department should continue to employ transparent and well-reasoned processes for determining the negotiable Y component of faculty salaries.
- The Departments should strive for effective and fair criteria for accelerations in academic advancement, considering the impact on UCSF's competitiveness and our ability to recruit and retain our outstanding faculty.
- The School should continue to strive for consistency in salary negotiations between Departments for faculty in similar series and emphasis (clinical or research). In addition, it is recommended that all faculty be apprised of leadership opportunities at the School and Department level to optimize their academic advancement and have equitable access to augmented funding via Z payments.
- The Departments must also ensure equity is maintained among similar faculty when adjustments are made to Y salaries.