THE UC DAVIS 2015-2016 FACULTY SALARY EQUITY PROGRAM: AN OUTCOME ASSESSMENT



Maureen Stanton, Philip Kass, Roberta Lasky, Everett Wilson May 16, 2016

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

UC Davis' faculty salary equity program was initiated in summer 2015 and implemented on October 1, 2015, with all adjustments retroactive to July 1, 2015. Approximately half of the ladder rank faculty at UC Davis received an equity adjustment, although this figure varied by academic unit and salary scale. The percentage increases in the average off-scale salary were often considerable, particularly in the undergraduate colleges. Reductions in variability in off-scale salaries within academic units were similarly substantial, ranging from approximately 20% to 50%. Of the 15 academic unit/salary scale combinations evaluated, 12 had their faculty off-scale salaries moved more than 50% of the way toward the average off-scale salary for their unit.

The joint Academic Senate-Administration salary analysis of 2014 specifically identified decade of hire as the most significant determinant of salary inequities due to the evolving use of off-scale salaries over the last 30+ years. An additional method of assessing the salary equity program's impact was to observe if the regression coefficients for decade of hire originally calculated in 2014 meaningfully changed by 2016. Across the university, the 2014 negative regression coefficients for decade of hire increased (i.e., became less negative) by over 50%, indicating a substantial reduction in inequity due to this factor. The regression coefficients remained significantly different from zero, demonstrating that although off-scale salary inequities were greatly reduced, they were not eliminated. Academic unit-specific regression coefficients largely followed the same pattern.

In 2014-2015 UC Davis ranked sixth among the nine UC campuses (i.e., excluding UCSF) in average salary for Assistant Professors (nine-month appointments), Associate Professors (nine-month appointments). It also ranked sixth using a weighted average of all three ranks (with weights provided by the number of faculty in each rank) both when the analyses were restricted to faculty on nine-month appointments and when all faculty were considered, with 11-month salaries converted to nine-month salaries.

In 2015-2016 UC Davis continued to <u>rank sixth</u> for Assistant Professors (nine-month appointments) and Professors (nine-month appointments). It <u>increased in rank to fourth</u> for Associate Professors (nine-month appointments). It remained <u>ranked at sixth</u> using a weighted average of all three ranks for faculty on nine-month appointments, and <u>increased in rank to fifth</u> when when all faculty were considered, with 11-month salaries converted to nine-month salaries.

UC Davis' percentage increase in per capita salary was in the top half of all UC campuses for the five salary groups evaluated, ranging from <u>first place</u> for Associate Professors (nine-month appointments), <u>second place</u> for all faculty (a weighted average, with 11-month salaries converted to nine-month salaries), <u>third place</u> for all faculty on nine-month appointments (a weighted average), and <u>fourth place</u> for Assistant Professors and (full) Professors.

PART 1: IMPACTS OF THE 2015-2016 FACULTY SALARY EQUITY PROGRAM

The UC Davis Salary Equity Program of 2015-2016 was based on work jointly completed in 2013-2014 by the UC Davis Academic Senate and the UC Davis Office of Academic Affairs.



This document is available at the UC Davis Academic Senate website: <u>http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/local_resources/docs/Faculty_Salary_Equity/2014_faculty_salary_equity_analyses.pdf</u> The 2014 Report evaluated salary equity using several different financial measures, including total salary and off-scale salary. The findings related to (log) off-scale salary components were particularly compelling, because such components are not typically a direct reflection of outstanding merit, but are instead largely a function of hiring and retention packages. Remarkably, there was little correlation between the magnitude of off-scale salaries and academic progress, as seen in the following figure (the blue horizontal lines represent, from lowest to highest, the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles):



To target the inequities found with respect to off-scale salaries, Academic Affairs developed a salary equity program in consultation with the Academic Senate. A summary of the program can be found at the following website:

https://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/policies/compensation/equity_adjustment.html .

The following criteria were used to determine eligibility to participate in the program:

- Appointment began prior to July 1, 2015 (exception: LPSOE/LSOE/SLSOE)
- Off-scale salary was below the average of the academic unit
- Assistant Professor Step 1 through Professor Step 4: 10-year progress rate ≥ 0.75
- Professor Step 5 and higher: 10-year progress rate ≥ 0.25
- Not on the Health Sciences Compensation Plan

Analyses were done separately by academic unit, and where appropriate, by salary scale:

- Regular
- Business/Economics/Engineering
- Academic Personnel Unit (School of Nursing)
- Strict Full Time (School of Veterinary Medicine)

The amount of funding available depended on the academic unit and (where appropriate) the salary groups:

- 1.5% of July 1, 2015* total salary expended in unit/group, as mandated by UCOP.
- 1.0% of *July 1, 2015** total salary expended in unit/group, as mandated by Provost Hexter for <u>ladder rank faculty only</u>.
 - Total = 2.5% of total salary expended in unit/group for ladder rank faculty.

Note: the July 1, 2015 total salary was used *after* the 1.5% 2015-2016 range adjustment was included.

The program acted by moving off-scale salaries below the average off-scale salary of the academic unit towards the average. The following figure illustrates this (left side: before equity adjustment; right side: after equity adjustment):



The UC Davis program was substantially different from those of the other UC campuses. The following are brief synopses of what the other campuses did:

- **Berkeley**: Associate 1 to Professor 6 only, no retention offer in 8 years, "strong achievement" in 2-3 areas of review, "who work effectively to build and sustain Berkeley as a strong institution."
- Irvine: Vague, but included merit and comparative salaries from peer institutions.
- Los Angeles: Vague, and done in consultation with equity advisors.
- **Merced**: "The campus used a third of the pool for a campus-wide off-scale bump of \$500 to each faculty member. Then additional salary increments were awarded so that every faculty member was [at least] at 65% of the average off-scale of the discipline."
- **Riverside**: Left up to deans and sometimes dept. chairs. No consistency across academic units.
- San Diego: Vague, but dealt with internal and external inequities
- Santa Barbara: 1% across the board; deans awarded 0.5% based on "equity studies, recent personnel actions, and personal knowledge," but was not consistently applied across units.
- **Santa Cruz**: All faculty received increases based on scale, rank, and step for addressing inter-campus inequities (i.e., they do not believe there are large inequities on campus).

Academic Affairs believes that there are *distinct* advantages of the approach taken in consultation with the Academic Senate:

- **Targets** inequities specifically identified by the 2014 UC Davis Salary Equity Task Force available on UC Davis Academic Senate website.
- **Transparent:** program details and examples are publicly available on the Academic Affairs website.
- Uniformity of approach across academic units.
- Utilizes <u>objective</u> eligibility criteria, including progress rates calculated by Academic Affairs.
- **Centrally performed** salary calculations not delegated to academic units.
- Algorithm-based software program based on data in university databases.
- **Respects** structural salary differences between academic units and salary scales.
- Retains positionality: no off-scale salary inversion for eligible faculty.
- Developed in consultation with UC Davis Academic Senate.

Overall, in most academic units, eligible faculty did not reach their unit's July 1, 2015 average off-scale salary, although substantial progress was made (depending on the unit). Approximately 750 ladder-rank faculty received equity adjustments out of approximately 1,500 ladder rank faculty at the university. The differences in equity adjustments between women and men within academic units were typically small (< \$200/year), with few exceptions.

The following tables shows the number and percent of faculty impacted by the program, by academic unit and salary scale, the average off-scale salary before and after the salary equity program, and the percentage increase in the average off-scale salary by academic unit and salary scale.

Academic Unit/Salary Scale	number	number receiving equity adjustments	percent of faculty receiving equity adjustments
AGRICULTURE/ENV SCIENCES REG	242	151	62%
AGRICULTURE/ENV SCIENCES BEE	62	39	63%
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES	112	50	45%
EDUCATION	27	14	52%
ENGINEERING	173	107	62%
LAW	33	19	58%
LS: HArCS	199	105	53%
LS: MATH & PHYSICAL SCIENCES	168	94	56%
LS: SOCIAL SCIENCES REG	180	88	49%
LS: SOCIAL SCIENCES BEE	28	14	50%
MANAGEMENT	29	17	59%
NURSING (APU 3)	10	3	30%
NURSING (APU 5)	8	5	63%
VETERINARY MEDICINE (SFT)	112	51	46%
VETERINARY MEDICINE (clinical)	61	21	34%

Academic Unit/Salary Scale	average: pre-equity	average: post-equity	percent increase in average
AGRICULTURE/ENV SCIENCES REG	\$8,099	\$11,344	40%
AGRICULTURE/ENV SCIENCES BEE	\$8,071	\$11,751	46%
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES	\$18,714	\$21,975	17%
EDUCATION	\$11,639	\$14,196	22%
ENGINEERING	\$8,539	\$11,719	37%
LAW	\$4,267	\$6,724	58%
LS: HArCS	\$6,554	\$8,895	36%
LS: MATH & PHYSICAL SCIENCES	\$16,437	\$19,839	21%
LS: SOCIAL SCIENCES REG	\$15,453	\$18,367	19%
LS: SOCIAL SCIENCES BEE	\$43,667	\$47,919	10%
MANAGEMENT	\$19,106	\$22,346	17%
NURSING (APU 3)	\$18,270	\$19,821	8%
NURSING (APU 5)	\$22,530	\$24,618	9%
VETERINARY MEDICINE (SFT)	\$26,644	\$30,490	14%
VETERINARY MEDICINE (clinical)	\$24,836	\$26,924	8%

An additional measure of the impact of the program is how much variability between the offscale salaries of faculty after the program's implementation. One method of demonstrating such variability is through the use of the *coefficient of variation*, which is calculated by dividing the standard deviation by the average. As a dimensionless quantity, it can be compared across academic units and over time. The following table shows how the coefficients of variation declined as the result of the salary equity program.

Academic Unit/Salary Scale	CV - pre equity	CV - post equity	% decline in CV
AGRICULTURE/ENV SCIENCES REG	1.83	1.18	36%
AGRICULTURE/ENV SCIENCES BEE	1.49	0.86	42%
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES	0.85	0.61	28%
EDUCATION	0.77	0.52	32%
ENGINEERING	1.78	1.17	34%
LAW	0.45	0.26	42%
LS: HArCS	1.64	0.84	49%
LS: MATH & PHYSICAL SCIENCES	1.13	0.68	40%
LS: SOCIAL SCIENCES REG	1.14	0.82	28%
LS: SOCIAL SCIENCES BEE	0.81	0.58	28%
MANAGEMENT	0.62	0.48	23%
NURSING (APU 3)	0.48	0.39	19%
NURSING (APU 5)	0.29	0.20	31%
VETERINARY MEDICINE (SFT)	0.93	0.70	25%
VETERINARY MEDICINE (clinical)	0.61	0.47	23%

An expected consequence of the salary equity program is that off-scale salaries below the average should increase towards the average – in some cases equaling but not exceeding it. The following figure shows how much progress each academic unit made in moving individual off-scale salaries toward the average. For example, if an academic unit achieved 100% of its goal, then the off-scale salaries of all faculty previously below the pre-equity adjustment average were brought to it. In contrast, if an academic unit achieved 50% of its goal, then there were sufficient funds available to only move the off-scale salaries half-way toward the average it.



PART 2: CONTRASTING THE REGRESSION ANALYSES FROM 2014 WITH NEW ANALYSES IN 2016 FOLLOWING THE FACULTY SALARY EQUITY PROGRAM

1. UNIVERSITY-WIDE ANALYSES

From the standpoint of developing a salary equity program intended to address the inequities identified in the 2014 report, one determinant of off-scale salary stood out above all others: decade of hire. The analysis decomposed this variable into four distinct categories based on year of hire: 2014-2005, 2004-1995, 1994-1985, and 1984-1975, with the 2014-2005 category as the reference against which all other decades were compared. The three regression indicator variables for these decades were all highly significant (P<0.001) predictors of off-scale salary, with the most recent decade having the highest salary, and the earliest two decades having the lowest.

In order to compare the 2014 to the 2016 findings, it was necessary to make certain minor and inconsequential adjustments to the original model because current data about some unit-sublevel memberships were unavailable at the time this report was prepared. These include the College of Biological Science's separate departments, the members of the various Academic Personnel Units in the School of Medicine, and the nine salary groups within the Graduate School of Management. Therefore, a regression model using the same data and variables from the 2014 university-wide analysis was re-fit, but omitted indicator variables for the sub-levels above, while retaining indicator variables for all the actual college/schools themselves. The differences between the regression coefficients for decade of hire in the original and recalculated models were negligible, and the *P*-values remained less than 0.001. An identical regression model was then fit using the updated 2016 salary data. Although it is possible to compare models from the two years, it is of course understood that some faculty may have separated since 2014, and new faculty have been added between 2014 and 2016.

The dependent variable in the regression models is the log (i.e., natural logarithm) off-scale salary, with all academic-year salaries converted to fiscal-year salaries. Although the regression coefficients do not have immediate interpretability, as effect measures they can nevertheless be contrasted between years. The absence of an effect by decade of hire (meaning that there is no inequity due to this variable) implies the regression coefficient = 0, and negative values indicate lower salaries for decades of hire relative to the reference decade of hire (either 2014-2005 or, following the salary equity program, 2016-2005). One would expect that if the salary equity program was effective at addressing inequities from decade of hire, that the negative regression coefficients should become less negative; i.e., become closer to 0. The following table shows these coefficients from the two regression analyses.

	2014 a	nalysis	2016 ar	nalysis	Percent
Decade of hire	coefficient	<i>P</i> -value	coefficient	<i>P</i> -value	change
2016 or 2014 – 2005 (reference)	0	-	0		
2004 - 1995	-1.999	<0.001	-0.779	<0.001	61%
1994 - 1985	-4.374	<0.001	-1.938	<0.001	56%
1984 - 1975	-4.183	<0.001	-1.936	<0.001	54%

2. ACADEMIC UNIT ANALYSES

To allow additional academic unit-level comparisons between 2014 and 2016, all regression models were re-fit as above. The following table shows the regression coefficients and *P*-values for decade of hire by academic unit.

		Regression	coefficients			P-values	
	1996-current	1995-2004	1985-1994	1975-1984	1995-2004	1985-1994	1975-1984
Agricultural and Environmental Sciences:							
2014	-	-6.253	-7.532	-7.811	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
2016	-	-2.075	-3.291	-3.418	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
n (2016)	112	61	58	40			
Biological Sciences:							
2014	-	-1.973	-6.338	-7.923	0.054	< 0.001	< 0.001
2016	-	-1.326	-2.249	-3.267	0.026	0.008	0.010
n (2016)	38	45	18	10			
Engineering:							
2014	-	-2.478	-6.229	-6.716	0.024	< 0.001	0.002
2016	-	-0.422	-1.918	-2.462	0.503	0.024	0.051
n (2016)	53	62	44	8			
L&S: Humanities, Arts, and Cultural Sciences:							
2014	-	-2.982	-2.874	-4.877	< 0.001	0.030	0.016
2016	-	-0.524	-0.924	-0.720	0.100	0.121	0.574
n (2016)	98	76	17	2			
L&S: Mathematical and Physical Sciences:							
2014	-	-3.483	-4.622	-1.847	< 0.001	0.001	0.336
2016	-	-2.149	-3.916	-4.196	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
n (2016)	63	54	35	10			
L&S: Social Sciences:							
2014	-	-2.110	-4.426	-5.389	0.001	< 0.001	0.002
2016	-	-0.749	-1.495	-1.765	0.023	0.006	0.100
n (2016)	107	72	24	4			
Education:							
2014	-	-2.935	-2.274	-	0.142	0.599	-
2016	-	0.113	-2.816	-	0.562	< 0.001	-
n (2016)	17	9	1	0			
Law:							
2014	-	-2.306	-4.715	-0.259	0.349	0.378	0.934
2016	-	-0.612	-6.284	-2.013	0.580	0.004	0.296
n (2016)	20	9	1	2			
Management:							
2014	-	-0.049	-3.258	-4.715	0.985	0.473	0.409
2016	-	-1.421	-0.597	0.774	0.301	0.805	0.801
n (2016)	13	9	5	1			
Veterinary Medicine:							
2014	-	-0.342	-6.403	-8.192	0.759	<0.001	0.001
2016	-	-0.798	-2.305	-1.447	0.083	<0.001	0.170
n (2016)	58	30	21	4			

3. INTERPRETATION OF THE CHANGES IN THE REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS

In the university-wide analysis, the increase in the (negative) regression coefficients (meaning they became closer to zero) corresponding to decade of hire is striking: the percent change in the coefficients ranged from 54% to 61%, depending on decade. Although the coefficients remained significantly different from zero, indicating that the salary equity program did not *eliminate* inequities in off-scale salary, their virtual halving indicates that the program was extremely effective in *reducing* the inequities due to decade of hire. *This is exactly what was expected.*

Evaluation of the academic unit-specific analyses tells a similar story, but with some caveats. First, in some units the number of faculty in oldest decade of hire cohort is extremely small, making the regression coefficients for that category very sensitive to changes for even a single individual (for example, not receiving an equity adjustment, or retiring between 2014 and 2016). Second, in the smaller professional schools decade of hire was not a significant determinant of off-scale salary inequities, so some upward as well as downward movement of those coefficients is expected; for the most part, the coefficients were not significantly different from zero. However, when the number of faculty in a category was over 10, almost every regression coefficient became less negative, and often appreciably. *This mirrors the findings of the university-wide analysis.*

Although the procedure used for the salary equity program did not specifically target decade of hire (or any other faculty member-specific determinant of inequity), by addressing inequities regardless of cause its overall impact was to reduce the average effect of *any* determinant of inequity. Moving the regression coefficients for any variable closer to zero is analogous to moving individual off-scale salaries below the average off-scale salary in an academic unit closer to it (as shown in the figure on Page 5).

PART 3: UC DAVIS SALARY RANKINGS IN THE UC SYSTEM, 2014-2015 AND 2015-2016

1. TOTAL SALARY EXPENDITURES: 2014-2015 AND 2015-2016

Information provided by the University of California (UC) Office of the President (OP) indicates that all UC campuses (not including UCSF) increased their salary expenditures (i.e., excluding fringe benefits) from 1.8% to 10.9% from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016. Expenditures are a function not only of per capita salary, but also the number of faculty hired and the percentage of the year employed (which can be less than 100% due to hiring, separation, retirement, death, etc.). UC Berkeley had the smallest proportional increase in salary expenditures (1.8%), whereas the two campuses making the greatest proportional change were UCLA (10.9%) and UC Riverside (9.0%). UC Davis ranked fifth out of eight UC campuses (UC Merced was excluded due to questionable data) in its proportional increase in total salary expenditures (6.2%) between the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years.

The following figure shows the total salary expenditures in dollars (left vertical axis) (2015=blue bars, 2016=red bars) and the percent change in expenditures between the two academic years on the right vertical axis (green lines).



2. PER-CAPITA SALARY EXPENDITURES: 2014-2015 AND 2015-2016

Salaries were evaluated using the following categories:

- Assistant Professor, nine-month
- Associate Professor, nine-month
- Professor, nine-month
- Professor, 11-month
- Weighted average of nine-month faculty (weights provided by number of faculty in each rank)
- Weighted average of all faculty, with 11-month salaries converted to nine-month salaries (weights provided by number of faculty in each rank)

Eleven-month salaries are far less frequently used in the UC system than nine-month salaries. UC Davis is the exception to this, with over 400 faculty members on 11-month appointments, approximately 300 of which are (full) Professors (the actual number varies by academic year). No other UC campus has more than 20 Assistant or Associate Professors on 11-month appointments, so no rankings are reported for 11-month appointments at these ranks.

Campus per-capita salaries tend to aggregate into three groups (Appendices 1 and 2). The highest per-capita salaries are found at UC Berkeley and UCLA, with nine-month weighted averages of \$153,654 to \$163,133, respectively, in 2015-2016. The middle per-capita salary group includes UC Davis, UC Irvine, UC San Diego, and UC Santa Barbara, with nine-month weighted averages of all faculty ranging from \$128,923 (UC Davis) to \$138,058 (UC Santa Barbara). The lowest per-capita salaries are found at UC Merced (questionable data), UC Riverside (\$115,692), and UC Santa Cruz (\$122,065).

The percent changes in per capita salaries between the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years are shown in Appendix 3. UC Davis ranked in the upper half of all campuses for all five salary categories for this metric (UC Merced was excluded due to questionable data provided). For Assistant, Associate, and (full) Professors UC Davis ranked fourth, first, and fourth, respectively. UC Davis also ranked third using a weighted average of nine-month (only) faculty, and ranked second using a weighted average of all faculty (for which 11-month salaries were converted to their equivalent nine-month salaries). Rankings are not shown for Professors only on 11-month appointments because of the relative scarcity of such faculty on most UC campuses.

3. PER CAPITA SALARY RANKINGS: 2014-2015 AND 2015-2016

Rankings of the per capita salary expenditures in 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 are shown in Appendices 1 and 2.

In the 2014-2015 academic year, with reference to the six salary categories evaluated on the previous page, <u>UC Davis ranked sixth</u> among the nine campuses in five of the categories. The sole exception was for Professors on the 11- month salary scale; in this category UC Davis ranked <u>fifth</u>. However, it is important to note when interpreting the latter ranking that only two other UC campuses (Berkeley and Riverside) have more than 20 faculty in this category, and their faculty headcounts (between 40 and 50, depending on academic year) are far below the 300+ faculty at UC Davis.

In the 2015-2016 academic year, <u>UC Davis' rankings remained at sixth place for four of the six salary categories</u>. However, there was upward movement in the rankings for two salary categories: for Associate Professors on the nine-month salary scale, where the ranking moved up to <u>fourth place</u>, and the overall weighted average of all faculty (for which 11-month salaries were converted to their equivalent nine-month salaries), where UC Davis' ranking moved up to <u>fifth place</u>.

4. PRECAUTIONARY NOTES

- The information provided by UCOP from UC Merced in 2015-2016 is almost certainly incorrect.
- UCOP's salary compilation provided to us did not distinguish the REG (Professor) series from other series with higher salaries (e.g., LAW, SFT, BEE). On one hand, campuses with higher proportions of faculty in these salary scales would be expected to have higher overall per capita salaries. However, because the distributions of faculty in these salary scales are unlikely to substantially vary over a one-year time period, the relative rankings should not appreciably be affected.
- Davis is an exceptional campus in hiring Assistant and Associate Professors on 11 month (FY) appointments, with 136 currently. UCLA has 33, Berkeley has 11 and the remaining campuses have between 0 and 8. Rankings for these two appointment categories are not reliable because of the small numbers and are not reported.
- Davis is also an exceptional campus in hiring full Professors on 11 month (FY) appointments, with currently 284 (about one-third of these are Vet Med faculty on the SFT salary scale). The next closest campuses are Riverside with 42 and Berkeley with 41. The remainder of the campuses have between 0 and 28. Again, the rankings are largely unreliable except perhaps for these three campuses, where Davis falls in the middle.

APPENDIX 1: PER CAPITA SPENDING, 2014-2015

		Salary Expenditures per Faculty																
	Berkeley		Davis		Irvine	Los	Angeles	_	Merced	1	Riverside	5	San Diego	Sa	nta Cruz	-	Santa Barbara	Davis rank
Faculty Rank and Basis								-								-		
Professor, 9 Month	\$ 173,	941	\$ 147,224	\$	152,654	\$	181,899	\$	142,930	\$	142,620	\$	153,163	\$	137,998	\$	153,041	6
headcount		841	489		521		864		39		264		519		278		509	
Associate Professor, 9 Month	\$ 115,	614	\$ 96,742	Ś	99,386	Ś	118,630	Ś	98,131	Ś	89,345	Ś	101,032	Ś	95,205	Ś	93,712	6
headcount		316	200		210		239		68		157		204	_	131		162	
Assistant Professor, 9 Month	\$ 104.	342	\$ 83,469	Ś	86,918	Ś	98,400	\$	79,657	\$	85,437	\$	91,825	Ś	83,101	\$	81,454	6
headcount		228	152		194		217		87		179		147		89		95	
				-				-								-		
Professor, 11 Month	\$ 172,	010	\$ 160,829	\$	152,900	\$	167,135			\$	152,308	\$	194,501	\$	166,366	\$	121,233	5
headcount		44	300		2		20		0		48		28		15		3	
Associate Professor, 11 Month	\$ 122,	942	\$ 118,645	\$	102,627	\$	117,171			\$	96,950	\$	97,501	\$	105,099	\$	82,800	2
headcount		5	74		7		14	_	0		2		1		1		1	
Assistant Professor, 11 Month	\$ 69,	700	\$ 109,745	\$	93,550	\$	94,624			\$	93,600	\$	104,700	\$	93,600	\$	71,499	1
headcount		7	64		4		18				1		1		1		1	
total headcount	1.	441	1.279		938		1.372	-	194		651		900		515	-	771	
Overall weighted average	\$ 149.	396	\$ 131.415	\$	126,508	Ś	155,650	s	98,852	Ś	114.547	Ś	132,498	Ś	118.302	Ś	131.434	5
			+ 131,413	-	220,000	-	233,030	Ĺ	50,032	Ť	224,047	÷	232,430	-	220,002	ĺ	101,404	-
Overall weighted average with 11 month																		
salaries converted to 9 month salaries	\$ 148,	566	\$ 124,508	\$	126,302	\$	154,978	\$	98,852	\$	112,937	\$	131,633	\$	117,580	\$	131,341	6
Nine month only weighted average	\$ 149,	176	\$ 123,696	\$	126,774	\$	156,717	\$	98,852	\$	111,620	\$	130,575	\$	116,930	\$	131,615	6

APPENDIX 2: PER CAPITA SPENDING, 2015-2016

							Salary Exp	per	nditures	per Fa	aculty						
		Berkeley		Davis		Irvine	Los Angeles		Merced	Rive	erside	S	ian Diego	Sa	nta Cruz	Santa Barbara	Davis rank
Faculty Rank and Basis		170.000					Å 100.000						450.000			A	
Protessor, 9 Month	Ş	179,962	Ş	154,131	Ş	159,472	\$ 188,308	Ş	111,888	Ş 1	149,878	Ş	158,820	Ş	146,355	\$ 161,494	 6
headcount	_	824		505	-	541	943		44		2/2		529		2/8	508	
Associate Professor, 9 Month	Ś	116.312	Ś	103.653	Ś	101.974	\$ 123.840	Ś	62.697	Ś	94.379	Ś	107,465	Ś	98.227	\$ 100.241	4
headcount		311		194		217	239		67		164		202		137	163	
Assistant Professor, 9 Month	\$	111,368	\$	86,148	\$	75,510	\$ 99,360	\$	35,148	\$	87,244	\$	92,309	\$	86,483	\$ 85,869	6
headcount		238		183		188	225		91		204		151		98	110	
					_												
Professor, 11 Month	\$	182,094	\$	169,961	\$	167,000	\$ 190,806			\$ 1	163,614	\$	205,939	\$	181,100	\$ 155,100	5
headcount		41		284	_	2	20	-	0		42		28		12	3	
Associate Professor, 11 Month	ć	62 825	ć	125 208	ć	104 593	¢ 122.492	-		ć 1	102 200	ć	163 433				 2
headcount	\$	2,623	2	83	2	104,383	5 125,485	-	0	, د ا	202,233	2	103,433		0	0	 2
		-									-						
Assistant Professor, 11 Month	\$	71,233	\$	115,914	\$	83,850	\$ 88,038			\$	99,100	\$	106,295			\$ 71,499	 1
headcount		9		53		2	15		0		2		1		0	1	
total headcount		1,425		1,302		956	1,460		202		686		914		525	785	
Overall weighted average	\$	153,825	\$	137,114	\$	129,422	\$ 162,252	\$	61,001	\$ 1	118,538	\$	137,883	\$	123,414	\$ 138,039	5
Overall weighted average with 11 month																	
salaries converted to 9 month salaries	\$	153,028	\$	130,248	\$	129,259	\$ 161,556	\$	61,001	\$ 1	117,076	\$	136,923	\$	122,843	\$ 137,944	5
Alles and the shared arrest		150 65 5	~	100.000	*	120 507	A 463.633	~	61.001				105 672	*	100.007	Å 100.050	
Nine month only weighted average	\$	153,654	Ş	128,923	Ş	129,597	\$ 163,133	Ş	61,001	Ş 1	115,692	Ş	135,672	Ş	122,065	> 138,058	6

	Percent Change in Per Capita Salary, 2014-2015 - 2015-2016										
	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Cruz	Santa Barbara	Davis rank		
Faculty Rank and Basis									-		
Professor, 9 Month	3.46%	4.69%	4.47%	3.52%	5.09%	3.69%	6.06%	5.52%	4		
Associate Professor, 9 Month	0.60%	7.14%	2.60%	4.39%	5.63%	6.37%	3.17%	6.97%	1		
Assistant Professor, 9 Month	6.73%	3.21%	-13.13%	0.98%	2.11%	0.53%	4.07%	5.42%	4		
Professor, 11 Month	5.86%	5.68%	9.22%	14.16%	7.42%	5.88%	8.86%	27.94%	_		
Overall weighted average with 11											
month salaries converted to 9 month											
salaries	3.00%	4.61%	2.34%	4.24%	3.66%	4.02%	4.48%	5.03%	2		
Nine month only weighted average	3.00%	4.23%	2.23%	4.09%	3.65%	3.90%	4.39%	4.90%	3		

APPENDIX 3: PERCENT CHANGE IN PER CAPITA SPENDING, 2014-2015 to 2015-2016