



THE UNIVERSITY
of **NORTH CAROLINA**
at **CHAPEL HILL**

**2019-20 FACULTY SALARY EQUITY
REPORT:**

**Academic Affairs Schools and Health Affairs
Schools Without Medicine**

Preliminary Results

Last Revised February 2021

Presented to:

Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Robert A. Blouin

Prepared by:

Institutional Research, Planning & Assessment

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

2019-20 FACULTY SALARY EQUITY REPORT

Preliminary Results¹

Introduction

This report describes the results from an analysis of faculty salaries requested by Chancellor Kevin Guskiewicz and Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Robert Blouin to examine whether systematic patterns of disparity by gender and race/ethnicity might exist at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. This analysis followed three other comprehensive salary equity studies released in 2002 (using 2001 data), 2012 (using 2009 data), and 2017 (using 2016 data).

Faculty with appointments in the following units were included in the analysis:

- **Academic Affairs:** The College of Arts and Sciences; Kenan-Flagler Business School; the Schools of Education, Government, Information and Library Science, Journalism and Media, Law, and Social Work; and Vice Chancellor for Research.
- **Health Affairs:** The Adams School of Dentistry, the School of Nursing, the Eshelman School of Pharmacy, and the Gillings School of Global Public Health. Faculty and staff in the School of Medicine conduct separate salary equity analyses to take into account the unique compensation plans and payment procedures in those units.

Methodology

Multiple regression analysis is the method most frequently used in higher education to examine the effects of gender and race/ethnicity on faculty salaries across a population. A statistical model is developed that predicts current salary (i.e., the dependent variable) as a function of a set of variables (i.e., independent variables). The goal is to determine if gender and/or race/ethnicity appear to impact salaries after holding constant career-related factors that are expected to be related to compensation.

The procedures used for this analysis were based on recommendations by the Association of American University Professors (AAUP) in their publication *Paychecks: A Guide to Conducting Salary-Equity Studies for Higher Education Faculty* (Haignere, 2002). These techniques are similar to those described in salary equity reports issued by the University of California at Berkeley (2019), North Carolina State University (2018), the University of Michigan (2012), the University of Virginia (2014) and others. During the 2012 salary study, a UNC-Chapel Hill faculty team of statistical experts from quantitative disciplines across campus evaluated and endorsed the AAUP recommendations.

Salary equity analyses were carried out separately for Academic Affairs and Health Affairs excluding Medicine. The study is typically conducted in two stages:

1. A preliminary population-based regression analysis that examined the effects of gender and race/ethnicity on average faculty salaries after controlling for variables such as highest degree, years of professional experience, tenure status, academic rank, and discipline. Those results are reported separately for Academic Affairs and Health Affairs in this document.
2. Follow-up reviews at the school and department levels (as appropriate) to include qualitative

¹ Throughout this report, the results of these analyses are referred to as “preliminary.” This is because revisions are typically made during the second stage of the study to correct HR system data errors and adjust the regression model variables based on review and feedback from the academic units.

information on individual faculty performance and other factors that affect current salary which are not available from central administrative data sources. This phase of the study is expected to occur during mid-2021 using updated faculty data from fall 2020.

Data Sources for Academic Affairs and Health Affairs Analyses

Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA) extracted faculty data for this study from the Human Resources databases in ConnectCarolina and official reports submitted to the UNC System. Because of changes in data definitions over time, caution should be used in comparing current findings with those from prior studies.

Population

A total of 1,815 faculty members were included in this study -- 1,276 from Academic Affairs schools and 539 from Health Affairs schools except for the School of Medicine. Selection criteria included a primary appointment as a permanent, full-time (100% FTE) faculty member who was active (i.e., not on leave with or without pay) on October 31, 2019. Faculty holding primary appointments as senior academic and administrative officers, such as the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, vice chancellors, and deans, were excluded from this study.

Regression Model Variables

Dependent Variables. Each regression model was tested using (1) annual base salary in dollars, and (2) the natural logarithm of annual base salary.

- **Academic Affairs:** 9-month annual base salary without supplements. Salaries for faculty with 12-month appointments (e.g., the School of Government) were converted to 9-month equivalent salaries by multiplying by 0.818 (9/11), as recommended by the AAUP.
- **Health Affairs without Medicine:** 12-month base salary without supplements. Salaries for faculty with nine-month salaries were converted to 12-month equivalent salaries by dividing by 0.818.

Independent Variables. Similar sets of independent variables were used as predictors in the regression models for Academic Affairs and Health Affairs without Medicine units, as shown in more detail in **Appendix A.**

- **Demographics:** Gender, race/ethnicity
- **Education:** Highest degree -- below doctoral level, doctoral, professional, multiple terminal degrees, and professional degrees with post-graduate master's.
- **Professional Experience:** Years between highest degree and hire date at UNC-Chapel Hill, years between hire date at UNC-Chapel Hill and year appointed to current rank, and years in current rank. These variables were expressed in years and as centered quadratic (squared) terms to adjust for nonlinearity that is often observed when salary increases decline as faculty move toward the end of their careers.
- **Professional Status:** Tenure status, academic rank, and rank modifiers
- **Discipline:** Indicators for each school or department

Interpretation of Regression Coefficients

In the regression analysis results that follow, the unstandardized regression coefficients may be used to estimate the extent to which the independent variables influence salaries. When salary in dollars is the dependent variable, the coefficient for gender can be interpreted as the difference between the average salaries of female and male faculty members after controlling for all other independent variables in the model. For example, a regression coefficient of -2000 for the variable representing females indicates that women faculty received, on average, annual salaries that are \$2,000 lower than males with comparable career attributes.

When the regression model uses the transformed natural logarithm of salaries as the dependent variable, the unstandardized regression coefficients no longer represent dollars. Instead, these values may be multiplied by 100 to estimate the percentage difference between the average salaries of the groups being compared. For example, a regression coefficient value of -.012 for the female indicator variable estimates that average salaries for women faculty are approximately 1.2% lower than average male salaries after controlling for all other variables. Using the natural logarithm transformation has several advantages in salary equity studies (Taylor, Lahey, Beck, & Froyd, 2019). First, the log transformation tends to create a more normal distribution that lessens the impact of extremely high salaries on the results of regression analyses. Second, results expressed as a percentage difference are more consistent with the way salary adjustments are typically made -- in proportion to current salaries rather than a fixed dollar amount to each faculty member. For these reasons, most institutional salary equity studies use the salary logarithm as the dependent variable instead of dollars.

Opinions differ regarding the use of statistical significance tests to evaluate observed group differences salary equity studies (Moore, 1993). Some authors argue that when all faculty members are included in the analysis, the dataset constitutes a population, not a sample, making inferences based on significance tests unnecessary. Others (Gray, 1993) suggest that statistical significance tests could be meaningful since point-in-time salary data snapshots function like a sample in that the cases captured fluctuate from day to day through new hires, departures, promotions, etc. This report adopts Haignere's (2002) recommendation that statistical significance be used as only one indicator in evaluating differences; the general pattern of results is also important. In addition, probability levels may be influenced by the small group sizes in campus faculty salary studies. Lack of statistical significance between groups does not guarantee that observed differences are not meaningful or that they are evidence of no bias (Snyder et al, 1994).

Limitations of the Analysis and Preliminary Findings Reported

It is important to recognize that the regression analyses used in salary equity studies estimate group level differences in salaries that are not explained by career status variables using data available in the University's administrative information systems. These results cannot be used to pinpoint the causes of these group differences or to determine what an individual faculty member should be paid.

Notably missing from this study are measures of individual faculty productivity and scholarly impact on their discipline. This is a serious limitation in assessing pay equity since the internal and external value of a faculty member's professional contributions are major factors in setting salaries. Individual salary equity determinations can be made only after review at the department level by those who are qualified to compile and assess performance information on individuals within that discipline.

This analysis did not examine the possibility that historical gender- or race/ethnicity-related bias could have influenced prior decisions made about rank, tenure, or distinguished professorships, resulting in salary inequities. If that occurred, use of these variables in the regression models might mask the actual relationship between gender and/or race/ethnicity on salary.

Finally, while care was taken to check all data for accuracy, undetected errors in the HR system could have influenced the results. The second stage of this study that involves additional data review and analysis at the school level is critical to ensure that conclusions are drawn from the most complete information.

Results

Descriptive Analyses

Appendix B provides descriptive statistics for Academic Affairs and Health Affairs without Medicine faculty populations by gender and race/ethnicity for the dependent variable annual salary (expressed in dollars) and the independent variables measuring professional background.

The following general observations can be made for both the Academic Affairs and Health Affairs

analyses.

Compared to male faculty, female faculty:

- Are less likely to hold tenure and more likely to have a fixed term appointment.
- Are less likely to hold a full professor rank.
- Are less likely to have been awarded a permanent distinguished professorship.
- Received their highest degree more recently.

Compared to white faculty, faculty members in other racial/ethnic groups:

- Are less likely to hold tenure.
- Are less likely to hold a full professor rank.
- Received their highest degree more recently.

The regression analysis described below provides estimates of the main effects of gender and race/ethnicity on salaries after accounting for multiple predictor variables simultaneously.

Regression Analysis Results

For the Academic Affairs and Health Affairs regression analyses that used actual salary in dollars and the natural logarithm of salary as dependent variables, respectively, independent variables reflecting education level, years of professional experience, tenure and rank status, and school/department were entered into the model first. Taken together, this set of predictors explained a large and significant portion of the variance in faculty salaries. The addition of variables representing gender (Female) and race/ethnicity categories (Black/African American, Asian, Hispanic/American Indian/Two or More Races, and Race/Ethnicity Not Reported) did not increase the percentage of variance already accounted for by the model.

Academic Affairs Regression Analysis

The results of the Academic Affairs regression analyses using nine-month equivalent annual salaries expressed as salary dollars and the natural logarithm salary are displayed in Table 1.

Dependent Variable – Salary Dollars. Nearly 86% of the total variation in salaries (Adjusted R^2) could be accounted for by the set of variables that included education level, tenure status, distinguished title, academic rank, professional experience, and school/department. Adding gender and race/ethnicity to the model made no contribution to the variance already explained.

The unstandardized coefficient for gender indicated that average female faculty salaries were estimated to be \$407 lower than the average for male faculty, after controlling for all other variables in the model. The race/ethnicity group contrasts suggested that average white faculty salaries were lower than that of each of the other race/ethnicity groups taking into account the other variables in the regression model. The estimated gaps ranged from \$85 for the combined Hispanic, American Indian, and two or more races faculty group to \$4,100 for Black/African American faculty. None of these differences were statistically significant at $p < .05$.

Dependent Variable – Natural Logarithm Salary. The total variance accounted for by the career-related variables in the model (Adjusted R^2) was 90.3%, and gender and race/ethnicity made no additional contribution.

The unstandardized coefficients estimated that average female faculty salaries were 0.4% higher than that the average for male faculty, all other factors considered. The salaries of all four of the race/ethnicity groups were estimated to be higher than the salaries of White faculty, by 2.6% for Black/African American faculty; by 1.6% for Asian faculty; by 1.4% for the combined group of Hispanic, American Indian, two or more races faculty; and by 1.0% for the group that did not report a specific race/ethnicity. None of these differences were statistically significant at $p < .05$.

Table 1. Academic Affairs: Population-Level Multiple Regression Model Results

Dependent Variable 9-Month Equivalent Annual Base Salaries								
	Group Statistics		Using Salary Dollars			Using Natural Logarithm Salary		
	N	%	Adjusted R ²	Unstandardized Coefficient	p-value	Adjusted R ²	Unstandardized Coefficient	p-value
Total Population	1276	100.0%	85.9%			90.3%		
Female	542	41.4%		-\$407	.776		.004	.630
Black/African-American	77	6.0%		\$4,100	.159		.026	.146
Asian	118	9.2%		\$3,376	.171		.016	.304
Hispanic, American Indian, 2 or more races	106	8.3%		\$85	.974		.014	.383
Race/Ethnicity not reported	39	3.1%		\$1,292	.741		.010	.671

Health Affairs without Medicine Regression Analysis

The results of the regression model for 12-month equivalent faculty salaries in Dentistry, Nursing, Pharmacy, and Public Health are summarized in Table 2.

Dependent Variable – Salary Dollars. Highest degree, professional experience, tenure and rank status, and discipline indicators explained a large portion of the variance in salaries (71%). Entering gender and race/ethnicity into the model made no contribution over and above those effects.

Analysis of the individual coefficients estimated that female faculty earned \$3,072 less than male faculty, controlling for all other factors. Compared to white faculty, Asian faculty earned \$5,551 less and the combined Hispanic/American Indian/Two or more races faculty group earned \$1,548 less. However, Black/African American faculty and the group that did not report race/ethnicity had salaries that averaged \$10,146 and \$14,934 higher, respectively, than white faculty. None of these relationships reached statistical significance at p<.05.

Dependent Variable – Natural Logarithm Salary. This analysis provided a similar pattern of findings. The total variance accounted for by the career- and unit-related variables in the model (Adjusted R²) was 77.6%, and did not change after the gender and race/ethnicity variables were added to the model.

The unstandardized coefficients estimated average female faculty salaries to be 1.5% lower than the average for male faculty. Compared to white faculty salaries, Asian faculty and the salaries of the combined group of Hispanic, American Indian, and two or more races were estimated to be 2.5% and 0.1% lower, respectively. Consistent with results of the analysis using salary dollars, the unstandardized coefficients from the natural logarithm salary analysis indicated that the estimated salaries of Black/African American and the group that did not report race/ethnicity were 4.7% and 10.2% higher, respectively, than salaries for white faculty. None of these differences were statistically significant at p<.05.

Table 2. Health Affairs Without Medicine: Population-Level Multiple Regression Model Results

Dependent Variable 12-Month Equivalent Annual Base Salaries								
	Group Statistics		Using Salary Dollars			Using Natural Logarithm Salary		
	N	%	Adjusted R ²	Unstandardized Coefficient	p-value	Adjusted R ²	Unstandardized Coefficient	p-value
Total Population	539	100.0%	71.0%			77.6%		
Female	320	59.4%		-\$3,072	.364		-.015	.399
Black/African-American	28	5.2%		\$10,146	.127		.047	.187
Asian	64	11.9%		-\$5,551	.248		-.025	.328
Hispanic, American Indian, 2 or more races	47	8.7%		-\$1,548	.779		-.001	.961
Race/Ethnicity not reported	8	1.5%		\$14,934	.219		.102	.116

References

- Gray, M. (1993). Can statistics tell us what we do not want to hear? The case of complex salary structures. *Statistical Science* 8,144-79.
- Haignere, I. (2002). *Paychecks: A Guide to Conducting Salary-Equity Studies for Higher Education Faculty*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors.
- Moore, N. 1993. Faculty Salary Equity: Issues in Regression Model Selection. *Research in Higher Education* 34(1),107-126.
- Snyder, J., Hyer, P., & McLaughlin, G. (1994). Faculty salary equity: Issues and options. *Research in Higher Education* 35:1-19.
- Taylor, L., Lahey, J, Beck, M., & Froyd, J. (2019). How to do a salary equity study: With an illustrative example from higher education. *Public Personnel Management*, 1-26.

Institution-Level Salary Equity Study Reports:

- University of Buffalo. (2018). Internal 2016-2017 Faculty Salary Equity Study. <https://www.buffalo.edu/content/dam/www/provost/files/Internal-Faculty-Salary-Equity-Study-Report-05172018.pdf>
- University of California at Berkeley. (2019). UC Berkeley Faculty Salary Equity Study, Annual Update, 2019. https://vpf.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/2019_faculty_salary_equity_study.pdf
- University of Michigan Gender Salary Study: An Update. (2012). University of Michigan. <https://www.provost.umich.edu/reports/Faculty%20Salary%20Study%20Report%202012.pdf>
- North Carolina State University. (2018). Triennial Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Salary Equity Study. <https://diversity.ncsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/2017-Salary-Equity-one-page.pdf>
<https://faculty senate.ncsu.edu/files/2018/10/Salary-Equity-Slides-for-Faculty-Senate-100918.pdf>
- University of Virginia. (2014). Faculty Salary Study Task Force Report to the Provost. <https://bov.virginia.edu/system/files/public/meetings/Faculty%20Salary%20Study%20Task%20Force%20Report%20exec%20summary%20only.pdf>
- Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. (2007). Salary Equity Study. <https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/bitstream/handle/10919/102361/VT%20Faculty%20Salary%20Equity%20Study%202007.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Appendix A

Independent Variables Used in the Regression Models

Variable Categories	Reference Group	Predictors
Demographics Gender Race/Ethnicity	Male White	Female Asian (with Hawaiian/Pacific Islander) Black/African American Combined Hispanic, American Indian, and 2 or more races Race/Ethnicity Not Reported
Education Highest Degree	Doctorate (e.g., PhD, DPH, EdD, DFA, DSW, DNP, AuD, DPT, etc)	Below Doctorate Professional Degree (MD, JD, DDS, PharmD) Multiple terminal degrees (e.g., PhD + JD) Professional degree with post-graduate degree (e.g., DDS with MS in Orthodontics)
Professional Experience Prior Experience Years at UNC-CH Years in Rank	(Continuous) (Continuous) (Continuous)	Years between highest degree and hire date at UNC-CH Years between hire date at UNC-CH and date appointed to current rank Years since appointment to current rank at UNC-CH
Professional Status Tenure Status Rank Title Modifier Distinguished Title	On Tenure Track Assistant No Title Modifier No permanent title	Fixed-Term = Not on tenure track Tenured = Holds tenure Professor, Associate, Instructor, Professor of the Practice Clinical, Research, Teaching Permanent Distinguished Title
Discipline/Unit Indicators Academic Affairs schools & departments Health Affairs (without Medicine) schools & departments	Biology Epidemiology	College of Arts & Sciences: Humanities & Fine Arts – 14 depts Social Sciences – 9 depts Natural Sciences – 10 depts KFBS: 7 depts Schools without depts: Education, Info & Library Science, Government, Journalism & Media, Law, Social Work Dentistry: 9 depts Nursing: no depts Pharmacy: 6 depts Public Health: 8 depts

Appendix B

Descriptive Statistics for Academic Affairs and Health Affairs without Medicine

Academic Affairs:
2019-20 Descriptive Statistics By Gender and Race/Ethnicity Group
 Includes the College of Arts and Sciences and the Schools of Business, Education, Government,
 Information & Library Science, Journalism & Media, Law, Social Work, Vice Chancellor Research
 (N=1,276)

	By Gender				By Race/Ethnicity									
	Male		Female		White		Black/AA		Asian		Hispanic, American Indian, 2 or more races		Not Reported	
Number of Faculty	734		542		936		77		118		106		39	
Percentage of Total	57.5%		42.5%		73.4%		6.0%		9.2%		8.3%		3.1%	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Tenure Status														
Tenured	478	65.1%	266	49.1%	580	62.0%	41	53.2%	67	56.8%	42	39.6%	14	35.9%
Tenure Track	105	14.3%	83	15.3%	107	11.4%	15	19.5%	30	25.4%	24	22.6%	12	30.8%
Fixed Term	151	20.6%	193	35.6%	249	26.6%	21	27.3%	21	17.8%	40	37.7%	13	33.3%
Rank														
Professor	339	46.2%	164	30.3%	423	45.2%	14	18.2%	38	32.2%	21	19.8%	7	17.9%
Associate	206	28.1%	205	37.8%	288	30.8%	34	44.2%	37	31.4%	42	39.6%	10	25.6%
Assistant	178	24.3%	167	30.8%	213	22.8%	27	35.1%	42	35.6%	42	39.6%	21	53.8%
Instructor	0	0.0%	3	0.6%	2	0.2%	1	1.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Prof of Practice	11	1.5%	3	0.6%	10	1.1%	1	1.3%	1	0.8%	1	0.9%	1	2.6%
Highest Degree														
Below doctorate	73	9.9%	75	13.8%	108	11.5%	10	13.0%	12	10.2%	13	12.3%	5	12.8%
Doctorate	619	84.3%	426	78.6%	758	81.0%	63	81.8%	101	85.6%	91	85.8%	32	82.1%
First professional	42	5.7%	41	7.6%	70	7.5%	4	5.2%	5	4.2%	2	1.9%	2	5.1%
Distinguished Title														
Permanent	147	20.0%	43	7.9%	168	17.9%	4	5.2%	12	10.2%	6	5.7%	0	0.0%
Years from Degree to UNC-CH Hire														
Mean	6.1		5.1		6.2		5.3		4.0		3.4		5.8	
Median	4.0		3.0		4.0		3.0		3.0		2.0		4.0	
Years from UNC-CH Hire to Current Rank														
Mean	5.8		6.1		6.4		4.2		4.9		5.0		3.1	
Median	6.0		6.0		6.0		2.0		5.0		5.0		0.0	
Years in Current Rank at UNC-CH														
Mean	8.5		5.6		8.0		5.5		5.6		5.2		3.4	
Median	5.0		4.0		5.0		4.0		4.0		3.5		1.0	
Total Career Years														
Mean	20.4		16.9		20.6		14.9		14.6		13.6		12.2	
Median	19.0		15.0		19.0		13.0		14.0		12.0		9.0	
9-Month Equivalent Salary														
Mean	\$127,937		\$101,202		\$119,735		\$99,025		\$132,216		\$88,981		\$103,269	
Median	\$108,668		\$89,943		\$102,954		\$89,955		\$106,312		\$84,106		\$87,281	

**Health Affairs Without Medicine:
2019-20 Descriptive Statistics By Gender and Race/Ethnicity Group**
Includes the Schools of Dentistry, Nursing, Pharmacy, and Public Health
(N=539)

	By Gender		By Race/Ethnicity				
	Male	Female	White	Black/AA	Asian	Hispanic, American Indian, 2 or	Not Reported
Number of Faculty	219	320	392	28	64	47	8
Percentage of Total	40.6%	59.4%	72.7%	5.2%	11.9%	8.7%	1.5%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Tenure Status														
Tenured	99	45.2%	87	27.2%	144	36.7%	4	14.3%	25	39.1%	11	23.4%	2	25.0%
Tenure Track	25	11.4%	40	12.5%	38	9.7%	4	14.3%	11	17.2%	12	25.5%	0	0.0%
Fixed Term	95	43.4%	193	60.3%	210	53.6%	20	71.4%	28	43.8%	24	51.1%	6	75.0%
Rank														
Professor	84	38.4%	79	24.7%	131	33.4%	2	7.1%	16	25.0%	11	23.4%	3	37.5%
Associate	65	29.7%	86	26.9%	107	27.3%	9	32.1%	20	31.3%	15	31.9%	0	0.0%
Assistant	61	27.9%	145	45.3%	138	35.2%	17	60.7%	28	43.8%	20	42.6%	3	37.5%
Instructor	4	1.8%	6	1.9%	9	2.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%
Prof of Practice	5	2.3%	4	1.3%	7	1.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.1%	1	12.5%
Highest Degree														
Below doctorate	9	4.1%	42	13.1%	43	11.0%	4	14.3%	2	3.1%	1	2.1%	1	12.5%
Doctorate	135	61.6%	215	67.2%	254	64.8%	17	60.7%	46	71.9%	27	57.4%	6	75.0%
First professional	36	16.4%	38	11.9%	54	13.8%	6	21.4%	9	14.1%	4	8.5%	1	12.5%
Multiple Terminal	21	9.6%	12	3.8%	21	5.4%	1	3.6%	4	6.3%	7	14.9%	0	0.0%
Prof + Postdoct	18	8.2%	13	4.1%	20	5.1%	0	0.0%	3	4.7%	8	17.0%	0	0.0%
Distinguished Title														
Permanent	31	14.2%	10	3.1%	30	7.7%	0	0.0%	9	14.1%	1	2.1%	1	12.5%

	Male	Female	White	Black/AA	Asian	Hispanic, American Indian, 2 or	Not Reported
Years from Degree to UNC-CH Hire							
Mean	9.7	6.1	7.7	5.4	6.9	8.5	8.0
Median	6.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	2.0
Years from UNC-CH Hire to Current Rank							
Mean	5.6	6.2	6.3	5.7	4.7	4.8	5.6
Median	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	2.0	1.5
Years in Current Rank at UNC-CH							
Mean	7.8	4.9	6.5	4.8	5.8	4.3	2.4
Median	5.0	3.5	4.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	0.5
Total Career Years							
Mean	23.1	17.1	20.4	15.9	17.4	17.6	16.0
Median	23.0	16.0	20.0	13.0	16.0	17.0	13.5
12-Month Equivalent Salary							
Mean	\$167,018	\$133,986	\$148,461	\$135,326	\$147,007	\$142,720	\$168,805
Median	\$148,388	\$123,632	\$132,850	\$119,463	\$131,668	\$133,600	\$155,088