



Complex Family Planning Faculty Salary Report FY 2022

Prepared by Kristin Nobel, MPH, Independent Evaluation Consultant
www.nobevaluation.org

CONTENTS

Background	2
Methodology	2
Participating medical schools	3
Table 1. Participating medical schools by geographic region and primary source of funding	3
Key findings	4
CFP faculty characteristics	4
Table 2. CFP faculty by region	4
Table 3. CFP faculty by institution type	4
Table 4. CFP faculty by rank	4
CFP faculty compensation	4
Table 5. CFP faculty compensation, all faculty (N=98)	5
Institution type	5
Table 6. CFP faculty compensation by institution type (N=98)	5
Region	5
Table 7. CFP faculty compensation by region (N=98)	5
Gender	6
Table 8. CFP faculty compensation by gender (N=98)	6
Race and ethnicity	6
Table 9. CFP faculty compensation by race and ethnicity (N=98)	6
Rank	6
Table 10. CFP faculty compensation by rank (N=96)	7

Background

The *Complex Family Planning (CFP) Faculty Salary Report FY 2022* is the Society of Family Planning's first review of full-time medical school faculty compensation for CFP full-time paid faculty, chairs, and chiefs. The CFP Faculty Salary Survey was modeled after the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) Faculty Salary Survey, using the same questions (where relevant) and instructions for comparability. Following the exclusion criteria of the AAMC Faculty Salary Survey, CFP faculty in administrative positions such as medical school deans, associate deans, or practice plan CFOs and center/institute directors with similar responsibilities were excluded, as were faculty who received 100% of their compensation from the Veterans Administration. The 2022 CFP Faculty Salary Survey was administered to 44 accredited medical schools in the US, and of those, 31 schools participated (Table 1).

The report presents the total compensation attributable to teaching, patient care, and research for 98 faculty, as reported by their institutions. All faculty included in this report hold an MD or equivalent degree. Medical schools provided data for an additional 11 faculty, but these faculty are not included in the published tables because the individuals earned income from the medical practice supplement or from bonus/incentive pay, but the institutions did not know those amounts.

Methodology

On March 10, 2023, the Society emailed 2022 CFP Faculty Salary Survey invitations to 44 accredited medical schools in the US, with continued follow-up through mid-April. Thirty-one schools participated in the survey (a 70% response rate). Of these schools, 13 (42%) are public and 18 (58%) are private. The survey collected data for the previous fiscal year (FY), FY 2022. Respondents reported the total compensation rounded to the nearest dollar for each full-time faculty member. The total compensation equaled the fixed/contractual salary component of total compensation plus the supplemental earnings components of total compensation (medical practice supplement and bonus/incentive pay) for the 12-month FY 2022 period. The Society deployed the survey via Qualtrics. Survey instructions, with definitions of the components of total compensation modeled on the AAMC Faculty Salary Survey, can be viewed at <https://www.societyfp.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Salary-Survey-Instructions-and-FAQs.pdf>. Descriptive data analysis for this report was conducted in Excel and statistical analysis was conducted in JMP. Following procedures established for the AAMC Faculty Salary Survey, faculty with missing compensation information (N=11) were excluded from analysis. In addition, in order to protect individual privacy, compensation figures for categories with a sample size under five are not represented in the report.

Participating medical schools

Table 1. Participating medical schools by geographic region and primary source of funding

Northeastern region	Southern region	Central region	Western region
Private (N=11)	Private (N=2)	Private (N=2)	Private (N=3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anonymous¹ • Boston University • Columbia University • Hackensack University Medical Center • Jefferson Health • Johns Hopkins University • Maimonides Medical Center • Stamford Hospital • Tufts University School of Medicine • University of Pittsburgh • Yale University 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emory University • University of Miami 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of Chicago • Washington University 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queens University Medical Group • Stanford University • University of Southern California
Public (N=1)	Public (N=1)	Public (N=1)	Public (N=10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of Connecticut 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of North Carolina Hospitals at Chapel Hill 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of Illinois at Chicago 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oregon Health & Science University • University of California, Davis • University of California, Irvine • University of California, San Diego • University of California, San Francisco • University of Colorado • University of Hawaii • University of New Mexico • University of Utah • University of Washington

¹ Institution prefers not to be listed.

Key findings

CFP faculty characteristics

A majority (57%) of CFP faculty were from the Western region of the US. Most other faculty were from the Northeast (29%), with only 14% located in the Central or Southern regions. Over half of all faculty (58%) worked at institutions primarily funded by public sources. Nearly all faculty (91%) were listed as professors at some level. Assistant Professor was the most common rank (45.9%), followed by Associate Professor (33.7%).

Table 2. CFP faculty by region

Region	N	%
Central	7	7.1%
Northeast	28	28.6%
Southern	7	7.1%
Western	56	57.1%
Total	98	100.0%

Table 3. CFP faculty by institution type

Institution type	N	%
Private	41	41.8%
Public	57	58.2%
Total	98	100.0%

Table 4. CFP faculty by rank

Rank	N	%
Assistant Professor	45	45.9%
Associate Professor	33	33.7%
Chair	1	1.0%
Chief	7	7.1%
Other	1	1.0%
Professor	11	11.2%
Total	98	100.0%

CFP faculty compensation

Mean total compensation for FY 2022 is shown in Table 5 below. The total mean compensation for all faculty (n=98) was \$277,496 and the median was \$268,440.

For CFP faculty who were ranked as professors (combining Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor), total compensation averaged \$271,128. AAMC's 2022 Faculty Salary Survey Report indicates that for these three combined ranks nationwide, professors in the basic sciences averaged \$198,222 and professors in the clinical sciences averaged

\$358,844.² CFP professor salaries were therefore 37% above the national average for professors in the basic sciences, and 24% below the national average for professors in the clinical sciences. Comparisons and percentage change between years for CFP faculty cannot yet be calculated since this is the first year the CFP Faculty Survey was conducted.

In multivariate analysis that included institution type, region, gender, race, and rank – and in univariate analyses for each of these variables - the only significant predictor of total compensation was rank (p<.0001).

Table 5. CFP faculty compensation, all faculty (N=98)

Count	98
25th percentile	\$ 245,542
Median	\$ 268,440
75th percentile	\$ 313,524
Mean	\$ 277,496

Institution type

The average total compensation of faculty employed at publicly funded institutions was 3% higher than that of faculty employed at private institutions. There was not a statistically significant difference between the salary of faculty at public and private institutions.

Table 6. CFP faculty compensation by institution type (N=98)

	Private	Public	All
Count	41	57	98
25th percentile	\$245,279	\$ 245,425	\$ 245,542
Median	\$265,225	\$ 269,511	\$ 268,440
75th percentile	\$305,131	\$ 313,848	\$ 313,524
Mean	\$272,360	\$ 281,190	\$ 277,496

Region

The average total compensation of faculty in the highest-earning region (Southern) was 8% higher than that of faculty in the lowest-earning region (Central). Total compensation did not vary significantly by region.

Table 7. CFP faculty compensation by region (N=98)

	Central	Northeast	Southern	Western	All
Count	7	28	7	56	98
25th percentile	\$244,754	\$247,992	\$254,811	\$237,051	\$ 245,542
Median	\$250,674	\$276,402	\$261,873	\$266,299	\$ 268,440
75th percentile	\$276,060	\$311,031	\$310,261	\$313,909	\$ 313,524
Mean	\$266,234	\$280,824	\$284,938	\$276,309	\$ 277,496

² Association of American Medical Colleges. *AAMC Faculty Salary Report FY 2022*. 2022. Accessed June 8, 2023.

Gender

The average total compensation of men was 8% higher than that of women. There was not a statistically significant difference between these two categories.

Table 8. CFP faculty compensation by gender (N=98)³

	Men	Women	Unknown	All
Count	11	81	6	98
25th percentile	\$252,550	\$245,279	\$233,070	\$ 245,542
Median	\$300,000	\$269,511	\$248,826	\$ 268,440
75th percentile	\$315,000	\$310,014	\$306,912	\$ 313,524
Mean	\$297,080	\$275,804	\$264,437	\$ 277,496

Race and ethnicity

The average total compensation of all faculty whose race and ethnicity had a sample size under five⁴ (the category with lowest compensation) was 10% lower than that of White faculty (the category with highest compensation). No significant differences were observed in univariate analyses with each of these classifications or in an analysis where these categories were combined.

Table 9. CFP faculty compensation by race and ethnicity (N=98)⁵

	Asian	White	Race and ethnicities with N<5 ⁴	Decline	Unknown
Count	12	57	7	12	10
25th percentile	\$245,603	\$242,102	\$247,475	\$252,416	\$237,103
Median	\$282,184	\$270,101	\$259,300	\$275,170	\$269,947
75th percentile	\$314,232	\$312,631	\$275,910	\$313,659	\$321,387
Mean	\$269,291	\$279,327	\$252,173	\$281,191	\$290,195

Rank

The average total compensation of Chiefs was 40% higher than that of Assistant Professors. The compensation of the highest-earning rank (“Chair”) and lowest-earning rank (“Other”) are not displayed because these categories had a sample size under five. Compensation differences between ranks were significantly different ($p < .0001$) whether or not the outlying categories of “Chief” and “Other” were included in analysis.

³ Available categories were “Man”, “Woman”, “Other”, “Unknown”, or “Decline to Respond”. No faculty were listed as “Other” or “Decline to Respond”.

⁴ Category includes people identifying as Black or African American, Hispanic, Latino, or of Spanish origin, Black or African American and White, Hispanic, Latino, or of Spanish origin and White, and Other. The categories were combined because each category had a sample size of less than five.

⁵ Categories are mutually exclusive. Faculty listed as more than one race and ethnicity were fewer than five and are included in the category “Race and ethnicities with N<5”.

Table 10. CFP faculty compensation by rank (N=96)⁶

	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Chief	Professor
Count	45	33	7	11
25th percentile	\$236,166	\$257,856	\$295,411	\$270,010
Median	\$250,674	\$276,060	\$323,344	\$313,727
75th percentile	\$277,898	\$320,858	\$403,444	\$341,007
Mean	\$248,677	\$283,101	\$345,206	\$320,986

⁶ Two faculty were omitted because the rank under which they were listed was less than five.