

The table below shows the average number and percentage of full-time faculty who were promoted at a medical school per year during academic year 2018–2019 through academic year 2021–2022. Data are reported to the Faculty Roster voluntarily on a rolling basis by medical schools throughout the year and thus reflect school-to-school differences in timeliness and consistency of reporting. As a result, comprehensive counts of promotions in academic year 2021–2022 could not be calculated for all medical schools. For those medical schools whose Faculty Roster data are not comprehensive through June 30, 2022, the average number and percentage of promotions were calculated for academic year 2018–2019 through academic year 2020–2021.

Medical School		Average Promot	ions to Associate F	Professor Per Yea	Average Promotions to Full Professor Per Year					
	Women Promotions		Men Promotions		Total Promotions	Women Promotions		Men Promotions		Total Promotion
	Average	%	Average	%	Average	Average	%	Average	%	Average
	21.7	38%	24.7	62%	EC 4	12.0	39%	10.0	61%	21.0
Alabama-Heersink* South Alabama-Whiddon	21.7 1.8	38%	34.7 3.0	63%	56.4 4.8	1.3	36%	19.0 2.3	64%	31.0
RIZONA	1.0	30/0	5.0	0370	4.0	1.5	30%	2.5	04/0	5.0
Arizona*	14.3	48%	15.7	52%	30.0	5.7	46%	6.7	54%	12.4
			7.7			3.7				
Arizona Phoenix* RKANSAS	6.7	47%	7.7	53%	14.4	3.7	58%	2.7	42%	6.4
	10.2	F10/	10.2	49%	27.6	7.2	4.40/	0.2	F.C0/	16.6
Arkansas* ALIFORNIA	19.3	51%	18.3	49%	37.6	7.3	44%	9.3	56%	16.6
California	0.0	0%	0.3	100%	0.2	0.8	62%	0.5	38%	1.2
California Northstate	0.0		0.0		0.3	0.0		0.0		1.3 0.0
		NA		NA			NA		NA	
Kaiser Permanente-Tyson** Loma Linda*	NA 4.3	NA 29%	NA 10.3	NA 71%	NA 14.6	NA 1.3	NA 33%	NA 2.7	NA 68%	NA 4.0
Southern Cal-Keck*	27.7	56%	21.7	44%	49.4	7.7	42%	10.7	58%	18.4
Stanford*	12.3	47%	13.7	53%	26.0	8.3	32%	17.3	68%	25.6
UC Davis*	13.7	42%	19.0	58%	32.7	12.3	42%	17.0	58%	29.3
UC Irvine*	6.3	41%	9.0	59%	15.3	3.7	32%	8.0	68%	11.7
UC Riverside*	2.7	36%	4.7	64%	7.4	1.0	30%	2.3	70%	3.3
UC San Diego*	30.3	51%	29.7	50%	60.0	18.3	40%	27.0	60%	45.3
UC San Francisco*	57.7	54%	49.0	46%	106.7	35.7	50%	35.7	50%	71.4
UCLA-Geffen*	21.0	45%	26.0	55%	47.0	16.7	42%	22.7	58%	39.4
OLORADO	67.7	ECO/	F2.2	4.407	424.0	26.7	450/	25.2	F50/	15.0
Colorado*	67.7	56%	53.3	44%	121.0	20.7	45%	25.3	55%	46.0
DNNECTICUT	40.5	men.			0.5.5	g -	0.571		===:	
Connecticut*	13.0	59%	9.0	41%	22.0	2.3	30%	5.3	70%	7.6
Quinnipiac-Netter*	0.3	10%	2.7	90%	3.0	0.3	50%	0.3	50%	0.6
Yale*	26.3	45%	31.7	55%	58.0	10.7	38%	17.7	62%	28.4
ISTRICT OF COLUMBIA										
George Washington*	15.3	55%	12.3	45%	27.6	5.7	41%	8.3	59%	14.0
Georgetown*	13.0	57%	10.0	43%	23.0	4.3	37%	7.3	63%	11.6
Howard*	2.3	43%	3.0	57%	5.3	1.0	77%	0.3	23%	1.3
ORIDA										
FIU-Wertheim*	3.0	36%	5.3	64%	8.3	1.0	33%	2.0	67%	3.0
Florida*	14.3	35%	27.0	65%	41.3	6.0	34%	11.7	66%	17.7
Florida Atlantic-Schmidt	1.5	75%	0.5	25%	2.0	0.5	50%	0.5	50%	1.0
Florida State*	1.0	43%	1.3	57%	2.3	1.3	57%	1.0	43%	2.3
Miami-Miller*	12.3	35%	23.0	65%	35.3	10.3	48%	11.3	52%	21.6
Nova Southeastern-Patel*	0.0	0%	0.3	100%	0.3	0.0	NA	0.0	NA	0.0
UCF*	3.0	48%	3.3	52%	6.3	1.0	33%	2.0	67%	3.0
USF-Morsani*	10.7	43%	14.3	57%	25.0	4.3	34%	8.3	66%	12.6
EORGIA										
Emory*	34.0	43%	44.3	57%	78.3	11.3	36%	20.3	64%	31.6
MC Georgia Augusta*	6.0	37%	10.3	63%	16.3	4.3	29%	10.7	71%	15.0
Mercer*	5.0	75%	1.7	25%	6.7	1.3	25%	4.0	75%	5.3
Morehouse	3.3	57%	2.5	43%	5.8	3.0	55%	2.5	45%	5.5
AWAII										
Hawaii-Burns*	1.0	59%	0.7	41%	1.7	1.3	43%	1.7	57%	3.0
LINOIS										
Carle Illinois*	1.0	8%	11.0	92%	12.0	1.0	17%	5.0	83%	6.0
Chicago Med Franklin*	0.7	41%	1.0	59%	1.7	1.0	50%	1.0	50%	2.0
Chicago-Pritzker	18.3	53%	16.3	47%	34.6	4.8	34%	9.3	66%	14.1
Illinois*	10.0	48%	10.7	52%	20.7	3.0	31%	6.7	69%	9.7
Loyola-Stritch*	18.0	58%	13.0	42%	31.0	4.7	41%	6.7	59%	11.4
Northwestern-Feinberg*	26.0	53%	23.3	47%	49.3	12.7	44%	16.3	56%	29.0
Rush*	14.0	52%	13.0	48%	27.0	3.7	44%	4.7	56%	8.4
Southern Illinois*	5.0	50%	5.0	50%	10.0	2.3	53%	2.0	47%	4.3
IDIANA										
Indiana*	18.3	44%	23.7	56%	42.0	8.3	39%	13.0	61%	21.3
OWA										
Iowa-Carver	11.3	46%	13.5	54%	24.8	5.0	43%	6.5	57%	11.5
ANSAS										
Kansas*	19.3	45%	24.0	55%	43.3	7.3	41%	10.3	59%	17.6
ENTUCKY										
Kentucky*	19.0	46%	22.7	54%	41.7	6.7	34%	13.3	67%	20.0
Louisville	15.8	55%	12.8	45%	28.6	3.8	30%	8.8	70%	12.6
DUISIANA										
LSU New Orleans*	9.7	52%	9.0	48%	18.7	2.0	22%	7.3	78%	9.3
LSU Shreveport*	2.7	28%	7.0	72%	9.7	2.3	46%	2.7	54%	5.0
Tulane*	3.3	43%	4.3	57%	7.6	1.0	27%	2.7	73%	3.7
ARYLAND				2.70						0.,
Johns Hopkins	28.8	45%	34.8	55%	63.6	16.0	42%	21.8	58%	37.8
Maryland*	11.3	39%	18.0	61%	29.3	7.7	37%	13.3	63%	21.0
Uniformed Services-Hebert*	18.7	34%	35.7	66%	54.4	3.7	22%	13.3	78%	17.0
IASSACHUSETTS	10.7	34/0	33.7	00/0	34.4	3.7	22/0	13.3	7070	17.0
BU-Chobanian Avedisian*	12.3	58%	9.0	42%	21.3	5.7	55%	4.7	45%	10.4
Harvard*	12.3 59.7	58% 42%	83.0	58%	142.7	17.3	35%	31.7	45% 65%	49.0
Massachusetts-Chan*	3.7	37%	6.3	63%	10.0	4.0	44%	5.0	56%	9.0
Tufts*	5.7	66%	3.0	34%	8.7	2.7	47%	3.0	53%	5.7



The table below shows the average number and percentage of full-time faculty who were promoted at a medical school per year during academic year 2018–2019 through academic year 2021–2022. Data are reported to the Faculty Roster voluntarily on a rolling basis by medical schools throughout the year and thus reflect school-to-school differences in timeliness and consistency of reporting. As a result, comprehensive counts of promotions in academic year 2021–2022 could not be calculated for all medical schools. For those medical schools whose Faculty Roster data are not comprehensive through June 30, 2022, the average number and percentage of promotions were calculated for academic year 2018–2019 through academic year 2020–2021.

Medical School		Average Promoti	ons to Associate	Professor Per Yea	Average Promotions to Full Professor Per Year					
	Women Promotions		Men Promotions		Total Promotions	Women Promotions		Men Promotions		Total Promotion
	Average	%	Average	%	Average	Average	%	Average	%	Average
IICHIGAN										
Central Michigan	0.0	NA	0.0	NA	0.0	0.0	NA	0.0	NA	0.0
Michigan*	36.3	44%	46.0	56%	82.3	13.3	36%	24.0	64%	37.3
Michigan State	2.0	67%	1.0	33%	3.0	0.5	33%	1.0	67%	1.5
Oakland Beaumont*	3.7	58%	2.7	42%	6.4	0.3	30%	0.7	70%	1.0
Wayne State	9.8	41%	14.0	59%	23.8	6.0	38%	9.8	62%	15.8
Western Michigan-Stryker*	1.3	57%	1.0	43%	2.3	0.7	70%	0.3	30%	1.0
IINNESOTA										
Mayo-Alix*	10.7	44%	13.7	56%	24.4	8.0	45%	9.7	55%	17.7
Minnesota*	21.7	49%	23.0	51%	44.7	10.7	42%	14.7	58%	25.4
IISSISSIPPI										
Mississippi*	11.3	47%	12.7	53%	24.0	6.0	45%	7.3	55%	13.3
IISSOURI										
Missouri Columbia*	7.7	35%	14.0	65%	21.7	3.3	32%	7.0	68%	10.3
Missouri Kansas City	11.8	58%	8.5	42%	20.3	3.5	45%	4.3	55%	7.8
Saint Louis*	8.7	43%	11.7	57%	20.4	3.3	33%	6.7	67%	10.0
Washington U St Louis*	35.0	41%	50.7	59%	85.7	16.3	37%	28.3	63%	44.6
EBRASKA					5511					
Creighton	0.8	35%	1.5	65%	2.3	0.0	0%	2.0	100%	2.0
Nebraska*	11.3	42%	15.3	58%	26.6	6.0	43%	8.0	57%	14.0
EVADA	11.0	.2,0	25.5	5570	20.0	5.5	.0,0	0.0	3.70	14.0
Nevada Reno*	1.7	46%	2.0	54%	3.7	0.3	19%	1.3	81%	1.6
UNLV-Kerkorian*	0.7	41%	1.0	59%	1.7	0.7	100%	0.0	0%	0.7
	0.7	41/0	1.0	35%	1./	0.7	100%	0.0	0/0	0.7
EW HAMPSHIRE	6.7	4.40/	0.7	F.C0/	15.4	2.7	200/	6.0	630/	0.7
Dartmouth-Geisel*	6.7	44%	8.7	56%	15.4	3.7	38%	6.0	62%	9.7
EW JERSEY		250/	0.7		40.4	4.7	2501	2.5	5.00	
Cooper Rowan*	4.7	35%	8.7	65%	13.4	1.7	36%	3.0	64%	4.7
Hackensack Meridian	0.0	NA	0.0	NA	0.0	0.0	0%	0.3	100%	0.3
Rutgers New Jersey*	6.0	39%	9.3	61%	15.3	1.7	31%	3.7	69%	5.4
Rutgers-RW Johnson*	9.3	42%	13.0	58%	22.3	1.7	22%	6.0	78%	7.7
EW MEXICO										
New Mexico*	21.3	56%	17.0	44%	38.3	9.7	61%	6.3	39%	16.0
EW YORK										
Albany	10.8	59%	7.5	41%	18.3	4.0	35%	7.3	65%	11.3
Buffalo-Jacobs*	5.3	38%	8.7	62%	14.0	1.7	19%	7.3	81%	9.0
CUNY	0.0	0%	0.3	100%	0.3	0.3	50%	0.3	50%	0.6
Columbia-Vagelos*	25.0	46%	29.0	54%	54.0	10.3	42%	14.0	58%	24.3
Cornell-Weill*	23.0	45%	28.0	55%	51.0	6.0	32%	12.7	68%	18.7
Einstein*	27.3	53%	24.7	48%	52.0	9.0	45%	11.0	55%	20.0
Mount Sinai-Icahn*	34.0	41%	48.7	59%	82.7	16.7	40%	24.7	60%	41.4
	NA	NA NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
NYU Long Island**						8.0				
NYU-Grossman	13.5	44% 40%	17.3	56%	30.8		40%	11.8	60% 64%	19.8
New York Medical*	4.0		6.0	60%	10.0	1.7	36%	3.0		4.7
Renaissance Stony Brook*	5.3	36%	9.3	64%	14.6	1.7	25%	5.0	75%	6.7
Rochester	23.3	46%	27.5	54%	50.8	8.3	34%	16.3	66%	24.6
SUNY Downstate*	3.3	52%	3.0	48%	6.3	3.0	53%	2.7	47%	5.7
SUNY Upstate-Norton*	8.7	49%	9.0	51%	17.7	2.3	33%	4.7	67%	7.0
Zucker Hofstra Northwell*	18.0	48%	19.3	52%	37.3	4.0	29%	10.0	71%	14.0
ORTH CAROLINA										
Duke*	17.7	37%	29.7	63%	47.4	12.7	39%	19.7	61%	32.4
East Carolina-Brody*	6.0	53%	5.3	47%	11.3	2.3	53%	2.0	47%	4.3
North Carolina*	26.7	54%	22.3	46%	49.0	17.7	48%	19.3	52%	37.0
Wake Forest*	12.7	47%	14.3	53%	27.0	5.3	37%	9.0	63%	14.3
ORTH DAKOTA										
North Dakota*	2.0	67%	1.0	33%	3.0	1.0	50%	1.0	50%	2.0
OHIO										
Case Western Reserve*	29.0	47%	32.7	53%	61.7	13.0	34%	25.7	66%	38.7
Cincinnati	35.0	46%	41.5	54%	76.5	15.8	42%	22.0	58%	37.8
Northeast Ohio*	2.0	47%	2.3	53%	4.3	0.0	0%	2.3	100%	2.3
Ohio State*	40.7	50%	41.3	50%	82.0	19.0	42%	26.0	58%	45.0
Toledo*	2.0	32%	4.3	68%	6.3	1.0	23%	3.3	77%	43.0
	1.3	32%	2.7	68%	4.0	0.7	23%	1.7	71%	
Wright State-Boonshoft*	1.3	3370	2.1	U870	4.0	0.7	2370	1./	/ 170	2.4
KLAHOMA	40.0	430/	42.2	E TO!	22.2	4.5	200/	0.0	C 401	40.5
Oklahoma	10.0	43%	13.3	57%	23.3	4.5	36%	8.0	64%	12.5
REGON										
Oregon*	28.3	52%	26.3	48%	54.6	10.3	46%	12.3	54%	22.6
NNSYLVANIA										
Drexel*	6.0	60%	4.0	40%	10.0	3.0	70%	1.3	30%	4.3
Geisinger Commonwealth*	1.0	25%	3.0	75%	4.0	0.3	13%	2.0	87%	2.3
Jefferson-Kimmel*	19.3	57%	14.7	43%	34.0	6.3	30%	15.0	70%	21.3
Penn State*	11.3	36%	19.7	64%	31.0	6.0	40%	9.0	60%	15.0
Pennsylvania-Perelman*	40.3	46%	47.0	54%	87.3	24.0	39%	37.7	61%	61.7
Pittsburgh*	18.0	45%	22.3	55%	40.3	8.3	37%	14.0	63%	22.3
Temple-Katz*	18.0	53%	16.0	47%	34.0	8.0	40%	12.0	60%	20.0
JERTO RICO	-5.5	22.3	22.3		22					
Caribe	0.0	NA	0.0	NA	0.0	0.0	NA	0.0	NA	0.0
Ponce	0.0	NA NA	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0		0.0
				NA 430/			NA C20/		NA 200/	
Puerto Rico	3.8	58%	2.8	42%	6.6	2.5	63%	1.5	38%	4.0
San Juan Bautista*	0.3	30%	0.7	70%	1.0	0.0	NA	0.0	NA	0.0
HODE ISLAND										



The table below shows the average number and percentage of full-time faculty who were promoted at a medical school per year during academic year 2018–2019 through academic year 2021–2022. Data are reported to the Faculty Roster voluntarily on a rolling basis by medical schools throughout the year and thus reflect school-to-school differences in timeliness and consistency of reporting. As a result, comprehensive counts of promotions in academic year 2021–2022 could not be calculated for all medical schools. For those medical schools whose Faculty Roster data are not comprehensive through June 30, 2022, the average number and percentage of promotions were calculated for academic year 2018–2019 through academic year 2020–2021.

		Average Promot	ions to Associate P	rofessor Per Yea	nr	Average Promotions to Full Professor Per Year					
Medical School	Women Promotions		Men Promotions		Total Promotions	Women Promotions		Men Promotions		Total Promotions	
	Average	%	Average	%	Average	Average	%	Average	%	Average	
SOUTH CAROLINA											
MU South Carolina*	13.3	47%	15.3	53%	28.6	7.3	31%	16.0	69%	23.3	
South Carolina Columbia*	2.3	46%	2.7	54%	5.0	0.7	41%	1.0	59%	1.7	
South Carolina Greenville*	5.0	43%	6.7	57%	11.7	1.0	23%	3.3	77%	4.3	
SOUTH DAKOTA											
South Dakota-Sanford*	3.3	62%	2.0	38%	5.3	0.7	15%	4.0	85%	4.7	
TENNESSEE											
East Tennessee-Quillen*	2.0	50%	2.0	50%	4.0	2.7	45%	3.3	55%	6.0	
Meharry*	0.0	0%	0.3	100%	0.3	0.0	0%	0.3	100%	0.3	
Tennessee	11.0	38%	18.0	62%	29.0	4.3	34%	8.3	66%	12.6	
Vanderbilt*	26.0	46%	30.7	54%	56.7	14.0	52%	12.7	48%	26.7	
TEXAS											
Baylor*	38.0	47%	42.7	53%	80.7	15.7	41%	22.7	59%	38.4	
Houston-Fertitta**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
TCU-Burnett**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Texas A&M*	1.0	50%	1.0	50%	2.0	0.3	50%	0.3	50%	0.6	
Texas Tech	5.8	44%	7.5	56%	13.3	3.8	47%	4.3	53%	8.1	
Texas Tech-Foster	2.3	50%	2.3	50%	4.6	0.3	23%	1.0	77%	1.3	
UT Austin-Dell*	1.7	50%	1.7	50%	3.4	0.7	70%	0.3	30%	1.0	
UT Houston-McGovern*	21.7	45%	27.0	55%	48.7	8.0	44%	10.3	56%	18.3	
UT Medical Branch-Sealy*	9.0	44%	11.3	56%	20.3	5.3	48%	5.7	52%	11.0	
UT Rio Grande Valley*	0.3	13%	2.0	87%	2.3	0.0	NA	0.0	NA	0.0	
UT San Antonio-Long*	22.7	50%	22.3	50%	45.0	7.7	39%	12.3	62%	20.0	
UT Southwestern*	28.0	46%	33.0	54%	61.0	9.3	27%	25.7	73%	35.0	
UTAH	20.0	1070	33.0	31,70	01.0	3.5	27,70	23.7	7370	33.0	
Utah-Eccles*	26.3	43%	34.3	57%	60.6	8.7	36%	15.7	64%	24.4	
VERMONT	20.0	1570	3 1.3	37,70	00.0	0.7	30,0	25.7	0170	2	
Vermont-Larner*	8.0	51%	7.7	49%	15.7	4.0	40%	6.0	60%	10.0	
VIRGINIA	0.0	31/0	7.7	4370	15.7	4.0	4070	0.0	0070	10.0	
Eastern Virginia	4.5	54%	3.8	46%	8.3	1.8	38%	3.0	63%	4.8	
Virginia*	19.0	48%	21.0	53%	40.0	3.0	27%	8.0	73%	11.0	
Virginia Commonwealth*	15.0	43%	20.0	57%	35.0	6.3	33%	13.0	67%	19.3	
Virginia Commonwealth  Virginia Tech Carilion*	9.3	54%	8.0	46%	17.3	0.0	0%	3.3	100%	3.3	
WASHINGTON	3.3	3470	0.0	4070	17.5	0.0	070	5.5	10070	3.3	
U Washington*	50.3	52%	47.3	48%	97.6	15.3	34%	30.0	66%	45.3	
Washington State-Floyd*	0.3	15%	1.7	85%	2.0	0.0	0%	0.7	100%	0.7	
WEST VIRGINIA	0.3	13/0	1.7	03/0	2.0	0.0	070	0.7	10070	0.7	
Marshall-Edwards	2.8	35%	5.3	65%	8.1	1.5	33%	3.0	67%	4.5	
West Virginia*	9.7	44%	12.3	56%	22.0	1.0	19%	4.3	81%	5.3	
WISCONSIN	3.1	44/0	12.3	3070	22.0	1.0	1370	4.5	01/0	5.5	
MC Wisconsin*	17.3	42%	24.0	58%	41.3	10.3	37%	17.7	63%	28.0	
Wisconsin*	17.0	40%	26.0	60%	43.0	11.0	34%	21.0	66%	32.0	
WISCOUSIII.	17.0	40%	20.0	00%	43.0	11.0	34%	21.0	00%	32.0	
Total	1,949.4	46%	2,254.3	54%	4,203.7	841.9	39%	1,329.7	61%	2,171.6	

## Notes

As an example of how to interpret this table, the 1.8 figure for South Alabama-Whiddon under Average Women Promotions to Associate Professor indicates that an average of 1.8 full-time women faculty per year were promoted to Associate Professor at the Frederick P. Whiddon College of Medicine at the University of South Alabama between academic year 2018–2019 and academic year 2021–2022, which represents 38% of the total average full-time faculty promotions to Associate Professor per year at the Frederick P. Whiddon College of Medicine at the University of South Alabama during the same time period (4.8).

Source: AAMC Faculty Roster, December 31, 2022 snapshot

<sup>\*</sup> The Faculty Roster data for these medical schools are not comprehensive through June 30, 2022, so the averages were calculated for academic year 2018–2019 through academic year 2021–2022.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Promotion data are not reported for medical schools that received accreditation after June 30, 2018.

The table does not include faculty with unreported gender (n = 1).