

SENATE Economic Status of the Faculty

Executive Summary of the Economic Status of the Faculty 2003-2004 Report

Introduction

This Executive Summary is meant to cover the most salient portions of the full Economic Status of the Faculty 2002-2003/04 Report. The full report is online at www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v51/n11/acrobat.html. It is the consensus of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF) that having a condensed summary of the full report will lead to a wider dissemination of this information to the faculty-at-large. Covered in this report are the following areas:

- Comparisons with Growth in the Consumer Price Index (CPI)
- Comparisons with Peer Universities Using MIT Survey Data
- Comparisons with Peer Universities Using AAUP Survey Data
- Variability in Average Salary Levels by Rank
- Trends in Variability Over Time
- Variability by Gender

The Summary concludes with the Committee's Recommendations and Questions for the Administration for 2003-04.

Comparisons with Growth in the Consumer Price Index (CPI)¹

Comparisons for FY 2003 with the CPI indicate that:

(a) for all ranks, the mean FY 2003 percentage salary increases were considerably higher than the percentage increases in the CPI,

(b) for all ranks, the median FY 2003 percentage salary increases were higher than the percentage increases in the CPI,

(c) for all ranks, the extent to which the percentage increase in the means and median salaries exceed the percentage increase in the CPI was not as high as in FY 2002 (though the percentage differentials in that year were the largest in the past 10-year period), and

(d) the mean percentage increases are substantial in absolute value and for the three ranks combined (though not for Assistant or Full Professors considered separately) exceed slightly the faculty guideline upper bound of 6.0%. We believe that such a trend, if it continues, will strengthen Penn's competitive position and allow us to attract even higher quality researchers and teachers.

Group/Condition	Average	FY 2003
Full Professors	Median	4.0%
	Mean	5.0%
Associate Professors	Median	4.0%
	Mean	6.5%
Assistant Professors	Median	4.0%
	Mean	5.3%
All Three Ranks	Mean	6.1%
U.S. City Average CPI	Mean	2.1%
Budget Guidelines	Mean	3.5%

NOTE: Academic base salary percentage increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members who continued in employment at the University during the periods of time reported. Excluded were all members of the Faculty of Medicine, all Clinician Educators from four other schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Work) that have such positions, and faculty members who entered Penn employment during the periods of time reported.

The most impressive salary increase percentages continue to be the cumulative compound salary increments over a 10-year period (from FY 1994 through FY 2003):

- Full Professors: 60.0%
- Associate Professors: 70.2%
- Assistant Professors: 70.0%

On the whole (all ranks combined) and for each of the three ranks, the cumulative mean Penn faculty salary increments in percentage terms during this 10-year period were more than twice the percentage growth of 27.2% in the CPI.

Comparisons with Peer Universities Using MIT Survey Data

The best currently available salary data from other institutions of higher education are provided by the MIT annual survey of a group of approximately 25 private and public research universities. These salary data are reported for the following academic fields:

- Natural Sciences (at Penn, represented by SAS departments)
- Humanities and Social Sciences (at Penn, represented by SAS departments)
- Engineering (at Penn, represented by SEAS)
- Architecture (at Penn, represented by GSFA²)
- Management (at Penn, represented by Wharton)

Salary Comparisons: Penn's Competitive Standing

The most meaningful comparisons of mean faculty salaries at Penn with those at other universities in the MIT salary survey sample are broken out by academic field and rank:

Rank order of mean salary levels for Penn faculty members by five academic fields in comparison with selected public and private research universities as of the Fall Terms of 2002 & 2003.

Academic Fields	2002-03	2003-04
<i>Full Professor</i>		
Natural Sciences	11/22	8/22
Soc Sci/Human	7/22	6/22
Engineering	10/20	13/20
Architecture	5/16	7/16
Management	5/17	5/17
<i>Associate Professor</i>		
Natural Sciences	9/22	7/22
Soc Sci/Human	7/22	5/22
Engineering	13/20	9/20
Architecture	-	-
Management	5/17	4/17
<i>Assistant Professor</i>		
Natural Sciences	8/22	8/22
Soc Sci/Human	8/22	10/22
Engineering	7/20	8/20
Architecture	7/16	5/16
Management	9/17	8/17

NOTE: Salary rank orders pertain to the mean academic base salary levels of Penn standing faculty members from the Sciences (of SAS) and Social Sciences and Humanities (of SAS), and the School of Engineering and Applied Science (for engineering), GSFA, now School of Design (for architecture), and Wharton (for management). Rank orders are reported only if the number of faculty members is four or more. Data source: MIT Salary Survey.

As a broad overall generalization for the four schools at Penn included in the MIT survey as weighted by faculty size, it is fair to conclude that Penn's mean faculty salaries for all ranks in 2003-04 tend to be above the mean of the MIT sample.

Comparisons with Peer Universities Using AAUP Survey Data

Presented below is a comparison of the mean salaries of all full professors at Penn with those at a small select group of research universities based on data obtained by the Penn administration and published annually by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in *Academe*.

Full professor salary comparisons: Percentage differences in mean academic base salary levels of Penn full professors in comparison with salary levels of full professors at a sample of comparable research universities.

University	Full Professor Salaries Percentage Differences by Year	
	2001-02	2002-03
Harvard	+13.0%	+13.0%
Princeton	+2.9%	+3.8%
Yale	+2.5%	+2.8%
Stanford	+2.3%	+2.8%
Chicago	+0.9%	+0.9%
Pennsylvania	128.0K	133.5K
NYU	-1.3%	-1.0%
Columbia	-2.0%	-2.2%
Northwestern	-4.5%	-4.3%
MIT	-3.8%	-4.4%
Duke	-7.2%	-6.4%
UCLA	-9.6%	-11.7%
U.C. (Berkeley)	-9.5%	-12.1%
Michigan	-14.9%	-14.0%
Carnegie-Mellon	-15.0%	-17.3%
Virginia	-15.9%	-19.3%
N.C. (Chapel Hill)	19.2%	-21.2%
Texas (Austin)	-22.8%	-22.9%
MN (Twin Cities)	-23.8%	-24.1%

¹ The consumer price index (CPI) refers to prices for a basket of goods and services purchased by "average workers."

² GSFA (now the School of Design) also included Departments of City and Regional Planning, Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning, and Fine Arts.

SENATE Economic Status of the Faculty

NOTE: Penn academic base mean salaries are based on standing faculty members at the rank of professor. Excluded are all members of the Faculty of Medicine and all standing faculty members who are appointed as Clinician Educators from four other schools that have such positions (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Work). Data source: AAUP Salary Surveys

Variability in Average Salary Increases by Rank and School/Area

Before reviewing these salary increases, it should be recognized that the salary increase guideline of 2.8% for FY 2004 is just that, a guideline, and pertains to an aggregate of all increases for all ranks combined for each of Penn's schools. Therefore, a comparison of the median increase awarded to faculty members of a particular rank and school with the salary guideline only gives an indication of the extent to which the guideline was implemented in that particular instance.

With respect to *full professors*, in seven of the 14 schools/areas the median salary increases for FY 2004 were within half a percent of the general guideline of 2.8% (between 2.3-3.3%), while two were lower than 2.3% (Annenberg, Dental Medicine) and the other five were above 3.3% (Graduate Education, Graduate School of Fine Arts, Law, Social Work, Wharton).

With respect to *associate professors*, in four of the 13 schools/areas (data for Law are not available) the median salary increases for FY 2004 were within half a percent of the general guideline of 2.8% (between 2.3-3.3%), while two were lower than 2.3% (Annenberg, Nursing) and the other seven were above 3.3% (Engineering and Applied Science, Graduate Education, Graduate School of Fine Arts, Medicine-Basic Sciences, Natural Science (A&S), Social Work, Wharton).

With respect to *assistant professors*, in four of the 12 schools (data for Annenberg and Social Work are not available) the median salary increases for FY 2004 were within half a percent of the general guideline of 2.8% (between 2.3-3.3%), while two were lower than 2.3% (Dental Medicine, Nursing) and the other six were above 3.3% (Graduate Education, Graduate School of Fine Arts, Law, Medicine-Basic Sciences, Natural Science (A&S), Wharton).

Variability in Average Salary Levels by Rank

Three-year data on mean and median faculty salaries by rank are shown for all schools combined, except Medicine.

Mean academic base salary levels of continuing Penn standing faculty members by rank.

Rank	Academic Year	Salary	
		Average	Amount
Full Professor	2001-02	Mean	127,446
		Median	112,546
	2002-03	Mean	136,238
		Median	127,450
	2003-04	Mean	140,782
		Median	130,048
Associate Professor	2001-02	Mean	90,050
		Median	82,187
	2002-03	Mean	92,963
		Median	85,000
	2003-04	Mean	96,254
		Median	88,200
Assistant Professor	2001-02	Mean	79,003
		Median	75,000
	2002-03	Mean	82,819
		Median	75,000
	2003-04	Mean	82,792
		Median	76,294

NOTE: Mean academic base salary levels are based on all Penn standing faculty members who continued in employment in FY 2002, FY 2003, and FY 2004 from their respective prior years. Excluded were all members of the Faculty of Medicine, all Clinician Educators from four other schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Work) that have such positions, and faculty members who were promoted effective for each year reported.

Trends in Variability Over Time

The variability (i.e., the Inter Quartile Range, IQR) of median salaries for Penn's 14 school/areas for the three professorial ranks in 2003-04 increased considerably from two years prior (2001-02), which also is reported in last year's SCESF report as a considerable increase from two years earlier (1999-2000). This is evidence of ongoing rapidly increasing disparity of faculty salaries across Penn's 14 schools/areas. Schools/areas offering higher median salaries apparently also offer higher annual percentage in-

creases. That is, the increases in the IQR are not just proportional to the increase in salary levels from one year to the next, but the disparities among schools/areas in median salaries is growing in percentage terms as well as in dollars.

In short, these statistical facts indicate that, in general, differences in median faculty salaries between lower paying schools/areas and higher paying schools/areas have been, and continue to be, slowly increasing both in dollar amount and in percentage difference. As noted in prior SCESF reports, variability among schools/areas is no doubt a product, to a considerable extent, of market forces in the hiring of faculty members and in the relative wealth of schools (i.e., financial ability to support faculty salaries). The relative wealth of schools available for supporting faculty salaries is, in major part, a function of how much income a school is able to earn and the level of non-faculty expenditures it regards as essential—each has been discussed above and in the section on Responsibility Center Budget System in SCESF's 2001-2002 report (*Almanac* March 25, 2003).

If the wide difference among schools/areas in median salaries of full professors seen at Penn is a general phenomenon at other universities as well, there will be evidence that Penn is experiencing a general market phenomenon instead of a local idiosyncrasy. To test this possibility, last year's report analyzed recent data from the MIT Salary Survey for 12 universities³ that reported salary means for full professors for all five academic areas. The result was that these 12 ratios ranged from a low of 1.32 to a high of 2.05, with a mean of 1.59—indicating that wide variation in mean faculty salaries across academic areas is common and substantial. Penn's ratio in the MIT data was virtually the same as the mean of the 12 universities. This suggests that the variability in mean faculty salaries across schools/areas at Penn is currently in line with experience elsewhere, and is a function of general economic forces affecting all of academia.

Variability by Gender

The SCESF requested that rates of salary increases be provided by gender. This table provides the percentage increases for the first, second and third quartiles by rank for FY 2004⁴.

Percentage Salary Increase Distribution by Gender and Rank

First Quartile (Q1), Median (Md.), and Third Quartile (Q3)

Rank	Gender	Percentage Salary Increases by Year		
		2003-04	Q1	Median
Full Professor	Men	2.50	3.00	4.30
	Women	2.60	3.25	4.73
Associate Professor	Men	2.75	3.50	7.55
	Women	2.80	3.20	7.10
Assistant Professor	Men	2.80	3.60	4.90
	Women	2.80	3.70	4.80

The general pattern seems to be approximately equal salary increases in percentage terms. The range of differences for the male minus female percentage increases by ranks-quartiles is -0.40 to 0.50, with the majority 0.1 or less in absolute value. In the majority of cases the percentage increases are slightly larger for women than for men (five of the eight cases in which they differ)—including all three quartiles for full professors. In contrast at the median and third quartile for associate professors the percentage increases are larger for men by 0.3 to 0.5%. Given interest in gender comparisons, the SCESF recommends that such data be included in future reports, perhaps with some disaggregation for cases in which there are sufficient numbers in the underlying cells.

SCESF Recommendations and Questions for the Administration for 2003-04

In accordance with Faculty Senate policy, following are recommendations and questions for the administration that have arisen in the SCESF discussions, including some updates on the status of recommendations made in last year's SCESF report.

1. *Salary Competitiveness Issue.* The need to attain and maintain faculty salary levels that are highly competitive with salaries provided by peer

³ The sample of 12 universities analyzed was selected from the following group of 13: Carnegie Mellon University, Columbia University, Cornell University, Georgia Institute of Technology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Rice University, University of California (Berkeley), University of California (Los Angeles), University of Illinois, University of Michigan, University of Pennsylvania, University of Texas, and Yale University.

⁴ This information is presented only at the aggregate level because for a number of school/areas-rank cells the number of one gender (generally female) is fairly low.

universities, while simultaneously sustaining other components of university operations essential to providing high quality instruction, research, and service.

SCESF Recommendations

a. While the recent changes in Penn salaries generally apparently have been positive relative to peer institutions, there are a few areas in which apparently mean faculty salaries in academic fields included in the MIT Salary Survey have fallen behind the comparison groups (e.g., compare first and last columns in Table 4). If these four faculty groups are as meritorious, on the whole, as comparable faculty groups at Penn with changes towards more competitive mean salary levels, it is recommended that priority be placed on increasing mean salaries to Penn's competitive level of the groups that have fallen behind. These areas are:

- (1) Full professors in:
 - (a) Engineering
 - (b) Architecture
- (2) Associate professors in:
 - (a) Social science/humanities
- (3) Assistant professors in:
 - (a) Management

The SCESF has identified specific areas where Penn may have fallen behind its peers. The Provost agrees to explore this further by examining what explains this outcome in each area.

b. Even though priority should be placed on regaining Penn's competitive level in the academic fields identified above, it is recommended that equal priority be given to recognizing in advance and rewarding with salary increases distinguished performance of faculty members who choose not to seek, or use, attractive offers of external appointment to negotiate salary increases. We note that while generally Penn's salaries have tended to become more attractive relative to the comparison group in the MIT survey, there are very few fields/ranks in which Penn is in the top tercile (only for professors and associate professors in management in column four in Table 4). The question arises whether the university can keep and attract faculty members of the caliber to improve the university to the top group to which it aspires unless faculty salaries are in the top group.

The Provost agrees that in setting salary increases, deans and department chairs must balance the need to attract distinguished faculty and to retain those with outside offers against the need to treat equally distinguished faculty fairly. The Provost will closely scrutinize data related to market conditions as the basis for ascertaining what level of increase is necessary to attract and retain faculty. In comparing our salary levels to those of our peer institutions, it must be noted that Penn has made steady progress over the last decade and overall ranks fourth in the listing. This reflects a conscious strategy of devoting resources to faculty compensation to increase Penn's competitiveness in attracting and retaining faculty. Moving into the top tercile, however, will be quite difficult in the immediate future given Penn's resource base as compared to some of our peers. Recognizing this, the President and the Provost are committed to growing the size of Penn's resource base to further enhance Penn's ability to attract and retain the very best faculty.

2. Salary Equity Issues. The need to identify and eliminate inequity among individual faculty salaries by rank within departments (and schools organized as single departments).

SCESF Comment

As reviewed in this SCESF's *Annual Report* for 2003-04, a considerable percentage of faculty members (11%) received salary increases for FY 2004 that were below the growth in the CPI (Phil.) for the 12 months ending June 2003. Though this percentage has been declining in recent years (e.g., from 18% in FY 2002), it still raises questions of whether some faculty members who have performed at least at a satisfactory level have received salary increases less than growth in the CPI. If so, this represents an effective reduction in salary in terms of purchasing power—a circumstance that is clearly inequitable given that the overall salary increase percentage for each school was well in excess of the growth in the CPI.

SCESF Recommendations

a. In view of the quantitative facts identified above, it is recommended that further consideration be given by the Provost and the Deans to decreasing the instances in which faculty members who have performed at least at a satisfactory level are awarded salary increases below the annual growth in the CPI (Phil.). In making this recommendation, we realize that the feasibility of awarding increases to faculty members with satisfactory performance

at least as great as growth in the CPI depends on the difference between funds available for salary increases and the CPI growth percentage—with the larger the positive difference, the greater the feasibility of providing salary increases of at least the CPI growth percentage.

At a time when the funds available for salary increases is not much larger than the CPI growth percentage, it is very difficult to provide salary increases of at least the CPI growth percentage to all faculty members regardless of their performance. The Provost is aware that in such a situation there may be instances where faculty members who are performing at a satisfactory level may receive salary increases less than the growth in the CPI. The Provost does review all salary increases submitted by the deans, and will continue to question the basis for giving low increases to individual faculty members.

3. A request that arose in the SCESF report for last year is to include in Tables 6, 7, and 8 quartiles for schools by rank where the sample size is 10 or less (as quartiles would be based on two people) by providing a two or three year average. Last year the Provost seemed to support this request, but so far there has not been implementation.

SCESF Recommendations

a. The procedure for providing information for small cells in Tables 6, 7 and 8 by averaging over two or three years be implemented in 2004-05.

The Provost's Office has already begun discussions on the ways in which the Office of Institutional Research can work more efficiently with the SCESF so that data requests can be met in a timely fashion.

4. The SCESF appreciates the provision by the administration of a new table on gender differences in percentage salary increases by rank (Table 11). To further illuminate possible gender differences, perhaps reflecting the cumulative effects of past gender differences in salary increases, the SCESF would like to have provided in future years also a table parallel to Table 11 with faculty salary levels by rank and by gender. It may be desirable to limit this table to individuals who have been five years or less in rank if there are substantial gender differences years in rank, as might be the case particularly for professors in some areas.

SCESF Recommendations

a. Information be provided to the SCESF on salary levels by gender and rank starting in 2004-05 (perhaps limited to those five years or less in rank).

The Provost agrees that this would be a useful table and will direct that data be supplied to the SCESF to enable it to engage in this analysis.

5. The SCESF lauds the partial participation of the School of Medicine in providing information for the basic sciences, for the second year. However the SCESF remains concerned about the broader participation of the health and medical-related areas in the report.

SCESF Recommendations

a. The Provost's Office take responsibility (rather than the SCESF) for obtaining faculty salary information for comparisons with other comparable universities from the Schools of Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine and Nursing.

b. Information be provided to the SCESF for the School of Medicine, basic sciences for Tables 9 and 10, in addition to the tables that report percentage changes in salaries.

c. Information be provided to the SCESF for the School of Medicine, basic sciences for external comparisons so that the SCESF can provide these faculty members the same information that the SCESF provides to most other schools and departments.

The Provost will engage in discussions with the deans of the Schools of Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, and Nursing to identify ways in which better faculty salary information for comparable schools can be obtained. While recognizing that the method of compensating faculty in the School of Medicine is complex, even for those faculty in the basic sciences, and that labor market conditions for faculty in the School of Medicine differ from those in other schools of the University, the Provost will explore with the dean of the School of Medicine whether it is possible to supply meaningful salary data on compensation in the basic sciences.

6. One further request that came out of the last year's SCESF meeting, was the possibility of having the Provost meet with the SCESF prior to setting salary guidelines for the next fiscal year. As we understand, such decisions usually take place in mid-late spring semester. We would hope that such a meeting could take place early in the spring semester. Our belief

SENATE Economic Status of the Faculty

is that this would add to the comfort level that the SCESF had about the decisions that were made regarding salary setting policy. While the Provost indicated willingness to meet with the SCESF for such purposes, this procedure was not implemented in 2003-04.

SCESF Recommendations

a. The Provost's Office meet with the SCESF early in the spring semester prior to setting salary guidelines starting in 2004-05.

The Provost accepts the recommendation of the SCESF with a view to scheduling a meeting at a time when it can be most fruitful.

7. As it has been five years since the 1998-99 report in which faculty benefits were examined in comparison to our peer institutions, we request that the Provost's Office provide this information to the SCESF for next year in accordance with what was done in 1998-99. Furthermore, going forward, we believe that this should be looked at roughly every five years if not more frequently. While the Provost agreed that this was a timely request in response to questions raised in last year's SCESF report, as far as we know this process has not been initiated.

SCESF Recommendations

a. The report on faculty benefits be undertaken in 2004-05.

Because employee benefits continue to be a very dynamic area, the Provost agrees that a review every five years is a sensible planning horizon. The Provost's Office will initiate a benefits review during 2004-05.

8. The SCESF expressed in last year's report concern about low relative spread in salaries at the full professor level which may indicate a problem in attracting faculty at the upper end of the scale. This is evidenced in Table 10, in which the spread in full professor salaries as a ratio to median salary is lower than that for assistant and associate professor. Last year the SCESF requested that the Provost continue monitoring this situation and advise the committee as to what efforts are being made to allow Penn's "top end" to stay competitive. We note that this spread has declined compared to the data from the past two years. But in any case we emphasize that ongoing monitoring of the competitiveness of "top end" salaries is important and should be continued.

9. *Issue Concerning Data on the Competitiveness of Faculty Salaries not Included in the MIT Survey.* Last year's SCESF report emphasized the need to seek, or compile, evidence about the competitiveness of faculty salaries at schools not included in the MIT survey. The Provost agreed. Such information, however, has not been provided for this year's SCESF report.

SCESF Recommendations

a. Further efforts be undertaken to provide this information to the SCESF in 2004-05.

At the present time there is an initiative to modify the way in which the MIT survey is conducted, and to have it done under other auspices. It appears that a larger group of universities may be included in the survey. The Provost wishes to ascertain the outcome of this process before deciding whether it is necessary for Penn to seek alternative methods of gathering additional data.

10. *Further Information about Salary Increases for Continuing Penn Faculty and Penn Faculty Continuing in Rank.* As noted in VII.A.1, there has been some confusion about whether the data provided to the SCESF has referred to continuing Penn faculty or to Penn faculty continuing in rank. We believe that this year's report has correctly identified which concept is used for different tables and comparisons (i.e., Penn faculty continuing in rank for Tables 3, 9 and 10; continuing Penn faculty elsewhere). If some schools have substantial salary increments for promotion, this difference may affect how the tables are interpreted. Both concepts have value for understanding various aspects of Penn's faculty salary structure and how it is evolving.

SCESF Recommendations

a. For the SCESF 2004-05 report, one set of Tables be provided to the SCESF based on continuing faculty and another set (excluding Tables 4 and

5) be provided based on faculty continuing in rank. The SCESF then can examine the two sets of tables, decide whether the difference is important, and decide in consultation with the Provost how best to present the data in the report itself.

b. Further efforts be undertaken to provide this information to the SCESF in 2004-05.

The Provost agrees that the data should be presented in a way where there is no confusion on this point. The Office of Institutional Research will supply the data in such a way as to make this clear.

11. *Providing More Information Directly to Faculty Members about How to Put Their Own Salary Increases into Perspective.* An important objective of the SCESF is to improve information to faculty members about salary levels and changes. Indeed, this report is devoted to attempting to provide such information. However, when faculty members receive notification of their salaries for the next academic year, they generally do not have at their fingertips information to help them put their salary increases into some broader perspective, and the next SCESF report will not be available to help with that perspective for almost a year. Therefore the question arises whether more information could be provided at the time of notification of the salary for the next academic year that would help the individual faculty members have better perspective at that time. Because of lags in information processing, it would not be possible to provide information about how their salary changes fit into the broader distribution of salary changes at the University or even school level. But at a minimum it would seem desirable to provide not only the new salary level, but the percentage change in salary that that level implies.

SCESF Recommendations

a. The Provost's Office consider implementing a procedure in which all faculty salary letters include the percentage change as well as the level of the new salary.

The Provost will discuss with the Deans the way in which salary increase information is communicated to faculty members. Where the Dean's office sends a letter or suggests a format to department chairs, the Provost will recommend that the letter include the percentage change as well as the level of the new salary.

12. *Improving the Timeliness of Information Provided to the SCESF.* Historically, information for the SCESF report has been provided by the administration some time in the middle of the spring semester, and occasionally fairly late in the spring semester. This has squeezed considerably the time that the SCESF has had to analyze this information, and runs the risk of creating an environment of irritation, if not distrust. It would appear, moreover, that much of the information that is provided is available in raw form much earlier.

SCESF Recommendations

a. The possibility be explored of providing some or all of the tables for the SCESF 2004-05 report earlier in the academic year by consultation with the Office of Institutional Research early in the academic year.

The Provost has already embarked on discussions with the SCESF regarding the setting of a timeframe for data requests and for the supply of data, such that this annual process can be handled in a more efficient and expeditious manner.

Members of the 2003-04

Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

Jere Behrman, *Chair* (School of Arts and Sciences)

Eric T. Bradlow (Wharton)

Linda Brown (School of Nursing)

Lance Donaldson-Evans, *ex officio* (School of Arts and Sciences)

Mitchell Marcus (School of Engineering and Applied Science)

Charles Mooney, *ex officio* (School of Law)

Pheobe Leboy (School of Dental Medicine)

Richard E. Khilstrom (Wharton)

Amita Sehgal (School of Medicine)