

Executive Summary of the Economic Status of the Faculty 2011-2012 Report

Introduction

This Executive Summary is meant to cover the most salient portions of the full Economic Status of the Faculty 2011-2012 Report. This report addresses salary increases in 2011-2012, not in 2012-2013, which will be the subject of the report next year.

The Summary concludes with the Committee's Recommendations and Questions for the Administration for 2011-2012. The Committee encourages readers to access and review the complete report: *Almanac*, www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v59/n23/esf.html

Table 1

Average Academic Base Salary Percentage Increases of Continuing Penn Standing Faculty Members by Rank in Comparison With the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and Penn Budget Guidelines		
Group/Condition	Metric	FYs 2011-2012
Full Professor	Mean	3.8%
	Median	2.8%
Associate Professor	Mean	5.6%
	Median	2.8%
Assistant Professor	Mean	4.1%
	Median	2.8%
All Three Ranks	Mean	4.3%
	Median	2.8%
US City Average CPI Growth	Mean	1.7%
Phil. CPI Growth	Mean	1.3%
Budget Guidelines	Mean	2.9%

Notes: All salaries are converted to a nine-month base. Academic base salary increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members with an appointment at the time of fall census for both years. Faculty members on paid leave or unpaid leave are reported at their full salaries.

Excluded are all members of the Faculty of Medicine except basic scientists, all Clinician Educators from four schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy & Practice), faculty members on phased retirement and Deans of all Schools.

FYs 2011-2012 CPI growth for the US and for Philadelphia are based on a change in CPI from June 2011 to June 2012.

Comparisons with Peer Universities Using Data from the AAU Data Exchange

The best currently available salary data from other institutions of higher education are provided by the American Association of Universities (AAU) Data Exchange. The AAU is comprised of 60 public and private research universities in the United States and two in Canada. The AAU includes several Ivy League institutions (e.g., Penn, Brown, Harvard, Princeton, Cornell and Yale), other private universities (e.g., Brandeis, Rice, Emory and Vanderbilt), public flagship universities (e.g., Berkeley, UCLA, the Universities of Michigan, Virginia and Wisconsin), and other public universities (e.g., Michigan State, University of California Davis and University of California-Irvine). Please refer to the AAU website for a complete list of member institutions: www.aau.edu/

Salary Comparisons: Penn's Competitive Standing

The most meaningful comparisons of mean faculty salaries at Penn with those at other universities in the AAU Data Exchange are broken out by academic field and rank.

For most of the 16 schools and areas, Penn's mean faculty salaries for all ranks in 2011-2012 rank in or near the upper fifth of the AAU institutions. The exceptions where rank is at or below the top quartile are Dental Medicine, Natural Sciences in Arts & Sciences, Nursing and Veterinary Medicine at the rank of Associate Professor as well as Natural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine

at the rank of Assistant Professor. Another group hovers between the top fifth and the top quarter in this comparison and include Dental Medicine, Engineering & Applied Science, Natural Science, Social Practice & Policy, and Wharton Public Policy at the rank of Full Professor; Engineering & Applied Science at the rank of Associate Professor; and Humanities in Arts & Sciences at the rank of Assistant Professor. We are pleased to note improvement in some persistently lower salary rankings over time. Notably, the School of Veterinary Medicine presents marked improvement of 35.7% (computed as the difference between 11/14 and 6/14) in the ranking for Associate Professor and 7.2% for Assistant Professor.

Last year, we underscored concerns about the adverse balance of substantial declines over gains. Importantly, the pattern of substantial losses versus gains this year is different from what it has been in the past two years. There are fewer substantial changes in rankings in either direction and some marked and important gains in ranking. Last year, the Provost noted that most of the salaries for all ranks and schools reported in Table 4 were within the top ten in the group of universities used for comparison. Several schools and areas do not meet the benchmark of top ten for this year and have generally ranked below that mark over the past five years. They are: SEAS, Natural Sciences—SAS and Wharton Public Policy at the rank of Professor; Dental Medicine, SEAS, Humanities—SAS and Natural Sciences—SAS at the rank of Associate Professor; and Humanities—SAS and Natural Sciences—SAS at the rank of Assistant Professor. We are particularly conscious that Natural Sciences—SAS is the sole school or area that is out of the top ten across all ranks.

Overall, the lack of movement in ranking and small declines in the rankings that predominate this year deserve continued attention in coming years in balance with the number of smaller gains made. Achieving excellence in all schools and areas, consistent with Penn's mission and place in American academia, requires close attention to trends in external competitiveness over time.

Comparisons with Peer Universities Using AAUP Survey Data

Table 5 presents 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, collected annually by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and published in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

The data in this table show that, during the past year, mean salaries for Full Professors at Penn became more competitive with some institutions in the comparison set—eight in total and most by margins greater than rounding error. Compared with last year, a small gain in competitiveness vis-à-vis Yale University resulted in six and not seven of the universities used for comparison ranking above Penn. However, in five cases, those universities have more than 5% advantage above Penn. Again, we give a more detailed analysis in the longer version of our report.

Variability in Average Salary Levels by Rank

Data on mean and median faculty salaries by rank for all schools combined are shown in Table 9 for each of the past five years: 2007-2008 through 2011-2012. The second-to-last column gives raw ratios of these values relative to the values for Assistant Professors. These ratios suggest that, in FY 2012, mean salaries were 66% higher for Full Professors than for Assistant Professors and 5% higher for Associate Professors than for Assistant Professors. Median salaries were 80% higher for Full than for Assistant Professors and 11% higher for Associate than for Assistant Professors.

(Continued on page 2)

Table 4

Rank of Mean Salaries of Penn Faculty by Academic Fields as Compared to 60 Selected Universities Participating in the American Association of Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE) Survey

Academic Field	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011
Full Professor					
Annenberg	1/38	1/38	1/40	1/41	1/41
Dental Medicine	10/38	11/43	2/44	9/45	10/45
Design	9/53	8/51	5/51	5/55	10/53
Engineering & Applied Science	14/56	14/53	11/53	13/57	13/55
Graduate Education	4/48	4/45	4/44	6/47	6/47
Humanities-SAS	10/56	8/53	9/54	9/58	7/56
Law	10/41	7/39	7/37	8/40	7/39
Perelman-Basic Science	3/37	5/53	6/54	6/58	6/56
Natural Science-SAS	15/57	13/54	15/54	14/58	12/56
Nursing	2/26	2/25	2/24	1/17	1/19
Social Policy & Practice	6/25	5/23	7/23	8/25	6/25
Social Science-SAS	9/57	9/54	8/54	9/57	8/56
Veterinary Medicine	4/17	3/14	3/13	3/14	3/14
Wharton-Business & Management	7/53	5/50	4/51	5/55	5/53
Wharton-Public Policy	-	15/50	15/52	-	13/54
Wharton-Statistics	1/34	1/34	1/32	1/36	1/34
Associate Professor					
Annenberg	-	-	-	-	-
Dental Medicine	8/35	14/41	9/42	9/43	13/43
Design	7/53	6/51	3/51	3/55	1/51
Engineering & Applied Science	10/56	9/53	7/53	8/57	11/54
Graduate Education	4/48	5/44	4/44	8/48	8/45
Humanities-SAS	10/56	6/53	12/54	12/57	11/55
Law	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Perelman-Basic Science	3/37	5/53	7/54	8/58	4/55
Natural Science-SAS	11/57	11/54	14/54	14/58	15/56
Nursing	5/26	7/24	6/23	3/17	5/19
Social Policy & Practice	-	3/24	-	-	-
Social Science-SAS	11/57	11/54	8/54	7/57	8/56
Veterinary Medicine	3/17	8/14	9/13	11/14	6/14
Wharton-Business & Management	2/53	1/50	2/50	2/54	2/51
Wharton-Public Policy	-	-	-	-	-
Wharton-Statistics	-	2/27	-	3/31	2/27
Assistant Professor					
Annenberg	-	-	-	-	-
Dental Medicine	11/36	8/42	8/43	-	-
Design	5/52	7/49	4/50	6/55	6/51
Engineering & Applied Science	13/56	10/53	5/53	6/57	7/54
Graduate Education	6/47	6/45	6/43	7/47	-
Humanities-SAS	19/56	17/53	14/54	14/58	14/56
Law	-	-	6/25	5/25	6/27
Perelman-Basic Science	6/37	7/53	10/54	8/58	6/56
Natural Science-SAS	18/57	15/54	15/54	15/58	15/56
Nursing	5/26	3/24	3/23	2/17	3/19
Social Policy & Practice	-	6/24	6/25	6/25	-
Social Science-SAS	10/57	13/54	11/54	8/57	7/56
Veterinary Medicine	1/17	6/14	5/13	6/14	5/14
Wharton-Business & Management	6/53	10/50	5/50	4/54	4/52
Wharton-Public Policy	-	-	1/51	-	1/54
Wharton-Statistics	1/33	1/33	-	-	-

Notes: Using the federal CIP (Classification of Instructional Programs) codes, departments at comparable universities were mapped to Penn Schools.

Between Fall 2007 and Fall 2008, several modifications were made to CIP Code classifications for the medical sciences. In Fall 2009, at the school's request, Wharton-Public Policy began being compared to Economics rather than Policy programs.

Because Penn's disciplines are not represented at all peer institutions, the number of universities among which Penn is ranked varies by field.

Rank is suppressed for all cells which contain fewer than five Penn faculty members.

Table 5

Percentage Differences in Mean Academic Base Salary Levels of Full Professors at a Sample of Comparable Research Universities for Academic Years 2005-2006 Through 2011-2012

Full Professor Mean Academic Base Salaries: Percentage Differences*	Percentage Differences*						
	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Harvard	12.5%	13.4%	13.2%	13.7%	12.4%	10.7%	9.3%
Chicago	3.5%	3.8%	4.6%	6.0%	8.2%	8.7%	8.9%
Columbia	N/A	N/A	-0.5%	3.4%	10.9%	9.3%	8.9%
Stanford	4.2%	5.0%	6.4%	7.4%	6.6%	7.6%	7.6%
Princeton	4.6%	4.6%	5.5%	6.4%	6.4%	6.2%	6.7%
NYU	-3.9%	-4.5%	-0.6%	0.8%	0.9%	0.5%	0.4%
Penn	\$149.9K	\$156.5K	\$163.3K	\$169.4K	\$170.1K	\$175.1K	\$181.6K
Yale	0.9%	0.7%	1.1%	3.1%	2.4%	1.1%	-0.7%
Duke	-9.0%	-9.3%	-6.6%	-4.8%	-5.5%	-6.7%	-3.5%
Northwestern	-6.1%	-5.9%	-5.9%	-4.5%	-2.2%	-3.2%	-5.2%
MIT	-6.4%	-6.8%	-7.2%	-5.4%	-5.3%	-5.3%	-5.4%
UCLA	-14.3%	-14.9%	N/A	-14.7%	-13.0%	-12.2%	-10.5%
UC Berkeley	-15.8%	-16.1%	N/A	-15.3%	-14.3%	-14.8%	-15.2%
Michigan	-16.2%	-16.7%	-16.1%	-16.1%	-15.3%	-16.1%	-18.1%
NC (Chapel Hill)	-23.1%	-19.0%	-15.1%	-15.8%	-15.9%	-18.2%	-20.7%
Carnegie-Mellon	-17.4%	-18.8%	-19.0%	-19.4%	-19.1%	-20.7%	-21.8%
Virginia	-17.9%	-18.2%	-18.7%	-21.3%	-20.8%	-22.0%	-22.0%
Texas (Austin)	-22.8%	-22.6%	-22.8%	-21.9%	-21.6%	-22.0%	-22.5%
MN (Twin Cities)	-26.4%	-25.5%	-25.7%	-24.8%	-26.6%	-29.6%	-30.8%

Notes: Mean academic base salary is provided for tenured and tenure-track standing faculty members at the rank of professor. Excluded are all standing faculty members who are appointed as Clinician Educators. Data Source: AAUP Salary Surveys.

*Universities are ordered from highest to lowest mean salaries for Full Professors as of 2010-2011. For each year reported, the difference between the Penn mean salary and the mean salary for a comparison university was computed as a percentage of the Penn salary.

(Continued from page 1)

Trends in Variability Over Time

The measure of variability of median salaries across schools/areas of continuing faculty members selected here is the interquartile range (IQR) (i.e., the 75th percentile salary in the distribution less the 25th percentile salary). However, the IQR can be expected to be larger when the general salary level is relatively high (such as for Full Professors) than when the general salary level is much lower (such as for Assistant Professors). To compensate for such differences in the general level of salaries, we have divided the IQR by the median of the distribution (i.e., the 50th percentile salary: Q2), thereby computing a ratio of the IQR to the median (as reported in the next to last column of Table 10 labeled "IQR to Median"). This ratio provides an index of the amount of variability in relation to the general level of the salary distributions, and has utility when comparing variability across ranks and trends over time.

The most striking feature of Table 10 is the rise in the past five years of the IQR to median ratio, particularly for Full Professors, suggesting that variability in payment levels continues to grow (from 0.46 to 0.48). For Full Professors in 2007-2008, the gap between the 25th and 75th percentile was \$61,030; in 2012, that gap had grown to \$79,617. For Associate Professors, the variability change is smaller and inconsistent. The variability for the Assistant Professor rank is much less stable in trend over time with a continued increase in IQR and in IQR to median ratio. It is for this rank that SCESF shares the concern of the Vice Provost for Faculty and endorses investigating the variability in salaries for the rank of Assistant Professor within and across schools and areas as well as departments where they exist.

Variability by Gender

In response to recommendations made in prior years, this SCESF Report includes two tables describing gender differences in faculty salaries. Table 11 provides the percentage increases in salaries for faculty continuing in rank by rank and gender for the first, second and third quartiles for FY 2011. The figures are generally very close, and in some cases, identical. Only in the third quartile are any differences appreciable and then, not by great margins.

Table 9
Mean Academic Base Salary Levels of Penn Standing Faculty Members who Continued in Rank by Rank

Rank	Academic Year	Average	Amount	Not Weighted	Weighted
Full Professor	2007-2008	Mean	\$160,803	1.72	1.85
		Median	\$147,875	1.94	1.84
	2008-2009	Mean	\$169,739	1.78	1.85
		Median	\$155,600	1.94	1.85
	2009-2010	Mean	\$172,615	1.78	1.85
		Median	\$158,337	1.95	1.84
2010-2011	Mean	\$177,139	1.69	1.82	
	Median	\$161,270	1.85	1.81	
2011-2012	Mean	\$183,176	1.66	1.81	
	Median	\$166,463	1.80	1.79	
Associate Professor	2007-2008	Mean	\$106,061	1.13	1.26
		Median	\$94,172	1.23	1.26
	2008-2009	Mean	\$110,913	1.16	1.25
		Median	\$98,206	1.23	1.23
	2009-2010	Mean	\$110,058	1.13	1.24
		Median	\$99,550	1.23	1.22
2010-2011	Mean	\$112,139	1.07	1.23	
	Median	\$100,474	1.15	1.21	
2011-2012	Mean	\$115,457	1.05	1.22	
	Median	\$102,929	1.11	1.20	
Assistant Professor	2007-2008	Mean	\$93,547	1.00	1.00
		Median	\$76,421	1.00	1.00
	2008-2009	Mean	\$95,382	1.00	1.00
		Median	\$80,030	1.00	1.00
	2009-2010	Mean	\$97,223	1.00	1.00
		Median	\$81,068	1.00	1.00
2010-2011	Mean	\$104,693	1.00	1.00	
	Median	\$87,105	1.00	1.00	
2011-2012	Mean	\$110,157	1.00	1.00	
	Median	\$92,400	1.00	1.00	

Notes: All salaries are converted to a nine-month base. Academic base salary increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members with an appointment at the time of fall census for both years. Faculty members on paid leave or unpaid leave are reported at their full salaries.

Excluded are all members of the Faculty of Medicine except basic scientists, all Clinician Educators from four Schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy & Practice), faculty members on phased retirement and Deans of all Schools.

The data are weighted by the number of continuing faculty members at each rank in each School.

Table 11
Percentage Salary Increase Distribution of Faculty Who Continued in Rank by Gender and Rank

First Quartile (Q1), Median (Md.), and Third Quartile (Q3)
Percentage Salary Increases by Year FYs 2011-2012

Rank	Gender	Q1	Md.	Q3
Full Professor	Men	2.5%	2.8%	3.2%
	Women	2.5%	2.9%	3.8%
Associate Professor	Men	2.5%	2.8%	3.2%
	Women	2.5%	2.8%	3.6%
Assistant Professor	Men	2.6%	2.9%	3.5%
	Women	2.5%	2.8%	3.7%

Notes: All salaries are converted to a nine-month base. Academic base salary increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members with an appointment at the time of fall census for both years. Faculty members on paid leave or unpaid leave are reported at their full salaries.

Excluded are all members of the Faculty of Medicine except basic scientists, all Clinician Educators from four Schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy & Practice) faculty members on phased retirement and Deans of all Schools.

The data are weighted by the number of continuing faculty members at each rank in each School.

Table 12
Mean Academic Base Salary Levels of Penn Standing Faculty Members who Continued in Rank by Gender and Rank

Academic Year	Metric	Unweighted			Weighted			
		Women	Men	% Difference	Women	Men	% Difference	
Full Professor	2007-2008	Mean	\$150,286	\$163,176	8.6%	\$151,196	\$163,176	7.9%
		Median	\$137,013	\$149,623	9.2%	\$148,819	\$159,493	7.2%
	2008-2009	Mean	\$160,576	\$171,779	7.0%	\$161,153	\$171,779	6.6%
		Median	\$143,983	\$157,550	9.4%	\$155,980	\$167,245	7.2%
	2009-2010	Mean	\$161,532	\$175,440	8.6%	\$166,672	\$175,440	5.3%
		Median	\$148,541	\$160,000	7.7%	\$165,669	\$170,459	2.9%
2010-2011	Mean	\$166,221	\$180,044	8.3%	\$171,246	\$180,044	5.1%	
	Median	\$152,030	\$163,900	7.8%	\$169,116	\$175,273	3.6%	
2011-2012	Mean	\$172,035	\$186,174	8.2%	\$179,817	\$186,174	3.5%	
	Median	\$158,631	\$169,112	6.6%	\$178,818	\$180,559	1.0%	
Associate Professor	2007-2008	Mean	\$96,729	\$110,812	14.6%	\$106,225	\$110,812	4.3%
		Median	\$89,972	\$98,170	9.1%	\$110,305	\$107,276	(2.75%)
	2008-2009	Mean	\$104,061	\$114,076	9.6%	\$110,244	\$114,076	3.5%
		Median	\$93,636	\$101,900	8.8%	\$110,470	\$107,352	(2.82%)
	2009-2010	Mean	\$101,538	\$114,421	12.7%	\$111,580	\$114,421	2.6%
		Median	\$92,925	\$102,750	10.6%	\$109,374	\$108,377	(0.91%)
2010-2011	Mean	\$103,011	\$116,923	13.5%	\$111,945	\$116,923	4.5%	
	Median	\$93,557	\$105,175	12.4%	\$111,297	\$110,787	(0.46%)	
2011-2012	Mean	\$107,783	\$119,589	11.0%	\$118,674	\$119,589	0.8%	
	Median	\$97,250	\$108,000	11.1%	\$116,981	\$116,890	(0.08%)	
Assistant Professor	2007-2008	Mean	\$88,223	\$97,907	11.0%	\$97,840	\$97,907	0.1%
		Median	\$72,641	\$82,900	14.1%	\$95,495	\$94,331	(1.22%)
	2008-2009	Mean	\$89,046	\$100,012	12.3%	\$99,900	\$100,012	0.1%
		Median	\$76,400	\$84,615	10.8%	\$97,667	\$96,777	(0.91%)
	2009-2010	Mean	\$89,601	\$102,559	14.5%	\$99,455	\$102,559	3.1%
		Median	\$77,925	\$85,152	9.3%	\$97,554	\$99,938	2.4%
2010-2011	Mean	\$98,764	\$108,534	9.9%	\$105,668	\$108,534	2.7%	
	Median	\$82,250	\$90,253	9.7%	\$102,623	\$104,670	2.0%	
2011-2012	Mean	\$104,768	\$113,590	8.4%	\$109,710	\$113,590	3.5%	
	Median	\$84,913	\$94,425	11.2%	\$106,715	\$110,943	4.0%	

Notes: All salaries are converted to a nine-month base. Academic base salary increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members with an appointment at the time of fall census for both years. Faculty members on paid leave or unpaid leave are reported at their full salaries.

Excluded are all members of the Faculty of Medicine except basic scientists, all Clinician Educators from four Schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy & Practice) faculty members on phased retirement and Deans of all Schools.

Female faculty members are weighted using male weights. Male weights are calculated as a ratio of male faculty in each School/area to the total number of male faculty at Penn. Percent difference is calculated as the difference between male and female salaries divided by the female salary. Negative percent differences occur when the female salary exceeds the male salary.

The Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF) Recommendations and Questions for the Administration for 2012-2013 are on the next page

SCESF Recommendations and Questions for the Administration for 2012-2013

The complete version of the report gives extensive discussion of the current economic status of the faculty and conditions of concern going forward and can be accessed at: www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v59/n23/esf.html

In accordance with Faculty Senate policy, following are recommendations and questions for the administration that arose in the SCESF discussions, including some updates on the status of recommendations made in previous SCESF reports.

1. Salary Competitiveness

To provide high-quality instruction, research and service, the University must maintain and attain faculty salaries at levels that are highly competitive with salaries provided by peer universities, while simultaneously sustaining other components of university operations.

SCESF Recommendations

a. Mean salaries at Penn showed some gains or stability in the comparison with AAUDE data in a number of schools and areas (see Table 4). However, gains are not consistent and are represented in a single year's salary data. The SCESF recommends that priority be placed on increasing mean salaries to competitive levels for the faculty groups that continue to fall behind or are stagnant in AAUDE comparisons.

The President and Provost are pleased with the gains during this past year in Penn's comparative standing in relation to selected peer schools. They remain committed to maintaining Penn's ability to offer highly competitive faculty salaries, while recognizing that some of our peers enjoy greater financial resources than Penn. Salary decisions are made at the level of Schools and Departments, taking into account the available salary pool. The Provost's Office agrees to examine in more detail those categories identified as "falling behind" in AAUDE comparisons and to explore, with deans, actions that may be justified and financially feasible.

b. SCESF notes that there is room for improvement for faculty salaries in many of the rank by school and area comparisons (Table 4), particularly in those schools and areas which consistently rank below the top ten or have dramatically lost rank in the comparison group. We continue to question whether the University can retain and attract the highest-quality faculty members unless some faculty salaries improve markedly in relation to peer institutions and maintain or advance a competitive advantage if Penn is to hold its national standing as it seeks to attract faculty candidates and retain current faculty. We applaud the Vice Provost for Faculty's attention to inequities in faculty salary within and across schools and areas. Further, we hope that our dialogue which advanced this year on this issue will continue in the next year and extend to a more sophisticated discussion on the issue of external competitiveness.

The Provost's Office is committed to continuing a dialogue with SCESF on the issue of inequities in salaries.

c. Variability in faculty salaries and especially in the IQR by rank (see Tables 6 to 10) suggests inequity in retention efforts. We recommend that due consideration be afforded rewards for distinguished performance among those faculty who choose not to seek, or use, attractive offers of external appointment to negotiate salary increases. We believe that veering away from retention through external competition and toward that which truly recognizes performance is essential to equity, morale and investment in the University's sustained and growing future excellence. The SCESF recognizes that these are decisions taken at the level of the Dean and Department Chair but we make this recommendation with the aim of enhanced guidance on this matter from the Provost to the Deans.

Salary increases are designed to reward "distinguished performance," which is broadly defined to encompass scholarly productivity, service and teaching. Variations in salaries within a rank among Schools arise from several factors, only one of which arises from responses to outside offers. Also important are years in rank and disciplinary differences in salary levels. The Provost will continue to discuss with School Deans issues posed by market competition, retention, and merit within school faculties. School Deans are aware of equity issues and regularly respond to them.

2. Salary Equity

Inequity among individual faculty salaries by rank within departments and schools organized as single departments must be identified and eliminated.

SCESF Recommendation:

As noted in the SCESF Report for the last two years, Tables 2 and 3 give information about the percentage of faculty members receiving increases less than the rise in the cost of living, but they give data only for a single academic year. The real cost to the faculty member of a series of increases each of which

is only slightly below the CPI growth percentages could be significant. In general, we would like to see Tables 2 and 3 supplemented with information cumulating increases and changes in the cost of living over a longer time interval. The Committee does not currently review such data and therefore cannot currently comment on whether or not CPI growth is a concern over time and, if it is, what the extent of the problem might be. The Committee wishes continued discussion with the Provost's Office on appropriate frames for measurement of this critical measure of economic status.

The Provost's Office agrees to explore this request with the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis.

3. Gender Equity

Both SCESF and the Vice Provost for Faculty note a concern in gender equity at the rank of Assistant Professor which stands out against a general analysis revealing broader equity at the ranks of Associate and Full Professor.

SCESF Recommendation

SCESF awaits more complete analysis of gender equity in salary in the forthcoming Gender Equity Report.

The Gender Equity Report (Almanac January 15, 2013) includes a detailed analysis of differences in faculty salaries according to gender. The Office of Institutional Research and Analysis carried out a regression analysis which explained 81% of the variance in the salaries of male and female faculty, taking into account differences in rank, time in rank, discipline and position as a department chair or endowed chair. The remaining variance in faculty salaries according to gender is small and has been declining over time. The Provost's Office is committed to the principle of gender equity in salaries, and we have explored with each of the Penn Schools existing gender differences in salaries to identify the origins of individual disparities. We will continue these discussions as part of the annual review of faculty salary increases.

4. Faculty Benefits

SCESF appreciates the continued provision of data for Table 5 Detail 2 and anticipates continued productive analysis of these data over time in complement to comparative mean salary data.

SCESF Recommendations

a. The SCESF continues to believe benefits should be comprehensively reviewed every five years to ensure competitiveness.

Faculty Benefits are discussed on an on-going basis by the University Council's Committee on Personnel Benefits in which faculty are represented. We agree that a more systematic review of faculty benefits is appropriate every few years and will explore with the Division of Human Resources an appropriate procedure for doing so on a five year cycle.

b. The SCESF recognizes that examination of faculty total compensation incompletely analyzes faculty benefits within the University and across ranks. Sabbatical leave is among important benefits not addressed in current data. Consequently, we request as we did last year that, in addition to data on mean total compensation, specific information regarding sabbatical leave within the university, across Schools and areas and also as compared to peers be provided where possible beginning next year.

This past year additional information on the accrual of sabbatical leaves across schools was compiled for the Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Committee on Sabbaticals. In addition, the Faculty Senate received information on the use of sabbaticals by standing faculty, which was collected in the Faculty Survey. The Provost's Office will continue a discussion with the Faculty Senate about the meaning and management of sabbaticals.

Members of the 2012-2013

Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

Carolyn Gibson, School of Dental Medicine
Sarah Kagan, School of Nursing, *Chair*
Andrea Liu, SAS/Physics
Janice Madden, SAS/Sociology
Lorraine Tulman, School of Nursing

Ex officio

Senate Past Chair, Camille Charles, SAS/Sociology
Senate Chair Elect, Dwight Jaggard, SEAS
Senate Chair, Susan Margulies, SEAS

The Committee would like to explicitly acknowledge the essential and valuable assistance of Sue White of the Office of the Faculty Senate.