

CONFIDENTIAL

SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE FACULTY

2007-2008 Annual Report - Revised¹

May 6, 2009

Contents

I. Introduction 3

II. Resources for Faculty Salaries and Annual Increases 4

III. Penn Faculty Salaries: External Comparisons 5

 A. Comparisons with Growth in the Consumer Price Index (CPI)..... 6

 B. Comparisons with Peer Universities Using AAU Data 9

 C. Comparisons with Peer Universities Using AAUP Survey Data 11

IV. Penn Faculty Benefits 13

V. Penn Faculty Salaries: Internal Comparisons 13

 A. Variability in Average Salary Increases by Rank and School/Area 13

 1. Median Increases Across Ranks and Schools in Comparison with General Guidelines 14

 2. First Quartile Salary Increases Across Ranks and Schools in Comparison with
 Increases in CPI..... 15

 B. Variability in Average Salary Levels by Rank 16

 C. Variability in Average Salary Levels by School/Area..... 17

 1. Measures of Variability 18

 2. Differences in Variability Across Ranks 18

 3. Trends in Variability Over Time 18

 D. Variability by Gender 19

VI. Conclusions 20

 A. Economic Status of the Faculty..... 20

¹ In July 2008 the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty released a preliminary report for 2007-08. This revised report reflects updated peer comparisons (Table 4) and adjusts the CPI comparisons in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

1. External Competitiveness	20
2. Internal Variability	21
B. Conditions of Concern	22
1. External Competitiveness	22
2. Internal Equity	23
VII. SCESF Communication with Provost Office.....	24
A. SCESF Requests to Provost Office in Preparation of the 2006-7 SCESF Report and Responses	24
B. SCESF Recommendations and Questions for the Administration	24
VIII. Members of the Committee	32
IX. Tables.....	33

I. Introduction

The Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF) is charged by the "Rules of the Faculty Senate" to:

- Gather and organize data on faculty salaries and benefits;
- Issue an annual report on the economic status of the faculty; and
- Represent the faculty in the determination of University policy on salary issues.

The focus of this report is on the current economic status of the faculty as based on salary data.

The report is organized in terms of three broad concerns:

- The salary setting process at Penn: the sources of funds for faculty salaries and how annual salary increase decisions are made.
- External comparisons: the competitiveness of faculty salaries at Penn in comparison with faculty salaries at other universities.
- Internal comparisons: variability of faculty salaries within Penn.

One major section of this report is devoted to each of these three topics. Section VI describes the SCESF's overall conclusions about the economic status of the faculty. We report in Section VII the committee's observations and recommendations, as adopted by the Senate Executive Committee and submitted to the Provost, and the Provost's responses to these recommendations.

In performing its responsibilities, the SCESF has been cognizant of Penn's current salary policy as stated by the President, Provost, and Executive Vice President (*Almanac*, April 8, 2008). Penn's guiding principle in salary planning is to pay faculty and staff (a) competitively, (b) in relationship to the markets for their services and prevailing economic conditions, (c) to acknowledge their contributions to the University, and (d) to help Penn remain a strong and financially viable institution.

In studying faculty salaries for this report, the SCESF has benefited greatly by access to detailed salary data (excluding, of course, any information that would make it possible to identify individual faculty salaries) that have been collected and provided by Penn's central administration. Our understanding, both of Penn's competitiveness with peer institutions in faculty salary levels and of faculty salary variability within Penn, has been enhanced by access to this information and by the assistance of those who produced it. The SCESF appreciates this assistance.

II. Resources for Faculty Salaries and Annual Increases

Faculty salaries are the product of a two-step process:

1. Setting Salary Levels: Faculty salary levels are set at the time of initial appointment by the dean of the faculty making the appointment.
2. Annual Salary Increases: Faculty salary levels are normally increased annually by a process described below. Such salary increases are ordinarily based on academic merit. Some annual increases are also the result of promotion in rank and equity adjustments.

Almost all funds for faculty salaries come from each school's operating budget; there is no central fund earmarked for general faculty salaries. Most of each school's resources are raised in accordance with the principles of Penn's Responsibility Center Budgeting System (RCBS).² In addition, subvention is distributed to schools by Penn's central administration. Of these resources, each school makes a certain amount available for faculty salaries in three respects: (a) sustaining existing faculty appointments, (b) providing annual salary increases for continuing faculty members, and (c) creating salary funding for new faculty positions. In addition, schools must provide funds for employee benefits that approximate 30% of all such faculty salary expenditures.

Annual salary increase recommendations for continuing faculty members are made by Department Chairs (in schools with departments) and by Deans, based on merit, with general review and oversight by the Provost (see the statement of the "Salary Guidelines For 2006-07" as published in the *Almanac*, April 17, 2007). Penn's President, Provost, and Executive Vice

² The 1998-1999 and 1999-2000 Reports of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty contain overviews of Penn's Responsibility Center Budgeting System.

President set an upper limit on a "pool percentage" for salary increases. For FY 2008, schools were authorized to award, as salary increases, a pool of up to 3.0% of the FY 2007 salaries of continuing faculty members. The recommended salary increase range was 1% to 6%, with Deans being obligated to consult with the Provost about any individual increases outside this range. To address possible inequity in faculty salaries, Deans were asked to "give careful consideration to salary adjustments for faculty members who have a strong performance record but whose salary may have lagged behind the market" and to discuss with the Provost any market conditions warranting an increase in the overall pool. Thus, Deans could propose additional salary increments to meet outside offers, reduce internal inequities, or address significant variances from prevailing markets. School resources are variable, however, and since raises are funded with school and center resources, the guidelines recognize "that some units may need to administer a smaller aggregate pool for both faculty and staff" to maintain fiscal health.

III. Penn Faculty Salaries: External Comparisons

Average Penn Faculty Salaries (i.e., academic year base salaries) are compared with three types of external indicators in the following sections: (a) growth in the Consumer Price Index (CPI), (b) average faculty salaries by rank at other universities as reported by annual surveys conducted at the school level, and (c) average salaries of full professors for a sample of 19 public and private research universities selected as comparable to Penn from among those included in the "Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession" issued by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). As a methodological note and unless otherwise specifically stated, all faculty salary information discussed in this report refers to the aggregated "academic year base salary" of individual faculty members whether salaries are paid from General Operating Funds and/or from Designated Funds.³ In addition, all salary data exclude members of the Faculty of Medicine except for basic scientists and all clinical educators from four other schools (Dental

³ These terms are used in Penn's Responsibility Center Budgeting System. See the 1999 or 2000 report on the Economic Status of the Faculty for a description of this system. Academic base year salary is that standing faculty salary that is paid for the normal academic duties of a faculty member (teaching, committee service, research). At Penn, the "academic base year salary" is a faculty member's compensation for the nine-month academic year, although it is typically paid out in twelve, equal amounts in a monthly paycheck. The only exception occurs in the health care area where some schools have all standing faculty on a 12-month, or "annualized" base. All salaries reported on a 12-month basis are adjusted to be comparable with the salaries reported on a 9-month basis.

Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy and Practice). Tables 1, 2, and 12 refer to continuing Penn faculty, whether they continued in the same rank or were promoted to a higher rank. Faculty members who were promoted from assistant professor to associate professor effective 1 July 2007, for example, are included among the associate professors for the 2007-8 year – and any salary increases they received due to their promotion are included in the percentage changes in salaries reported for associate professors in 2007-8 (it is only the percentage changes in their salaries that generally are reported; only Tables 9, 10, and 12 report actual salary levels). For Tables 3 and 6 through 11, in contrast, the information refers only to faculty members who continued in the same rank. Tables 4 and 5 provide data regarding faculty members who were in the designated rank on the date of the snapshot used to compile the data reported to the AAUP or AAU Data Exchange.

A. Comparisons with Growth in the Consumer Price Index (CPI)⁴

Mean and median faculty salary increases in percentage terms by rank, averaged for all schools between fall 2006 and fall 2007 (i.e., FY 2007 to FY 2008) are shown in Table 1 in comparison with comparable data for two measures of inflation (the U. S. city average CPI and the Philadelphia CPI) as well as Penn budget guidelines.⁵ The U.S. city average CPI increased 5% and the Philadelphia CPI increased 5.1% between June 2007 and June 2008. Comparisons for FY 2008 indicate that: (a) for all ranks combined, the mean FY 2008 percentage salary increase was less than the percentage increases in the U.S. city-average CPI and Philadelphia CPI, (b) for each rank, the median FY 2008 percentage salary increases were lower than the percentage increases in the U.S. city average CPI and the Philadelphia CPI, (c) mean salary percentage increases were below the percentage increases in the U.S. city average CPI and the Philadelphia CPI for full professors and associate professors, and (d) unlike in prior years (see prior reports), the mean

⁴ The consumer price index (CPI) refers to prices for a basket of goods and services purchased by “average workers.” There are questions about how well this index captures quality changes in goods and services (i.e., if it understates quality improvements as suggested by some observers then it overstates price increases for goods and services of a given quality) and how well this index captures goods and services consumed by faculty (i.e., if faculty consume goods and services that have had greater quality improvements for which corrections have not been made in the CPI than do average workers then faculty salaries in purchasing power terms have increased more than would be indicated by a comparison in the reported CPI). Nevertheless, use of the CPI is widespread and helps give some perspective.

⁵ The fiscal year refers to the year starting on 1 July and continuing through 30 June of the next calendar year. This report refers to the second of the two calendar years covered in a fiscal year. That is, the FY 2008 refers to the fiscal year (or academic year) starting on 1 July 2007 and continuing through 30 June 2008.

percentage increases for associate professors (4.5%) did not exceed the faculty guideline upper bound of 6.0%.

Over this period Penn's budget guidelines for percentage increases in faculty salaries (3%) were lower than the percentage growth in the U.S. city average CPI (5.0%) and the Philadelphia CPI (5.1%). If the CPI accurately captures inflation in the goods and services purchased by faculty, this means that a faculty member who received the recommended percentage increase in salaries for FY 2008 would have experienced a decline in real purchasing power. Table 1 shows that the median salary increase was 3.0% for full professors, 3.0% for associate professors, and 3.8% for assistant professors, while the U.S. city average CPI was 5.0% and the Philadelphia CPI was 5.1%. Mean salary increases were 4.5% for full professors, 4.5% for associate professors, and 5.4% for assistant professors.

The mean growth in faculty salaries over this period exceeded Penn's budget guidelines for percentage increases in faculty salaries by 1.5 percentage points for full professors, 1.5 percentage points for associate professors, and 2.4 percentage points for assistant professors. The Penn budget guidelines refer to the centrally recommended salary pool percentage for faculty continuing in rank. There are at least two reasons why the actual salary percentage increases on average for continuing faculty exceeded guidelines for percentage increases in faculty salaries. First, a number of faculty may have received additional salary increments due to promotion. Second, a number of faculty may have received additional salary increments to meet actual or potential higher outside offers, to address perceived previous inadequate salary levels, or to reward what has been perceived as very meritorious behaviors. Apparently many (perhaps all) of the Deans of Penn's schools have added additional school resources to the recommended cumulative base pool for salary increases. Thus, it is apparent that Penn's administrators have made efforts to permit percentage increases in the average level of faculty salaries that exceed the University guidelines.

The overall increases in faculty salary by rank in comparison with growth in the CPI, as seen in Table 1, are reported by school (including three disciplinary areas of SAS) in Table 2 for FY 2008. Table 2 shows that, in FY 2008, 20% of faculty in all schools and areas combined received percentage salary increases that exceeded 5.1% (the Philadelphia CPI for June 2007 to June 2008). In FY2008, at least one-third of the standing faculty in only four schools received percentage increases that exceeded the rate of inflation (Engineering & Applied Science, 33%; Law, 50%; Nursing, 36%; Wharton, 36%). In six schools/areas, no more than 10% of standing

faculty received percentage increases that exceeded the rate of inflation (Annenberg, 0%; Dental Medicine, 4%; Design, 4%; Graduate Education, 3%; Humanities (SAS), 10%; and Natural Science (SAS), 10%). In four schools/areas, between 10% and 33% of standing faculty received percentage increases that exceeded the rate of inflation (Social Science (SAS), 15%; Social Policy & Practice, 13%; Veterinary Medicine, 13%; Medicine-Basic Science, 25%).

Table 3 provides additional information about trends for full professors continuing in rank (i.e., excluding promotion increases). Between fall 2006 and fall 2007, across all schools/areas, 18% of all full professors continuing in rank received cumulative percentage salary increases above the 5.1% increase in the Philadelphia CPI. Again, there is variation across schools/areas. Half of full professors continuing in rank in two schools/areas (Law and Nursing) received percentage increases that exceeded the growth in the Philadelphia CPI. In three schools/areas, between one-fifth and one-third of continuing full professors received percentage increases that exceeded the growth in the Philadelphia CPI (Engineering & Applied Science, 30%; Wharton, 21%; Medicine-Basic Science, 22%). In the other schools/areas, substantially smaller percentages of full professors continuing in rank received percentage salary increases that exceeded the growth in the Philadelphia CPI: Annenberg, 0%; Dental Medicine, 6%; Design, 0%; Graduate Education, 0%; Humanities (SAS), 10%; Natural Science (SAS), 11%; Social Science (SAS), 16%; Social Policy & Practice, 11%; and Veterinary Medicine, 17%. Or, to make the same point in a slightly different way, 82% of full professors continuing in rank in all schools/areas combined, and 100% of full professors continuing in rank in Annenberg, Design, and Graduate Education, experienced a decline in their real purchasing power between FY 2007 and FY 2008.

The SCESF recognizes that there are legitimate reasons for individual faculty members to be awarded increments less than the growth in the CPI. For example, in a particular year (e.g., FY 2008), the salary increment pool may only approximate, or even be less than, the rate of growth in the CPI. Furthermore, in a small department or school, a few promotions or market adjustments needed to retain a valued faculty member could obligate a disproportionate share of an existing increment pool, thereby leaving little to award to other faculty members in the unit. Finally, some faculty members may be sufficiently lacking in merit to justify an increment exceeding the CPI growth.

Nonetheless, to the extent possible, individual faculty members should receive cumulative salary increases equal to, or exceeding, growth in the CPI (defined over some “to be discussed”

time horizon) unless their performance has been unsatisfactory over a substantial period of that time horizon. It, therefore, seems possible that the salary increments received by some continuing full professors have been inequitably low, particularly in Annenberg, Dental Medicine, Design, Graduate Education, Humanities (SAS), Natural Science (SAS), Social Science (SAS), Social Policy & Practice, and Veterinary Medicine. This issue merits further exploration, not only for full professors continuing in rank but also for others.

B. Comparisons with Peer Universities Using AAU Data

The Association of American Universities (AAU) Data Exchange is one source of faculty salaries at peer universities. 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, Vanderbilt), public flagship universities (e.g., Penn State and the Universities of Michigan, Virginia, and Maryland), 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: <http://www.aau.edu/about/article.aspx?id=5476>.

Data from the AAU member institutions provide comparisons for faculty salaries by rank and school/area. Table 4 provides comparisons by rank for each of the following schools/areas: Annenberg, Dental Medicine, Design, Engineering & Applied Science, Graduate Education, Humanities (SAS), Law, Natural Science (SAS), Nursing, Social Science (SAS), Social Policy & Practice, Veterinary Medicine, Wharton-Statistics, Wharton-Public Policy, Wharton-Business & Management, and Medicine-Basic Science. The data in Table 4 cover the academic years from fall 2004 through fall 2007.

For the 16 schools/areas, Penn's mean faculty salaries for all ranks in 2007-08 are in the upper third of the AAU institutions. In fact, mean faculty salaries are at least in the top quartile of AAU institutions for all three ranks in all schools/areas except assistant professors in Dental Medicine, where Penn's salaries ranked 11th of 36th in fall 2007; Humanities (SAS), where Penn's salaries ranked of 19th of 56; and Natural Science (SAS), where Penn's salaries ranked 18th of 57. Being above average in this comparison group, of course, is good. But, it may be necessary to increase faculty salaries relative to these competitors if Penn has aspirations of being in the top part of this comparison group. Penn may experience challenges attracting and retaining enough of the best and

the brightest faculty if faculty salaries remain at the current levels relative to this comparison group.

Table 4 shows that the competitiveness of Penn's mean salary levels varies across academic fields and by professorial rank within fields. There certainly is room for improvement in the competitiveness of Penn mean salary levels in nearly all rank by school/area comparisons. Compared with mean salaries of faculty at AAU institutions, mean salaries at Penn in fall 2007 appear particularly low for full professors in Dental Medicine (10th of 38), Engineering (14th of 56), Law (10th of 41), Natural Science (SAS) (15th of 57), Social Policy & Practice (6th of 25), and Veterinary Medicine (4th of 17). Mean salaries are also particularly low for associate professors in Dental Medicine (8th of 35), as well as assistant professors in Dental Medicine (11th of 36), Engineering (13th of 56), Humanities (SAS) (19th of 56), and Natural Science (SAS) (18th of 57). How much improvement should be expected is a matter of assessing how relative faculty salaries affect attainment of the University's long-run objectives. But it is clear that more improvement is required if Penn is to move further up in the ranks of the nation's research universities.

Looking across the schools and ranks between fall 2004 and fall 2007, we note a number of changes in relative standing: 6 improved, 7 remained unchanged, and 23 declined. We also note that some of the rankings change a fair amount from year to year so that such comparisons need to be qualified because of their dependence on the time period selected. If comparisons are limited to changes of at least two positions between fall 2004 and fall 2007 (therefore lessening the influence of noisy small changes), there are four cases of better positions, 16 cases of changes less than two in position, and 16 cases of declining positions. The four improvements of at least two positions are: Engineering for full professors; Design and Nursing for associate professors; and Graduate Education for assistant professors. For full professors in Engineering and for assistant professors in Graduate Education the improvement was 6 positions (from 20th to 14th for full professors in Engineering and from 12th to 6th for assistant professors in Graduate Education). These improvements are particularly noteworthy when considering the future of the University. Improvement in the relative salaries of full professors suggests that the University may be more likely to retain these senior faculty, while improvement in the relative salaries of assistant professors suggests efforts to compete with comparable institutions for the highest-quality junior faculty.

Declines of at least two positions occurred for full professors in seven schools/areas: Dental

Medicine, Graduate Education, Humanities (SAS), Law, Natural Science (SAS), Veterinary Medicine, and Wharton-Business Management. Declines of at least two positions also occurred for associate professors in three schools/areas: Dental Medicine, Graduate Education, and Humanities (SAS). For assistant professors, declines of at least two positions occurred in five schools/areas: Design, Humanities (SAS), Medicine-Basic Sciences, Natural Science (SAS), and Wharton-Business Management. For full professors, the decline was 6 positions in Dental Medicine (from 4th of 34 in fall 2004 to 10th of 38 in fall 2007), and four positions in Humanities (SAS) (from 6th of 56 to 10th of 56), Law (from 6th of 36 to 10th of 41), Natural Science (SAS) (from 11th of 57 to 15th of 57), and Wharton-Business Management (from 3rd of 52 to 7th of 53). For associate professors, the decline was seven positions in Dental Medicine (from 1st of 30 to 8th of 35), five positions in Natural Science (SAS) (from 6th of 57 to 11th of 57), and four positions in Humanities (SAS) (from 6th of 56 to 10th of 56). For assistant professors, the decline was eight positions in Natural Science (SAS) (from 10th of 57 to 18th of 57) and five positions in Humanities (SAS) (from 14th of 56 to 19th of 56). These statistics are averages; but they suggest serious challenges to the ability of the University to recruit and retain faculty in these schools and areas.

C. 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 from annual salary surveys conducted by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and published in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. To make meaningful and fair comparisons of Penn salaries with those at other universities, the following five criteria were used to select comparison universities: (a) be included in the Research I category of the Carnegie Classification System, (b) offer a broad array of Ph.D. programs in arts and sciences disciplines, (c) include at least two of three major professional schools (law, business, engineering), (d) not include a school of agriculture, and (e) have a composite academic reputation rating greater than 4.0 (on a five point scale) in a rating system reported by *U.S. News and World Report*.⁶ The 17 research universities meeting all five of these criteria are identified in the first column of Table 5. In addition, as Princeton and NYU are considered by the SCESF as main competitors of Penn for

⁶ A composite rating was constructed by computing the mean of three separate academic reputation ratings: a general rating, a mean rating of key Ph.D. programs, and a mean rating of key professional schools.

faculty, we included these two schools as well.

The relative standings of mean salaries of Penn full professors are presented for three years in Table 5. Universities are listed in Table 5 in order of the magnitude of mean salaries of full professors (from high to low) for the most recent academic year (2007-08). Each row (except for Penn) gives the difference between a comparison university's mean salary and Penn's mean salary as a percentage of Penn's mean salary. For example, Table 5 shows that, in 2007-08, the mean salary of full professors was 11.7% higher at Harvard than at Penn (\$163,300), but 6.3% lower at Northwestern than at Penn.

The data in Table 5 show that, during the past three-year period, mean salaries for full professors at Penn became somewhat more competitive with some institutions and somewhat less competitive with other institutions. For example, the salary advantage of Harvard over Penn declined somewhat between 2006-07 and 2007-08, falling from 13.4% to 11.7%. But, the salary advantage of Stanford, Princeton, Chicago, and Yale over Penn increased over this period. Penn also somewhat reduced its percentage advantage in average salaries for full professors over NYU, Duke, and UNC-Chapel Hill. The data in Table 5, thus, raise questions about trends in the competitiveness on Penn's part for full professors, overall.

Between 2005-06 and 2007-08, the gap between the average salaries of full professors at Penn and full professors at Harvard, Stanford, Princeton, and Chicago remained substantial, as average salaries were 11.7% higher at Harvard, 6% higher at Stanford, 5.2% higher at Princeton, and 4.4% higher at Chicago than at Penn in 2007-08. The SCESF emphasizes that it is important to monitor the average salaries of faculty at Penn relative to the universities with the highest full professor salaries so that Penn continues to become increasingly competitive.

Even though the SCESF was careful to select universities for overall mean salary comparisons that are similar to Penn on several important criteria and made comparisons at the full professor rank (i.e., we did not aggregate across the three professorial ranks), AAUP salary data did not permit the SCESF to control for the specific schools sponsored by each university and the number of full professors appointed in each school. Such controls would be desirable because mean salary levels vary by school, as do the number of professors appointed to the faculty of each school on which the means are based. Therefore, the relative standing of Penn mean salaries in Table 5 might be misleading for understanding what has been happening in particular schools or departments. Nonetheless, the general pattern between 2005-06 and 2007-08 in Penn's relative

standing seems to be sufficiently representative to include in this report.

VI. Penn Faculty Benefits

The 1998-99 SCESF Annual Report included a section with comparative faculty benefits data. More recent cross-university benefits data are of insufficient precision to permit meaningful quantitative comparisons. Accordingly, no such comparisons are made in this report.

V. Penn Faculty Salaries: Internal Comparisons

As previous reports of the SCESF have highlighted, there is a great deal of variability in faculty salaries at Penn attributable to several recognized factors: differences in individual merit, rank, time in rank, external labor market forces, the relative wealth of schools, and perhaps differences among schools in principles and practices for allocating salary increments.

One of the SCESF's concerns has been that existing variability in faculty salaries might include some significant element of inequity (e.g., salary setting based on incomplete or inaccurate information about merit, or bias that could be involved in the process of deciding salary increments). However, it is not possible for the SCESF to pinpoint any instance of individual or group inequity without individual faculty salaries and associated information about individual merit, labor market forces, etc. What we can do is review some facets of salary variability and raise questions about the possibility that inequity might be responsible for some degree of the observed variability. These questions might lead to further review and action by senior academic administrators (Department Chairs, Deans, and the Provost) with a view to correcting any inequities that might be identified.

This section describes several dimensions of faculty salary variability within Penn. As with the external salary comparisons above, the salary data reviewed in this section exclude all standing faculty members who are appointed as Clinician Educators from Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy and Practice and include only basic science faculty in the School of Medicine.

A. Variability in Average Salary Increases by Rank and School/Area

As reported in Table 1, median faculty salary increases by rank, both overall and for each rank, in FY 2008 were below the rate of growth in the U.S. average CPI and below the rate of growth in the Philadelphia CPI, and, for all academic ranks, equaled or exceeded Penn's "budget guidelines" of 3% (i.e., the "pool percentage" that the President, Provost, and Executive Vice President established for salary increases, discussed in section II of this report). These salary increases are broken out by school and rank in Tables 6, 7, and 8. These tables show considerable variability in median salary increases across schools and years, as well as among the first and third quartile increases (Q_1 and Q_3 , respectively).

Before reviewing these salary increases, it should be recognized that the salary increase guideline of 3% for FY 2008 is no more than a guideline, and pertains to an aggregate of all increases for all ranks combined for each of Penn's schools (i.e., merit increases for continuing faculty members, special increases for faculty members who have been promoted in rank, and market adjustments for faculty members with competitive salary offers from other institutions). Schools may allocate more, or fewer, resources to faculty salary increases than the guideline, depending upon each school's financial circumstances. 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 category. Accordingly, a median increment of less than 3% should not be regarded as a specific failure of salary policy, since there is no policy for each rank and each school to be awarded at least that much on average. Furthermore, the 3% guideline pertains to the mean increase, a measure of central tendency that is usually higher than the median salary increases as shown in Table 1. These data indicate that the majority of salary increases are bunched toward the low end, with a small or modest percentage of faculty members benefiting from relatively large increases.

Nonetheless, the overall mean salary increase for all continuing faculty members for FY 2008 was 4.7% (see Table 1), an increase well above the guideline of 3%. Even so, this substantial mean salary increase was not distributed sufficiently widely to lift the median salaries of all ranks in all schools/areas by at least the guideline amount - a phenomenon that may be attributable to differences in wealth, competitive pressures, and budget priorities among the various schools as permitted under RCBS as well as to extraordinary retention efforts pre-empting more broadly-based compensation measures.

1. Median Increases Across Ranks And Schools/Areas In Comparison With General Guidelines

With respect to full professors (see Table 6), in four of the 14 schools/areas (Dental Medicine, Medicine-Basic Science, Social Policy & Practice, and Veterinary Medicine) the median salary increases for FY 2008 were within half a percentage point of the general guideline of 3.0% (i.e., between 2.5% and 3.5%), while three were lower than 2.5% (Humanities (SAS), Natural Science (SAS), and Social Science (SAS)), and the other seven were above 3.5% (Annenberg, Design, Engineering & Applied Science, Graduate School of Education, Law, Nursing, and Wharton).

With respect to associate professors (see Table 7), in six (Dental Medicine, Design, Engineering & Applied Science, Medicine-Basic Science, Social Science (SAS), and Veterinary Medicine) of the 12 schools/areas (data describing Annenberg and Law are not published because of the small number of faculty at this rank), the median salary increase for FY 2008 was within half a percentage point of the general guideline of 3% (i.e., between 2.5% and 3.5%), while two were lower than 2.5% (Humanities (SAS), Natural Science (SAS)) and the other four were above 3.5% (Graduate School of Education, Nursing, Social Policy & Practice, and Wharton).

With respect to assistant professors (see Table 8), in two (Dental Medicine, Design) of the 12 schools/areas (data for Annenberg and Social Policy and Practice are not published because of the small number of faculty at this rank) the median salary increases for FY 2008 were within half a percentage point of the general guideline of 3.0% (i.e., between 2.5% and 3.5%), while three were lower than 2.5% (Humanities (SAS), Natural Science (SAS), Social Science (SAS)) and the other seven were above 3.5% (Engineering & Applied Science, Graduate School of Education, Law, Medicine-Basic Science, Nursing, Veterinary Medicine, and Wharton).

2. First Quartile Salary Increases Across Ranks and Schools/Areas in Comparison with Increases in CPI

The SCESF has regularly questioned the principles by which salary increases are awarded in relation to increases in the CPI (the U.S. city average and the Philadelphia CPI from Table 1). Therefore, we compare the salary increases in FY 2008 at the 25th percentile for schools with data at the different ranks in Tables 6, 7, and 8 relative to the real-time increase in the Philadelphia CPI of 5.1%. This comparison shows that, at the full professor, associate professor, and assistant professor ranks, all schools/areas had a 25th percentile salary increase below the increase in the

Philadelphia CPI in FY 2008. Table 6 shows that, for full professors, all 13 schools/areas with data had 25th percentile salary increases below 5.1%. Table 7 shows that the 25th percentile salary increase was below 5.1% for associate professors in all ten of the schools/areas with data. Table 8 shows that the 25th percentile salary increase for assistant professors was below 5.1% in all seven of the schools/areas with data.

At the other end of the distribution, at only a small number of schools/areas did the salary increase at the 75th percentile exceed the increase in the Philadelphia CPI in FY 2008. For full professors, only three of 13 schools/areas with data had 75th percentile salary increases above 5.1%: Engineering (6%), Law (8%), and Nursing (7%). For associate professors, only two of ten schools/areas with data had 75th percentile salary increases above 5.1%: Engineering & Applied Science (5.8%) and Wharton (5.8%). For assistant professors, only two of seven school/areas had 75th percentile salary increases above 5.1%: Medicine-Basic Science (10%) and Wharton (6.3%).

As noted in previous reports, Tables 6, 7, and 8 do not report quartiles for schools/areas by rank when the number of faculty is 10 or fewer (as quartiles would be based on two people). While we agree wholeheartedly with this protection of individual information, we would still like to see a measure of dispersion for these schools by rank. Accordingly, we repeat the recommendation from previous reports that, in future years, the committee be provided a two or three year average of those quartiles for those schools/areas in which we otherwise would not be able to report a first or third quartile.

B. Variability in Average Salary Levels by Rank

Four-year data on mean and median faculty salaries by rank are shown in Table 9 for all schools combined.⁷ Ratios also are given for these values relative to the values for assistant professors. These ratios suggest that, in FY 2008, mean salaries were 75% higher for full professors than for assistant professors and 16% higher for associate professors than for assistant professors. Median salaries were 96% higher for full than assistant professors, and 25% higher for associate than for assistant professors. Between 2004-05 and 2007-08, the ratio of median salaries

⁷ The mean salary figures for full professors recorded in Table 9 are higher than those recorded in Table 5, which are drawn from AAUP reports. Table 5 includes all faculty members at the rank of full professor (including those newly appointed to a rank) whereas Table 9 is limited to faculty members who continued in the same rank from the prior year (a difference that reduces the AAUP mean). Moreover, data in this Table 9 differ from data in Table 9 in the 2006-07 report describing some of the same time periods. The differences reflect errors in the calculation of academic base salary in the 2006-07 report.

increased somewhat for full professors to assistant professors (from 1.84 to 1.96) and for associate professors to assistant professors (from 1.19 to 1.25).

Such ratios give a crude perspective on rank differences in salary because of aggregation biases across schools, so interpretation must be made with care. For example, one might expect a considerably larger difference between assistant and associate professor mean salaries. The modest difference might occur if the Law School has a considerably lower percentage of associate professors than other schools, a difference that could reduce the observed mean salary for associate professors, or if the Wharton School has a considerably higher percentage of assistant professors than other schools, a difference that could increase the observed mean salary for assistant professors.

A more meaningful comparison of variation in faculty salaries by rank can be made by computing the ratios for continuing faculty members for each school and then computing a mean weighted ratio (weighted for the number of continuing faculty members at each rank in each school.)⁸ Thus, Table 9 also gives the weighted ratios. Using the weighted ratios generally increases the spread in salary levels by rank, as the weighted ratios show that mean (median) salaries of full professors are 85% (84%) higher than assistant professors and mean (median) salaries of associate professors are 26% (27%) higher than assistant professors.

C. Variability of Average Salary Levels by School/Area

As described in previous SCESF reports, there is considerable variability in median faculty salary levels across Penn's 14 schools/areas. Information about the extent of this cross-school variability is presented by rank in Table 10 for the 2004-05 to 2007-08 academic years in terms of the first quartile (Q_1), second quartile (Q_2 , the same as the median), and third quartile (Q_3) of median faculty salary levels.⁹ For full professors, the interquartile range of median salaries in 2007-8 based on the 14 schools/areas was \$60,400 (i.e., the third quartile salary of \$186,500 minus the first quartile salary of \$126,100). The comparable interquartile range of salary levels across schools/areas was understandably less for associate professors (\$27,600) and assistant professors (\$29,400) in absolute dollars. Three facets of these data are considered below: 1. Measures of

⁸ Weighted ratios were based on all schools except Annenberg, which had no assistant professors, and Law, which had only one assistant professor.

⁹ Data in this Table 10 differ from data in Table 10 in the 2006-07 report describing some of the same time periods. The differences reflect errors in the calculation of academic base salary in the 2006-07 report.

salary variability, 2. Differences in variability across ranks, and 3. Trends in variability over time.

1. Measures of Variability

The measure of variability of median salaries across schools/areas of continuing faculty members selected here is the interquartile range (IQR) (i.e., the third quartile salary in the distribution minus the first quartile, all as described in more detail in footnote "b" of Table 10). 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 second quartile: Q_2), 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").¹⁰ 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 variabilities across ranks and trends over time.

2. Differences in Variability Across Ranks

As seen in Table 10, the ratio of the IQR to the median varies across rank and year with no particular pattern. In FY 2008, the ratio of the IQR to the median was 0.41 for full professors, 0.29 for associate professors, and 0.39 for assistant professors. Variations in this ratio may be a consequence (at least in part) of the variations in external competitiveness for faculty of different ranks and in the extent to which Penn is matching the highest-end salaries of its competitors. The cross-rank variation is low relative to historic values. This may imply increased competitiveness for senior faculty relative to junior faculty. Ongoing monitoring of this parameter is warranted.

3. Trends in Variability Over Time

Also, as seen in Table 10, the variability (i.e., the IQR) of median salaries for Penn's 14 schools/areas for the three professorial ranks increased between FY 2005 and FY 2008 for full professors. 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 increases. 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.

¹⁰ The statistically inclined reader will recognize this ratio as similar to the coefficient of variation (i.e., the ratio of the standard deviation to the mean of a distribution).

In short, these data 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. Analyses in the 2001-02 SCESF report suggest that the variability in mean faculty salaries across schools/areas at Penn is currently in line with the experience of peer institutions and, thus, reflects general economic forces affecting all of academia.

D. Variability by Gender

In response to recommendations in previous reports, this report includes two tables describing gender differences in faculty salaries. Table 11 provides the percentage increases in salaries by rank and gender for the first, second, and third quartiles for FY 2008.¹¹ 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 in FY 2008 was -0.7 to 0.2 percentage points. In three cases the percentage increases in FY2008 are lower for women than for men: the first, second, and third quartiles for assistant professors.

Table 12 reports the observed mean and median salaries for men and women by rank. These data show that both mean and median salaries were higher for men than women at all ranks for each year from FY 2005 to FY 2008. The magnitude of the percentage difference in salary was generally smaller for full professors than for associate and assistant professors. For example, Table 12 shows that, in FY2008, mean salaries were 9.5% higher for men than for women among assistant professors, 12.3% higher for men than for women among associate professors, and 7.6% higher for men than women among full professors.

An important limitation of the average salary data shown in the first two columns of Table 12 is that they do not control for differences in the distribution of faculty by gender or differences in average salaries across schools/areas. The small numbers of men and women at some ranks in

¹¹ 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.

some schools/areas limit further disaggregation of the data. Nonetheless, to address these issues, Table 12 also provides “weighted” salary data to reflect differences in the distribution of women across schools/areas. Male weights were calculated as the ratio of male faculty in each school/area to the total number of male faculty at Penn. Salaries for women faculty were weighted by male weights.

Table 12 shows that gender differences in salaries are substantially reduced after correcting for gender differences in the distribution of faculty across schools/areas. After applying the weight, median and mean salaries for women and men assistant professors differ by no more than 1.3% from FY 2005 to FY 2008. Among associate professors, mean weighted salaries were 2.1% higher for men than for women and median salaries were 3.5% lower for men than for women in FY 2008. Among full professors, both mean and median weighted salaries were substantially higher for men than for women in FY 2008 (6.2% and 5.9%).

VI. Conclusions

A. Economic Status of the Faculty

1. External Competitiveness.

Comparisons of Penn faculty salary percentage increases with percentage increases in the CPI: The mean percentage salary increases for continuing faculty at Penn exceeded the increases in the U.S. city and Philadelphia CPI in FY 2008 only for assistant professors (Table 1). Median percentage salary increases were lower than increases in the U.S. city average CPI and Philadelphia CPI for all three ranks (Table 1). Only 20% of faculty members in all schools/areas combined received percentage salary increases in FY2008 that exceeded the percentage increase in the Philadelphia CPI (5.1%) (Table 2). These results are troubling and raise questions that merit further consideration. First, is it really the case that 80% of continuing faculty are underperforming to the extent that their salaries should be declining in real purchasing power? Second, are the relatively high percentages of faculty who received percentage increases in salaries below the percentage increases in the CPI – especially in Annenberg, Dental Medicine, Design, Graduate Education, Humanities (SAS), Natural Science (SAS), Social Science (SAS), Social Policy & Practice, and Veterinary Medicine – justified in terms of performance?

Comparisons with other universities: The comparisons of salaries for full professors at Penn with salaries at other AAU institutions in this report show improvements but also raise concerns that have been raised in prior reports.

Penn made substantial improvements between fall 2004 and fall 2007 in several areas. Table 4 shows an improvement of at least two positions in a total of 4 rank/school area comparisons: full professors in Engineering & Applied Science, associate professors in Design and Nursing, and assistant professors in Graduate Education.

Over the same period, mean salaries worsened by at least two positions for 16 rank-school/area comparisons. Compared with AAU institutions, mean salaries at Penn appear particularly low for: full professors in Dental Medicine, Engineering, Law, Natural Science (SAS), Social Policy & Practice, and Veterinary Medicine; associate professors in Dental Medicine; and assistant professors in Dental Medicine, Engineering, Humanities (SAS), and Natural Science (SAS). How much improvement should be expected depends on how relative faculty salaries affect attainment of the University's long-run objectives.

The results of the annual AAUP salary survey for a group of 19 peer research universities place the mean salary of Penn full professors in rank order six as of academic year 2007-08, the same position as in 2005-06 and 2006-07. The highest mean salary in this group (at Harvard) is 11.7% higher than the Penn mean (Table 5). Mean salaries for full professors at Penn became slightly less competitive during the past three years. For example, between 2005-06 and 2007-08 the percentage advantage in salaries at Stanford, Princeton, Chicago, and Yale over Penn increased. Moreover, the percentage advantage in salaries at Penn over NYU declined from 4.5% in 2006-07 to 0.6% in 2007-08. The SCESF emphasizes that it is important for Penn to continue to monitor the level of salaries for full professors relative to salaries at the leading universities so that Penn is in a position to become increasingly competitive.

2. Internal Variability.

There is great variability in the distribution of faculty salary resources among the three professorial ranks (Table 9), among the fourteen schools/areas included in this report (Table 10), and among percentage salary increases by rank within schools (Tables 6, 7, and 8) although not among percentage salary increases by rank and gender (Table 11) or average salary levels by rank and gender after weighting salaries to reflect the gender distribution of faculty across schools/areas –

except for full professors (Table 12). Tables 6 to 8 show a few patterns in the schools/areas with median salary increases below the University guidelines. The median percentage salary increase was at least half a percentage point lower than the Penn budget guideline for Humanities (SAS) and Natural Science (SAS) for all ranks in FY2008. The tables also show patterns in school/areas with median percentage salary increases above the guidelines. In FY2008, median percentage salary increases were at least half a percentage point above the median for faculty of all ranks in Graduate School of Education, Nursing, and Wharton. The within-rank variation relative to median salaries is relatively high for assistant professors and full professors (Table 10). Some level of variability in average faculty salaries among schools/areas is likely required to maintain Penn's competitive standings within different academic fields. Nonetheless, the SCESF believes that this variability should continue to be monitored to be sure that these differences are warranted by factors such as competitive pressures.

B. Conditions of Concern

1. External Competitiveness.

Although Penn faculty salaries are generally competitive with those provided by a select group of universities (as noted above), the following particular conditions are of concern about the external competitiveness of faculty salaries at Penn:

- In order to recruit and retain a superior faculty, Penn's salaries must be competitive with those of peer institutions. For academic fields for which data are available from the AAU Data Exchange, it appears that Penn generally has strengthened its competitive position between fall 2004 and fall 2007 for full professors in Engineering, associate professors in Design and Nursing, and assistant professors in Graduate Education. However, between FY2005 and FY2008, Penn's competitive position, as measured by mean faculty salaries, declined at the full professor rank in Dental Medicine, Graduate Education, Humanities (SAS), Law, Natural Science (SAS), Veterinary Medicine, and Wharton-Business & Management, at the associate professor rank in Dental Medicine, Graduate Education, Humanities (SAS), and Natural Sciences (SAS); and at the assistant professor rank in Design, Humanities (SAS), Medicine-Basic Science, Natural Science (SAS), and Wharton-Business & Management. Accordingly, the SCESF suggests that salaries in these areas be reviewed to ensure that salary increases are

sufficient.

- Compared with mean salaries for faculty at other AAU institutions, mean salaries at Penn appear particularly low for full professors in Dental Medicine, Engineering, Law, Natural Science (SAS), Social Policy & Practice, and Veterinary Medicine; associate professors in Dental Medicine; and assistant professors in Dental Medicine, Engineering, Humanities (SAS), and Natural Sciences (SAS). These findings plainly raise the question of whether such salaries are likely to attract and to keep faculty of the caliber necessary for Penn's longer-run aspirations to be in the top end of these comparison groups.
- Compared with mean salaries at 19 leading research universities, mean salaries for full professors at Penn became somewhat less competitive between 2005-06 and 2007-08. While the salary advantage of full professors at Harvard over Penn declined from 12.5% to 11.7%, over this same period the salary advantage for full professors over Penn increased at Stanford, Princeton, Chicago, and Yale. Moreover, the salary advantage for full professors at Penn over full professors at NYU declined from 3.9% to 0.6%.

2. Internal Equity.

In the absence of data on individual faculty merit to compare with data on individual faculty salaries, the SCESF is not able to identify any specific instance of inequity among the dimensions of salary variability included in this report. However, the SCESF is concerned that some of the wide variability in individual faculty salaries may entail more than a trivial element of inequity. Although we are not able to report specific instances of salary inequity among individual faculty members, ranks, departments, or schools, this report has identified the following conditions that may give rise to equity concerns:

- About 80% of all continuing standing faculty (Table 2) and 82% of continuing full professors (Table 3) received percentage increases in salary between fall 2006 and fall 2007 that were below the cumulative percentage increases in the Philadelphia CPI over the same period.
- The share of faculty receiving percentage salary increases above the rate of inflation over this period varies across schools, with particularly low shares in Annenberg (0%), Dental Medicine (4%), Design (4%), Graduate Education (3%), Humanities (SAS) (10%),

Natural Science (SAS) (10%), Social Science (SAS) (15%), Social Policy & Practice (13%), and Veterinary Medicine (13%) (Table 2).

These data may reflect changing competitive markets across schools/areas and differing shares of faculty across schools/areas that are not performing adequately. But, these aspects of the distribution of Penn faculty salaries also may reflect growing inequities. The SCESF emphasizes that these developments should be monitored in an attempt to understand whether they are warranted or reflect, even in part, undesired inequities.

VII. SCESF Communication with Provost's Office

A. SCESF Requests in Preparation of the 2007-08 SCESF Report and Responses

In September 2008, then-Provost Ronald Daniels, Associate Provost Vincent Price, and Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Analysis Stacey Lopez met with the SCESF. Provost Daniels and Associate Provost Price addressed questions about the salary-setting process, including processes for setting faculty salary guidelines and communicating with faculty about salary increases. Associate Provost Price addressed questions about the timeline for acquiring the data needed to produce the tables for the annual SCESF report. The SCESF considered this information, along with the trade-offs associated with having timely versus complete data. Based on this information, the SCESF requested that, from this point forward, the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis will provide a complete set of tables for a given academic year by the end of the following December (e.g., tables describing the 2008-09 academic year will be provided to the SCESF by December 2009). The SCESF will then issue its report in January.

The SCESF also decided to revise the initial 2007-08 report issued in July 2008 to reflect this decision. Therefore, this is the second report produced for the 2007-08 academic year. With the goal of providing data as quickly as possible, the first report, issued in July 2008, made comparisons to the CPI covering a different time period from the salary data (i.e., from February 2007 to February 2008) and did not include peer comparisons for the 2007-08 academic year (Table 4). This revised report adjusts the CPI data to cover the same period as the salary

increase (i.e., from June 2007 to June 2008) and includes the current peer comparison data.

B. SCESF Recommendations and Questions for the Administration for 2007-08

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. Accuracy of Information

As indicated in prior reports and in conversations with the Provost's Office, the SCESF continues to have concerns about the accuracy of data and information in the tables produced by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis. During the process of completing the first version of the 2007-08 report, the SCESF learned of errors in the data provided to the SCESF for the 2006-07 report and made necessary revisions. In the process of completing this second version of the 2007-08 report, the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis informed the SCESF of challenges in reconstructing the previously supplied tables for 2007-08. According to the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis, these challenges likely reflect the sensitivity of the data to criteria for selecting faculty to include in the analyses.

SCESF Recommendation

The SCESF recommends that the Provost's Office and the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis identify and adopt the selection criteria and other procedures that are needed to ensure the accuracy and consistency of all future faculty salary data.

The Provost, the Office of the Vice President for Institutional Affairs, and the Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Analysis accept this recommendation and are committed to resolving these issues effectively.

2. Timeliness of Information Provided to the SCESF

Over the past several years, the SCESF has struggled to obtain timely faculty salary data. The administration's current procedures for providing data on the characteristics of Penn's faculty are complex and require substantial time to complete.

SCESF Recommendation

The SCESF recommends that the Provost continue efforts to develop the Faculty Database Information System in order to easily provide accurate academic base salary data for faculty in all schools. The SCESF also recommends that the Provost's Office establish a timeline to ensure that the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis provides the necessary tables to the SCESF by the end of each calendar year, so that the SCESF may issue its report each January.

The Provost is committed to further development and maintenance of a Faculty Information System in the interests of timelier reporting of faculty data, including salary information. While we still depend upon data from the University payroll system for reporting on faculty salaries – data which for number of reasons have proven problematic for this purpose -- we are examining ways of refining the entry of payroll data to improve the accuracy and flexibility of reporting. In the meantime, we are working with the Office of the Vice President for Institutional Affairs and the Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Analysis to set a more efficient timeline for the supply of data to the Committee.

3. Inclusion of SCESF in Process of Setting Budget Guidelines

As in previous reports, this committee suggests that the SCESF meet with the Provost for substantive discussion before salary guidelines for the next fiscal year are established. As we understand that salary guidelines are usually determined by mid-spring semester, we recommend that such a meeting would take place when the SCESF report is produced. We believe that this meeting will raise the SCESF's confidence about the decisions that are made regarding salary-setting policy. While SCESF reports since 2004-05 have indicated the Provost's willingness to meet with the SCESF for such purposes, this procedure has consistently not been implemented. Consultation is rendered meaningless unless it occurs before salary setting policy is made.

SCESF Recommendations

The Provost's Office will meet with the SCESF late in the fall semester prior to setting and, *ipso facto*, well prior to announcing salary guidelines, starting in 2009-10.

The Provost agrees to meet with members of SCESF in the fall of 2009, prior to the time the salary increase is announced for the following year.

4. 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 have fallen behind the comparison groups in the AAU Data Exchange in a number of areas (e.g., compare first and last columns in Table 4). The SCESF recommends that priority be placed on increasing mean salaries to competitive levels for the faculty groups that have fallen behind.

The Provost agrees to explore reasons for the competitive standing of Penn's salaries in particular fields identified by the Committee, and to work with the school deans to take corrective actions that may be justified and financially feasible.

b. Even though priority should be placed on regaining Penn's competitive level in the academic fields identified above, the SCESF recommends that equal priority be given to recognizing 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 there is room for improvement for faculty in many of the rank by school/area comparisons (Table 4). Moreover, the gaps in mean salaries between full professors at Penn and full professors at Stanford, Princeton, Chicago, and Yale increased between 2005-06 and 2007-08 (Table 5). The question arises whether the University can keep and attract the highest-quality faculty members unless faculty salaries are in the top group.

The Provost will closely scrutinize market conditions as the basis for salary recommendations of the schools and departments, recognizing that deans and chairs must balance needs to attract distinguished faculty, retain those with outside offers, and treat comparably

distinguished faculty equitably. The President and Provost remain committed to further enhancing Penn's ability to offer highly competitive faculty salaries, while recognizing that some of our peers enjoy greater financial resources than Penn, and may also have more developed faculties in some fields of study. We seek, through strategic investments in faculty recruiting and compensation, to consolidate our competitive strengths and address any competitive shortcomings.

5. Salary Equity

Inequity among individual faculty salaries by rank within departments (and schools that are organized as single departments) must be identified and eliminated. Only 20% of all continuing standing faculty and 18% of continuing full professors received percentage salary increases for FY 2008 that were above the growth in the CPI (Phil.) for the same period (Tables 2 and 3). This finding suggests that many faculty members who have performed at a satisfactory level have received salary increases less than growth in the CPI. This circumstance is not surprising given that the University's budget guideline (3.0%) was 40% less than the increase in the Philadelphia CPI (5.1%) and that the overall mean salary increase percentage for all ranks combined over this period was less than the growth in the Philadelphia CPI (4.7% versus 5.1%, Table 1). Nonetheless, this finding represents an effective reduction in salary in terms of purchasing power for these faculty.

SCESF Recommendations

a. The SCESF recommends that the Provost and Deans give further consideration to decreasing instances in which faculty members who have performed at least at a satisfactory level are awarded salary increases that are 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.

The Provost agrees to give this matter further consideration. When increases in the available salary pool are comparable to the percentage increase in the CPI, Deans and Department Chairs may have difficulty rewarding especially meritorious faculty performance

while also granting increases at or above the growth in CPI to all faculty members who are performing at a satisfactory level. Cost considerations, meanwhile, limit the extent to which the aggregate salary pool can exceed the growth in CPI.

b. The SCESF also requests support from the Provost to meet with Deans of particular schools to further understand processes for determining salary increases and communicating salary increases to faculty, as well as the forces that contribute to low percentage increases for faculty in the school. The committee is especially interested in understanding forces that contribute to differences across schools in the percentage of faculty who receive salary increases at or above the rate of inflation.

The Provost believes that Deans have been responsive to such requests in the past and encourages their cooperation with the Committee.

6. Gender Equity

Data in Table 12 show that average salaries are lower for women than for men faculty, especially for full professors, even after weighting the data to reflect differences in the gender distribution of faculty by school and area. The suggestion of gender inequity in faculty salaries is troubling.

SCESF Recommendation

The SCESF recommends that the Provost's Office place priority on identifying the causes of observed gender differences in salaries and addressing any inequities that are not attributable to legitimate forces.

The Progress Report on Gender Equity completed this year included a follow-up analysis indicating general equity in salaries once individual departmental affiliation, time in rank, and other factors are taken into consideration.

7. Completeness of Data

Previous SCESF reports requested that Tables 6, 7, and 8, which provide percentage salary

increases by rank, school, and quartile, be adapted to show a two- or three-year average for cases in which the number of faculty is 10 or fewer (as quartiles would be based on two people). This recommendation has not yet been implemented. The SCESF also requests that future reports show not only percentage salary increases by rank and school, but also actual average salary levels by rank and school.

SCESF Recommendation

Implement the procedure for providing information for small cells in Tables 6, 7 and 8 by averaging data over two or three years for the 2008-09 report. Provide an additional table to the SCESF for the 2008-09 report that summarizes average salary levels by rank and school.

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

8. Faculty Benefits

As faculty benefits at Penn compared with peer institutions have not been examined since the 1998-99 report, the SCESF requests that the Provost's Office provide this information for next year in accordance with what was done in 1998-99. Furthermore, going forward, we believe that, as recommended in prior reports, benefits should be looked at roughly every five years. Although the Provost indicated in previous SCESF reports that this was a timely request, we believe that this process has not yet been initiated.

SCESF Recommendations

Undertake the report on faculty benefits in the next SCESF report.

While time is limited for a report on faculty benefits this academic year, the Provost agrees to work with the Vice President for Human Resources to undertake such a study next academic year, and every five years thereafter.

9. Competitiveness of Salaries at the "Top End"

The SCESF has previously expressed concern about the low relative spread in salaries at

the full professor level, as low spread may indicate a problem in attracting faculty at the upper end of the scale. Table 10 provides continued evidence of this problem, as the spread in full professor salaries as a ratio to median salary is comparable to that for assistant professors. Moreover, the spread in full professor salaries remained virtually unchanged between 2004-05 and 2007-08. In previous reports, 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.

SCESF Recommendation

As in previous reports, we emphasize that ongoing monitoring of the competitiveness of "top end" salaries is important and should be continued.

The Provost's Office, in reviewing proposed salary increases, will continue to monitor salaries and increases at the upper end of the distribution of full professors. As noted above, however, when increases in the available salary pool are limited, deans and chairs may have great difficulty rewarding especially meritorious faculty performance while also granting increases at or above the growth in CPI to all faculty members who are performing at a satisfactory level.

10. Information for Putting Individual Salary Increases into Perspective

As stated in the previous SCESF report, one important objective of the SCESF is to improve information to faculty members about salary levels and changes. However, when receiving notification of their salaries for the next academic year, faculty generally do not have 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. Because of lags in information processing, information about how their salary changes fit into the broader distribution of salary changes at the University or even school level cannot be provided at the time of the salary increase notification. But, at a minimum, it would seem possible and desirable for salary notification letters to provide not only the new salary level, but also the percentage change in salary that that level implies.

SCESF Recommendation

The Provost's Office should consider implementing a procedure so that all faculty salary letters include the percentage change, as well as the level, of the new salary.

The Provost considers this a reasonable recommendation and will discuss its implementation with the Deans.

VIII. Members of the 2008-09 Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

Laura W. Perna, Chair (Education)
Anne O'Sullivan (Nursing)
David Pope (SEAS)
Daniel Raff (Wharton)
Sarah Kagan (Nursing)
Larry Gladney, (Physics) *Ex-Officio*
Sherri Adams, (Dental) *Ex-Officio*
Harvey Rubin, (Infectious Diseases) *Ex-Officio*

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	Average	FYs 2007-08
Full Professors	Median	3.0%
	Mean	4.5%
Associate Professor	Median	3.0%
	Mean	4.5%
Assistant Professor	Median	3.8%
	Mean	5.4%
All Three Ranks	Mean	4.7%
U.S. City Average CPI Growth	Mean	5.0%
Phil. CPI Growth	Mean	5.1%
Budget Guidelines	Mean	3.0%

Note 1: Academic base salary increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members who were faculty at the fall census of both years (or three years for cumulative increases) for which percentage increases are calculated. Excluded were all members of the Faculty of Medicine except basic scientists, all Clinician Educators from four schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Work), faculty members who were on unpaid leave of absence, faculty who had chosen phased retirement, and Deans of all schools.

Note 2: FYs 2007-08 CPI growth for the U.S. and for Philadelphia are based on a change in CPI from June 2007 to June 2008.

Table 2

Percentage of continuing Penn standing faculty members awarded percentage salary increases exceeding the percentage growth in the consumer price index (CPI) for Philadelphia

Percentage of all Standing Faculty Members with Salary Increases Exceeding Growth in the CPI (Phil.)

Schools and Disciplinary Areas	FYs 2007-08
Annenberg	0.0%
Dental Medicine	3.8%
Design	3.7%
Engineering & Applied Science	32.6%
Grad Education	2.9%
Humanities (A&S)	10.2%
Law	50.0%
Natural Science (A&S)	9.8%
Nursing	36.4%
Social Science (A&S)	15.2%
Social Policy & Practice	13.3%
Veterinary Medicine	13.3%
Wharton	35.5%
Medicine-Basic Science	24.6%
Median Across Schools/Areas	13.3%
All Schools/Areas Combined	20.1%
U.S. City Average CPI Growth	5.0%
Phil. CPI Growth	5.1%

NOTE 1: Academic base salary increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members who were faculty at the fall census of both years for which percentage increases are calculated. Excluded were all members of the Faculty of Medicine except basic scientists, all Clinician Educators from four schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Work), faculty members who were on unpaid leave of absence, faculty who had chosen phased retirement, and Deans of all schools.

Note 2: FYs 2007-08 CPI growth for the U.S. and for Philadelphia are based on a change in CPI from June 2007 to June 2008.

Table 3

Percentage of continuing Penn full professors awarded percentage salary increases exceeding the percentage growth in the consumer price index (CPI) for Philadelphia

Percentage of all Full Professors with Cumulative Salary Increases Exceeding Growth in the CPI (Phil.)

Schools and Disciplinary Areas	FYs 2007-08
Annenberg	0.0%
Dental Medicine	6.3%
Design	0.0%
Engineering & Applied Science	29.6%
Grad Education	0.0%
Humanities (A&S)	10.4%
Law	51.4%
Natural Science (A&S)	11.2%
Nursing	50.0%
Social Science (A&S)	16.0%
Social Policy & Practice	11.1%
Veterinary Medicine	16.7%
Wharton	20.5%
Medicine-Basic Science	22.2%
All Schools/Areas Combined	18.2%
Phil. CPI Growth	5.1%

NOTE 1: Cumulative compounded academic base salary increases pertain to all Penn full professors who continued as full professors between Fall 2006 and Fall 2007. Excluded were all members of the Faculty of Medicine except basic scientists, all Clinician Educators from four other schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Work), and faculty members who were on unpaid leave of absence, faculty who had chosen phased retirement, and Deans of all schools.

Note 2: FYs 2007-08 CPI growth for Philadelphia is based on a change in CPI from June 2007 to June 2008.

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 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Fall 2007
Full Professor				
Annenberg	1/34	2/35	2/36	1/38
Dental Medicine	4/34	6/34	8/35	10/38
Design	9/52	7/51	3/53	9/53
Engineering & Applied Science	20/56	14/55	14/56	14/56
Graduate Education	2/44	3/43	4/45	4/48
Humanities (A&S)	6/56	5/55	5/56	10/56
Law	6/36	6/36	7/36	10/41
Medicine-Basic Science	2/34	3/35	3/37	3/37
Natural Science (A&S)	11/57	12/56	11/57	15/57
Nursing	2/23	2/24	2/24	2/26
Social Policy & Practice	5/22	4/22	6/24	6/25
Social Science (A&S)	10/56	9/55	9/56	9/57
Veterinary Medicine	1/14	1/14	1/13	4/17
Wharton-Business & Management	3/52	2/52	3/53	7/53
Wharton-Public Policy	3/19	3/19	3/18	--
Wharton-Statistics	1/35	1/34	1/35	1/34
Associate Professor				
Annenberg	--	--	--	--
Dental Medicine	1/30	--	--	8/35
Design	9/50	7/50	1/51	7/53
Engineering & Applied Science	11/56	9/55	7/55	10/56
Graduate Education	2/47	2/46	3/46	4/48
Humanities (A&S)	6/56	8/55	6/56	10/56
Law	--	--	--	--
Medicine-Basic Science	2/31	4/34	2/36	3/37
Natural Science (A&S)	6/57	11/56	9/57	11/57
Nursing	7/26	3/26	3/26	5/26
Social Policy & Practice	--	5/22	5/24	--
Social Science (A&S)	11/56	11/55	9/56	11/57
Veterinary Medicine	2/14	2/14	1/13	3/17
Wharton-Business & Management	1/51	1/52	1/53	2/53
Wharton-Public Policy	--	--	--	--
Wharton-Statistics	--	--	--	--

Table 4 – continued

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 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Fall 2007
Assistant Professor				
Annenberg	--	--	--	--
Dental Medicine	--	--	4/34	11/36
Design	2/50	4/49	--	5/52
Engineering & Applied Science	12/56	11/55	6/56	13/56
Graduate Education	12/43	7/43	6/45	6/47
Humanities (A&S)	14/56	13/55	14/56	19/56
Law	3/23	5/28	--	--
Medicine-Basic Science	4/33	5/34	9/38	6/37
Natural Science (A&S)	10/57	7/56	8/57	18/57
Nursing	5/27	6/27	4/26	5/26
Social Policy & Practice	--	--	--	--
Social Science (A&S)	9/56	8/55	15/56	10/57
Veterinary Medicine	1/14	1/14	1/13	1/17
Wharton-Business & Management	3/50	7/52	3/53	6/53
Wharton-Public Policy	--	--	--	--
Wharton-Statistics	--	--	--	1/33

Note 1: Median salary data from this particular data source is not complete and therefore the more complete data set of average salary is used. The AAUDE survey instructions requests academic bases salaries and this was the metric used for submitting Penn faculty salaries.

Note 2: Using the federal CIP (Classification of Instructional Programs) codes for 2000, departments at comparable universities were mapped to Penn Schools.

Note 3: Calculations of rank only include those universities that have relevant departments. Therefore, the number of universities among which Penn is ranked varies by field.

Note 4: -- Indicates that comparisons are not available. Rank is suppressed for all cells that contain fewer than five Penn faculty members.

Table 5

Full professor salary comparisons: Percentage differences in mean academic base salary levels of full professors at a sample of comparable research universities for Academic Years 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-2008

Full Professor Salaries: Percentage Differences by Year			
University^a	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
Harvard	12.5%	+13.4%	11.7%
Stanford	4.2%	+0.7%	6.0%
Princeton	4.6%	+4.6%	5.2%
Chicago	3.5%	3.8%	4.4%
Yale	0.9%	0.7%	1.1%
Pennsylvania	\$149.9K	\$156.5K	\$163.3K
Columbia	N/A	N/A	-0.4%
NYU	-3.9%	-4.5%	-0.6%
Northwestern	-6.1%	-5.9%	-6.3%
Duke	-9.0%	-9.3%	-7.0%
MIT	-6.4%	-6.8%	-7.7%
N.C. (Chapel Hill)	-23.1%	-19.0%	-17.9%
Michigan	-16.2%	-16.7%	-19.1%
Virginia	-17.9%	-18.2%	-23.1%
Carnegie-Mellon	-17.4%	-18.8%	-23.5%
Texas (Austin)	-22.8%	-22.6%	-29.6%
MN (Twin Cities)	-26.4%	-25.5%	-34.6%
UCLA ^b	-14.3%	-14.9%	N/A
U.C. (Berkeley) ^b	-15.8%	-16.1%	N/A

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 except basic scientists, 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.

^aUniversities are ordered from highest to lowest mean salaries for full professors as of 2007-2008. 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.

^bUCLA and U.C. (Berkeley) did not participate in the 2007-2008 AAUP Salary Survey.

Table 6

Full Professors: Median academic base salary percentage increases of faculty continuing in rank who were Penn full professors for FY 2007, along with the first and third quartile salary increases

**First Quartile (Q₁), Median (Md.)^a, and Third Quartile (Q₃)
Percentage Salary Increases by Year**

School/Area	Q₁	Md.	Q₃
All Schools		3.0%	
Annenberg	3.8%	4.2%	4.5%
Dental Medicine	2.8%	3.0%	3.2%
Design	3.5%	4.0%	4.0%
Eng & Applied Sci	3.0%	4.0%	6.0%
Grad Education	3.4%	3.9%	4.1%
Humanities (A&S)	2.0%	2.0%	2.1%
Law	4.1%	5.1%	8.0%
Medicine-Basic Science	3.0%	3.0%	5.0%
Natural Science (A&S)	1.8%	2.0%	2.6%
Nursing ^b	4.5%	5.3%	7.0%
Social Science (A&S)	2.0%	2.0%	3.9%
Social Policy & Practice ^b	-	3.0%	-
Veterinary Medicine	3.0%	3.0%	3.5%
Wharton	3.0%	4.0%	4.9%
Budget Guideline		3.0%	

NOTES: The Budget Guideline shown under each rank is for comparison purposes. Per Penn policy, it is a guideline for a salary increment pool for all standing faculty members in each school, but not specifically for each rank.

Academic base salary percentage increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members who were full professors at the fall census of both years for which percentage increases are calculated. Excluded were all members of the Faculty of Medicine except basic scientists, all Clinician Educators from four other schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Work), faculty members who were on unpaid leave of absence, faculty who had chosen phased retirement, and Deans of all schools.

Salary increases include increases from all sources (e.g. merit, market, retention).

^aA median (Md.) percentage salary increase is the mid-point of the increase within each school/area and rank (i.e., half of all increases were below the median and half were above). Variability of salary increase percentages is indicated by the first quartile (Q₁) and third quartile (Q₃) percentage increases. At the lower end of the salary increase percentages, 25% of all increases were below the Q₁, while 75% were above. At the upper end, 75% of all increases were below the Q₃, while 25% were above. Median increases are reported only if the number of faculty members is four or more. The quartile increases are reported only if the number of faculty members is more than ten.

^b"-" in quartile columns means that there are less than ten faculty members.

Table 7

Associate Professors: Median academic base salary percentage increases of Penn faculty continuing in rank who were associate professors for FY 2007, along with the first and third quartile salary increases

**First Quartile (Q₁), Median (Md.)^a, and Third Quartile (Q₃)
Percentage Salary Increases by Year
FYs 2007-2008**

School/Area	Q₁	Md.	Q₃
All Schools		3.0%	
Annenberg ^b		NA	
Dental Medicine ^c	-	3.0%	-
Design ^c	3.0%	3.2%	4.0%
Eng & Applied Sci	3.0%	3.4%	5.8%
Grad Education	3.6%	4.2%	4.5%
Humanities (A&S)	2.0%	2.0%	2.2%
Law ^{bc}	-	-	-
Medicine-Basic Science	2.0%	3.0%	4.0%
Natural Science (A&S)	2.0%	2.0%	2.6%
Nursing	4.0%	4.5%	5.0%
Social Science (A&S)	2.0%	2.5%	2.8%
Social Policy & Practice ^b	-	4.0%	-
Veterinary Medicine	3.0%	3.1%	4.0%
Wharton	3.5%	4.3%	5.8%
Budget Guideline		3.0%	

NOTES The Budget Guideline shown under each rank is for comparison purposes. Per Penn policy, it is a guideline for a salary increment pool for all standing faculty members in each school, but not specifically for each rank.

Academic base salary percentage increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members who were associate professors at the fall census of both years for which percentage increases are calculated. Excluded were all members of the Faculty of Medicine except basic scientists, all Clinician Educators from four other schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Work), faculty members who were on unpaid leave of absence, faculty who had chosen phased retirement, and Deans of all schools.

Salary increases include increases from all sources (e.g. merit, market, retention).

^aA median (Md.) percentage salary increase is the mid-point of the increase within each school/area and rank (i.e., half of all increases were below the median and half were above). Variability of salary increase percentages is indicated by the first quartile (Q₁) and third quartile (Q₃) percentage increases. At the lower end of the salary increase percentages, 25% of all increases were below the Q₁, while 75% were above. At the upper end, 75% of all increases were below the Q₃, while 25% were above. Median increases are reported only if the number of faculty members is four or more. The quartile increases are reported only if the number of faculty members is ten or more.

^bNA means that there are no faculty in this rank to report.

^c"-" in quartile columns means that there are less than ten faculty members, and "-" in median columns means that there are less than four faculty members in the school/area.

Table 8

Assistant Professors: Median academic base salary percentage increases of Penn faculty continuing in rank who were assistant professors for FY 2007 along with the first and third quartile salary increases

School/Area	First Quartile (Q ₁), Median (Md.) ^a , and Third Quartile (Q ₃) Percentage Salary Increases by Year		
	FYs 2007-2008		
	Q ₁	Md.	Q ₃
All Schools		3.5%	
Annenberg ^b	-	-	-
Dental Medicine ^b	-	3.0%	-
Design ^b	-	3.5%	-
Eng & Applied Sci	3.5%	4.0%	5.0%
Grad Education ^b	-	4.0%	-
Humanities (A&S)	2.0%	2.0%	2.6%
Law ^b	-	4.3%	-
Medicine-Basic Science	3.0%	4.0%	10.0%
Natural Science (A&S)	2.0%	2.2%	4.1%
Nursing ^b	-	5.0%	-
Social Science (A&S)	2.0%	2.0%	2.2%
Social Policy & Practice ^b	-	-	-
Veterinary Medicine	3.0%	4.0%	5.0%
Wharton	4.0%	5.3%	6.3%
Budget Guideline		3.0%	

NOTES: The Budget Guideline shown under each rank is for comparison purposes. Per Penn policy, it is a guideline for a salary increment pool for all standing faculty members in each school, but not specifically for each rank.

Academic base salary percentage increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members who were assistant professors at the fall census of both years for which percentage increases are calculated. Excluded were all members of the Faculty of Medicine except basic scientists, all Clinician Educators from four other schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Work), faculty members who were on unpaid leave of absence, faculty who had chosen phased retirement, and Deans of all schools.

Salary increases include increases from all sources (e.g. merit, market, retention).

^aA median (Md.) percentage salary increase is the mid-point of the increase within each school/area and rank (i.e., half of all increases were below the median and half were above). Variability of salary increase percentages is indicated by the first quartile (Q₁) and third quartile (Q₃) percentage increases. At the lower end of the salary increase percentages, 25% of all increases were below the Q₁, while 75% were above. At the upper end, 75% of all increases were below the Q₃, while 25% were above. Median increases are reported only if the number of faculty members is four or more. The quartile increases are reported only if the number of faculty members is ten or more.

^b"-" in quartile columns means that there are less than ten faculty members, and "-" in median columns means that there are less than four faculty members in the school/area.

Table 9

Mean academic base salary levels of Penn standing faculty members who continued in rank by rank

Rank	Academic Year	Salary		Prof. Salary Level	
		Average	Amount	Not Weighted	Weighted ^a
Full Professor	2004-2005	Mean	141,863	1.74	1.81
		Median	129,850	1.84	1.78
	2005-2006	Mean	148,154	1.71	1.83
		Median	137,000	1.88	1.82
	2006-2007	Mean	154,314	1.72	1.84
		Median	143,000	1.92	1.84
	2007-2008	Mean	160,865	1.75	1.85
		Median	148,000	1.96	1.84
Associate Professor	2004-2005	Mean	94,513	1.16	1.23
		Median	84,100	1.19	1.22
	2005-2006	Mean	99,374	1.15	1.26
		Median	87,550	1.20	1.26
	2006-2007	Mean	102,928	1.15	1.26
		Median	91,600	1.23	1.27
	2007-2008	Mean	106,229	1.16	1.26
		Median	94,336	1.25	1.27
Assistant Professor	2004-2005	Mean	81,664	1.00	1.00
		Median	70,524	1.00	1.00
	2005-2006	Mean	86,704	1.00	1.00
		Median	72,723	1.00	1.00
	2006-2007	Mean	89,564	1.00	1.00
		Median	74,336	1.00	1.00
	2007-2008	Mean	91,784	1.00	1.00
		Median	75,500	1.00	1.00

NOTES: This table describes years that were also presented in the 2006-07 report. However, some of the data differ, as the prior report included several errors.

Mean academic base salary levels are based on all Penn standing faculty members who continued in rank in FY 2008 from their respective prior years. Excluded were all members of the Faculty of Medicine except basic scientists, all Clinician Educators from four other schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Work), faculty members who were on unpaid leave of absence, faculty who had chosen phased retirement, and Deans of all schools.

All salaries reported on a 12-month basis, for the purposes of this analysis, are adjusted to be comparable with the salaries reported on a 9-month basis.

^aThe weighted ratios were computed by the following procedure: first, the ratios for continuing faculty members for each school were computed (except for Annenberg, which had no assistant professors, and Law, which had but one assistant professor); next a mean weighted ratio was computed (weighted for the number of continuing faculty members at each higher rank in each school).

Table 10

Variability of academic base salary levels for faculty who continued in rank^a: First, second, and third quartile median salary levels by rank and year

Rank	Academic Year	Quartiles ^b of Median Salaries				IQR ^b	Ratio: IQR to Median ^c	Number of Areas
		Q ₁	Q ₂	Q ₃				
Full Professor	2004-2005	\$110.0K	\$129.9K	\$164.4K	54.4	0.42	14	
	2005-2006	\$116.7K	\$137.0K	\$172.8K	56.1	0.41	14	
	2006-2007	\$120.8K	\$143.0K	\$180.0K	59.3	0.41	14	
	2007-2008	\$126.1K	\$148.0K	\$186.5K	60.4	0.41	14	
Associate Professor	2004-2005	\$75.5K	\$84.1K	\$100.1K	24.6	0.29	13	
	2005-2006	\$77.6K	\$87.6K	\$105.7K	28.1	0.32	13	
	2006-2007	\$81.0K	\$91.6K	\$106.5K	25.5	0.28	12	
	2007-2008	\$83.5K	\$94.3K	\$111.2K	27.6	0.29	12	
Assistant Professor	2004-2005	\$62.4K	\$70.5K	\$87.4K	25.1	0.36	13	
	2005-2006	\$65.2K	\$72.7K	\$100.1K	34.8	0.48	14	
	2006-2007	\$67.8K	\$74.3K	\$102.3K	34.5	0.46	14	
	2007-2008	\$69.9K	\$75.5K	\$99.4K	29.4	0.39	14	

NOTES: This table describes years that were also presented in the 2006-07 report. However, some of the data differ, as the prior report included several errors.

Median academic base salary levels are based on all Penn standing faculty members who continued in rank in FY 2008 from their respective prior years. Excluded were all members of the Faculty of Medicine except basic scientists, all Clinician Educators from four other schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Work), faculty members who were on unpaid leave of absence, faculty who had chosen phased retirement, and Deans of all schools.

All salaries reported on a 12-month basis, for the purposes of this analysis, are adjusted to be comparable with the salaries reported on a 9-month basis.

^aThe fourteen schools/areas used for this analysis are the same as those listed in Table 3. In some years the number of areas reported was slightly less if the school had no continuing in rank faculty for a given rank.

^bVariability of median salary levels is reported by quartile. At the lower end of the median salary level distribution, 25% of all median salary levels were below the first quartile (Q₁), while the other 75% were above. In the middle, 50% of all median salary levels were below the second quartile (Q₂, also called the median), while the other 50% were above. At the upper end, 75% of all median salary levels were below the third quartile (Q₃), while the other 25% were above. Using Q₃ and Q₁, a measure of variability of median salaries termed the interquartile range (IQR) is then computed by subtracting the lower quartile salary (Q₁) from the upper quartile salary (Q₃).

^cThis is a ratio of (a) the variability of median salaries (i.e., the IQR) to (b) the average of those median salaries. With this ratio, it is possible to make meaningful comparisons across years, and across professional ranks, in the variability of salaries. The IQR is divided by the median salary (Q₂), thereby indexing the variability to the general level of salaries and making comparisons of variability more meaningful.

Table 11**Percentage Salary Increase Distribution of Faculty Who Continued in Rank by Gender and Rank****First Quartile (Q₁), Median (Md.)^a, and Third Quartile (Q₃)****Percentage Salary Increases by Year**

Rank	Gender	FYs 2007-2008		
		Q₁	Median	Q₃
Full Professor	Men	2.0%	3.0%	4.4%
	Women	2.0%	3.7%	5.1%
Associate Professor	Men	2.0%	3.0%	4.0%
	Women	2.0%	3.0%	4.4%
Assistant Professor	Men	2.2%	3.6%	5.0%
	Women	2.0%	3.5%	4.8%

NOTE: Academic base salary percentage increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members who were in the same rank at the fall census of both years for which percentage increases are calculated. Excluded were all members of the Faculty of Medicine except basic scientists, all Clinician Educators from four other schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Work), faculty members who were on unpaid leave of absence, faculty who had chosen phased retirement, and Deans of all schools.

Table 12

Mean academic base salary levels of Penn faculty members by gender and rank

Rank	Unweighted			Weighted					
		Women	Men	% Difference	Women	Men	% Difference		
Full Professor	2004-05	Mean	134,083	142,944	6.6%	136,564	142,944	4.7%	
		Median	120,538	131,100	8.8%	129,656	139,868	7.9%	
	2005-06	Mean	139,891	149,032	6.5%	142,952	149,032	4.3%	
		Median	127,051	138,450	9.0%	138,089	146,213	5.9%	
	2006-07	Mean	146,762	155,230	5.8%	149,979	155,230	3.5%	
		Median	132,200	144,150	9.0%	145,760	152,018	4.3%	
	2007-08	Mean	151,066	162,614	7.6%	153,170	162,614	6.2%	
		Median	137,200	149,718	9.1%	149,735	158,595	5.9%	
	Associate Professor	2004-05	Mean	87,999	99,150	12.7%	97,948	99,150	1.2%
			Median	78,600	90,150	14.7%	97,018	96,317	-0.7%
2005-06		Mean	92,619	102,478	10.6%	93,111	102,478	10.1%	
		Median	82,750	93,000	12.4%	93,649	100,531	7.3%	
2006-07		Mean	94,695	107,698	13.7%	105,236	107,698	2.3%	
		Median	87,263	95,900	9.9%	107,349	104,579	-2.6%	
2007-08		Mean	98,373	110,473	12.3%	108,174	110,473	2.1%	
		Median	91,150	98,226	7.8%	109,888	106,065	-3.5%	
Assistant Professor		2004-05	Mean	77,794	85,464	9.9%	86,074	85,464	-0.7%
			Median	65,845	74,500	13.1%	83,808	84,000	0.2%
	2005-06	Mean	80,762	89,345	10.6%	89,955	89,345	-0.7%	
		Median	68,190	77,340	13.4%	86,653	87,421	0.9%	
	2006-07	Mean	83,835	92,169	9.9%	93,002	92,169	-0.9%	
		Median	70,563	80,038	13.4%	89,946	88,924	-1.1%	
	2007-08	Mean	87,247	95,505	9.5%	96,663	95,505	-1.2%	
		Median	73,054	82,000	12.2%	93,592	92,420	-1.3%	

NOTES: This table describes years that were also presented in the 2006-07 report. However, some of the data differ, as the prior report included several errors.

Mean academic base salary levels are based on all Penn standing faculty members who were at Penn in FY 2008. Excluded were all members of the Faculty of Medicine except basic scientists, all Clinician Educators from four other schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Work), faculty members who were on unpaid leave of absence, faculty who had chosen phased retirement, and Deans of all schools.

All salaries reported on a 12-month basis, for the purposes of this analysis, are adjusted to be comparable with the salaries reported on a 9-month basis.

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. Schools/areas which had less than three female faculty in a given rank in a given year are assigned male weight of zero.

% 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.