

## Executive Summary of the 2019 SCESF Report on the Economic Status of the Faculty

### Introduction

This Executive Summary provides an overview of the 2019 Report of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF). The Report relies on 1) a series of tables that summarize faculty base compensation provided by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and 2) benefits information collected by SCESF from other institutions. The 2019 Report covers Fiscal Year (FY) 2018, from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018. This Executive Summary presents key observations and issues of concern. The full 2019 Report, including all publicly viewable tables provided to the Committee by the Vice Provost's Office and administrative responses to SCESF's recommendations, is published on the *Almanac* website at [https://almanac.upenn.edu/uploads/media/SCESF\\_full\\_report\\_2019.pdf](https://almanac.upenn.edu/uploads/media/SCESF_full_report_2019.pdf)

### Key Observations and Concerns

a. *A 3% annual increase for faculty continuing in rank remains the University target.* Penn continues to specify a 3% annual increase in base salary for faculty continuing in rank. Data provided by the Vice Provost's Office confirm a median increase of 3% across Schools and ranks, albeit with considerable variation, in part because Schools and other units whose budgets do not permit such average increases are not required to maintain the target.

b. *Base salaries of Assistant Professors are highly competitive; those of Professors and Associate Professors are less so.* When salaries at Penn are compared to those at comparable research institutions, salaries of Assistant Professors remain near the top, whereas those for Professors and Associate Professors have settled into a middle range that stamps Penn as a notch below the top institutions.

c. *The gender gap in faculty base salaries is increasingly a gap due to differences in salaries across Schools.* Statistical analysis shows that base salaries *within Schools* are, on average, essentially the same for male and female Associate Professors and Assistant Professors, and that the difference among Professors is small and fading. But even as women at Penn attain a distribution by rank that is increasingly similar to that of their male colleagues, the continuing concentration of women in Schools and fields with lower average salaries augurs a continuation of a gender disparity in salaries across the University as a whole.

d. *Penn provides excellent benefits for dependent education, but retirement contributions lag.* Compared to peer institutions, Penn offers excellent benefits for dependent education that benefit a select group of faculty each year. The current 9% limit on contributions to retirement accounts, however, is lower than the 10% norm at peer institutions.

e. *Our report is limited to base salary, an incomplete measure of compensation.* The report uses base salary as a measure of compensation, but faculty at Penn earn additional compensation for a variety of activities, including supplemental teaching, summer research and department administrative tasks. These may differ across faculty and they may differ among Schools. The magnitude and distribution of these additional sources of compensation are unknown to the Committee, and thus, our report is limited in its ability to fully characterize compensation differences across Schools and on the basis of demographic categories, such as gender.

f. *Data omit segments of the Standing Faculty.* Data provided to

SCESF cover all members of the tenure-line faculty in most Schools of the University. As in past years, however, these data exclude tenure-line faculty from the Perelman School of Medicine (PSOM), except those in basic science departments. Also excluded are roughly 1,000 Standing Faculty-Clinician-Educators from the schools of Medicine, Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, and Nursing. Because SCESF's mission is to report on the economic status of *all* Standing Faculty at Penn, we note that our report is incomplete.

### Recommendations

SCESF offers the following recommendations to the Office of the Vice Provost.

a. *Provide data summarizing total compensation.* Base salary permits SCESF to compare salaries at Penn to those at other universities. Base salary does not, however, provide an adequate foundation for assessing gender and other equity issues related to compensation.

b. *Provide data for all Standing Faculty.* The absence of these data is of continuing concern to SCESF, since the committee is charged with representing the interests of *all* Standing Faculty at Penn.

c. *Maintain an eminent faculty via competitive salaries.* Salaries of Professors and Associate Professors in several fields and Schools lag the comparative standing targeted by the administration.

d. *Consider the structural source of continuing gender equality in salaries.* Average salaries are lower in the Schools in which female faculty are comparatively numerous.

e. *Increase the retirement benefit matching contribution to 10%.* Such an increase would bring Penn into alignment with competing institutions and better prepare faculty for retirement.

### SCESF Membership 2018-2019

Peter Cappelli, Wharton/Management  
 Blanca Himes, PSOM/Biostatistics, Epidemiology, & Informatics  
 Sarah Kagan, Nursing  
 Iouri Manovskii, SAS/Economics  
 Pamela Sankar, PSOM/Medical Ethics & Health Policy  
 Herbert Smith, *Chair*, SAS/Sociology

#### Ex Officio:

Jennifer Pinto-Martin, Nursing, Faculty Senate Chair  
 Santosh Venkatesh, SEAS/Electrical & Systems Engineering,  
 Faculty Senate Past Chair  
 Steven Kimbrough, Wharton/Operations, Information & Decisions,  
 Faculty Senate Chair-Elect

The Committee gratefully acknowledges the essential and invaluable assistance of J. Patrick Walsh of the Office of the Faculty Senate and the additional information provided in response to SCESF requests by the offices of the Provost, Institutional Research & Analysis, and Human Resources. The Committee also notes that this year's full report directly benefited from presentation and analysis described in reports from previous years and, where appropriate, some previous text is included.

The full report of the 2019 SCESF, including numerous Tables and the Responses from the Administration, can be found online at [https://almanac.upenn.edu/uploads/media/SCESF\\_full\\_report\\_2019.pdf](https://almanac.upenn.edu/uploads/media/SCESF_full_report_2019.pdf)

## Report of the Faculty Senate Grievance Commission

The Faculty Senate Grievance Commission of the University of Pennsylvania is an independent committee consisting of three faculty members appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. This Commission is available to members of the Penn faculty and academic support staff who allege they have been subject to action that is contrary to the University procedures, policies, and/or regulations, that is discriminatory, or that is arbitrary. During Academic Year 2018-2019, the Commission was composed of James Palmer (PSOM/Otorhinolaryngology, Past Chair), and Martha Farah (SAS/Psychology, Chair), and Connie Ulrich (Nursing, Chair-Elect).

During this year the Commission was approached by three faculty members concerning a variety of issues. One case involved a long-standing but unresolved problem with laboratory facilities. After discussions with the Commission chair concerning the requirements and procedures for a formal grievance, the professor opted to pursue other courses of action. A second case, involving procedures for reappointment as an assistant professor, was resolved within the faculty member's school. The third case, regarding compensation, grants management, and intellectual property, remains under discussion between the faculty member and the Commission chair.

–Martha Farah (Grievance Commission Chair, 2018-2019)