

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

The Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, March 20, 2015 at 2:10 p.m. in the State Room, 1957 E Street, N.W., seventh floor.

AGENDA

1. **Call to order**
2. **Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on February 13, 2015 (minutes to be distributed)**
3. **Interim Report of the Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies (including Fringe Benefits) (The report is included with this agenda along with the appended Annex I, Report of the Joint Task Force of the Faculty Senate Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee and the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee Charged With Investigating Faculty Benefit Levels**

Professor Harrington, Chair
Professor Anbinder (Joint Task Force Member)

4. **Faculty Governance Discussion**
Professor Garris
5. **Annual Report on Core Indicators of Academic Excellence**
Provost Lerman
6. **Introduction of Resolutions**
7. **General Business**

- a) **Nominees for election to the Nominating Committee that prepares a slate of nominees for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for the 2015-16 Session:**

Professor Miriam Galston (GWLS), Convener
Professors Mary Granger (SB), Paula Lantz, Milken Institute School of Public Health), Murray Loew (SEAS), Barbara Miller (ESIA), Kathryn Newcomer (CCAS), Joyce Pulcini (SON), Gary Simon (SMHS), James Williams (GSEHD)

- b) **Report of the Executive Committee, Charles A. Garris, Chair**
- c) **Provost's Remarks**

- d) **Chair's Remarks**

- 8. **Brief Statements (and questions)**

- 9. **Adjournment**

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

The George Washington University
Faculty Senate Committee on
Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies
(including Fringe Benefits)

Friday, February 13, 2015

Interim Report

The Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies (Including Fringe Benefits) Committee (ASPP) of the Faculty Senate has had four meetings during the Fall 2014 semester and three so far during the Spring 2015 semester.

This report is comprised of edited minutes from those seven meetings.

Meeting #1, September 5, 2014

Vice President Ellis confirmed that the following faculty had been nominated for election at the next meeting of the Faculty Senate to serve on the Benefits Advisory Committee: Professors Anbinder, Castleberry, Gupta, Harrington, Rice & Thorpe. This would comprise a committee of twelve once the administration had appointed their members.

Vice President Ellis gave an update on the presentation the Human Resources department was preparing to give to the Faculty Senate at its meeting on September 12. The highlights were that the overall increase by the faculty of around 3% was budgeted for accounted to a 4% increase in the monthly premiums but counteracted by no increase in the deductible or prescription charges. This applied to the two major plans used by the faculty. The premium plan was to be replaced by a low premium high deductible plan with a special long term savings account.

Vice Provost Martin was able to give the ASPP Committee an update on the state of nonconcurrences which amounted to 3 cases out of a total of 42 faculty recommendations for tenure and/or promotion during the AY 2013/2014. One of these cases had been referred to the President who had decided it. On the other two, issues arising from the departmental and school by-laws required a decision to be made at a later date. The issue of the precise meaning of ‘compelling reasons’ was under review by the Executive Committee in conjunction with the administration.

The Board of Trustees had established four working groups, each chaired by a member of the Board with faculty representation from most of the schools. Their charge was to report their findings to the Board during the Spring semester 2015.

The Faculty Salary Equity committee, on which Professor Galston and Vice Provost Martin had both served, had produced a report on the situation as of AY 2010/2011. Professor Tuch of the Sociology Department was the co-chair of this committee which was currently looking at salaries in the AY 2012/2013 and would be available to discuss this with the ASPP Committee. It was agreed to invite Professor Tuch to the next meeting of the ASPP in October.

Meeting #2, October 10, 2014

Further discussion on the Health Benefits was addressed. It was generally agreed that these had been well presented by Vice President Ellis at the September meeting of the Faculty Senate and the Health Benefits were therefore in place for the coming year. Questions concerning other issues covered by the Benefits Advisory Committee would be addressed at the next meeting.

Meeting #3, November 7, 2014

The Faculty Salary Equity Committee discussion was the first item of business. The committee understood that there was still an ongoing activity within the Equity Committee and a report was due soon on the salaries for the Academic Year 2013/2014. Professor Tuch, chair of the Faculty Salary Equity Committee (FSEC) and Associate Provost Annie Wooldridge gave a detailed explanation of the work of the FSEC and provided relevant data. Further discussion then followed on the general principles applied by the FSEC especially in identifying those faculty lying outside a specific norm. The Deans of the schools in which these outliers were identified were contacted and in some cases salary adjustment was made, depending on the specific school's criteria. Of the 81 outliers from the 2013 report, 13 faculty identified in 2011 were in this category. If the school did not have sufficient funds to make the necessary adjustment, the Provost was able to do so.

Further discussion on the Health Benefits was then addressed. Vice President Ellis gave the committee an update on the enrollment of the faculty and staff. There was a total of 3112 enrollments of which 114 were for the High Deductible option. The increase in overall costs to the individuals on aggregate was 3%.

Health Coverage for Faculty traveling abroad whether on University Business or on privately was then discussed. The University does provide such coverage for faculty traveling on business with faculty are recommended to register with abroad services. Vice President Ellis would look into coverage for those faculty traveling abroad on private business.

The Tuition Remission Benefit reduction applied to all staff and faculty without 'grandfathering' in existing members did comprise a specific loss. Vice President Ellis stated that the \$750k savings with this benefit reduction had to be made to keep the overall benefits within the margins as laid out by the Board of Trustees. It was a question of trade-offs, and GW did not appear to be out of line with our peer institutions. This particularly

affected the Graduate Assistants in GSEHD and would have a major impact on recruiting GA's. The committee felt that more data on this benefit reduction was needed.

The question of the overall effect of applying the Board of Trustees 3% increase in the University Budget was raised. After much discussion, it was agreed that Professors Anbinder & Rau would serve on a Task Force together with two members of the Fiscal Planning & Budgeting Committee to look into this and to report back to their relevant committees.

Meeting #4, December 12, 2014

The issue of traveling faculty had been raised at a previous meeting and it was discovered that the particular faculty who had asked for this to be discussed had been billed as out-of-network. This was being looked into by HR.

Professor Anbinder had met with the Provost regarding Faculty Salaries and compared these with the Market Basket Schools salaries on a total compensation basis. Further discussions with the administration are on-going. The Task Force for which he was the convener was still in discussions and would be reporting to the ASPP Committee at its next meeting.

It was agreed to meet again in the New Year when a room could be reserved in the Science & Engineering Hall, probably on January 16. It was expected that the ASPP Committee would be discussing the Board of Trustees proposals to modify the Faculty Code.

Meeting #5, January 16, 2015

Professor Anbinder, presently leading a Joint Task Force (JTF) with the Fiscal Planning & Budgeting Committee informed the committee that the JTF had not completed their deliberations and would be reporting to the ASPP Committee at its next meeting.

There then followed a lengthy discussion on the various aspects of the amendments to the Faculty Code which had been proposed by the Board of Trustees. The document circulated to the committee and titled 'Faculty Governance – Draft Recommendations' was drafted by the Executive Committee and presented by Professor Marotta-Walters.

It was suggested by the committee that Section E. School-Wide Personnel Committees on Page 5 should allow for exceptions for the School of Medicine and Health Sciences (SMHS), the School of Nursing (SON) and the Millikan Institute and School of Public Health (MISPH).

The ASPP committee also recommended that subsection 3 be amended to read

'The recommendation of a school-wide personnel committee shall be construed as a faculty recommendation as defined by Section B.3 of the Procedures for Implementation of the Faculty Code however the recommendation of the department shall remain the primary faculty recommendation'.

Much of the rest of the Executive Committee's amendments to the Draft Recommendations were accepted. In the case of Section I Academic Personnel on pages 17 & 18, the SON was added in with the SMHS.

Meeting #6, January 23, 2015

Professor Anbinder had met with the Provost regarding Faculty Salaries and compared these with the Market Basket Schools salaries on a total compensation basis. Further discussions with the administration are on-going. He is presently leading a Joint Task Force with the Fiscal Planning & Budgeting Committee which had not completed their deliberations and would be reporting to the ASPP Committee at its next meeting.

There then followed a lengthy discussion on the various aspects of the new Faculty Code proposed by the Board of Trustees. These had been selected by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee as being especially applicable to the ASPP Committee. The specific details of this discussion were in an accompanying document. As there was still further activity by the Executive Committee on these proposals relevant to the ASPP Committee, the next meeting of the ASPP Committee on February 6 would be especially important. In particular, the proposed establishment of a Provost Advisory Committee with regard to the granting of Tenure and Promotion had already been criticized by a significant faction of the GW Faculty at large. Other issues were around the role of the School Appointments, Tenure & Promotion committees advisory to the Dean.

Meeting #7, February 6, 2015

Ms. Hayton gave an update on the recent meetings of the Benefits Advisory Committee and President Knapp's new Task Force also on benefits. A company entitled 'Advisory Board' had been engaged to determine the best Medical Plans for the University keeping in mind the total cost and a presentation was made to highlight the areas in which the University could reduce expenditures while maintaining the same level of benefit.

Avoiding emergency room visits were possible and accepting generic drugs in place of named varieties were examples of significant savings to the University. In both these cases, no loss of benefit would result.

Professor Anbinder, who was the convener of the Joint Task Force (JTF) with the Fiscal Planning & Budgeting Committee, presented the JTF's report. It is attached to this report as Annex 1. The ASPP committee welcomed the report and after considerable discussion agreed to forward the report with recommendations to the Executive committee as follows:

Conclusions and Recommendations (ASPP)

- 1) The data indicate that the overall level of fringe benefits provided to GW faculty is lower than almost all of the market basket schools at almost all faculty ranks both in percentage terms and in dollar terms. Even comparable schools outside the market basket with lower endowment-per-student resources than GW typically pay significantly more than GW in benefits.**

- 2) **We recommend that the Senate Executive Committee ask the administration to address GW's low spending on faculty benefits as compared to similar universities, and that the administration increase spending on benefits in 2016 above and beyond the normal 3% increase to "catch up" to the benefits paid by other comparable universities.**
- 3) **We urge the administration not to cut one benefit to pay for an increase in another benefit, because that will not solve the main problem – that GW's overall benefits compensation to faculty is far below that of comparable universities.**
- 4) **We recommend that the administration not reduce the merit pool to fund an increase in the benefits pool – paying for an increase in benefits through a cut in the merit pool would only mask the problem rather than fix it.**

The ASPP Committee requests the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to ask the administration for a written response to these recommendations prior to the end of academic year 2014-2015 (Commencement).

Members of the ASPP Committee:

R.J. Harrington (Chair)

Professors: Anbinder, Abravanel, Briggs, Galston (Executive Committee Liaison), Gupta, LeLacheur, Marotta-Walters, Plack, Rau, Schanfield, Williams

VP Ellis, Exec VP & Treasurer Katz, Provost Lerman, Vice Provost Martin,

M. Shea (Gelman Library)

Respectfully submitted,

R.J. Harrington

February 13, 2015.

ANNEX 1

**Report of the Joint Task Force of the
Faculty Senate Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies Committee and
The Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee
Charged With Investigating Faculty Benefit Levels**

Prepared by Prof. Tyler Anbinder, Columbian College of Art and Sciences; Prof. Theresa Gabaldon, School of Law; Prof. Benjamin Hopkins, Elliott School of International Affairs; Prof. Pradeep Rau, School of Business

The charge given to this task force was to examine GW's relative standing in faculty benefits and to examine, if GW's benefits lag behind those of other institutions, why this is the case. The task force began by considering published fringe benefits rates. In 2014, VP for Human Resources Sabrina Ellis distributed to the Benefits Advisory Committee a list of faculty fringe benefits rates that showed that GW ranked next to last:

**Published Fringe Rate of GW, Market-Basket Competitors,
And Other Comparable Universities**

Institution	Fringe Rate
Syracuse U.	40.9%
NYU	35.4%
Georgetown	35%
Johns Hopkins	34.5%
Columbia	33.7%
USC	33.5%
Northeastern	31.9%
U. of Chicago	29.6%
Boston U.	29.2%
Tufts	28.8%
U. of Rochester	28.6%
SMU	28%
Tulane	28%
Northwestern	27.2%
U. of Miami	26.8%
Washington U.	26.7%
American U.	26.%
Emory	25.8%
Duke	25%
GWU	25%
Vanderbilt	21.9%

When members of the GW Benefits Advisory Committee recently suggested that GW's low fringe rate explained why we seem to pay more and get less health coverage than faculty at comparable schools, Ellis responded that published fringe rates do not always reflect the true amount that universities spent on benefits. She asserted that some of the universities above GW on this list actually do not spend as much on benefits as this list indicates.

We investigated the assertion that GW may rank better in actual fringe benefits paid than in its published fringe rate suggests by locating the actual amount schools spent on faculty benefits in 2013-14 in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. These data show that published fringe rates do closely correlate with the amount universities spend on benefits:

**Average Faculty Fringe Benefits, By Faculty Rank,
Paid By GW and Its "Market-Basket" Competitors**

University	Avg. Fringe Benefits per Assistant Professor
USC	\$36,900
Boston U.	\$36,600
NYU	\$36,000
Northwestern	\$33,000
Tufts	\$26,200
Duke	\$24,900
SMU	\$24,500
Georgetown	\$24,100
U. of Miami	\$22,000
Emory	\$21,300
Tulane	\$20,400
Vanderbilt	\$19,100
American	\$18,900
GWU	\$18,500
Washington U.	\$16,600

University	Avg. Fringe Benefits per Associate Professor
USC	\$41,500
Duke	\$39,900
NYU	\$36,600
Northwestern	\$36,200
Tufts	\$33,000
Boston U.	\$29,800
U. of Miami	\$29,800
SMU	\$28,700
Georgetown	\$28,200
Emory	\$26,800
Washington U.	\$26,500
American	\$25,700
Tulane	\$23,300
Vanderbilt	\$22,800
GWU	\$22,800

University	Avg. Benefits Paid to Each Full Professor
NYU	\$64,000
Duke	\$53,900
USC	\$51,100
Boston U.	\$49,100
Northwestern	\$48,100
Tufts	\$45,000
Washington U.	\$44,100
Georgetown	\$40,500
U. of Miami	\$39,800
SMU	\$38,300
Emory	\$35,400
American	\$34,300
Tulane	\$33,400
GWU	\$32,900
Vanderbilt	\$29,800

In defending GW's benefits package, the Provost has argued in the past that what really matters is total compensation. If GW is especially generous in salaries, then that fact would compensate for a benefits package that is less generous. GW fares only slightly better in this metric, below both the median and the mean at all ranks:

**Total Compensation (Salary and Benefits) for GW Faculty
and Their Market-Basket Competitors, by Rank**

University	Avg. Total Compensation for Assistant Professors
NYU	\$146,000
Northwestern	\$135,700
USC	\$132,500
Boston U	\$129,800
Duke	\$128,400
Georgetown	\$125,300
SMU	\$122,400
Washington U.	\$114,900
Tufts	\$112,600
Vanderbilt	\$108,000
Emory	\$107,200
GWU	\$106,000
U. of Miami	\$105,500
Tulane	\$100,200
American	\$99,000

University	Avg. Total Compensation for Associate Professors
Duke	\$160,700
USC	\$151,500
Northwestern	\$151,300
NYU	\$148,700
Boston U.	\$140,000
Georgetown	\$139,500
Washington U.	\$137,100
Tufts	\$135,300
GWU	\$132,200
Emory	\$131,600
American	\$131,400
Vanderbilt	\$130,300
U. of Miami	\$129,200
SMU	\$129,000
Tulane	\$115,300

University	Avg. Total Compensation for Full Professors
NYU	\$259,700
Duke	\$240,300
Northwestern	\$230,100
Washington U.	\$227,700
Georgetown	\$218,400
USC	\$215,700
Boston U.	\$210,700
Vanderbilt	\$204,600
American	\$195,700
GWU	\$194,300
Emory	\$193,800
U. of Miami	\$190,900
Tufts (has no law school)	\$188,200
SMU	\$184,300
Tulane	\$180,500

These data show that GW ranks especially low in its total compensation for assistant professors, something confirmed when looking outside the market basket as well.

Total Compensation for GW Faculty Compared to AAUP 80th Percentile, 2013-14

	GW	AAUP 80th Percentile
Assistant Professors	\$106,000	\$114,900
Associate Professors	\$132,200	\$131,600
Full Professors	\$194,300	\$187,300

Source: <http://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/2014%20salary%20report/table9b.pdf>

GW assistant professors fall below the 70th percentile in total compensation, even though by salary alone they rank at exactly the 80th percentile. The only possible explanation for this disparity is that GW does not provide benefits to lower-paid faculty members at the same rate as other institutions that pay the same salaries.

One might imagine that the solution to this problem would be to add to the compensation of assistant professors, but our analysis suggests that the issue is not one of rank but of how benefits relate to salary level. Some universities in our market basket have vesting periods before the employer matches employee retirement contributions, which lowers the compensation for the newest (typically lowest ranked) faculty members, but GW does not have a vesting period. Other schools in our market basket pay retirement benefits at a lower rate to younger employees, which also reduces the benefits paid to assistant professors, but GW does not do that either. So it seems most likely that GW's benefits package is undercompensating lower-paid faculty in general, not younger or pre-tenure faculty in particular.

We recognize that the "market-basket" schools may not in all cases be the best institutions with which to compare GW. Only three schools on the list (American, Boston University, and the University of Miami) have an endowment-per-student at or below GW's (NYU's is slightly higher but comparable). While we may aspire to compete with the other schools on the list, perhaps we do not have the financial wherewithal to do so.

But a number of schools not in our "market basket," with smaller endowments per student than GW, pay significantly more in benefits and total compensation than GW. Northeastern University in Boston, for example, pays more than GW in total compensation at every faculty rank, even though it has a much lower endowment per student than GW. Fordham University also pays far higher total compensation at the assistant and associate faculty levels than GW, even after adjusting for New York's higher cost of living, and despite the fact that Fordham has no medical school to boost its salary pool. Within the market basket, too, schools with much lower endowment-per-student levels than GW, such as Boston University, manage to pay far more than GW in benefits, and therefore more in total compensation. While endowment clearly affects how much a university can afford to pay its faculty, the data we have collected indicates that endowment is not the decisive factor that explains why GW's benefits lag behind almost all comparable schools.

What we also found striking in the total compensation figures is that other than American University, every school that ranked below GW in total compensation is located in a place with a far lower cost of living than Washington. When adjusting total compensation for cost of living in the city in which each university is located, GW again falls to the bottom of the rankings.

**Total Compensation for GW Faculty and Their Market-Basket Competitors,
Adjusted for Cost of Living¹**

University	Avg. Total Compensation for Asst. Profs. Adjusted to Reflect What That Compensation Equates to in the Washington Metropolitan Area
Duke	\$194,911
SMU	\$177,113
Washington U.	\$170,397
Vanderbilt	\$169,668
Northwestern	\$162,297
Emory	\$153,189
Tulane	\$144,088
USC	\$140,318
U. of Miami	\$134,618
Boston U.	\$132,266
NYU	\$127,020
Georgetown	\$125,300
Tufts	\$114,739
GWU	\$106,000
American	\$99,000

University	Avg. Total Compensation for Assoc. Profs. Adjusted to Reflect What That Compensation Equates to in the Washington Metropolitan Area
Duke	\$243,943
Vanderbilt	\$204,701
Washington U.	\$203,319
Emory	\$188,056
SMU	\$186,663
Northwestern	\$180,955
Tulane	\$165,801
U. of Miami	\$164,859
USC	\$160,439
Boston U.	\$142,660
Georgetown	\$139,500
Tufts	\$137,871
GWU	\$132,200
American	\$131,400
NYU	\$129,369

¹ We used Money/CNN.com's cost-of-living calculator, which is based on federal cost-of-living data, to determine the buying power of each school's total compensation in comparison to the buying power of compensation in Washington. That meant that pay for the New York City school in our market basket was adjusted downward (to reflect New York's higher cost of living) and those for all other cities were adjusted upward, because those other cities, according to federal data, have lower costs of living than Washington (the "Washington" cost-of-living figure combines the cost of living in D.C. and its inner suburbs). For the New York cost of living, we used an average of the cost of living for Manhattan, Brooklyn, Queens, and the inner suburbs.

University	Avg. Total Compensation for Full Professors Adjusted to Reflect What That Compensation Equates to in the Washington Metropolitan Area
Duke	\$364,775
Washington U.	\$337,679
Vanderbilt	\$321,427
Emory	\$276,940
Northwestern	\$275,200
SMU	\$266,682
Tulane	\$259,559
U. of Miami	\$243,398
USC	\$228,426
NYU	\$225,939
Georgetown	\$218,400
Boston U.	\$214,703
American	\$195,700
GWU	\$194,300
Tufts*	\$191,776
* has no law school	

When adjusted for cost of living, GW ranks poorly in total compensation, beating only American University at the assistant professor level, only AU and NYU at the associate professor level, and only Tufts (a university with no law school, which drives down its average full-professor compensation) at the full professor level. Washington did not always have such a high cost of living, but now ranks only behind New York and San Francisco in this category.

Conclusions and Recommendations

- 1) The data indicates that the overall level of fringe benefits provided to GW faculty is lower than almost all of the market basket schools at almost all faculty ranks both in percentage terms and in dollar terms. Even comparable schools outside the market basket with lower endowment-per-student resources than GW typically pay significantly more than GW in benefits.**

- 2) We recommend that the Senate Executive Committee ask the administration to explain why GW's spending on faculty benefits is so low compared to comparable universities.**

- 3) We recommend that the university increase spending on benefits in 2016 to "catch up" to the benefits paid by other comparable universities.**

- 4) We urge the university not to cut one benefit to pay for an increase in another benefit, because that will not solve the main problem—that GW's overall benefits compensation to faculty is far below that of comparable universities.**

- 5) We recommend that the university not reduce the salary pool to fund an increase in the benefits pool—paying for an increase in benefits through a cut in the salary pool would only mask the problem rather than fix it.**