

I was not able to make the AMC meeting yesterday, but I just read the PowerPoint. I am currently trying to have a [REDACTED] child, and will be devastated if the bonding leave is taken away. One of my main reasons for working at NYU is the family-friendly benefits, and I would seriously consider leaving if this is no longer the case. 6 weeks paid leave really seems the least the university can do for a long-term dedicated employee.

I should add that I currently get healthcare and prescription benefits through my husband, so I will not be affected directly by those changes.

Also, I believe strongly that we should keep full tuition remission for current employees. While I do not intend to take advantage of this myself (and my [REDACTED] is [REDACTED] months old, so I am not thinking so far ahead as to using it for her), I have many colleagues who are in degree programs and I believe that they work here mainly because of this benefit. Reducing it would be a huge blow to them, and I think it would lead to a great loss of talent for the administration.

I know you have some hard choices to make, but wanted to make sure that you had my input as you make them. Thank you for your consideration.

---

Dear AMC,

Thank you for being transparent with the rest of the community about these proposed changes in benefits.

Of course people are not going to be happy with any of these reductions in benefits, but the ones that strike me as the most important to oppose are:

1) instituting a 3 month waiting period for health insurance for new hires. They reason that people can keep COBRA for those 3 months. COBRA is expensive, and some people may not even have COBRA. They may be new grads from graduate school or even college, and may not have any health insurance at all. Some people choose not to keep COBRA even if they are eligible. A waiting period is a bad idea, and not very compassionate.

2) increasing co-pays for doctor's visits and prescription drugs, and increasing out of pocket maximums for health care affects every employee, and is terrible.

The other things, like TR and even retirement contributions, those are important to people, but those are truly "benefits" that are very nice to have but are not essential. Health care is something the school should not scrimp on.

Thanks for soliciting feedback!

---

Hi,

Thanks for sending this information along. I did have one question that wasn't addressed in the materials.

Slide 8 mentions a cap of rollover amounts for vacation but this is not mentioned anywhere else. Is there a proposed cap on rollover, and if so, what is it? As it is, I think [REDACTED]'s cap of 5 rollover days is problematic. I lead scholars groups during winter and spring break and have to be here every day from June through mid-July for orientation and then be back in the office the week before welcome week for staff training. This leaves about 4 weeks during which I, along with everyone else in the advising office, has to take the bulk of our vacation. There needs to be more flexibility with how we are able to use our vacation time, not less.

Also, it seems to me that the projected cost savings from reducing and/or eliminating tuition benefits is a bit of a smoke screen. If you reduce the benefit too much, people will just go elsewhere for their education. They won't come to NYU and pay full tuition (spouses) or even 25% of their tuition (f/t employees). While you can argue that a University-subsidized student takes the seat of a potentially full-fare student, that isn't always the case, certainly not at the undergrad level and not always even at the grad level. (And besides, there are programs like the BA/MA program here in [REDACTED] that gives an automatic 50% reduction in tuition, and nobody is in a rush to eliminate this). What I see happening is that more people will either 1) not pursue further degrees, which will prevent NYU from capitalizing on a better- educated workforce or 2) will leave for one of our peer institutions that offer better tuition benefits for both employees and spouses. At the very least the University could offer a base TR rate of 75% and then a certain number of 100% scholarships that employees would have to apply for on a competitive.

This would at least fit with their "talent management" rhetoric, rather than the one-size-fits-all approach

that they currently employ which doesn't reward top performers and is often out of touch with the academic mission of the schools.

---

I was only able to attend part of the meeting yesterday and am thankful for the briefing sent today. I have to say, I am a bit stunned by some of the proposals. Most of the proposals I can understand why they may work - however the below are the particular proposals I feel would be a mistake if implemented:

#### Tuition Remission

I tend to agree with the proposed revisions of the tuition remission policies regarding those that have been laid off or retired. I can even understand why limiting the number of degrees and/or increasing the waiting period for current employees, spouses, and children might be a way to save NYU some money.

However I have to wholeheartedly disagree with the proposal to eliminate spouse tuition remission entirely. I find this benefit to be key for those of us who are younger, mid-level employees whose families depend on career advancement. As with almost all higher education positions, the compensation isn't the main draw to any position - working with the students and the benefits are. I feel eliminating so much of the tuition remission benefit would have a very adverse effect to the University and the quality of employees it retains/attracts would decrease significantly.

#### Bonding Leave Elimination

It is possible that my judgment on this clouded by the place I am in my life, however I feel cutting bonding leave would be a terrible idea. As someone who is about to go on maternity leave, the very fact that NYU offers this amazing benefit is why I will be returning to work after the time has ended. Without the extra 6 weeks given as bonding leave, I would feel the need to leave my position and stay focused on my family.

The extra 6 weeks with pay makes all the difference in ones ability to return to their position and be happy to do so. I am thankful for this extra time with my family and feel more indebted to NYU as a result - it makes me feel as though the University cares about its employees and is not just the typical workplace.

If there is anything above you feel I should elaborate on, please feel free to contact me.  
Thank you kindly,

---

Hello,

After reviewing the guidelines, I have several concerns. It seems that in looking for cost savings for the university, the employees are being squeezed. For a university that already pays exceedingly low salaries (especially compared with Columbia), I think this is a mistake and will result in difficulties with recruitment, retention and employee morale. Unless you plan to raise salaries, I think it is a very poor idea to raise copays (particularly for specialists, which are already high) or premiums. Raising medical premiums will put employees in a very bad position, particularly after not providing raises for the past year - that is essentially causing a drop in pay, and will foster resentment and anger.

I also believe not providing medical coverage for 3 months problematic, in terms of recruitment. Cobra costs an astronomical amount, and many high performers will be reluctant to take a position with this policy in place.

I think the tuition remission changes make sense. They are less painful to the employee.

Many thanks,

---

To Whom It May Concern:

Although I am not a representative, I have passed this e-mail message along to my co-workers as the information presented yesterday is highly important.

I would like to address one very big problem with cutting tuition remission.

Education is our core business. In fact, it is the one and only thing all NYU employees have in common. No matter where your office is located (around the world), or what you do day-to-day, we are all working toward making NYU a better, stronger, more recognized, global network university. By cutting back our tuition remission, we are cutting back our connection to the core business. Executives in corporate

organizations are connected to the performance of their company through stock options. They have an invested interest in the success of their business. A large portion of our invested interest as NYU employees is tied to our benefits in tuition remission, a benefit that is our direct link to our core business. It is this link that made the conversation yesterday so passionate. It is this link that brings employees here in the first place. It is this link, to education, that keeps employees dedicated to the institution.

If we need to fine \$4 million in fringe benefits cutting tuition remission is not the answer.

Thank you,

---

I am writing to share my view on the benefits redesign.

Although I agree with almost all of the changes, I am NOT for the bonding leave removal.

I am also not in favor of the increased co-pays for medical and prescription benefits especially during a year when none of the code 100 employees received a pay raise.

---

Dear Benefits Committee,

Thank you for assuming the role of compiling AMC feedback on the proposed changes to Benefits and HR policies. As an HR Administrator in [REDACTED], I deal directly with the implementation and explanation of such policies and would like to provide some feedback based on my interaction with code 104/106/100 employees.

1. **403b transition to a Safe Harbor Plan** – This is a win-win situation because it ensures greater compliance from a University standpoint and gives all code 100's a retirement plan even if they don't/can't contribute.
2. **Retiree Tuition Remission** – For the symbolic undertone alone, TR for retirees should not be eliminated. This sends a message that we will value your hard work while you are here but will not support you after you leave. As someone stated in the AMC meeting, it seems backwards to offer tuition remission to someone who has worked for the University for 2 years and not to someone who has worked here for 30 years. Besides, how big is the population that this affects anyway? It is not worth removing the benefit.
3. **Employee, Spouse and D/P Tuition** – Do not touch the employee TR policy – this is the main reason why so many people come to work for NYU. Spouse and D/P should be limited to one degree at each level. This is more than generous.
4. **Tuition Remission Waiting Period** – If there is one change that should NOT be made, it is extending the tuition remission waiting period. The first question new hires ask me is when they become eligible for tuition remission. It is a major recruitment tool. Many new hires have either already started their degree or have come to NYU specifically to pursue a degree. To make them wait a year, or even 6 months, before becoming eligible will make us lose quality candidates. This should be a non-negotiable.
5. **Tuition/Registration Fees** – If there was a second change that should NOT be made it is reinstating the full tuition/registration fees. Employees have a hard enough time paying the taxes on their tuition remission. If we made them pay the full tuition fees, this would put them over the edge and they could not pay for their degree. This would severely harm our recruitment and retention efforts as employees would seek higher-paying jobs to cover the cost of tuition.
6. **Age 25 Limit for Tuition Remission** – For medical purposes, a child over the age of 25 is not considered a dependent anymore. It makes sense that they would not be able to receive tuition remission either if they are not already enrolled in a program. They are old enough to work for NYU and get the tuition remission themselves. Cap the age limit at 25.
7. **Retiree Medical Benefits** – Raising the minimum age/service requirement to 75 seems reasonable now that people are working and living longer as a whole. The other suggestions regarding retiree medical benefits are taking away too much from the population who has been loyal to NYU for the longest period of time.

If any of these proposals are implemented, NYU should grandfather the existing employees and only implement the changes for incoming new hires so people can make informed decisions up front about what their benefits will be before accepting a position at NYU.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

hi, i was wondering if these benefits will actually occur or are they up for discussion? also, i have been at nyu [REDACTED] years and my children will approach undergraduate tuition benefits eligibility in [REDACTED] years. would someone of my background be grandfathered into the old benefit as this was the contract of the time when i was being hired? i have the same question about retirement benefits.

the very serious consequence of reducing tuition benefits for someone with long term employment, like me, is that essentially, i have lost years of advance planning for the out-of-pocket expenses that i would be confronted with. that is to say, if you had assumed for [REDACTED] years that your [REDACTED] children would be eligible for tuition benefits, you have lost years of saving for college for your children. this seems to be a very tough situation to put employees in, especially those who have dedicated years of service to nyu.

and, of course, my major concern here is that these policy changes would essentially enrich nyu while eroding the salaries (and morale) of its employees.

---

\*\*\* It would really help if the presentation offered a few concrete examples of "cost shifted to employees" regarding health care. For example, if I participate in "UH Advantage," what will the monthly cost be next year if these HRPAT recommendations are ratified? That would really clarify matters.

Otherwise, the details of the presentation (about tuition remission, the 403b and severance) make sense. I recognize the need to examine and then cut institutional costs.

---

I think there should be a clarification of the 2nd Preliminary Benefits Recommendation:

"Eliminate Retiree Tuition Remission benefits: Savings = \$600,000 to \$1 million"

I believe it is supposed to mean TR for the retiree, but it can be misconstrued as ALL of the retiree's TR benefits, including their children. If the TR for the children of 20 yr plus retirees were to be cut, there would be a huge issue with retention of experienced employees.

Thanks,

---

I am concerned about the potential recommendation for using age 40 as the sole cut-off for determining some retirement benefits. For someone like myself who (a) will turn 40 in late 2012 and (b) at that point would have worked for NYU for approximately 14 years, a "Rule of Z" to determine retiree benefits might be more appropriate than solely using an age cut-off. This would provide an eligibility cut-off based on age and years of service ( $\text{age} + \text{service} = Z$ ).

Thank you,

---

To whom it may concern:

There is much in the document we received that is troubling. To whom can we personally speak to in order to voice these concerns.

---

Are these recommendations to be effective January 1, 2010? I hope not. I always had HIP and that was dropped last year. My doctors only take HIP or Oxford. Now they are proposing to drop Oxford. Increasing PCP and Specialists by \$5 sounds fair. The proposed prescription co-pays are too high. Remember, code 100s did not receive a raise this year and the lower grade 100s can least afford the increases.

---

I would appreciate clarification as to the medical plan for future retirees. It is not clear as to plan and cost involved.

---

-Limiting the number of bachelor's degrees received via TR will be moot for many employees; Admissions has a blanket prohibition on issuing a second Bachelor's degree, which limits the benefit for anyone already holding a bachelor's.

-I strongly object to the "under age 40" threshold being considered for certain benefit reductions; this smacks of age discrimination. Any cutbacks should be confined to new hires, and those with fewer years of service to the University, perhaps with some sort of buy-in option for those on the cusp of whatever limit is established.

Greetings,

I am writing to share with you my personal displeasure at the thought of reducing employee tuition remission benefits. I currently am receiving these benefits to pursue my MBA. This benefit was one of the single most important reasons I sought and continue my employment here. Without this benefit salaries are far less than equivalent positions in the private sector and I feel it will result in a lower caliber of candidate. We have accepted reduced benefits for family members in order to produce a savings for the University, but a direct reduction to those benefits of the primary employee is too much. Please do not jeopardize this benefit.

Regards,

---

Dear AMC,

I'm writing to object to the proposed change in the tuition remission policies. I appreciate the need to find savings for the sake of our organization but I believe this is an area that should not be negatively affected. This benefit is one of the most valuable offered to NYU employees and it would be an outrage to make it any less available. Please allow this benefit to remain the same and do not reduce the amount of applicable tuition remission for employees.

Thank you,

---

Dear HR Policy Assessment Taskforce,

Your 11/3 briefing was recently brought to my attention, and I was shocked to say the least. I realize that the current economic climate presents multiple challenges for the university, but I think some of the possible cost cutting measures are extremely detrimental to university employees. Personally, I was most taken back by the reduction in Tuition Remission benefits. I can understand limiting T.R. to retirees, spouses/domestic partners, and even dependents, but I was alarmed at the idea of limiting T.R. to actual employees. I have worked at NYU for [REDACTED] years and started a part-time Master's in [REDACTED] this semester at Wagner. I think T.R. is what initially attracts many bright and talented college graduates to seek employment at NYU. Degree-seeking employees provide stability to offices and foster better morale since employees feel connected to the university in a deeper way.

I realize that some benefits must be changed in order to cut costs, but I think it would be a very poor decision to cut tuition remission benefits to employees. If anything, I would think that as an employer, NYU would encourage professional and personal development among its workforce. Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Regards,

---

Hi AMC,

I have to echo the below sentiment.

Tuition remission helps us attract smart, motivated employees. As a non-profit, benefits like this keeps us competitive with businesses that can afford to pay much higher salaries for similar work.

One of the cornerstones of NYU's success in recent years has been our ability to attract top research faculty – and this has not been cheap.

I would argue that, just as we require talented and well-paid leadership and faculty to achieve our educational mission, so do we need top-notch administrators. Reducing their benefits would harm the University.

I am not currently enrolled at NYU, but I have been looking into graduate school, and the amount of remission offered here will certainly effect both my educational and career choices.

Thank you very much for hearing my say on this matter, and I hope that, as a community of professionals, we can find ways to cut costs without sacrificing quality in any area that supports our mission.

Best regards,

---

To Whom It May Concern:

I write with great concern after reading about possible HR policy changes from the NYU Administrative Management Council. The proposed changes to tuition remission will greatly impact those of us currently working towards a degree while employed at NYU, or planning to do so.

While not currently enrolled at NYU, I pursued employment here with plans for continued studies, and consider the University's tuition remission package to be one of the best and most important benefits we receive. As a colleague noted, "tuition remission helps us attract smart, motivated employees."

I urge you to seriously reconsider the proposed changes to tuition remission. It is unfair to expect employees who put in much time and effort toward degrees to make us better at their jobs, to come up with so much extra money to complete our studies. This is especially difficult at a time when non-union salaries are frozen.

Thank you very much for hearing my say on this matter. I hope that, as a community of professionals, we can find ways to cut costs without sacrificing quality in any area that supports our mission.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Best Regards,

---

Comments on benefit changes proposed:

Eliminate Retiree Tuition Remission benefits: Savings = \$600,000 to \$1 million - The elimination of this benefit will likely affect many current employees who have spent many years working at NYU anticipating the usage of a benefit after they retire. The savings is small compared to the affect on individuals who have presumably given a great deal of service to the organization

Eliminate spouse/partner TR; Savings = \$814,175 - The elimination of this benefit will severely affect recruiting efforts on all levels from faculty to professional staff as many employees come to NYU in order to take advantage of this benefit. Additionally, as with all Tuition Remission savings the savings are not 'real' dollars and affect the revenue coming to schools on the other side of the ledger.

Increase employee TR eligibility waiting period from 3 months to 6 months plus pass probation: Savings

projected to be \$250,000 - same as above

I fully support the Dependent Audit Best Practices - this is something every employer should do - I also support front loading vacation days

Proposal: Reduce Employee Tuition Remission Benefit to 75%: Savings = \$1.8M AND Spouse/Partner TR: Reduce benefit to 25% or 0; Savings: \$426,411 (25% level) or \$852,822-\$1,705,575 to eliminate it (based on current enrollment)-Tuition Benefits: Dependent Children: reduce undergraduate benefit from 100% to 75%: Savings = \$1.3 million As with other TR benefits these will greatly impact the hiring and retention of well qualified faculty and staff and should be avoided at all costs. There will also be an impact in that you will not be encouraging your employees to pursue higher education goals. Staff who have spouses or domestic partners will not come to NYU if their schooling will not be covered more than 25% or at all

Proposal: Eliminate Bonding Leave - Draconian and unsupportive suggestion that will not effectively save much money.

Implementation of a 3 month waiting period for medical plan for Faculty & Administrators can save NYU \$500,000 to \$750,000 (assuming a new hire rate of 5%) per year.

- This does not mean employees will have a coverage gap since the employee can continue the prior employer's coverage under the provisions of the federal COBRA - This plan would have a HUGE impact on hiring qualified faculty and administrators - COBRA is not a plan for withholding benefits and many of our employees come from out of country where COBRA is not offered - these employees may be left without any coverage - COBRA also does not cover people returning to the workforce after an absence or newly graduated employees

Increasing co-pays, employee cost of benefit and maximum out of pocket effectively decreases your employees net income greatly - in a time when you are not giving an increases in pay this is draconian and will see people leaving the University as soon as the market gets better.

---

Good morning,

I am writing against the proposed change in tuition remission benefits for employees. For me, tuition remission is one of the most useful benefits that NYU offers, and part of the reason that I wanted to work here in the first place. My graduate course work nicely complements my job, and I cherish both of them as interrelated aspects of my life that make me a more informed citizen. In addition, since I plan to be an academic, tuition remission allows me to pursue an education that I might not otherwise be able to afford. I plan to pursue my PhD here once I obtain my MA, something I will not be likely to be able to afford under the proposed change.

My experience is not unique across the University; in fact, I would count employees' commitment to education as one of the hallmarks of the NYU community, particularly compared to other universities where I know faculty, staff, and students. I would estimate that about half of my coworkers at [REDACTED] are pursuing or received at least one NYU degree, and many more of us plan to continue once we are done. The degree to which this shared interest gets a collegial office cannot be understated; I honestly believe that it is one of the reasons we work together so well, and from which some of our commitment to NYU stems.

In these troubling economic times (and particularly as a staff member in the University's [REDACTED] office), I understand the great extent to which NYU is pressured (and needs to) reduce operating costs in order to preserve the rich educational environment that it offers students. However, cutting tuition remission would, I firmly believe, undermine that very pedagogical mission, since it affects thousands of staff members who are trying to educate themselves.

Please add my voice to the many others who are contacting you in support of the tuition remission benefit at NYU.

Sincerely,

---

Hello,

I learned today that the full tuition remission benefit to employees is currently under review. Limiting this benefit would be a mistake. I know many people, myself included, who came to work at NYU because they wanted the opportunity for further education but did not want to go (often, further) into debt to do so. It is clear that the tuition remission benefit attracts talented, hardworking people to work at the University. Often, similar jobs in the private sector would pay more, and the tuition remission benefit helps offset that discrepancy and attract an equally high caliber of employee talent.

Since NYU is in the "business" of education, and the classes employees attend are being held anyway, allowing employees who are admitted into degree-granting programs to take classes for free does not impose significant additional costs on NYU. In fact, in my experience I have seen it increase productivity, as people who are waiting for their classes to begin in the evening often stay at work longer. Many employees' degree programs also have a direct bearing on their work at NYU, making them better at their jobs. There is less staff turnover if people are taking years to complete their degree. Numerous people in my office are NYU graduates who have taken advantage of this benefit, and while the value added back to the University from their education may not be directly quantifiable, I am certain it is worth the 100% tuition remission provided.

I valued my undergraduate education at NYU very highly. I recently completed my Master's degree at Wagner using tuition remission, and I am grateful to have had the opportunity to return to NYU for another degree. NYU's tuition is high enough that curtailing the tuition remission benefit to 75% of credits would impose a burden on employees that may be insurmountable, particularly those with families and/or pre-existing educational debt.

I sincerely hope you consider these concerns before making any decisions that affect the availability of full tuition remission benefits to University employees.

Best,

---

Dear AMC,

I was dismayed to learn that the University is proposing to cut tuition remission benefits to save costs. These tuition remission benefits have been a wonderful and important asset for me as an NYU staff member. I am currently pursuing a [REDACTED] at Steinhardt. Many of the NYU positions I hope to grow into as I gain experience require or at least prefer this type of degree. With the proposed cuts in tuition remission, I will have to cut back on how many classes I can take per semester, seriously delaying my completion of this degree. It's possible that I may not be capable financially to complete this program at all if these benefits are decreased. This will be detrimental to me, but also to NYU, as I will not be gaining important skills that could help me perform my job even better.

As an institution of higher learning, I believe that it is important to send the message to staff and students that the university values higher education for everyone.

Please reconsider the cuts to the tuition remission benefit.

Sincerely,

---

Hello;

I am a staff member writing in to voice my opinion about the possible reduction in tuition remission benefits. I came to NYU three years ago specifically because of the tuition remission opportunity that NYU offers. I work in a department with extremely high turnover (as is traditional in development - not at all because of NYU as an employer) and I feel quite strongly that one of NYU's competitive advantages in development is that tuition remission works to keep the most driven and talented staff at the University for longer periods of time, able to accomplish more and reduce the inefficiencies caused by high turnover. If tuition remission benefits are reduced, I feel that our most talented staff (myself included) will be less induced to stay at NYU for longer periods of time where we can have significant impact and continue to outperform our peers.

I am happy to discuss at more length if you have any questions. Thank you for the opportunity to share my opinion on this matter.

Best,

---

Dear AMC

Good morning to you, and I want to express my gratitude for your hard work. I have given a AMC briefing on 11/3/2009 pdf file and have couple concerns.

On Page 12 and 13: TR Upon Layoff : Current Policy /New Policy

I understand, it is a trend to reduce and eliminate long term commitments (royalty) to employees by employer for the Bottom Line, and in turn, reduces the royalty from employees to employer. Furthermore, I could appreciate the fact that 29% of TR budget is spent on Child Undergrad.

However, eliminating the benefit, for those of us who has been here more than or close to 10 years, may reduce the willingness to stay longer.

Also, it has potential of increasing situations of people who are seeking a position and staying only while their child(ren) complete(s) a degree.

This was one of THE most important benefits that I have considered when I taken the position with NYU even with 45% pay cut from my previous job.

It would be interesting to see the breakdown of 29% by those 3 length of services on page 12 and see what is the true cost of Child Undergrad with >10 service.

At least, I ask a consideration of new policy for future hire.

Thank you once again for your hard work and consideration of this matter. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me.

---

Dear Benefits Office,

I feel completely dumbstruck having reviewed the proposed benefits cuts. Having just joined NYU from a corporate environment I was elated to become part of this wonderful institution where it seemed people, not money, truly mattered. I had willingly accepted a pay cut as compared with my previous salary, because I knew I would be more than compensated for the lost money with exceptional benefits, one of them being tuition remission.

I joined Stern's [REDACTED] program last Spring and have been struggling to pay the astronomical cost of good education (\$5000 per class!), while also being the sole bread-winner in my family with my husband in [REDACTED] school. Having joined [REDACTED] as an employee, I felt I could finally breathe a little freer. Though my tuition remission will only begin next Spring and though I would still be liable for 40% in taxes, and even though I would now be making less money, it would still be worth it. It would be worth it not just monetarily, but psychologically, because here was finally a place I felt employees were appreciated. We are not just numbers in a large organization, I thought, we are the people that help this university grow and prosper.

During my Employee Orientation, [REDACTED], I saw the address of President Sexton and I was truly inspired. I felt so proud to become part of this amazing scholarly environment. He said "This University is the sum of its people," and I believed him. Only to find out a couple days later, that we are in fact liabilities or numbers that can be easily cut.

I am not sure I will be able to afford the cut in tuition remission in conjunction with a pay cut and the various other benefit cuts proposed including health plans. I am not sure if it is still worth it for me.

Please consider the people of this organization before jumping to any number-bolstering decisions. If we truly are the parts making up NYU, maybe it is unwise to start cutting at the roots.

Sincerely,

---

Good morning,

I've just received word that the task force is considering cutting tuition benefits for employees and wanted to voice my opposition. Although other benefits offered by NYU are no less important to those employed here, the tuition remission benefits for employees provide an invaluable recruitment and retention tool. It is particularly effective at attracting ambitious individuals that would otherwise shun the academic environment.

As an institution based in New York City, the issue of salary differences between non-profits and industry is particularly salient. Companies in the city pay a substantial premium for talent that can be recruited at a fraction of the cost in other parts of the country because of the high cost of living. When choosing where to work, potential employees must feel that the lower pay offered by NYU is worth taking, and tuition benefits are a very compelling reason. I know because this was a conscious choice that I made when applying to work at NYU - comparable positions in industry offered starting salaries that were 35% higher, not to mention bonus opportunities, better promotion opportunities, and more relevant industry experience.

When contemplating what sort of services to cut, it is also important to keep in mind that tuition benefits keep cash within the schools that make up NYU. Compensating employees with the services offered by the university have two distinct advantages. First, they are "cheaper" than comparably priced benefits serviced by external vendors, since in theory it costs NYU less to offer courses than the sticker price it charges to students. Future recruits who intend on pursuing a degree would also demand more cash compensation to make up for the reduction in tuition benefits, which would be greater than the reduction in benefits since they would pay for tuition after-taxes.

The second is that tuition benefits sustain the operations of the various schools by creating an internal demand for their services - many of the employees attend NYU do so solely because of the tuition benefits. Since many are living paycheck to paycheck as a result of the reduced pay of working for a non-profit as well as the additional tax burden tuition benefits place upon them, I suspect the removal of tuition benefits would likely be accompanied by a reduction in enrollment. Since educational services are very scale sensitive, this would drive up the costs for those students who remain, spurring a cascade of either further cost cutting to keep tuition costs steady or tuition hikes, which could potentially reduce enrollment further.

There are many other areas, such as improved efficiency and reductions in infrequently used client services, that could have a much more positive impact on the bottom line. Although I myself will be gone before the changes take effect, I strongly urge to committee to re-evaluate their position on cutting employee tuition benefits for the well being of the NYU community.

---

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a code 100 staff member at NYU [REDACTED], and a matriculated student at Wagner. I initially sought employment at NYU for two reasons: as a Steinhardt graduate I have a passion for Steinhardt's programs, and the tuition remission policy allowed me to further my personal and professional goals while avoiding extra long-term financial burden. Should the proposed change in tuition remission policy be approved and implemented, I will not be able to complete my Wagner degree without a significant pay increase or building additional student loan debt on top of my currently deferred undergraduate loans.

Given the constraints of the personnel budget here on campus, the current raise freezes for non-union employees and the state of the economy I am forced to assume that not only is a significant pay increase not possible at this time but that taking on additional student loans is a poor personal choice.

Therefore, I write to express great concern over the proposed revisions to NYU's employee tuition remission policy. I would like to do so from a couple of perspectives:

**As an NYU employee:** Like many of my co-workers I live paycheck to paycheck in one of the most expensive cities in the world. Despite that fact, I am saving money and cutting corners to pay for registration and books each semester. NYU's tuition remission policy enables people like me to live with the daily personal cost-cutting and saving measures as I recognize that I am receiving a world-class education, and am therefore willing to live with those trade-offs. Should you accept the proposed changes to the TR policy, I would be forced to seriously re-evaluate those trade-offs.

Additionally, the office in which I work here at NYU, [REDACTED], sees quite a bit of **turnover** - recently **at the leadership level**. At a point in our department when morale is low and our future is uncertain, a change in benefits as large as the proposed TR policy change could have a serious affect on [REDACTED] staff personnel.

**As an NYU Steinhardt fundraiser:** Many schools here at NYU are comprised of passionate students who pursued their dreams, despite the fact that they are entering fields with inevitably low wages. I meet with alumni who are barely making ends meet on a daily basis. When they are unable to make \$50 and \$100 donations to NYU it is not because they do not appreciate the education they received; it is because they are still paying off student loans 2, 5, 10 and 20 years after receiving their degree. NYU is in the midst of a **scholarship fundraising campaign**, entitled Call to Action. We aim to raise scholarship funds to reduce the debt our students incur while and pursuing their education achieving their dream. Because of the TR policy, our moneys raised can go toward NYU's neediest students. By changing the current TR policy, you are asking your matriculated employees, who dedicate themselves to NYU's non-profit mission to join the ranks of the very people we raise money for everyday.

I seriously hope you will consider the points I have made above when making your final decision regarding this policy. Please keep in mind that this message is coming from an NYU employee, graduate and student whose position it is to advocate for the needs of our students. The current need is financial aid. Please make the right decision, and keep NYU's matriculated employees from overlapping into the category of "NYU's neediest students".

Sincerely,

---

To Whom it May Concern:

I am a Code 100 employee in the Department of [REDACTED] and a current graduate student at the Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development. I am writing to express my grave concern over the proposed changes to the University's tuition remission policy.

As an NYU employee, I bring a wealth of experience to my position as a Development Associate. When I started here two years ago, I gladly took a pay cut from my previous position and accepted a position here for which I was undoubtedly over qualified. I did this largely based on the wonderful benefits available to me at NYU – most importantly, the tuition remission benefit. Now, as a graduate student in the Department of Teaching and Learning, I have a 4.0 GPA, and as a [REDACTED], I helped my team surpass our fundraising goals for FY 08 and FY09, raising funds for scholarships, capital improvements, and research.

I, like so many of my colleagues, give 110% to New York University. Unfortunately, due to the lack of opportunity for raises this year – even small cost of living increases – I am forced to live paycheck to paycheck and struggle to pay for the books, fees, and taxes on my graduate courses. But I do so happily, knowing that I am getting a world-class education and that the university, in essence, is giving back to me. That said, I would not be able to afford the additional costs for tuition that are now being considered; in fact, I would be forced to consider seeking employment elsewhere. There are other universities in this city that offer higher base pay for employees and generous tuition remission policies.

I understand that the financial crisis has placed a huge burden on the university and that cost-saving and revenue-generating measures are absolutely necessary in order to sustain NYU's tradition of excellence. Working in [REDACTED], I am keenly aware of the need for funds. However, I believe that if you alter the current tuition remission policy, you will lose one of the University's greatest assets – a staff made up of exceptional and dedicated professionals. Such a move could potentially lead to a level of discontent among employees that could seriously affect the level of professional excellence this University is known for, and – eventually – the level of service provided to students.

I hope you will re-consider the proposed changes for the good of the university, its students, and its staff.

My best,

---

AMC,

As a full-time employee for the University I have a number of concerns over the recent proposals to modify benefits:

- **Tuition Remission** – One of the most important benefits NYU provides is tuition remission. This University is very expensive and employees deserve to be able to attend classes for free, which is the case at almost every university nationwide. Moving from 100% tuition remission to 75% TR without coverage of fees would increase the cost of the average graduate Steinhardt class from \$261 this fall semester (50% of the \$521 registration fee and 0% of the \$3,609 tuition). Under the proposed change, this class would cost \$1,423 (100% of fees plus 25% of tuition). While it seems that this is only a 25% difference in coverage, it affects employees very differently. For me it would be a 545% increase in costs – a ludicrously high increase when you consider the state of the economy for individuals as well.

Additionally, the 6-month waiting period to take classes virtually ensures that any employee will have to wait a full academic year before enrolling in a degree-granting program. Because registration happens a couple months before classes begin, an employee that were to start work in July would have to wait until January to get tuition remission, and at that point it would be too late to take classes in the spring.

- **Medical Waiting Period** – The 3 month medical waiting period will add an extraordinary cost to employees. To ask employees to wait 3 months before getting benefits from their employer is asking them to shell out an additional \$1000 a month for a COBRA plan that assumes they are coming from an employer that had benefits in the first place. For many graduate students that transition into full time work at NYU, this is not an option and they are left uninsured for 3-months. With the current health care crisis this is absolutely unacceptable.

- **Increase in PCP co-pays & deductibles** – While a \$5 increase in PCP co-pays wouldn't break the bank, it would put more costs on the employee – which is a trend in all of the benefits proposals. If any of these options were to happen I would suggest an increase in specialist co-pays but not PCP co-pays. I see my PCP regularly, and while the \$20 is low I pay it at least once a month. This means at the end of the year I have already spent a lot just to talk to my doctor. Additionally, increasing the deductibles by \$100 or \$200 is a 50% or 100% increase. I can understand increasing it 5-10%, but doubling it is not responsible.

- **Medical Subsidy Decrease** – The decrease in the medical subsidy from 82% to 75% is horrendous. The rate just decreased in January, and this decrease would pass a considerable amount of costs onto the employee. I just had surgery and the bill was \$13000. Luckily NYU paid for most of it. If this rate was decreased it would have almost doubled the amount I actually paid to the doctor. 7% seems like a little amount, but when doctor bills are exorbitantly high it makes a huge difference.

- **Prescription co-pay increase** – This is another case of incredibly high rate increases. Changing the co-pay from \$5 to \$10 is a 100% increase. Prescription prices have gone up, but that doesn't warrant a 100% increase in the cost we pay, as I highly doubt costs have risen that much. Co-pays were last updated in 2005, only 4 years ago.

Overall these proposals undoubtedly save the University money, but they do so by making employees pay more out of pocket. This wasn't the mentality proposed when cuts were made in student departments. Students were given more financial aid and more opportunities to save money as academic departments cut costs. So why is NYU proposing that to save money they take money away from employees? There are already salary freezes, which remove any cost-of-living increase we normally receive to stay up with the times. Asking us to take additional money out of our pockets when we are

struggling to get by is not the right move to make. It sends a message to employees that we aren't valued.

Thank you for your support.

---

I am beyond incensed at the changes that are being proposed. They are not only insulting, they are penny wise and pound foolish. Everyone knows that salaries at a university are lower than they would be in a comparable position at a corporate entity, but the lower salary is expected to be offset by a better benefits package. And what better benefit could there be at a university than the chance to get a first-class education at a fraction of what it would cost if one weren't an employee? I'm not using tuition remission not because I don't want to, but because I cannot afford to due to the tax implications. But the employees who do use tuition remission are not the people who make the highest salaries around here, they tend to be the people at the bottom of the totem pole, the ones who would like to have the opportunity to move up, here or elsewhere. And now the university wants to for all practical purposes take that away?!?! They've GOT TO BE KIDDING!

And that's only part of what has me riled up. We administrators are told we're not getting a raise this year or for the foreseeable future because the university's costs are rising. And ours AREN'T??? What costs less this year for an administrator...food? the train? rent? Coles? Why does John Sexton need a car and driver to take him from the library to his apartment on Washington Square West? If he needs a car, let someone call him a cab. And by the way, is he getting a raise this year? We saved this university some \$40 million dollars, and have as our thanks that our jobs are threatened and our benefits package is getting torn to shreds and we're supposed to be happy??? This package is going to have a major impact on employee morale.

I was told quite a few years ago that a survey was done that discovered that more than half the administrators who were here for 5 or more years were under the halfway point in their salary grade level. What would that kind of survey show now?

I haven't used tuition remission, or bonding leave, or the mortgage help. But I do use the medical benefits and am most unhappy that there is a proposal on the table to double the copays for drugs, as part of all the other suggestions affecting medical benefits.

It's time for the administrators to unionize and GO ON STRIKE! Let's see how well this university functions without administrators to keep it going. I am really upset about this and expect the AMC to support strong language against these changes to the university senate and anyone else.

---

Hello,

I write to you in regard to the Human Resources Policy Assessment Task Force's proposal to reduce the employee tuition remission benefit to 75%. I recognize the need in the current environment to realize cost savings wherever possible. However, of the numerous proposals outlined in 11/3/09 AMC Briefing, this is by the far the most objectionable.

To introduce this change to employees currently enrolled in degree programs would foist upon them a financial burden that many would not be able to shoulder. For many employees, myself included, the full tuition remission benefit was the primary factor that drew us toward employment at the university. To significantly dilute this benefit for already-enrolled employees would be viewed as effective violation of employee/employer compact at NYU. Many talented workers have chosen to work here – instead of at higher paying jobs in the private sector – primarily for the opportunity to further their education and hone the skills we use on the job. I firmly believe that the dilution of this benefit would deal a powerfully negative blow to employee morale, and force numerous talented employees to reassess whether or not they ought to continue working at the university while remaining enrolled in a degree program. Others may elect to drop out of their programs, affecting the graduation rates – and therefore the prestige – of the programs themselves.

I urge the AMC to protect the full tuition remission benefit for employees currently enrolled in degree programs.

Thank you for your time,

---

Dear AMC,

The proposed benefit changes the University is proposing show that very little consideration has been given to the challenges NYU administrators face every day.

More specifically, I'm outraged at the proposal to reduce the TR to 75% and to eliminate the 50% subsidy for registration fees. Many of us work in a University for the educational benefits, certainly not for the financial benefits. This change will impact those who are at the bottom of the pay scale, those who need the most help. Whether they are pursuing an undergraduate or graduate degree, many are not earning substantial salaries – they're trying to improve their knowledge base and become stronger administrators by returning to the classroom.

As an administrator who works primarily with adult students, I see first hand the challenges employees face when juggling work, school and the financial constraints. I have observed the sacrifices they are made in the pursuit of a degree while staying dedicated and committed to working at the University. It's simply unconscionable for the University to remove the benefit which makes us proud not only of working here but of attending classes here. Reducing the benefit will drive many of us to pursue our professional careers as well as our academic aspirations elsewhere. When you look at cost, it's easy to figure that reducing the TR benefit to 75% and eliminating the 50% subsidy of fees equals the cost of more than one course at a state institution. For example, it would cost employees over \$1,400 for one graduate course at Steinhardt if this proposal becomes a reality. How can we reconcile this cost, at this time, when administrators' salaries have been frozen.

It seems unfair to expect employees to come up with so much extra money to do something that will only make them better at their current jobs. Plus, the cost savings aren't as significant as the University would like us to believe – saving \$550,000.00 after removing the 50% subsidy is not a significant saving. Can't the University look elsewhere for this small amount? I think about all the time we have to turn on little space heaters because the air conditioning in our office building is blasting through our vents. Perhaps, the University should consider investing in efficient air conditioning and heating systems instead!

I also believe the University needs to allow more time for discussion and not try to implement these changes beginning in January. While it's a bit unclear from the presentation when some of these changes are to be implemented, we need time to plan ahead, especially from a financial stand point, to prepare for them. If we'll need to pay \$1,400 for one course, then we need the time to adjust our own budgeting to allow for this increase. At the same time, if bonding leave is to be removed, we need time to plan ahead. Those of us who are expecting new babies in 2010 have already counted on this benefit and have already adjusted our personal, financial and work lives to accommodate it – therefore, to remove it now is yet another example of how the University is not thinking about the full effect that these changes will have on many of us.

I hope you're receiving feedback from many of us and I truly hope that these concerns will be presented to the Senate with a sense of urgency and outrage.

Thank you.

---

Hello Benefits Office,

Thank you for alerting me to this awful news. I find these new changes that NYU is looking to make to be appalling.

Part of the draw to working at NYU is the feeling of community it gives. As an employee of NYU I feel that my needs are important and that my company cares about my well-being. A big part of this care, and a big part of my needs, is tuition remission. For many of us, our salaries are merely average and we could never afford to attend NYU. Tuition remission, health care and all of the other benefits that NYU offers are what makes my position here so valuable. It's what makes me consistently strive to give my job 110%. I'm proud to be here, and it shows. This pride comes from having the rare privilege of having a caring employer. I feel that with these proposed changes, that care will be diminishing. It will essentially, make my position less valuable to me.

This is saddening. Please do not change our tuition remission benefits. This is about more than money. It's about caring for your employees and for your NYU family.

Sincerely,

To whom it may concern:

I am very concerned about the possibility of having these changes implemented. After having to resolve myself to the fact that I will not be receiving a merit increase and to now discover that many of my benefits, especially those that come with working for a University will be drastically altered in that they really will not be considered a benefit at all.

The cost of living is increasing in every aspect, higher gas prices, increase in mortgages, home owners insurance, taxes and commuter cost yet salaries are either being decreased, if not by directly reducing pay but by increasing out of pocket expenses on medical and dental.

Many University employees use the tuition remission benefits as a means of furthering their education so that they may offer the University their very best service. Now that it will cost and or for some cost more, it may make it impossible for one, like myself the ability to pursue a higher level degree so that I may market myself in a different arena within the University.

I am very disappointed that many of these changes are being considered. Throughout the entire briefing, I leaned of everything I could possible lose along with a not receiving a merit increase and to be honest and I'm sure I speak for many, it does nothing to boost and already diminishing moral. I feel as though I will be paying the University for my services.

Thank you for allowing me this opportunity to express my opinion. I hope you decide to reconsider implementing this brief as it stands now.

Best regards,

---

Dear Administrative Management Council,

I am writing to express my concerns about the current benefits proposals, namely the reduction of tuition benefits for employees, elimination of the 50% subsidy for registration fees for employees, and the elimination of bonding leave.

Reduction of tuition benefits/elimination of registration fees subsidy:

I am an academic advisor in the [REDACTED], where student enrollment has decreased over the past year. From my conversations with students, I have found that for those did not enroll in courses, the main reason for this decision was financial. Many students have experienced job loss or reduction or elimination of employee tuition benefits, and therefore cannot afford to continue to pursue their degree at NYU.

Of approximately 1,020 students enrolled at [REDACTED] in Fall 2009, 163 are NYU employees. Most of the advisees with whom I work and are employees are married, have children, and/or are caretakers for other family members. All were unable to complete their degree in the past for various reasons, and now feel fortunate to have the opportunity to do so at NYU with the benefit of tuition remission.

If tuition remission is reduced, I project that many of our adult degree students would be unable to afford the remainder and would be forced to stop their degree studies yet again. Most employees who are pursuing degrees at [REDACTED] are enrolled for 8 credit hours, which in Fall 2009 cost \$9,313. Reducing tuition remission to 75% (as well as eliminating the 50% subsidy for registration fees) would mean that a student must pay \$2,328 out-of-pocket per semester. Financial aid is scarce or unavailable to employees on the undergraduate level. Furthermore, there have been no salary increases and there is uncertainty about whether there would be increases in the near future. And we're all aware that the economy has not improved.

Losing these students would also mean a 16% decrease in student enrollment at [REDACTED]. Decreases in enrollment would force the division to reduce course offerings, which would lead to the termination of faculty and staff. The reduction of tuition remission would impact the entire division as a whole.

Elimination of bonding leave:

I will address this on a more personal note. I am expecting my [REDACTED] child in [REDACTED], a mere [REDACTED] months away. One of the struggles my husband and I are facing is the search for child care. We're confident that we will manage to find care, however it will take time. Most quality child care centers have waiting lists that extend for months if not over a year. The additional time that bonding leave provides will make a world of a difference.

Thank you for taking my thoughts into consideration, and for your time.

Sincerely,

---

Dear AMC,

I am writing to express my concern about the revised tuition remission plan. Please tell me if there are additional individuals I should write or speak to about this proposed change.

I have one direct report and one indirect report on my team who are studying for graduate degrees at NYU. Both are taking advantage of tuition remission and doing stellar work for our team.

In the short term, cutting tuition remission will save the University money, and in the short term we *may* be able to retain these two employees. However, in the long term, their loyalty to NYU will be severely damaged, they will leave, and we will not be able to replace them with employees of the same quality.

Both of our team-mates took jobs below their skill set to come to NYU and develop themselves professionally in graduate school. *NYU is paying them salaries that are far below their value on the open market. The thing that keeps them here is tuition.* I don't want to be in the position of having to hire for these positions without the benefit of tuition remission. The employees we will get will not be as good.

On a personal note, both my husband and I took advantage of tuition remission. We finished graduate school in the spring of [REDACTED]. I am still working at NYU [REDACTED] years later because of the strong loyalty I feel to this organization and the professional development opportunities I have had here – all as a result of tuition remission.

I hope that the tuition remission benefit will remain as generous as it has been in the past.

With thanks,

---

To HR and the Benefits office,

My name is [REDACTED] and I'm a full time employee of the [REDACTED] department. I was forwarded an email that stated that you are thinking about changing the tuition remission program to . In a time where raises are out of the question, no new hires, and no bonuses or promotions this is a very bad idea. I left my company to come work for [REDACTED] because I plan on going back for my MBA next semester. I took a massive pay cut because I know the value of the NYU education and wanted to work for my degree. I just took a GRE course and am studying every night to get into the program. If the tuition remission is cut then I will not be able to afford going back to school and my entire reason for coming to NYU will be lost.

I know many people in my office who are planning or are currently taking courses and they are very worried as well. This is a very significant change at a very bad time that will effect many people who care very much about NYU. Its also been mentioned that this is a way of "getting rid" of employees by making them angry and upset in the hopes that they will leave. I hope this is not the case, but when you overhear people saying this about the school in general it really effects moral across the board.

I urge you to reconsider this change to tuition remission. While I understand that money is tight right now, there has to be better ways to save money then to cut this much needed benefit. If this passes it will really effect the school in a negative way.

Thank you,

---

Dear AMC Benefits and/or holders of some people's financial destinies:

This letter is in response to the AMC briefing on November 3, 2009 and the budget proposals it entailed. In dire times, such proposals seem more like imminent announcements than they do mere considerations. I am writing to you because I am deeply troubled by the University's apparent obsession with cost cuts that are at the employees' expense (some employees more than others).

The combination of increased copay and slashed tuition remission would be devastating to any beneficiary of affordable health care and a "free" degree as they exist today. As a MBA student and a [REDACTED] specialist at [REDACTED], I've been fortunate enough to be one of relatively few who work and study at a preeminent university. With the proposed cuts, however, employees with tuition remission will have to bear a significantly greater burden in the cost cuts than their fellow employees, who themselves must deal with what will seem cruel frugality. What I mean to say is, not only would "student-employees" have to pay more for health care like everyone else, they would also have to account for an extremely constricting combination of tuition remission taxes (which cut our paychecks by about half at about \$30,000 in) and a >\$10,000 bursar bill. So, around the time I'll begin thinking about how to pay for rent, bills, and food, NYU will smack me with a humongous bill. Is this supposed to improve morale as we also witness fellow NYU employees being let go simultaneously? Is it fair that some corporate sponsorships, weakened as they may be in a more aggregate sense, will be superior to NYU's own? What is most unnerving about reducing tuition remission is that it is not simply a cost-cutting strategy. When tuition remission is reduced, it means that employees will pay out of pocket, which in turn means more revenue for the University. I will not claim that such practice is unprecedented, but I have never heard of a good company that tries to profit from its employees, especially those in a non-profit organization who are already dealing with financial burdens.

There's no question that tuition remission is the university's strongest and most alluring benefit. Please do not compromise it. Tuition remission lets us apply at work what we learn in school at a reasonable fraction of the normal cost. This strengthens the school's human capital and is worth considerably more than the \$1.8M in potential savings. What makes tuition remission so valuable to the university is that it is also a renewable resource: as long as it remains as good as it is today, it will inspire non-student employees to apply for a chance to study and become more knowledgeable employees. That is to say, tuition remission is capable of attracting talent and keeping it.

Please reconsider.

Best,

---

Hello,

This is in response to the proposal to reduce tuition remission for NYU employees. I joined the NYU community as a staff member because I received two degrees (BA and MA) from the university, and hoped to pursue a career in college administration at a university that I love. I am one among many that was attracted to working at a prestigious university not only for the tuition remission, but to be part of an intellectual community that fostered curiosity, intelligence, and personal growth. These factors, to me, were more valuable than private sector jobs in non-educational industries. Reducing tuition remission may reduce costs for the university, but it will also drive many of us to find job opportunities elsewhere- for companies that may provide tuition remission, or that pay significantly more than the base salaries here.

While I love being part of this community, the reality for most of us is that we would be unable to pay this increased cost of tuition, and would be forced to either find better paying jobs or leave the academic programs.

Again, I love the department I work for, the school I work in, and the part-time Langone program at which I am pursuing my MBA, but by reducing tuition remission, the University is revoking perhaps the most important benefit of working in a university setting- the benefit to take advantage of the resources that we help the university provide.

Best,

---

To whom it may concern:

I received notification about a recommendation of a task force assigned to look into employee benefits and HR Policy. I believe these proposed changes will greatly impact the quality and caliber of employees (both Administrative and Academic) which NYU attracts and employs. During this time of economic recovery, the University should be looking for ways to INCREASE its employee education benefits and make it MORE attractive for employees to enroll in higher degree programs. This will strengthen the university community and help propel NYU into the future as an outstanding academic institution which prides itself on education and excellence.

Regards,

---

Hi,

I recently learned that there's been discussion of reducing tuition remission to 75%. Please consider that the only reason I decided to work for NYU was because of the 100% tuition remission. In fact, I turned down a job offer that would have paid me 10% more after adding the post tax cost of tuition remission.

If NYU had already implemented this proposed policy I would have certainly not applied to work for the school and I think there are many other people in the same boat as me.

NYU's salary is significantly lower than what the corporate world offers but the benefits make up for the difference. I don't see how NYU can attract good talent by paying lower salaries and also cutting the benefits. Certainly those who can do better will leave and those who can't will stay.

Regards,

---

Administrative Management Council,

I want to strongly urge you to NOT make changes to the tuition remission benefits for employees as listed on page 2 and page 18 of Human Resources Policy Task Force proposal. This change affects many NYU employees who have made long term investments with the school to obtain degrees.

---

Hello,

I'm writing to raise concern about two potential changes to our employee Tuition Reimbursement Benefits, which were recommended by the University Benefits Assessment Team (UBAT) at the recent Administrative Management Council meeting on November 3rd.

- **Eliminating 50% subsidy for registration fees for employees who use grad & undergrad Tuition Remission (page 2 of briefing)**
- **Reducing Employee Tuition Remission Benefit to 75% (page 18 of briefing)**

I am a project manager here at NYU, and I have recently been accepted to the part-time Langone MBA program at Stern. I'm looking forward to this opportunity to gain an incomparable education that I can in turn contribute to my own department, and use to help the university in the best way I can.

My salary falls below \$50,000 per year, and it is frozen because I am a non-union member. If not for NYU's current tuition reimbursement benefits, it would be difficult for me to afford even a portion of this costly tuition while also affording my regular living expenses. (I know from speaking with other colleagues that I am not alone in this scenario.)

Consequently, I am troubled by the financial burden the proposed reductions could cause. One three-credit course in my initial semester currently costs **\$442** (50% of the \$884 total fees for one course, and 0% of the \$4,545 tuition for that same course). But, if the above recommendations went into effect, that *one* course would cost **\$2,020.25** — over *quadruple* the amount. Then consider that an average semester for the Langone program includes *two* of these courses. This means that under the proposed changes, in that first semester, I would realistically pay the full registration fee (\$1,061) and 25% tuition (\$2,272.50) for two courses, for a **total of \$3,333.50**.

It seems unfair to expect employees — who have put so much time and effort toward degrees to improve their job performance, or who plan to do so — to scramble for extra money to fund their studies. These tuition benefits are financially crucial to us, and make us feel valued as NYU administrators.

In light of the many situations like mine, I respectfully urge the UBAT not to move forward with these recommendations.

With sincere thanks,

---

Instead of doing away w tuition remission entirely, why not offer only SCPS courses w a 8 credit cap each year. This could be offered to retirees w 20 or more years of service. When I retire I will have over 35 years of service. Why should someone who begins working at NYU at 55 and leaves at 65 have the same tuition benefits as I do. They should be on a scale determined by years of service. It is only 3 % and saves \$660,000. Dont throw out the baby w the bath water !!!

---

Dear AMC HR Representative,

I was recently informed about proposed changes to the Tuition Remission (TR) benefit offered to NYU code 100, 102 and 103 employees. My main concern is that employees currently receiving 100% TR benefit continue to receive this benefit regardless of benefit changes implemented for future employees. Reducing the TR benefit for employees currently enrolled in a program of study, or planning to enroll in the near future, could undermine their efforts toward financially-responsible career development. Furthermore, reducing the TR benefit for code 100, 102 and 103 employees while union employees continue to receive 100% TR could demoralize administrators who often work closely with union colleagues.

As a fulltime Administrator at NYU [REDACTED] and a graduate student in the [REDACTED] program at Steinhardt, I would be one of the employees adversely affected by the reduction in the TR benefit. Receiving 100% TR is very important to my career and financial planning. As a future [REDACTED], I will be working in a service-oriented profession with a moderate income and would have considerable difficulty paying back student loans. Knowing my future salary range, I deduced that I could only afford to attend graduate school with tuition assistance. Reducing the TR benefit will require me to take significantly more loans, thus negating my efforts toward financially-responsible career development.

I understand that current economic pressures have put the university under considerable strain to balance the needs of the school's administration while still maintaining a standard of excellence in education and research for the students and faculty. However, stripping the Tuition Remission benefit from code 100, 102 and 103 employees, who have already been denied raises in the 09-10 AY, will only further demoralize NYU administrators. This demoralization will be especially stark for the many administrators working closely with union colleagues, who will continue to receive 100% TR and yearly raises. It would be a grave error for NYU to create this divide among code 100, 102 and 103 employees and union employees. NYU has a history of union and non-union members working together with mutual satisfaction for the benefits they receive for their work, but reducing the TR benefit for code 100, 102 and 103 employees could unsettle this balance. NYU also has a history of encouraging the career development of its employees, who often advance from union positions to non-union administrative roles, creating a stable administrative support for the university. Reducing employee benefits in the proposed manner could undermine this valuable employee morale and administrative stability.

It is my hope that NYU will choose to maintain the 100% TR benefit for all its current employees, all of whom have provided superior and dedicated service to the university in expectation that their work will be rewarded by the faithful provision of the salary and benefits that originally attracted them to this institution.

Sincerely,

---

Dear AMC HR Representative,

It has come to my attention that your committee has a proposal on the table to reduce Tuition Remission benefits to full-time Administrators code 100, 102, and 103. This would directly affect me and a number

of my colleagues at [REDACTED] who are currently in the middle of Masters programs at NYU. I understand in financially risky times that budgets become more rigid and adjustments often have to be made. With that said, many of our committed Administrators at NYU already pay a significant amount in taxes toward tuition remission and having to pay 25% of tuition could make graduate school financially impossible. I can only speak for myself, but I've already created a budget for the next two year of my graduate studies, which includes taking out Student Loans and taking on additional work projects. If this reduction in T.R. were to occur I do not know if I could continue my academic studies for very long. I hope that this email, along with the many other letters you may receive from others will help your committee make the right decision. Reducing a benefit such as Tuition Remission, which perhaps was a huge draw for many when they first applied to work at NYU seems unwarranted. Being able to attend graduate school under the current T.R. policy is a great motivation to our employees and I think this change would set the wrong example.

---

NYU AMC,

I understand that there may be changes in NYU's tuition remission policy for administrators. As a master's student at Steinhardt and employee of NYU, I am very concerned about the proposed reduction in tuition coverage. Should this new policy be implemented, it will have a direct impact on my employment satisfaction at NYU as tuition remission is one of the most significant benefits that is offered at NYU.

I hope you reconsider this policy and recognize the importance of full tuition coverage for employees. Thank you.

---

#### **Task Force: HR**

**Comments:** I am writing to express my concern over the HR policy recommendations in this document that was circulated to the AMC constituency. I have been an employee of NYU for [REDACTED]. I realize that in the face of these economic times, some measures have to be taken to eliminate excess spending and understand the difficult task ahead of you, however, I think some of these proposals will unfairly hurt many administrators.

I am especially concerned about the recommendation to decrease tuition remission for employees. Having attended several meetings held by the AMC, I understand that the current system spends a lot of money on tuition remission for spouses and children of administrators, but I would only like to focus on the TR benefit for the administrators themselves. I am currently enrolled in [REDACTED]. At the end of this academic year, I will be [REDACTED]. Is the proposed cut to employee TR going to affect people who are already enrolled in a program or will our TR be grandfathered for the rest of the degree [REDACTED]?

As you know, many administrators choose to work at NYU because they believe in the mission of education, not only for our students but also for ourselves. With each course we take, we become better employees of the university and are able to provide a deeper level of service and expertise to the students. Decreasing the covered amount of tuition remission from 100% to 75% and not covering any part of the registration fees would put a serious burden on administrators pursuing an education. In my case, the next year of my degree would cost me [REDACTED]. While I understand that this is still only a fraction of full tuition, I was hired on the belief that my salary would be augmented by the cost of tuition, a major benefit unavailable in most other sectors of the job market. This is the primary reason why many of us choose to work here, and especially choose to work for relatively low salaries.

In a conversation with [REDACTED] he expressed to me a concern that 1) it was unfair to give special privileges to people who could afford to pay tuition, and that the 25% cost works in the same way as a co-payment on our health insurance; and 2) that there was no guarantee that once finished with our degrees we would continue to work at NYU.

To address the first point, I would like to point out that the current amount that I pay for my registration fees does already act as a co-payment for my TR benefit. Additionally, if the cost of my "co-payment" were to go up to [REDACTED], I might as well take a better paying job in a different field and enroll in CUNY -- for the same price. I would also like to point out that some of us are in a particularly bad

situation. I am grade [REDACTED], meaning that I make the same amount of money as the staff employee in my office. However, because the staff person is union she has been receiving a cost of living raise each year, while I have still been earning the same salary as a year and a half ago. I am getting a much worse deal but think it unfair that if I were to take a demotion I would actually be better compensated than I am now.

To the second point, I would like to say that if this was a real concern, NYU could require employees to stay at the University for a number of years at the completion of their degrees. While I don't think this is an ideal solution, it is one that already occurs in many businesses who sponsor MBA programs. I also think that with each course we take, we become better employees, so even as we are going through our MA programs, we are already giving back to the University.

I know that one of the strongest pulls to be an administrator at NYU is the tuition remission benefit. We could be fulfilling the same kind of administrative services for a variety of business sectors, and earning a commensurate salary for our work. But I, as many of my colleagues, have calculated that the benefit of earning discounts on our tuition, outweigh the relatively small salaries we earn. If you take away this one significant benefit, what reason do administrators have to continue to stay here? If our benefits do not add to a satisfactory compensation package, I think you will see many administrators give up on their degrees or leave their positions with the University all together. I strongly urge you to reconsider decreasing the TR benefits, if you want to continue to attract a motivated and qualified administrative staff. Having an educated staff will also increase the quality of services that NYU can provide for its students. We all stand to benefit from allowing administrators to pursue degrees.

Thank you for your time and for providing a forum where we can express our concerns about your recommendations.

---

**Task Force:** Human Resources

**Comments:** In reviewing the proposed changes to faculty and staff benefits, I feel I must respond to a number of the suggestions published in the recent AMC briefing:

1. Administrators and Faculty hired by NYU should NOT be without medical insurance during their initial months of employment; if a new hire does not have a grace period of coverage from previous job, he/she must be covered through an NYU plan;
  2. Retirees should not be subject to reduced medical coverage; individuals who have devoted their careers to the University should have the benefits they expected they would have upon retirement;
  3. Cost-saving changes to tuition reimbursement would entirely unfair, particularly with regard to dependent UG tuition remission. Those of us who have been with NYU for as long as 20 years and chose to devote our professional teaching careers to the University did so with the understanding that, should our children be accepted to NYU, they would have full tuition remission. My salary, which is at the lower end of the NYU scale, can only be justified by the benefit of full tuition remission for my dependents. IF there is a reduction in tuition remission benefits, it should apply only to employees whose salaries make it possible for them to subsidize a child's education at New York University.
-