

TO: NYU Faculty Senate Finance Affairs Committee

From: NYU Full Time Continuing Contract Faculty Senators Council

Prepared by: CFSC Committee Members
Susan Stehlik, Chair, Stern
Jamie Skye Bianco, Steinhardt
Leila Jahangiri, School of Dentistry
Tommy Lee, Tandon School of Engineering
Jon Ritter, Faculty of Arts and Science

Date: March 28, 2017

Re: Report and Comments on Faculty Budget for 2017-18

As requested by the Committee, our Council submits the following comments on the 2017-18 budget. This proposal was unanimously approved by our Council at the Meeting held today.

Summary of Request and Concerns

We are requesting a **formal review** of total compensation and benefits for the continuing contract faculty in all schools.

Rationale and Context: Historically, the Annual Merit Increase (AMI) has been a budget item tied to inflation and various other issues and concerns. However, this process has a twofold gap:

- *Its focus is solely on base compensation, rather than considering compensation as a comprehensive package of salary, core benefits and fringe benefits.*
- *The definition of “merit” and the process for rewarding “merit” are not clearly defined*

The result of this gap is that problems with compression, inequity and competitive positioning do not get adequately addressed in an increasingly competitive market where school ranking matters. If, as we have heard frequently, our University is committed to attracting and retaining the best quality faculty, especially those that are primarily in the classroom and labs face to face with our students, we need a more comprehensive and effective review and response process in place.

Last year we conducted a survey¹ within NYU that identified a number of concerns with our continuing contract faculty; this year, we have discovered additional survey data within the US and Metropolitan NYC area that supports our initial findings and suggests we take a serious look at how our compensation policies and practices align with NYU’s goals and standards for the highest quality of delivering education.

Several years ago, former Stern Dean Sally Blount led a study of benefits at NYU. The result of that study produced numerous cost effective changes. Equally as important were the discussions, town halls and conversations that provided transparency around issues that affected everyone. Today we can actually calculate, per person, exactly what the University spends on each of us towards benefits. What we don’t have is an equally transparent process for clarifying and communicating the criteria for determining compensation. And, given the survey data attached to this request, it appears the concerns are escalating, particularly for those faculty members at the lowest end of the spectrum.

¹ Exhibit B: collected 851 responses or about 32% of all continuing faculty, including Shanghai and Abu Dhabi, and close to 40% or more from most of the schools.

Our objective is to have a comprehensive compensation and benefits study that would support a more substantive review of the following concerns:

1. *Competitive base salary within the current market: most of this data is a mystery in many schools*
 - a. Ranges of compensation within rank by school
 - b. Minimum salary within minimum teaching loads
 - c. Compression issues particularly with graduate students and new hires
 - d. Equity issues that persist by gender

2. *Related policy issues that affect quality of teaching/performance and compensation:*
 - a. Criteria for AMI related to merit, i.e. increases are frequently given without explanation or review
 - b. Access to teaching overloads, i.e. in some schools faculty are discouraged from teaching additional courses as overloads, which could provide the difference between making ends meet or not for families.
 - c. Support for cross school teaching, i.e., frequently faculty are discouraged because the credit payment system is described as “complicated” even though creative courses could be delivered.
 - d. Professional Development Funds, i.e., these funds are expected to be provided in each school, but the disparity between schools is wide; assuming budgets will automatically address the needs for professional development of our faculty has not proved to be effective.
 - e. Access to external projects or teaching, i.e., mixed communication from school to school about who can teach where and when outside of the NYU system.

3. *Competitive Benefits that affect work/life balance and ability to participate in the NYU community: what are the benefits that have become standard in our marketplace? Are any of the following a possibility at NYU to make us more competitive?*
 - a. Transportation subsidies for faculty that live off campus, commute long distances and regularly participate in community activities at NYU
 - b. Housing assistance in finding, negotiating and working with the City Admin. to find more affordable housing, especially for families.
 - c. Health benefits as a percentage of salary – are they competitive?
 - d. Retiree benefits – what do other schools offer?
 - e. Child care – are we competitive with other universities?
 - f. Tuition Remission – Is it competitive and administered equitably?

Overall more communication about opportunities, benefits and policies would be welcomed. As NYU adopted third party vendors to service our benefits, we gained efficiency and lost touch. Many faculty discover benefits on an as need basis; more pro-active communication and open comparison of the competitive factor would support attracting and retaining our faculty. How can we better utilize the local HR teams? What are other universities doing?

With hard data in hand we hope to engage in a dialogue that would lead to a plan for keeping our faculty compensated according to market. In that same conversation we would intend to address potential operational efficiencies to offset any increased costs. Here are a few examples:

- Developing monetary incentives for CCFaculty derived from more revenue-producing experiential learning opportunities;
 - Incubator labs and Entrepreneurial Competitions award students in their new ventures; frequently our faculty coach, lead and support the student successes. Innovative policies could offer equity participation in these ventures for the faculty that engage in them. Our

- university could take advantage of equity participation in these ventures as well. Currently many support programs are one-way awards without sufficient follow-up.
- Alumni engagement can encourage faculty to participate and be rewarded for their efforts; students appreciate the personal contact with former faculty. Incentives could be developed for our faculty to become more involved in these alumni activities.
 - Experiential learning is becoming the new creative edge for universities to compete; encouraging our faculty with incentives to develop such projects would have a two-fold effect on financial reward and creative acknowledgement.
 - Grant Writing to encourage more collaborative research projects with teaching faculty.
 - New Programs, particularly developing on-line programs.
- Supporting discovery of potential reductions in other expenses by collaborating with the Administrative Council. Inherent to this process is having more detailed information on expenses and processes. Here are some of our concerns:
 - Processes for acquiring simple supplies can be extraordinarily cumbersome and administratively costly; engage faculty to find savings and offer incentives for those savings.
 - Coordinate a productivity study in each of the schools to examine cost saving opportunities

To support our assessment/recommendation we offer the following data:

*Exhibit A: Faculty earning less than \$60,000 (TBD)

Exhibit B: 2016 CCFS survey

Exhibit C: 2014 FAS survey

Exhibit D: AAUP 2016 annual faculty survey

Exhibit E: Current CUNY and SUNY surveys

Exhibit F: Current NYC Public School teacher salary survey

Exhibit G: Compression pressure points between postgraduate students and new hires

*Exhibit H: Policies at Medical/Dental Schools exhibiting creative and transparent opportunities for incentives

****to be added later***

Preface:

2 years ago, we stated an overriding principle to guide our process of reviewing budget matters. We would like to reiterate our statement of purpose:

As continuing contract faculty under various contract terms and status, we feel that any Annual Merit Increase factors referenced in determining the increase, such as productivity measurements or administrative responsibilities, should be directly correlated with sound and competitive pedagogical guidelines that sustain and expand the reputation of this global University in all of its Schools.

In the spirit of transparency we request that these AMI and Professional Development Fund allocations be communicated to all of the faculty as well as the rationale for their per capita distribution.

Recommendations:

- 1. Annual Merit Increase: 5% base budget with an additional separate allocation for Professional Development Funds and a separate budget to address specific issues related to compression, inequity and a reasonable minimum wage.**

Exhibit B; CCFS Survey Summary (attached): Two years ago we recommended a formula for AMI directly related to inflation and cost of living, along with a review for compression issues. Last year we faced the same concerns. For the benefit of our new President and Provost, we wish to reiterate our concerns, based on the survey, and that the definition of a “merit” based salary increase seems unclear and ill-defined across the university. Faculty are not satisfied with their current base compensation. 48% expressed dissatisfaction and only 31% expressed satisfaction, with the remainder being neutral. 52% of faculty believe there is or may be a compression problem. A majority of 53% felt the AMI did not adequately compensate them on an annual basis.

The majority responded that the following factors should be considered in the annual merit review process:

- 83% Collaborative work
- 82% Service to the University
- 80% Administrative responsibilities
- 80% Creative additions to course content and delivery
- 68% Research activity
- 66% Outside activities that promote the School/university
- 57% Student evaluations
- 57% Student engagement
- 50% Peer evaluations

Competitive Salaries: This year we reviewed 5 salary surveys (Exhibits C, D, E, F) within NYU’s FAS, the CUNY/SUNY system, AAUP and NYC public school teachers. Each of these surveys has a warning bell that we are edging on noncompetitive salaries. When we add the number of faculty earning below a reasonable minimum salary of \$60,000² for full time faculty, the bell gets louder. We would need much more data to do a complete analysis of competitive salaries within the University, as well as outside of the University to offer a definitive conclusion. Based on these points, we are requesting

² The actual number of continuing faculty earning below \$60,000 on a comparative basis is not available as of this writing. Estimates are over 100 but comparative data on teaching load and salary schedule of 10 or 12 months has not been determined.
Recommendation on Budget 2017-18 from CFS Council to University Finance Committee Page 4 of 9

a comprehensive review of compensation and benefits by a recognized third party consulting firm in collaboration with our own Administration and Councils.

A few examples may serve to illustrate our concerns:

Exhibit C: FAS Equity Study from 2014:³ With respect to compensation of Continuing Faculty (“CF”), at all ranks, even when controlled by department, and length of service, women are undercompensated (Tables 12 and 13); however, for new hires, there was no salary differential (Tables 14 and 15). This is not the only concern. Starting and continuing salaries for CF are low in comparison to School Public/ Private Starting Salaries.

- CUNY Public Lecturer \$43,018 in the 2010 contract + negotiated increase
- Rutgers Public Instructor \$44,963 2014
- Brown Private Lecturer \$70,500
- 2014/15 median salary data Columbia Private Lecturer \$53,000

Email from chair, Latin American & Iberian Cultures NYC Public Secondary MS degree, and no experience \$54,459.

FAS Master Teachers (LS) and Language Lecturers are paid less than other NYU FAS CF, even considering the recent establishment of a \$50,000 floor.

Low salaries may contribute to the high turnover and also to a diminished competitiveness with other employers. This is a serious concern, and among our action items.

Table 14: Mean starting salary by gender, minority status, and underrepresented minority status (contract faculty)

	Gender		Minority		Underrepresented Minority	
	Female	Male	Yes	No	Yes	No
2009 to 2014						
Clin. Assistant	63,799 (7,620)**	68,808 (7,526)**	67,417 (4,565)	66,383 (7,603)	†	†
Clin. Associate	†	†	†	†	†	†
Clin. Professor	†	†	†	†	†	†
Lang. Lectr.	45,643 (6,900)	44,822 (6,178)	45,193 (7,846)	45,353 (6,185)	43,392 (7,194)	45,597 (6,482)
Master Teacher	57,246 (2,246)	56,364 (2,248)	†	†	†	†
2003 to 2008						
Clin. Assistant	62,444 (12,837)	59,173 (16,112)	†	†	†	†
Clin. Associate	†	†	†	†	†	†
Clin. Professor	†	†	†	†	†	†
Lang. Lectr.	42,059 (4,231)***	43,746 (3,217)***	41,983 (3,620)**	43,253 (3,579)**	41,400 (3,805)**	43,231 (3,481)**
Master Teacher	53,215 (3,144)	57,088 (26,588)	†	†	†	†

Note: Citizenship/Ethnicity data was missing for 4 contract new hires from the 2003 to 2008 cohort and 1 from the 2009 to 2014 cohort †Categories with <=5 faculty are not reportable due to confidentiality concerns. Means are compared with a two sample t-test ***p<.01 **p<.05 *p<.10

³ <http://as.nyu.edu/docs/IO/13742/2014EquityStudy.pdf>

- Exhibit D: AAUP Salary data** from March-April 2016 looking at salary alone in Private-Independent schools from a low of \$50,917 for an Instructor with a Bachelor’s degree to \$158, 080 for a Professor with a Doctorate. The average for an Assistant Professor with a Master’s degree in the same category was \$66,551. Salary increases for this same category of Assistant Professor last year were 4.2%. Additionally, the differentials between men and women in the same category showed women earning 2% less than men. If we expand our data to look at regions, the average salary for an assistant professor in the Middle Atlantic region with a Master’s degree is \$69,712. If we look at competitive rank and consider the average salary for the same category in schools ranked in the 80th percentile or above, the range of salary is between \$74,000 and \$82,000. Clearly faculty making less than \$60,000 per year is cause for concern. Consider the following table which compares Assistant Professors with doctorate degrees⁴:

Institution Name

FULL PROFESSORS		ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS		ASSISTANT PROFESSORS		INSTRUCTORS		UNRANKED FACULTY	
Institution Category State	Avg. Salary Assistant Professors	Avg. Change Continuing Assistant Professors	Count Assistant Professors	Avg. Total Compensation Assistant Professors	Salary Equity Assistant Professors				
St U New York at New Paltz Master's NEW YORK	\$62,500	2.8%	97	\$85,200	96.6				
St John's U-New York Doctoral NEW YORK	\$98,300	3.1%	129	\$121,500	94.1				
New York U Doctoral NEW YORK	\$115,000	3.9%	286	\$152,100	88.6				
Pace U-New York Doctoral NEW YORK	\$79,900	2.6%	121	\$102,800	101.0				
Columbia U in the City New York Doctoral NEW YORK	\$121,500	5.9%	205	\$146,200	99.7				

Reviewing this data shows that any of our Assistant Professors at or below \$60,000 per annum is a cause for concern. Most importantly is the Average change from last year which is shown to be from 2.8% to 5.9%. These kinds of variable increases may infer a more volatile labor market.

⁴ <https://www.insidehighered.com/aaup-compensation-survey/state/new-york-1493?institution-name=New+York+U&professor-category=1601>

- **Exhibit E: 2010-17 CUNY Collective Bargaining Agreement⁵** shows an Assistant Professor in April 2017 earns between \$47,340 and \$90,149 depending on level and year of service. SUNY Professional salaries can be comparable.⁶

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

	10/20/2009	4/20/2012	4/20/2013	4/20/2014	4/20/2015	4/20/2016	4/20/2017
42,873	\$43,302	\$43,735	\$44,828	\$45,725	\$46,640	\$47,340	
44,552	\$44,998	\$45,448	\$46,584	\$47,516	\$48,466	\$49,193	
46,302	\$46,765	\$47,233	\$48,414	\$49,382	\$50,370	\$51,126	
48,596	\$49,082	\$49,573	\$50,812	\$51,828	\$52,865	\$53,658	
51,195	\$51,707	\$52,224	\$53,530	\$54,601	\$55,693	\$56,528	
53,032	\$53,562	\$54,098	\$55,450	\$56,559	\$57,690	\$58,555	
55,017	\$55,567	\$56,123	\$57,526	\$58,677	\$59,851	\$60,749	
57,616	\$58,192	\$58,774	\$60,243	\$61,448	\$62,677	\$63,617	
59,608	\$60,204	\$60,806	\$62,326	\$63,573	\$64,844	\$65,817	
61,903	\$62,522	\$63,147	\$64,726	\$66,021	\$67,341	\$68,351	
64,956	\$65,606	\$66,262	\$67,919	\$69,277	\$70,663	\$71,723	
68,024	\$68,704	\$69,391	\$71,126	\$72,549	\$74,000	\$75,110	
71,073	\$71,784	\$72,502	\$74,315	\$75,801	\$77,317	\$78,477	
74,133	\$74,874	\$75,623	\$77,514	\$79,064	\$80,645	\$81,855	
76,395	\$77,159	\$77,931	\$79,879	\$81,477	\$83,107	\$84,354	
81,645	\$82,461	\$83,286	\$85,368	\$87,075	\$88,817	\$90,149	

- **Exhibit F: Current NYC Public School teacher salary schedule⁷**: effective May 1, 2016, a teacher with 5 years of experience and a Master’s degree earns between \$60,959 and \$67,369, depending on extra credits of education and/or trade license.

OFFICE OF SALARY SERVICES - ROOM 815
65 COURT STREET, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11201

SALARY SCHEDULE EFFECTIVE MAY 1, 2016
CERTIFIED TEACHERS SCHEDULE

OFFICIAL DESIGNATION	C1 (MA)	C2 (PA)	C2+ID (QA)	C2+ PD (RA)	C2+PD+ID (SA)	C2+C6 (TA)	C2+PD+C6 (UA)
GENERAL DESCRIPTION	BASE	BA+30 CREDITS	BA+60 CREDITS	APPROVED MA OR BA + 30 CREDITS w/36 CREDITS IN AREA OF SPECIALIZATION	BA + 60 CREDITS INCLUDING APPROVED MA or 36 CREDITS IN AREA OF SPECIALIZATION	WORK EXPERIENCE FOR TRADE LICENSES OR BA + 60 FOR OTHER STIPULATED LICENSES (SEE AGREEMENT)	BACHELORS, MASTERS AND 30 ADDITIONAL CREDITS
1A	51,650	53,383	56,589	58,062	61,265	59,796	64,472
1B	51,650	53,383	56,589	58,062	61,265	59,796	64,472
2A	52,676	54,409	57,615	59,088	62,291	60,822	65,498
2B	52,676	54,409	57,615	59,088	62,291	60,822	65,498
3A	53,112	54,845	58,051	59,524	62,727	61,258	65,934
3B	53,112	54,845	58,051	59,524	62,727	61,258	65,934
4A	53,881	55,614	58,820	60,293	63,496	62,027	66,703
4B	53,881	55,614	58,820	60,293	63,496	62,027	66,703
5A	54,547	56,280	59,486	60,959	64,162	62,693	67,369
5B	54,547	56,280	59,486	60,959	64,162	62,693	67,369

⁵ <http://www.psc-cuny.org/sites/default/files/Full-TimeFaculty.pdf>

⁶ https://www.suny.edu/media/suny/content-assets/documents/hr/UUP_2011-2017_ProfessionalSalarySchedule.pdf

⁷ <http://schools.nyc.gov/nr/ronlyres/eddb658c-be7f-4314-85c0-03f5a00b8a0b/0/salary.pdf>

- NYU posted job openings for administrators comparable to many CCF salaries: Many Administrative positions showed a range between the mid \$30s to \$75,000.⁸

Recommendation: Based on these findings we are requesting a 5% annual increase budget with an additional specific allocation for professional development and a special budget to address compression, equity and a targeted minimum wage of \$65,000. Noting the most important issue as being competitive, we strongly recommend a comprehensive review of our compensation and benefits policies and distributions of same. We are concerned that we are facing a repeat of the issues brought up 2 years ago.

Given the wide range and distribution of professional development funds available in all the schools, switching to a percentage basis would provide equity in the administration of these funds, and lend a clearer definition to the policy for the use of these funds. The professional development fund could be further defined by allocating a portion for well-defined merit factors or achievements tied to job descriptions and contract terms; we recommend adding a remaining portion for equal distribution at a minimum level to support excellence in performing at the highest standard expected by the Schools. These professional funds would also save the University the required benefit costs associated with a similar salary increase.

There are many creative avenues to achieving a competitive compensation program, even in the current budget crunch and pressure we face as a tuition-driven University. It is for that reason that we as a Council would like to participate in the process of uncovering more creative incentives for our Continuing Contract Faculty so that we can achieve a base level of income that is reasonable and competitive within our academic community.

2. Request for Professional Development: specific budget, policy, procedure and transparency**

Two years ago we recommended a specific budget for professional development. Last year, the survey results suggested we needed a clearer commitment to professional development.

- While 45% of the CCS indicated they had a professional development budget, 7 % said they didn't have one and 45% indicated they "didn't know if they had a budget" for professional development.
- Over 60% of the faculty did not know if there was a budget to reimburse them for any necessary updating of professional credentials.
- 42% indicated sufficient resources to do their best in the classroom; 26% indicated they were not.
- 58% felt they were given full support to be intellectually challenged in their work.

Last year we described the situation as follows:

If our faculty feel they work in an intellectually challenging and supportive environment, how can we best support their professional development in a way that is meaningful, tangible and public? If we are in a competitive environment as a global university, how can we best support our faculty to continually update their thinking and teaching strategies?

We strongly reiterate last year's request to specifically allocate a budget for professional development funds in all schools and to fully explain the budget, how funds may be used,

⁸ [http://www.payscale.com/research/US/Employer=New_York_University_\(NYU\)/Salary/by_Job](http://www.payscale.com/research/US/Employer=New_York_University_(NYU)/Salary/by_Job)

who is eligible and for how much. ***This should be a fully transparent policy and procedure for all faculty.***

The CCF faculty is clearly engaged, but need to be more comprehensively informed. By specifically allocating a professional development fund for each NYU school, we can dispel the perception that some faculty are valued over others.

These same issues persist and we wish to put them on the table again.

Continuing Faculty Senators Council Voice

As we approach the end of our third year as a Council, we view the opportunity to share best practices with each other and offer our voice in the governance of the University to be a golden opportunity for managing this ever complex, global university. It is in this spirit that we offer our recommendations for consideration for the 2017-18 budget.