ANNUAL REPORT 1968-69
COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENT,
SALARY, AND PROMOTION POLICIES
(Including FRINGE BENEFITS)

The Committee has met six times this academic year mainly to consider the following issues: (1) University progress towards reaching the A average AAUP salary level by the specified goal of 1970-71; (2) the adequacy of our Fringe Benefit Program; (3) the possibility of a cash tuition benefit to faculty members whose children choose to pursue their undergraduate studies at an institution other than George Washington University; and (4) the lowering of the retirement age from sixty-five to sixty-two years.

(1) As regards salary scales, the Committee received the assurance of Mr. Johnson, Director of the Budget, that George Washington was firmly committed to reaching the A average AAUP level by 1970-71. In addition, Mr. Johnson supplied the Committee with his projected salary averages from 1968-69 to 1970-71 as follows: (these are salary averages, not compensation which would be about 12% more)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>$19,205</td>
<td>$11,950</td>
<td>$9,386</td>
<td>$7,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>20,059</td>
<td>12,295</td>
<td>9,777</td>
<td>7,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>20,959</td>
<td>12,650</td>
<td>10,177</td>
<td>7,895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above figures were sent to the various Deans and Administrative Officers as a basis of their budget recommendations for 1969-70. The last salary report submitted to the AAUP by Mr. Johnson in October 1968 indicated that George Washington was on the A level from Instructor to Associate Professor, and on the B level for full Professors.

(2) The Committee met with Mr. Cantini, Assistant Vice President and Assistant Treasurer, and Mr. Bacon, Director of Personnel Services, and the latter's Assistant, Mr. Herrema, to discuss our Fringe Benefit Program. Last year an outside consulting firm, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Company, had reviewed our Program and concluded as follows:

"It appears to us that your overall employee benefit program has been developed with considerable care and thought and is generally a very good one. The only major weakness that we find is in your existing retirement plan as it applies to your non-professional employees."

Thus we seem to have an excellent program. The weaknesses in the program pertain to the non-salaried employees and these were being strengthened according to Mr. Bacon. Mr. Bacon emphasized very strongly the importance, in his opinion, of extending the same kinds of benefits to all the University employees (e.g., cash tuition benefits, if established). The Committee also compared the University's Retirement Plan with those described in the December 1968 issue of the AAUP Bulletin and again our program compared very favorably with the programs listed in the Bulletin.

(3) The Committee has acquired additional information as to the cost and extent of the benefits at several institutions (Chicago, Rochester, etc.) of their Cash Tuition Benefit Program. However, the Committee decided not to make any recommendations at this time in consideration of economic priorities, especially the five year program to reach the A average salary level by 1970-71.

*The salaries listed are the projected AAUP "A" salary levels - not GW salaries
Nevertheless, the Committee recommends that continuous consideration be given to the benefit. Vice President Bright has arranged to have information regarding the number of George Washington Faculty children eligible for such a program included in next year's Annual Reports as a necessary basis for projecting the cost of such a program.

(4) Having ascertained from Mr. Cantini that any member of the faculty can elect to retire at any age prior to sixty-five by making personal arrangements with TIAA/CREF, the Committee decided not to recommend lowering the retirement age to sixty-two years, as this would imply that the University favored retirement at the age of sixty-two, which is not the case. For those interested in retiring at age sixty-two, it should be noted that annuity benefits are reduced by nearly 18%.

Finally, in a joint meeting with the Faculty Performance and Development Committee it was decided jointly not to recommend to the Senate that a Faculty Tenure Committee be established to review recommendations for promotion and tenure, a responsibility now of the Board of Trustees.
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