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Introduction

Since 1983 the Office of the President has periodically surveyed faculty recruitment and retention efforts on the nine UC campuses. The survey is designed to evaluate the University’s continuing ability to attract faculty of the highest quality and to learn the reasons for faculty resignations from the UC system. In addition, the campuses and the Office of the President use the results of this survey to develop new hiring and retention programs and policies.

Survey Methods and Population

In September 1999 the campuses were notified of the impending survey and asked to provide lists of all faculty hires and resignations meeting the survey criteria. The survey data were then obtained through phone interviews with department chairs, department staff, and occasionally deans or academic personnel officers whose responsibilities include academic recruitment and retention. These interviews were conducted between October 1999 and February 2000.

Faculty included in the recruitment survey were all ladder-rank hires reported by the campuses whose appointments were effective between July 1, 1999 and June 30, 2000, most of whom were recruited during the 1998-1999 academic year. This includes new hires from outside the UC system, inter-campus recruitment, and hires into the ladder rank from UC non-ladder-rank positions. Acting appointments were also included. Academic appointments in the executive series such as deans, provosts, and vice-chancellors were excluded from the survey. The population for this year’s survey included 319 hires. However, a low response rate meant that information on first-choice hires was only available for 244 hires; detailed information on recruitment incentives was only available for 233 hires. The survey does not collect information on recruitment efforts that failed to result in positions being filled.

1 The target population for this survey was all ladder-rank hires whose appointments were effective between July 1, 1999 and June 30, 2000, most of whom were recruited during the 1998-99 academic year. However, it is unlikely that all faculty hires effective between July 1, 1999 and June 30, 2000 are reflected in the data. A list of hires was developed in October 1999 based on campus information and data in the Corporate Personnel System. The interviewer contacted departments on the list and updated the list when informed of additional recruitments. Departments whose appointments were effective later in the 1999-2000 academic year may not be on the list and therefore would not have been contacted by the interviewer.
The retention survey included all ladder-rank faculty reported by the campuses whose resignation from the UC system was effective between July 1, 1998 and June 30, 1999. This population differs from the population in the surveys prior to the 1996-97 report, which included only resignations from the tenured ranks. To maintain consistency with prior versions of this report, tenured faculty are reported separately from non-tenured faculty in the retention data tables. The population of the retention survey included 111 faculty, of which 89 were resignations from the tenured ranks. However, a low response rate meant that detailed information (on retention efforts, reasons for leaving, and destinations) was only available for 78 resignations, of which 60 were resignations from the tenured ranks. The survey does not collect information on successful retentions (those who were considering new positions but did not resign from the UC).

Data Collected

Survey respondents were asked briefly about the immediate prior employment of the new hires and extensively about the types of incentives used to bring them to the UC. Respondents were also asked whether new faculty members had been the first choice of the department for their position, and if not, why the first choice candidate had declined the UC offer. In the resignation cases, respondents were asked where the former UC faculty member is now employed, and what efforts had been made to retain that faculty member. They were also asked to assess the degree of loss to the department stemming from the resignation.

1999-00 Recruitment Profile

There were 319 new ladder-rank faculty recruitments included in the 1999-00 recruitment survey, slightly more than the 314 reported in the 1997-98 survey. Of these new hires:

- 77 percent were men and 23 percent were women, a slightly higher percentage of men than in 1997-98 (Table 1A).

---

2 The target population for the retention survey was all ladder rank faculty whose resignation was effective between July 1, 1998 and June 30, 1999. However, it is unlikely that all resignations were included in the survey file. Separations due to death, dismissal, expiration of appointment and retirement are not included in the survey.

3 Most previous reports have used the date of appointment for the recruitment survey. However the last two reports used the date of recruitment (the year before the date of appointment) and were referred to as the 1994-95 and 1996-97 Recruitment Reports respectively. For consistency, the data from these reports are referred to as 1995-96 and 1997-98 recruitment data respectively (the actual effective dates of the appointments surveyed) throughout the current report.
• 60 percent were hired as assistant professors, 13 percent as associate professors, and 28 percent as full professors. Tenured appointments were a larger percentage of the total in 1999-00 (40 percent) than in the prior two survey years (30 percent in 1995-96, 37 percent in 1997-98). (Table 1A)

• 83 percent of the new hires at the professor rank in 1999-00 were men, as were 68 percent of new hires at the associate level. Men also accounted for 76 percent of new hires at the assistant level. (Table 1B)

• 65 percent of the new assistant professors were hired at either step II or step III, and 85 percent of those hired as associate professors came in at step I, step II or step III. By contrast, almost half of the full professors came in at step IV or higher. Eight percent (7 faculty) were hired at an above-scale level. (Table 2A and Table 2B)

• Social sciences accounted for the largest share of new hires (23 percent), followed by engineering and computer science (21 percent). In prior years, arts and humanities accounted for the largest share of new hires but declined in 1999-00 from 24 to 12 percent. (Table 3A)

• The percentage share of new hires increased in engineering and computer science from 11 percent in 1997-98 to 21 percent in 1999-00. In social sciences, the percentage share of new hires increased from 16 percent in 1997-98 to 23 percent in 1999-00. As noted above, the percentage share of new hires declined in the arts and humanities from 24 percent in 1997-98 to 12 percent in 1999-00. Smaller declines may be observed in the percentage share of new hires in the life sciences and the health sciences (Table 3A)

• Women accounted for 35 percent of new hires in the professional schools, 32 percent of new hires in the social sciences, and 44 percent of new hires in the arts and humanities. Only 8 percent of new hires in engineering and 3 percent in the physical sciences were women. (Table 3B)

• Of the new hires, 73 percent were white, 24 percent were from other ethnic groups, and 2 percent were of unknown ethnicity. The largest single group included in the non-white category was native-born Chinese and Chinese-Americans, accounting for 11 percent of all new hires. (Table 4A)
First-Choice Hires, 1999-00

As a means to assess how competitive the University is in hiring faculty of the highest caliber, survey respondents were asked whether the candidate hired was the first choice of the hiring department for the position filled. This designation also includes those faculty hired into a position for which a search was waived. In some cases, the person reported as the first choice was the first person to whom an offer was made because a higher-ranked candidate withdrew from consideration before any offers could be presented. The response rate for this question was only 244 out of 319 known hires.

The percentage of new faculty identified as first-choice hires was 84 percent in 1999-00, down from 92 percent in 1997-98 (Table 5). It should be noted that 84 percent is within the range of historical values and represents only one data point. Thus, it does not necessarily signal a significant and sustained downturn.

The percentage of first-choice hires varied by discipline, ranging from 77 percent in the professional schools and 79 percent in the life sciences to 100 percent in the arts and humanities (Table 6). The percentage of first-choice hires fell in all disciplines except arts and humanities between 1997-98 and 1999-00. In the professional schools, the rate of first-choice hires fell from 93 percent to 77 percent; the rate of first-choice hires fell from 96 percent to 86 percent in the health sciences, from 95 percent to 86 percent in the physical sciences, and from 92 percent to 84 percent in the social sciences.

Hiring Incentives Offered for Appointments Effective 1999-00

Information on recruitment incentives was available for 233 hires. Survey respondents in all disciplines reported that the market for faculty is very competitive. As in previous years, a variety of recruitment incentives were used to attract new faculty. (Table 7A).

Computers and Other Equipment. The most popular incentives were computers or other new equipment, received by 87 percent of new hires.

Research Support and Enhanced Salary. As in prior years, a very large percentage of new faculty hires received some type of research support (86 percent), and/or some type of enhanced salary (81 percent). Almost two-thirds of all new faculty hires (65 percent) received an above or
off-scale salary (Table 7B), 54 percent of new hires received some type of summer salary, and 9 percent received a stipend of some sort.

Moving Expenses. As in prior years, a large percentage of new hires received moving expenses (86 percent).

Course Relief. Course relief was offered to 68 percent of new faculty hires (Table 7A).

Housing Assistance. Housing assistance was offered to 61 percent of all new hires.

Spousal Employment Assistance. The percentage of new faculty receiving spousal employment assistance (17 percent of new hires) was approximately the same as in 1997-98.

Start-up Packages. Information was also collected on start-up packages. In some cases, funding was provided for renovation of facilities, acquisition of new equipment, and research support (for Research Assistants). In a sample of approximately 25 recruitments in the Science and Engineering fields, renovations of laboratory or office space averaged approximately $50,000; acquisition of new equipment averaged approximately $75,000, and research support ranged from $30,000 to $100,000.

Reasons First Offer Candidates Declined Offer

Thirty-nine first-offer candidates declined their offer from UC for appointments effective 1999-00. Interviewees discussed reasons for first-offer candidates declining in 34 cases. Among the reasons cited for not coming to UC were a better salary offer elsewhere, spousal employment problems, geographical considerations and lack of affordable housing (Table 8).

1998-99 Retention Profile

In contrast to the years prior to the 1996-97 retention report, assistant professors are included in the retention statistics in this report because of concerns about faculty losses at this level.

The campuses reported 111 faculty resignations from the UC in 1998-99. Of these, 22 were assistant professors (20 percent), 37 were associate professors (33 percent), and 52 were full professors (47 percent) (Tables 9A and 9B). The 89 tenured faculty who left the UC in 1998-99
continue the increase in the number of tenured resignations over previous years; 83 tenured faculty resigned the UC in 1996-97, and 68 resigned in 1994-95.

Over three-fourths of the tenured faculty who resigned from the UC in 1998-99 were men, and about one-fourth were women (Table 9A). The largest share of resignations was in the social sciences (29 percent), followed by arts and humanities (17 percent) and the health sciences (15 percent).

Detailed information on reasons for leaving, retention efforts, and destinations was available for 78 resignations, of which 60 were separations from the tenure ranks.

Reasons given for leaving the UC in 1998-99 continue some of the trends observed in 1996-97 (Table 10A). For example, 22 percent of the tenured faculty who resigned in 1998-99 did so because of low salaries, compared to 33 percent who left for this reason in 1996-97 and 56 percent in 1994-95. On the other hand, 20 percent left because of spousal employment problems in 1998-99 compared to 13 percent in 1996-97 and 10 percent in 1994-95.

In almost all cases, faculty members chose to leave for a combination of reasons, and often for reasons not strictly related to resources (Table 10A). Although about one-fourth of the tenured faculty who left cited low pay or a better offer elsewhere as the main reason for leaving, 23 percent of tenured faculty left primarily for family reasons, 23 percent left for geographical reasons, and 20 percent left because of problems with their spouse’s employment. According to survey respondents, 63 percent of the tenured faculty who resigned cited “other” reasons for leaving, including acceptance of administrative office (chair, dean, provost), time off, department specialization, etc.

Efforts were made to retain tenured faculty in 37, or about 62 percent, of the retention cases, up from 54 percent in 1996-97 (Table 11A). At the same time, the faculty member’s departure was rated as a moderate or serious loss in 39 cases (65 percent). Even then, an offer with any kind of quantifiable incentives was made in only about one-fourth of the cases, with a number of respondents indicating a sense that retention efforts would have been futile given the personal nature of the departure (e.g. family considerations). There was also an indication that some departing faculty specifically requested that no effort be expended to retain them.

Of the tenured faculty who left the UC in 1998-99, 87 percent went to other universities, a bit more than in the prior survey year (Table 12). Twenty-five percent of the tenured faculty who
left the UC in 1998-99 went to another public institution in the United States, compared to 19 percent of those who resigned in 1996-97, and the percentage of tenured faculty choosing to leave the UC for a private institution in the United States rose from 30 to 38 percent. In 1996-97, seventeen tenured faculty members chose to move between the campuses (20 percent of tenured resignations); in 1998-99 that number had fallen to 9 (15 percent). The rate of resignations associated with inter-campus moves was higher in 1996-97 and in 1998-99 than in the previous years of the survey (Table 13).

The statistical data cannot explain why the rate of inter-campus movements by tenured faculty increased in 1996-97 and 1998-99, but it is possible to compare the reasons those faculty gave for moving with the reasons given by those faculty who left the UC altogether (Table 14). Tenured faculty who moved from one UC campus to another frequently cited a better salary offer as a reason for moving (33 percent compared to 20 percent of those who left the UC). Faculty who moved from one campus to another also identified better research support at their new campus as a reason for the change (22 percent compared to 6 percent of those who left the UC). By contrast, the faculty who left the UC were more likely to cite spousal employment problems or geography as reasons for leaving than were those who moved between campuses.

**UC Recruitment and Retention: Impediments and Strengths**

Department chairs were also asked about their department’s strengths, and the impediments facing their department, in recruitment and retention. Several key issues were mentioned by the interviewees.

*Location.* Geographical location was viewed a definite asset in recruitment and retention. Advantages for many campuses within the UC system include climate, community atmosphere, availability of professional networks, and opportunities for collaboration with industries close to campus. However, a key concern was the high cost of housing.

*Academic Support.* The high academic national rankings of UC departments are considered a primary strength in recruitment. Innovations in interdepartmental and interdisciplinary programs are also attractive to many faculty. Chairs identified UC’s overall prestige and UC’s commitment to the long-term success of faculty as advantages to recruitment.

UC also benefits from an engaged and collegial faculty and stimulating graduate and undergraduate students. However, there is some concern over maintaining quality of graduate
students in the future, with chairs mentioning current funding problems and their perception of the quality of recent graduate student applicant pools. Some chairs also pointed to the lack of faculty and student diversity as an impediment to recruitment and retention. Some chairs were also concerned that the amount of teaching required at UC was not competitive with other institutions.

**Salaries, Financial Support and Campus Facilities.** Chairs noted the difficulties of competing over salary with other academic institutions and with industry. Several chairs observed that the current UC salary scale is non-competitive and thus they need to hire faculty off-scale. For retention purposes, some noted that the step system is too rigid to reward senior faculty. Attention was drawn to the limited flexibility in salary negotiations and it was also noted that the approval process was too slow. The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) was viewed by respondents on some campuses as moving too slowly which creates difficulties, especially if there is a need for a quick counter-offer.

Some interviewees noted that start-up funds in science and engineering are inadequate. Other identified problems include lack of funding for support staff, deteriorating campus buildings and laboratories, and lack of space on campus. Some chairs have been helped by discretionary start-up packages, and establishment of endowed chairs. In some cases, departments are turning to donors and support outside the University.

**Spousal/Domestic Partner and Other Family Issues.** Several chairs addressed issues affecting the children of UC faculty, concerns about the quality of K-12 public schools, the local cost of living for families with small children, and child care needs. One chair viewed the availability of child care facilities on campus as a recruitment strength.

By far the most prominently mentioned impediment to recruitment/retention revolves around spousal/domestic partner employment issues. The majority of those interviewed identified this as a major issue, whether the spouse/domestic partner was seeking academic or non-academic professional work. It was universally acknowledged that the issue of spousal hiring is complex, involving issues of fairness and maintenance of program quality. Some noted that the UC’s awareness of spousal employment needs has helped them in recruitment and retention, and pointed to local campus programs that have assisted them in finding spousal/domestic partner employment for new hires.
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