REPORT OF THE FACULTY FLOW COMMITTEE

March 2003

Barry Pasternack, Chair
Fred Anderson
Peggy Atwell
Robert Buckley
Sam Edelman
William Fasse
Bernie Goldstein
Gary Hammerstrom
David Hood
Jackie Kegley
Bill Meyer
Dick Montanari
Cordelia Ontiveros
Les Pincu
Gary Reichard
Barbara Swerkes
Don Wort

Executive Summary

For the past two years a committee made up of representatives of the Academic Senate CSU, campus Provosts/VPAA and AVPAA, and representatives of the Chancellor's Office have studied the issues of faculty recruitment, retirement, and retention (faculty flow) with an eye towards improving recruitment success, faculty retention, and better planning for future campus faculty hiring needs. The attached report focuses on the current state of affairs in the CSU together with an analysis of factors that influence recruiting success. It also contains our recommendations for campus best practices with regard to recruitment, retention, and replacement of retiring faculty, system policy changes that we believe will be beneficial in these endeavors, and possible trustee actions that might facilitate improvement in such processes.

Major findings of the committee include the following:

- While the system success rate in recruiting has averaged around 75%, individual campus success rates vary widely. For campuses in operation during the period 1998 – 2001 the overall recruiting success rate ranged from 58.5% to 94.0%.
- Success rates in recruiting also vary widely by discipline. During the 1998 – 2001 period the overall recruiting success rate ranged from a low of 58.5% for business/ management to a high of 82.1% for home economics.
- Campus success rates do not seem to be significantly affected by local housing costs or the disciplines being recruited for. There was a negative correlation between salary offered and campus success rate during the 2000 and 2001 recruitment cycles.
- Location is the reason most often cited by faculty who accept offers from CSU campuses (61%). Colleagues/faculty (28%) and department (24%) are the two and three most cited reasons. Faculty who rejected offers from CSU campuses cited high teaching load most often (26%). Also frequently cited reasons include better offers elsewhere (23%), higher salaries elsewhere (22%), spouse's career (21%), the high cost of living (20%), and location (19%).
- More than 10% of the faculty who accepted offers indicated that the recruitment process could be more timely, felt their questions about benefits were not answered completely, and indicated service expectations were not clearly presented. Over 20% of the faculty who rejected offers felt that the process was not timely and service expectations were not made clear.
- The average annual salary offered to assistant professors who accepted CSU offers in 2002 was $2,354 higher than for assistant professors who rejected CSU offers. Salary was listed as a reason by only 12% of faculty who accepted CSU offers but over 20% of the faculty who rejected CSU offers. For 37% of respondents who accepted a position with the CSU, the CSU offer was higher than other offers received. For 55% of respondents who rejected an offer from the CSU, the CSU offer was lower than other offers received.

Recommendations of the Committee

Campus Actions

- Departments should start recruiting earlier.
- Campuses should engage in a continuous improvement plan relative to reducing the time necessary to prepare an offer.
- Campuses should prepare a workbook for department recruitment committees detailing the recruitment process.
- Training sessions should be held annually on the campus for recruiting committee chairs.
- Departments should be encouraged to prepare recruitment brochures to be mailed to Ph.D. granting institutions.
- In hard to hire disciplines, campuses should seriously consider advertising positions with an open rank
- Campuses should collect projected retirement data on a discipline basis to project hiring needs over each upcoming five-year period.
- Campuses should undertake exit interviews of departing faculty to identify reasons for their leaving the campus.

System Office Action

- For disciplines with a low success rate in recruiting, CSU should take out advertisements in professional journals listing campuses for which positions are open.
- For disciplines with a low success rate in recruiting, on an experimental basis CSU should sponsor an information table and/or reception at major national conferences.
- Departments should work with other CSU departments to facilitate placement of faculty spouses.
- CSU should prepare a brochure highlighting faculty benefits that would be targeted to individuals who area being recruited.
- The Chancellor's Office and individual campuses should work with ERFA in engaging emeriti faculty in activities that would be of mutual benefit.

Actions for Consideration by Trustee Committees

- Work towards reducing the current normal teaching load of 12 WTU's so that it is in line with the norms of peer institutions.
- Work to increase CSU faculty salaries to a level at which they are comparable with those offered faculty in peer institutions.
- Eliminate salary caps for all ranks.
- Develop a comprehensive housing assistance program for faculty
- Provide support for campus based childcare and eldercare facilities.
- Provide health insurance for new faculty immediately upon date of appointment.
- Develop more attractive benefits for faculty and dependents.
- Provide new hires with the option of going into either PERS or a defined contribution plan such as TIAA/CREF.
- Create an enhanced leaves program for faculty.

• Section 1 – INTRODUCTION

Faculty members are integral to the success of any university. Replacements of faculty who have left the CSU as well as hiring faculty to meet growth in student enrollment are essential to maintaining a quality education for our students. In the five-year period, 1995 – 2000, a total of 2801 tenured and tenure track faculty left the CSU[1] while only 2315 tenure track faculty members were hired[2]. Thus only 83% of tenured and tenure track faculty who left the CSU during this five year period were actually replaced with tenure track hires. Since approximately 53% of the retiring faculty elected to participate in the FERP, the actual number of full time tenured and tenured track faculty employed during this period increased by 62 from 9,643 to 9,705. However, given the 12% growth in the student population (as measured in FTES), it is clear that the percentage of students being taught by temporary faculty has increased significantly during this period. This is borne out by the 51% increase (from 7,219 to 10,896) in the number of temporary and FERP[3] faculty employed by the CSU during this period.

As of 1999, roughly 18% of the full time faculty members employed by the CSU were over the age of 60 and nearly 60% were over the age of 50. Given recent changes in the PERS retirement formula, it is conceivable that the average age at retirement will decline somewhat from the historic mean of approximately 63 years of age.

In light of these facts, the Academic Senate CSU formed a Faculty Flow Committee in December, 2000 to investigate the issues relating to faculty recruitment, retention, and retirement and to make suggestions for long range planning relative to faculty flow.

The following report contains the committee's analysis and recommendations. These recommendations are based on surveys conducted directly by the committee as well as by the Social and Behavioral Research Institute at CSU San Marcos together with data compiled in several other documents. These documents include "An Analysis of the Use of Tenured and Tenure-Track and Lecturer Faculty in the California State University", "CSU Analysis of Staffing Changes and Program Expenditures 1995-2000", "CSU Faculty Workload Report", "Faculty Salaries at California's Public Universities, 2002-03", "Profile of CSU Employees Fall 2000", "Rebuilding the Faculty – A Report of the Academic Senate CSU Fresno", "Reports on Faculty Recruitment Survey (Years 1998 – 2001)", "Support Budget 2002-2003, the California State University", and "The California State University at the Beginning of the 21st Century – Meeting the Needs of the People of California"

This report consists of the introduction and four subsequent sections. Section 2 contains an overview of the current state of affairs in the CSU relative to recruitment, retention, and retirements. Section 3 presents the committee's recommendations regarding what could be done at the campus level to improve the recruiting process. The committee hopes that these recommendations can form the basis of defining "best practices" for the recruitment process. These recommendations were reviewed and commented upon by

[1] Includes faculty who elected to participate in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP).
[2] The California State University at the Beginning of the 21st Century, ASCSU, September 2001.
[3] A total of 944 faculty entered the FERP program between academic years 1996/1997 and 1999/2000.

campus Vice Presidents and Provosts as well as members of the Academic Senate, CSU. Section 4 presents recommendations regarding actions the CSU could take at the system level to address the issues relative to faculty flow, while Section 5 details recommendations for actions that would require consideration by Trustee committees.

Section 2 – OVERVIEW

History of Recruitment

From 1988 through 1991 the number of searches conducted by the CSU was fairly constant, ranging from a low of 883 in 1988 to a high of 992 in 1990. The success rate during this period rose from 72% in 1988 to 74% in 1990 and then dropped dramatically in 1991 to 59%. This dramatic decline in the success rate in 1991 was probably caused by California's worsening fiscal situation. As a result of a slowdown in the State's economy in 1992, the number of searches conducted by the CSU declined by more than 50% (on a year to year basis) to 441. This was accompanied by a decline in the success rate for that year to a low of 54%. In 1993 the number of searches reached a 13 year low of 302, but there was an improvement in the success rate to 61%.

As the California economy began to recover after 1993, the number of searches conducted by the CSU increased from 504 in 1994 to 1,142 in 2001. During this period the overall system success rate ranged from a low of 69% in 1999 to a high of 79% in 1996. Table 1 provides this information.

Table 1: CSU TENURE TRACK FACULTY RECRUITMENTS AND SUCCESS RATES, FALL 1988-2001

	1988	**1989**	**1990**	**1991**	**1992**	**1993**	**1994**	**1995**	**1996**	**1997**	**1998**	**1999**	**2000**	**2001**
Searches	883	962	992	891	441	302	504	486	504	511	759	889	937	1,142
Appoint-ments	634	700	736	526	237	184	371	367	401	388	543	616	704	845
Success Rate	72%	73%	74%	59%	54%	61%	74%	76%	79%	76%	72%	69%	75%	74%

Possible Factors Influencing Campus Success Rates

While the system's success rate has been reasonably consistent, there have been significant variations in the success rates on the individual campuses. Table 2 shows the average success rates for the 23 campuses during the period 1998 through 2001. One sees the average success rate over this period ranged from a low of 54.2% to a high of 94%, with an overall system success rate of 72.7%.

Table 2: Recruiting Success Rate by Campus for the Period 1998 through 2001

Campus	Searches	Appointments	Success Rate
Bakersfield	111	82	73.9%
Channel Islands	24	13	54.2%
Chico	213	159	74.6%
Dominguez Hills	94	55	58.5%
Fresno	186	146	78.5%
Fullerton	258	175	67.8%
Hayward	116	90	77.6%
Humboldt	90	76	84.4%
Long Beach	307	240	78.2%
Los Angeles	205	135	65.9%
Maritime	18	16	88.9%
Monterey Bay	44	32	72.7%
Northridge	277	200	72.2%
Pomona	175	137	78.3%
Sacramento	224	169	75.4%
San Bernardino	143	100	69.9%
San Diego	327	234	71.6%
San Francisco	205	146	71.2%
San Jose	283	171	60.4%
San Luis Obispo	193	149	77.2%
San Marcos	81	51	63.0%
Sonoma	84	79	94.0%
Stanislaus	69	53	76.8%
System	3727	2708	72.7%

The success rate on the different campuses may have been caused by several factors. Among these are the disciplines recruited, the average campus starting salary, and whether the campus is in an area in which housing costs are high. Each of these factors was considered by the committee.

Table 3 gives the average success rates during the 1998 – 2001 period broken down by discipline. As this table demonstrates, the average success rate ranged from a low of 58.5% for business/management to a high of 82.1% for home economics.

Table 3: Recruiting Success by Discipline for the Period 1998 - 2001

Discipline	Searches	Appointments	Success Rate
Agriculture	63	48	76.2%
Architecture	22	14	63.6%
Business/Management	364	213	58.5%
Communications	116	85	73.3%
Education	780	537	68.8%
Engineering	166	117	70.5%
Fine Arts	256	197	77.0%
Health Sciences	159	111	69.8%
Home Economics	56	46	82.1%
Letters	336	264	78.6%
Mathematics/Computer Science	242	156	64.5%
Natural Science	300	243	81.0%
Public Affairs	195	148	75.9%
Social Sciences	614	484	78.8%
Misc./Other	58	45	77.6%

To determine whether the discipline being recruited played a significant role in the success rate, an investigation was made as to the campus success rates by discipline for the 2000 and 2001 recruiting cycles. Tables 4a and 4b display these data. In the cells of these tables the first number gives the number of positions being recruited, the second number gives the number of positions hired, and the third number gives the success rate.

Table 4a. Tenure Track Success Matrix by Campus and Discipline for 2000

	Agriculture	Architecture	Business & Management	Communications	Education	Engineering	Fine Arts	Health Sciences	Home Economics	Letters	Math & Computer Science	Natural Sciences	Public Affairs	Social Sciences	Misc/Other	Total
Bakersfield			2/0/0%	1/1/100%	12/3/25%		1/1/100%	2/2/100%		3/2/67%	2/2/100%	2/2/100%	5/4/80%	5/5/100%		35/22/63%
Chico	1/1/100%		3/2/67%	1/1/100%	1/1/100%	1/1/100%	5/4/80%	3/2/67%	2/2/100%	7/7/100%	1/1/100%	6/6/100%	6/5/83%	9/6/67%		46/39/85%
Dominguez Hills				1/1/100%	5/1/20%		1/1/100	3/1/33		3/3/100%	4/0/0%		1/1/100%	4/1/25%		22/9/41%
Fresno	5/4/80%		2/1/50%	1/1/100%	4/3/75%	2/1/50%	5/3/60%	5/3/60%	2/1/50%	8/5/63%	1/1/100%	4/4/100%	4/3/75%	11/10/91%		54/40/74%
Fullerton			10/7/70%	2/1/50%	17/11/65%		3/3/100%		3/2/67%	5/4/80%	5/3/60%	4/4/100%	3/3/100%	13/13/100%	2/2/100%	67/53/79%
Hayward			2/2/100%		7/5/71%	1/1/100%	1/1/100%			3/3/100%	3/3/100%	2/2/100%		3/2/67%		22/19/86%
Humboldt				1/1/100%	3/3/100%	1/1/100%	1/1/100%				2/2/100%	4/4/100%		6/5/83%		18/17/94%
Long Beach			13/5/38%	3/3/100%	21/19/90%		11/7/64%	5/4/80%	1/1/100%	8/8/100%	3/1/33%	6/6/100%	3/3/100%	12/11/92%		86/68/79%
Los Angeles			2/1/50%	1/1/100%	13/5/38%		1/1/100%	4/3/75%	1/1/100%	5/3/60%		3/2/67%	4/3/75%	5/4/80%		39/24/62%
Maritime Academy			1/0/0%			4/4/100%									2/2/100%	7/6/86%
Monterey Bay			1/1/100%	4/4/100%	4/4/100%					1/1/100%		2/2/100%			2/2/100%	14/14/100%
Northridge			6/5/83%	2/1/50%	17/10/59%		6/6/100%	3/2/67%	1/0/0%	11/10/91%	4/4/100%	6/6/100%	1/1/100%	26/26/88%		83/68/82%
Pomona	2/0/0%	1/0/0%	8/5/63%		7/6/86%	7/6/86%	5/4/80%			5/4/80%	9/4/44%	4/4/100%		6/6/100%	1/1/100%	55/40/73%
Sacramento			6/4/67%		18/14/78%	1/1/100%	5/5/100%		2/2/100%	2/2/100%		2/1/50%	8/6/75%	8/5/63%		52/40/77%
San Bernardino			2/0/0%	3/1/33%	8/7/88%		6/5/83%	2/2/100%		4/3/75%	4/4/100%	2/2/100%	2/2/100%	1/0/0%		34/26/76%
San Diego			11/9/82%	2/2/100%	18/12/67%	5/4/80%	4/4/100%	2/0/0%		8/6/75%	6/3/50%	10/10/100%	5/3/60%	19/14/74%	4/4/100%	94/71/76%
San Francisco			3/2/67%	1/1/100%	6/1/17%			1/0/0%	1/1/100%	8/4/50%	4/2/50%	9/9/100%	1/1/100%	9/8/89%		43/29/67%
San Jose	1/1/100%		11/5/45%	3/3/100%	17/9/53%	10/5/50%	3/3/100%	3/3/100%		4/4/100%	7/2/29%	1/0/0%	6/4/67%	7/7/100%	1/1/100%	74/47/64%
San Luis Obispo	5/3/60%	5/3/60%	5/3/60%		1/1/100%	5/5/100%	2/1/50%			2/1/100%	7/4/57%			5/5/100%		37/26/70%
San Marcos			4/3/75%		3/2/67%					3/2/67%	1/1/100%			3/3/100%		14/11/79%
Sonoma			3/3/100%		4/4/100%		1/1/100%	1/1/100%		1/1/100%	2/2/100%		2/2/100%	4/4/100%	1/1/100%	19/19/100%
Stanislaus				3/2/67%	6/2/33%		1/1/100%			2/2/100%		4/4/100	1/1/100%	5/4/80%		22/16/73%
Total	14/9/64%	6/3/50%	95/58/61%	29/24/83%	192/123/64%	37/29/78%	62/52/84%	34/23/68%	13/10/77%	93/75/81%	65/39/60%	71/68/96%	52/42/81%	161/136/84%	13/13/100%	937/704/75%

Table 4b. Tenure Track Success Matrix by Campus and Discipline for 2001

Table 4b. Tenure Track Success Matrix by Campus and Discipline for 2001

	Agriculture	Architecture	Business & Management	Communications	Education	Engineering	Fine Arts	Health Sciences	Home Economics	Letters	Math & Computer Science	Natural Sciences	Public Affairs	Social Sciences	Misc/Other	Total
Bakersfield			3/2/67%		11/10/91%			3/2/67%		2/2/100%	6/4/67%	5/3/60%	5/5/100%	6/5/83%		41/33/80%
Channel Islands			3/1/33%	1/0/0%	5/2/40%		1/1/100%			2/1/50%	2/1/50%	4/3/75%	1/0/0%	5/4/80%		24/13/54%
Chico			6/3/50%	2/1/50%	9/8/89%	2/1/50%	3/2/67%	1/1/100%		8/6/75%	6/2/33%	1/1/100%	5/5/100%	11/8/73%		54/38/70%
Dominguez Hills			1/1/100%		6/3/50%			3/3/100%		1/0/0%	4/0/0%	3/2/67%	1/1/100%	4/3/75%	4/3/75%	27/16/59%
Fresno	8/6/75%		2/2/100%	1/0/0%	7/6/87%	1/1/100%	3/3/100%	6/5/83%		4/3/75%	3/2/67/%	4/4/100%	2/2/100%	6/5/83%		47/39/83%
Fullerton			5/5/100%	5/1/20%	18/14/78%		7/6/86%	3/3/100%	2/2/100%	6/5/83%	6/1/17%	3/2/67%	1/1/100%	8/7/88%	2/2/100%	66/49/74%
Hayward			6/6/100%	2/2/100%	8/7/88%	2/2/100%	3/1/33%	1/1/100%		3/3/100%	3/2/67%	3/2/67%	1/1/100%	4/2/50%	1/1/100%	37/30/81%
Humboldt	3/3/100%			2/2/100%	4/2/50%		1/1/100%				3/3/100%	6/6/100%	1/1/100%	6/5/83%		26/23/88%
Long Beach			15/10/67%	5/5/100%	20/18/90%	2/1/50%	10/5/50%	4/2/50%	1/1/100%	9/9/100%	8/8/100%	9/5/56%	6/6/100%	18/17/94%		107/87/81%
Los Angeles			7/1/14%	1/1/100%	23/17/74%	4/1/25%	5/5/100%	5/3/60%	2/1/50%	3/2/67%	1/1/100%	4/3/75%	5/4/80%	11/5/45%		71/44/62%
Maritime Academy			1/1/100%		4/4/100%	4/3/75%									1/1/100%	10/9/90%
Monterey Bay			1/1/100%	3/3/100%	1/1/100%		1/1/100%				2/1/50%	1/1/100%			3/3/100%	12/11/92%
Northridge			7/4/57%	2/1/50%	10/6/60%	1/0/0%	10/6/60%	1/0/0%	5/4/80%	6/5/83%	5/4/80%	5/4/80%	2/1/50%	16/11/69%		70/46/66%
Pomona	1/1/100%	2/2/100%	4/4/100%	1/1/100%	6/6/100%	7/7/100%	5/5/100%		2/2/100%	1/1/100%	7/7/100%	3/3/100%	1/1/100%	3/3/100%	1/1/100%	44/44/100%
Sacramento			8/3/38%	1/1/100%	16/13/81%		3/2/67%	6/6/100%	3/3/100%	3/1/33%	2/0/0%	5/3/60%	9/9/100%	16/15/94%	1/1/100%	73/57/78%
San Bernardino			5/2/40%	4/3/75%	10/6/60%		2/2/100%	5/4/80%		8/8/100%	1/1/100%	1/1/100%	4/3/75%	11/5/45%		51/35/69%
San Diego			7/6/86%	1/1/100%	13/9/69%	3/1/33%	9/7/77%	4/3/75%		8/4/50%	8/5/63%	12/10/83%	7/5/71%	26/19/73%	8/5/63%	106/75/71%
San Francisco			8/6/75%	3/3/100%	16/11/69%	1/0/0%	10/9/90%	1/1/100%		4/3/75%	3/2/67%	3/3/100%	3/1/33%	12/7/58%	1/1/100%	65/47/72%
San Jose	1/1/100%		11/3/27%	1/0/0%	12/5/42%	6/3/50%	2/1/50%		1/0/0%	8/6/75%	12/7/58%	4/3/75%	3/2/66%	5/4/80%		66/35/53%
San Luis Obispo	8/6/75%	4/3/75%		4/1/25%	4/2/50%	9/7/78%	3/2/67%			5/5/100%	11/10/91%	8/7/88%	1/1/100%	5/4/80%		62/48/77%
San Marcos			5/2/40%	1/1/100%	7/5/71%		2/2/100%			4/3/75%	3/2/67%	1/1/100%		4/1/25%	3/2/67%	30/19/63%
Sonoma			2/2/100%		5/5/100%		3/3/100%			2/2/100%	1/1/100%	3/3/100%	1/1/100%	4/4/100%	1/1/100%	22/22/100%
Stanislaus			1/1/100%	2/1/50%	10/7/70%		4/4/100%			2/2/100%	1/1/100%	1/1/100%		10/8/80%		31/25/81%
Total	21/17/81%	6/5/83%	108/66/61%	42/28/67%	225/167/74%	42/27/64%	87/68/78%	43/34/79%	16/13/81%	89/71/80%	98/65/66%	89/71/80%	59/50/85%	191/142/74%	26/21/81%	1142/845/74%

Using the data for 2000 and 2001 (omitting the Channel Islands data) a regression analysis was conducted in which the campus success rate was the dependent variable and the percentage of campus searches occurring in disciplines for which the overall success rate was below 70% was the independent variable. For these data the sample correlation coefficient was -.133 with a p value of .389. Hence, one cannot assert that the percentage of searches that were taking place in disciplines for which the overall success rate is low was statistically significant in determining a campus's overall success rate.

Table 5 gives the average starting salary at the 23 campuses during the four- year period 1998 – 2001. Table 6 gives the average starting salary by rank during the same four-year period. In general, urban campuses paid higher average starting salaries than rural campuses. Using the data for 2000 and 2001, (again neglecting Channel Islands) a regression analysis was conducted in which the campus success rate was the dependent variable and the average campus starting salary was the independent variable. For this data the sample correlation coefficient was -.30 with a p value of .048. Hence, the data supports the assertion that during the years 2000 and 2001 average starting salary was a significant factor in a campus's recruiting success rate, however surprisingly the relationship is negative. That is, campuses that had a lower average starting salary tended to have a higher recruiting success rate. One possible explanation for this phenomenon is that campuses that had lower success rates may have felt that they had to offer somewhat higher salaries to improve their overall success rate. Unfortunately, these higher salaries alone did not seem to be enough to improve the campuses' success rate.

The committee also looked at housing costs versus recruiting success. Designating Dominguez Hills, Fullerton, Hayward, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo, San Marcos, and Sonoma as campuses that have high housing costs, a regression analysis was conducted using the 2000 and 2001 recruiting success data. The sample correlation coefficient was -.148 with a p value of .339. Hence, the data indicate that campuses in high housing cost areas do not have a significantly different success rate in recruiting than campuses in low housing cost areas.

Table 5: Average Starting Salaries by Campus for Newly Hired Tenure-Track Faculty for the Period 1998 - 2001

Campus	Year 1998	1999	2000	2001
Bakersfield	50,301	49,235	50,511	54,185
Channel Islands				96,714
Chico	46,011	45,870	47,256	50,439
Dominguez Hills	44,830	48,601	55,273	58,025
Fresno	44,766	49,282	48,747	53,501
Fullerton	46,163	50,277	51,819	55,926
Hayward	43,508	48,864	54,616	57,667
Humboldt	41,709	46,306	48,790	47,268
Long Beach	51,172	53,582	54,469	57,256
Los Angeles	54,547	50,363	56,199	62,809
Maritime		45,000	44,450	50,895
Monterey Bay	46,456	65,451	58,650	55,700
Northridge	44,669	48,205	47,990	50,979
Pomona	47,308	52,625	53,084	57,777
Sacramento	43,515	46,866	48,079	53,237
San Bernardino	47,060	47,333	50,721	50,671
San Diego	48,868	51,632	56,575	59,272
San Francisco	50,918	50,448	58,650	62,104
San Jose	49,583	54,931	56,131	63,842
San Luis Obispo	50,585	54,177	57,278	55,396
San Marcos	47,307	54,391	51,418	51,690
Sonoma	43,133	45,311	52,521	48,613
Stanislaus	43,248	49,193	43,649	46,717
System	47,482	50,330	52,402	56,240
Year to Year % Increase		6.00	4.12	7.32

Table 6: Average Starting Salaries by Rank for Newly Hired Tenure-Track Faculty for the Period 1998 – 2001

Rank	Year							
	1998		1999		2000		2001	
	Number	*Av. Salary*	*Number*	*Av. Salary*	*Number*	*Av. Salary*	*Number*	*Av. Salary*
Professor	17	71,473	20	78,093	36	79,848	47	90,269
Associate Professor	66	57,276	76	60,026	96	63,913	122	67,198
Assistant Professor	460	45,191	520	47,845	569	48,763	674	51,921

Attitudes of Faculty Being Recruited

In order to get a better view of what may cause faculty being recruited to accept or reject an offer, surveys were done on both faculty who accepted offers from a CSU campus as well as faculty who rejected offers from a CSU campus during the 2001/02 recruiting cycle for fall 2002 appointments. These surveys were carried out by the Social and Behavioral Research Institute at San Marcos. A copy of their entire report is included as Appendix A attached to this report. In total 420 individuals who accepted job offers from the CSU and 114 who declined job offers in the CSU were surveyed by telephone.

Table 7 shows the reasons given for accepting an offer from a CSU campus together with the frequency and relative frequency of how often the particular reason was cited. Here we see location was the most often cited reason (identified by 60.8% of respondents) followed by colleagues/faculty or department (identified by 49.3% of respondents). Perhaps one reason location was cited so frequently was that half of the respondents who accepted offers were already living in California. Interestingly, only 11.7% of respondents cited salary as a reason for accepting an offer from a CSU campus.

Table 7: Reasons Given for Accepting an Offer from a CSU Campus

	Count	%
Location	254	60.77
Colleagues/Faculty	115	27.51
Department	99	23.68
Job Respondent Wanted/Perfect Fit	64	15.31
Emphasis on Teaching/Opportunities for Teaching	54	12.92
Good Offer	52	12.44
Quality of Institution	50	11.96
Salary	49	11.72
Advancement of Career	47	11.24
Academic Program	43	10.29
Combination of Research/Teaching	38	9.09
Familiarity with Campus/Previous Teaching/Schooling Experience with University	38	9.09
Positive Experience with Recruiting Process	35	8.37
Area of Research	31	7.42
Diversity of Student Body	27	6.46
Tenure Track Position/Opportunity for Tenure	27	6.46
Timing/First Offer/Only Offer	25	5.98
Family in Area	24	5.74
Helping Department Develop	21	5.02
Compatibility of Respondent's Goals/Philosophy with University/Department	19	4.55
Flexibility in Position	12	2.87
Spouse's Career	12	2.87
Other	37	8.85

Another aspect queried was the recruitment process. Table 8 gives the respondents' ratings of the recruitment process for those individuals who accepted offers from CSU campuses. Here we see that while nearly all applicants either agreed or strongly agreed with the statements made, there were some areas for which there was disagreement of over 10%. This indicates that campuses could do a better job of making service expectations clearer, ensuring that the process is timely, and explaining faculty benefits. Specifically, 11.4% of respondents suggested that the process should be more timely while 11.2% of respondents suggested that the process could be improved by giving better details of the position package-expectations/compensation.

Table 8: Ratings of Recruiting Process by Accepting Respondents

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. The Interview Allowed Me to Ask All the Questions I Had	Count	2	11	96	310
	%	0.48	2.63	22.91	73.99
2. The Interview Allowed Me to Demonstrate Competence	Count		11	141	268
	%		2.62	33.57	63.81
3. The Process Was Fair	Count		8	156	236
	%		2.00	39.00	59.00
4. Teaching Expectations Were Clear	Count	1	16	180	222
	%	0.24	3.82	42.96	52.98
5. The Process Was Timely	Count	6	42	174	195
	%	1.44	10.07	41.73	46.76
6. Scholarship and Creative Activity Expectations Were Clear	Count	3	40	206	168
	%	0.72	9.59	49.40	40.29
7. Faculty Compensation Questions Were Answered Completely	Count	3	37	217	154
	%	0.73	9.00	52.80	37.47
8. Faculty Benefits Questions Were Answered Completely	Count	4	48	215	135
	%	1.00	11.94	53.48	33.58
9. Service Expectations Were Clear	Count	4	75	228	110
	%	0.96	17.99	54.68	26.38

In terms of competing offers, those accepting offers from a CSU campus received an average of 1.10 other offers and over half (54.3%) indicated that they had received at least one other offer. For those receiving other offers, Table 9 shows the salary compared to the other offers received. As can be seen from this table, in 37.4% of the cases the CSU salary offer was the highest salary offer received while in 33.6% of the cases the CSU salary offer was lower than the highest salary offer received.

Table 9: Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Other Offers Received

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Higher	80	19.05	37.38	37.38
	2 The Same	62	14.76	28.97	66.36
	3 Lower	72	17.14	33.64	100.00
	Total	214	50.95	100.00	
Missing	8 Don't Know	9	2.14		
	9 Refused	2	0.48		
	System	195	46.43		
	Total	206	49.05		
Total		420	100.00		

Respondents who received offers that differed from the one accepted at the CSU campus were asked about the magnitude of the difference. This information is presented in Table 10. Here we see that for 22.4% of the respondents for which the CSU offer was higher than the other offers received, the difference was at least $10,000. For 28.9% of respondents for which the CSU offer was lower than the highest offer received the difference was greater than $10,000. Interestingly, 8 individuals accepted offers from a CSU campus even though they received a $20,000 or greater salary offer from another institution.

Table 10: Difference in Salary between Accepted Offer and Other Offers Received for Individuals Who Accepted an Offer from a CSU Campus

		Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Other Offers Received		
		Higher	**Lower**	**Total**
Less than $2,500	Count	13	9	22
	%	17.11	13.04	15.17
From $2,500 to under $5,000	Count	23	18	41
	%	30.26	26.09	28.28
From $5,000 to under $10,000	Count	23	22	45
	%	30.26	31.88	31.03
From $10,000 to under $15,000	Count	9	9	18
	%	11.84	13.04	12.41
From $15,000 to under $20,000	Count	4	3	7
	%	5.26	4.35	4.83
$20,000 or more	Count	4	8	12
	%	5.26	11.59	8.28
Total	Count	76	69	145

Salaries by rank of the individuals accepting offers from a CSU campus are presented in Table 11.

Table 11: Salary Offered to Respondents Who Accepted an Offer from a CSU Campus

Rank Offered		N	Minimum	Maximum*	Mean*	Std. Deviation
Assistant Professor	Salary Offered	356	$41,940	$82,500	$53,893	$8,917
Associate Professor	Salary Offered	43	$50,568	$85,008	$66,955	$9,154
Professor	Salary Offered	16	$70,500	$125,004[+]	$92,381	$14,481

* - Data includes salaries of faculty on 12 month appointments
[+] - This salary is for a 12 month position

Table 12 gives the reasons cited for individuals declining offers from the CSU. Here we see the top reasons include a high teaching load, better salary elsewhere, spouse's career, and cost of living/location. In many of the reasons cited (e.g. teaching load, cost of moving, timing), campuses could conceivably take actions that would address such concerns.

For individuals who declined offers from a CSU campus, the view of the recruitment process was generally the same as for those individuals who accepted offers except in two areas. Specifically 21% of these respondents did not feel that the recruiting process was timely while 27.4% of the respondents did not believe that service expectations were made clear. Additionally, 7% of respondents rejecting offers did not believe they were able to demonstrate competence during the interview as compared to only 2.6% of respondents who accepted a CSU campus offer feeling this way. Table 13 gives the ratings of the recruitment process for individuals declining offers.

Table 14 lists the institutions at which individuals who rejected offers at a CSU campus will be working. Note that 19 individuals (18.8%) rejecting an offer at one CSU campus actually chose to work at another CSU campus. Eight other individuals (7.9%) selected a UC campus or another California university over the CSU.

Table 12: Reasons Given for Declining an Offer from a CSU Campus

	Count	%
Teaching Load too Great	29	25.89
Better Offer Elsewhere	26	23.21
Higher Salary Elsewhere	25	22.32
Spouse's Career	23	20.54
Cost of Living too High	22	19.64
Location	21	18.75
Not a Good Fit/Not in My Field	10	8.93
Quality of Institution/Academic Program	10	8.93
Negative Experience with Campus/Faculty/Staff	9	8.04
Present Employment Changed/Counter Offer	9	8.04
Did Not Want to Move	8	7.14
Lack of Research Funding	8	7.14
Cost of Moving	6	5.36
Timing	6	5.36
More Opportunity to Grow/Attain Career Goals Elsewhere	5	4.46
No Opportunity for Tenure	4	3.57
Personal Reasons	4	3.57
Other	12	10.71

Table 13: Ratings of Recruiting Process Characteristics by Respondents Who Declined an Offer from a CSU Campus

		Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
1. The Process Was Timely	Count	8	16	42	48
	%	7.02	14.04	36.84	42.11
2. The Process Was Fair	Count	1		37	73
	%	0.90		33.33	65.77
3. The Interview Allowed Me	Count	1	7	34	72
to Demonstrate Competence	%	0.88	6.14	29.82	63.16
4. The Interview Allowed Me	Count	1	3	28	82
to Ask All the Questions I Had	%	0.88	2.63	24.56	71.93
5. Faculty Compensation	Count	2	12	49	49
Questions Were Answered Completely	%	1.79	10.71	43.75	43.75
6. Faculty Benefits Questions	Count		12	55	45
Were Answered Completely	%		10.71	49.11	40.18
7. Teaching Expectations Were	Count	1	10	47	56
Clear	%	0.88	8.77	41.23	49.12
8. Scholarship and Creative	Count		11	62	40
Activity Expectations Were Clear	%		9.73	54.87	35.40
9. Service Expectations Were	Count	1	30	55	27
Clear	%	0.88	26.55	48.67	23.89

Table 14: Institution Where Respondent Who Declined a CSU Campus Offer Will Be Working

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Cal State University	19	16.67	18.81	18.81
	UC School	6	5.26	5.94	24.75
	Other Cal.University	2	1.75	1.98	26.73
	Other US University	58	50.88	57.43	84.16
	Internatonal Univ.	3	2.63	2.97	87.13
	Junior College	8	7.02	7.92	95.05
	Other	5	4.39	4.95	100.00
	Total	101	88.60	100.00	
Missing	Refused	5	4.39		
	System	8	7.02		
	Total	13	11.40		
Total		114	100.00		

Those individuals who rejected offers from a CSU campus were asked how the salary they accepted compared to that offered by the CSU. Of the respondents who gave this information, 55.4% reported that the salary offer they accepted was higher than that offered by the CSU campus while 28.4% indicated that the CSU campus offer was higher. Table 15 gives this information.

Table 15: Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Declined CSU Offer

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Higher	41	35.96	55.41	55.41
	The Same	12	10.53	16.22	71.62
	Lower	21	18.42	28.38	100.00
	Total	74	64.91	100.00	
Missing	Don't Know	4	3.51		
	Refused	1	0.88		
	System	35	30.70		
	Total	40	35.09		
Total		114	100.00		

In terms of the magnitude of the difference in the salary offers, for those individuals sampled who rejected an offer from a CSU campus, 35% reported that the salary they accepted was $10,000 or greater, while 25% reported that the CSU offer they rejected was $10,000 or greater. This data is given in Table 16. Interestingly, 8 individuals responding to the survey who rejected a CSU offer received competing offers that were $20,000 or higher from another institution.

Table 16: Difference in Salary between Accepted Offer and Declined CSU Offer

Difference in Salary between Accepted Offer and Declined CSU Offer		**Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Declined CSU Offer**		
		Higher	**Lower**	**Total**
Less than $2,500	Count	5	4	9
	%	12.50	20.00	15.00
From $2,500 to under $5,000	Count	8	2	10
	%	20.00	10.00	16.67
From $5,000 to under $10,000	Count	9	9	18
	%	22.50	45.00	30.00
From $10,000 to under $15,000	Count	7	2	9
	%	17.50	10.00	15.00
From $15,000 to under $20,000	Count	3	1	4
	%	7.50	5.00	6.67
$20,000 or more	Count	8	2	10
	%	20.00	10.00	16.67
Total	Count	40	20	60
	%	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table 17 gives the salaries offered by rank to individuals who declined an offer by a CSU campus. Comparing Tables 11 and 17 we see that there is a $2,354 difference in the average salary of assistant professors who accepted and rejected CSU offers[4]. For the offers made to associate professors the difference in the average salary offers was only $794.

[4] Significant at p = .05.

Table 17: Salary Offered to Respondents Who Declined a CSU Campus Offer

Rank Offered	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Assistant Professor	95	$41,940	$78,000	$51,539	$7,872
Associate Professor	15	$51,684	$90,000	$66,161	$11,379

What we see from the surveys is that for some individuals working in California was a definite plus, while others viewed this negatively. Not surprisingly, many of the individuals who viewed this favorably already were living in California. In cases where working in California was viewed positively, CSU campuses seemed to have good successes. It also appears that campuses could do a better job of explaining benefits and service requirements to prospective hires. Timeliness of offers was also an area in which improvement appears to be needed.

Sources of Recruitment and Resignations

In terms of faculty flow, it is important to understand where new faculty come from and which disciplines are experiencing resignations. Table 18 gives the source of new tenure-track faculty recruited to the CSU over the four-year period 1998 – 2001. As can be seen from this table, during this period, between 28.6% and 21.8% of new tenure track hires were either working at a sister CSU campus or as lecturers on their own campus. The average over the four years was approximately 25%.

Table 18: Sources of CSU New Tenure Track Faculty for the Period 1998 – 2001

	Year			
	1998	**1999**	**2000**	**2001**
Other Higher Education	59.5%	64.4%	70.5%	68.4%
Lecturer Appointments	22.7%	19.5%	16.5%	16.1%
Other CSU Campuses	5.9%	5.0%	5.3%	7.3%
Other/Unknown	12.0%	11.0%	7.8%	8.2%

Table 19 presents the resignations by discipline during the years 2000 and 2001. There were 283 discipline-identified resignations during this two-year period (not including 18 classified as miscellaneous or other).

Table 19: Resignations during Academic Years 1999/2000 and 2000/2001 Combined by Discipline

Discipline	Total Resignations	Resignations as % of Searches
Agriculture	6	17.1%
Architecture	1	8.3%
Business/Management	37	18.2%
Communications	17	23.9%
Education	49	11.8%
Engineering	9	11.4%
Fine Arts	21	14.1%
Health Sciences	17	22.1%
Home Economics	1	3.4%
Letters	26	14.3%
Mathematics/Computer Science	8	4.9%
Natural Science	21	13.1%
Public Affairs	18	16.2%
Social Sciences	52	14.8%
Total	283	13.9%

It is interesting to contrast the number of resignations during this period with the number of searches taking place during the same time. If one measures the ratio of the number of resignations to the number of searches, the average percent ratio was 13.9%. Disciplines for which the percentage was at least 3% higher than this average ratio include agriculture, business/management, communications, and health sciences. Of these four disciplines, both business/management and health sciences had a lower than average success rate for recruiting during the four year period 1998-2001. This signifies potential long-term problems in ensuring adequate tenured faculty coverage in business/management and health sciences.

While an attempt was made to survey individuals who resigned from an academic position in the CSU during 2001/02, the number of respondents was too small to draw any meaningful insights. It appears that a regularized exit interview process would be worthwhile to determine the key factors upon which individuals base their resignation decision.

Future Recruitment Needs

While it is difficult to determine the exact number of faculty members who will need to be recruited in the future, approximations can and have been made. For example, in the draft concept paper "Instructors Post-Doctoral Fellowship Program: A Joint CSU/UC Initiative" it was estimated that 47% of the 9600 full-time faculty will retire by the year 2010[5].

In "The California State University at the Beginning of the 21st Century – Meeting the Needs of the People of California" it was noted that more than 8,000 new tenure track faculty will need to be hired by 2010. This would consist of an estimated 4853 faculty who will be retiring during the period and 3198 faculty who will be necessary to retain the current SFR while meeting estimated enrollment growth (assuming 75% of FTEF are staffed by tenure/tenure track faculty). This report goes on to state that these are minimal calculations and indicates that the number of tenure/tenure track hires may be as high as 10,000 or more.

More recently, a joint CSU, Academic Senate, CFA task force was established to respond to ACR 73. This resolution calls for the percentage of tenure-track faculty to be at least 75%. In order to achieve this goal the task force estimated that over the eight-year period from 2003 through 2011 CSU will need to hire approximately 11,350 tenure-track faculty[6]. This number is based on hiring approximately 4800 tenure-track faculty to account for separations and retirements, 4654 faculty to handle enrollment growth, and 1476 faculty to improve the student faculty ratio to 18.0 to 1. The proposed decrease in the SFR is extremely important for recruitment. Unless the teaching loads of CSU faculty are competitive with national norms, it is believed that campuses will have difficulties in recruitment. The Faculty Flow Committee (three of whose members served on the ACR 73 task force) confirms the estimate made by the ACR 73 task force.

Recruiting Success and the Impact on Searches

As indicated above, the success rate of recruitment has varied from year to year. Over the eight-year period from 1995 to 2001 the average success rate was 73.9%. One of the issues the Faculty Flow Committee wanted to look into was how the CSU's success rate in recruiting compared to similar institutions. Unfortunately, we were unable to obtain recruiting success data from other institutions to make such a comparison. It is hoped campuses can increase their overall success rate by following the recommendations outlined below. Assuming a future average success rate of 75%, successful recruitment of 11,500 faculty would require approximately 15,300 searches, or an average of over 1900 searches per year.

[5] Page 1 of Draft Concept Paper – Instructional Post-Doctoral Fellowship Program: A Joint CSU/UC Initiative, December 20, 2000.
[6] ACR 73 Task Force Report

Section 3 – Campus Specific Actions

In examining the needs and accomplishments of CSU campuses dealing with "faculty flow" issues, the committee discovered a number of processes and practices that amount to "best practices" and wishes to recommend them to all campuses for consideration.

Recruitment Process

One of the most important elements of successful recruitment of tenure-track faculty is timeliness. While our current System-wide recruitment "success rate" of around 75 percent may not be significantly lower than those of other universities, nonetheless it is important to try to improve upon that rate if at all possible. Getting an early start on faculty searches can only help in this regard. Campuses that position themselves to be first with an offer might well improve their success rates. In addition, hiring procedures on many campuses were not designed to meet the demands of our present increased rates of hiring. The inability to process the necessary paperwork in a timely manner can cause departments to lose qualified candidates. It is time for campuses to re-examine and perhaps re-design their recruitment "systems" in order to process and manage the greater numbers of recruitments and hires required to meet the demands of our present situation

Time can also be wasted as campuses work to get search committees "up to speed" with respect to process. Having all of the rules, procedures, and contacts available to search committee members from the outset would be a step in the right direction. This could result in earlier starts, more efficient processing, and consequently earlier offers to the candidates of choice. In addition, search committees could benefit immensely from assistance with the logistics of travel and interview arrangements. The entire search process could be advanced if one office, skilled and experienced with such logistics, performed the routine work, rather than requiring each search committee to master the "learning curve" associated with such tasks. Economies of scale can also result from "centralizing" campus connections with travel agencies, hotels, etc. Providing such assistance to committees can also help to offset the problem of increasing workload for declining numbers of tenured faculty who must handle all of the work of searches.

Another efficiency that could aid campuses in meeting the intense faculty recruitment needs of the present and immediate future is aggressive and inclusive advertising. The time to start recruiting future faculty members is while they are still in school. With other universities facing the same shortage of potential new faculty as the CSU, getting an early start by searching for potential faculty while still in graduate programs can only help in this regard. On the other hand, there is also a need to recruit in senior ranks. Our campuses are filled with gaps in the age/tenure of faculty members, reflecting past hiring surges. This will result in a lack of adequate numbers of senior faculty on many campuses in the near future. Part of our hiring problem is the result of the massive hires of Assistant Professors in the late 1960s and early 1970s. There are many departments with only new faculty and those about to retire. The present tendency of most of our campuses to advertise positions only at the lower Assistant Professor salaries eliminates

potential applicants of more senior rank who might be interested in relocating to a CSU campus.

In light of this, the Faculty Flow Committee recommends the following as "best practices" for CSU campuses to consider in order to address these faculty recruitment issues:

- **Departments should start their recruiting early. Search committees should be formed during the spring semester. Departments should be given their hiring allocations as early as possible during the spring semester.**
- **Campuses should engage in a continuous improvement process in terms of the internal paperwork flow to reduce the time between a department recommendation and a formal offer. In general, it should take no more than ten days to prepare an offer.**
- **Campuses should prepare an easily understandable workbook describing the recruitment process. This workbook should be given to all selection committee members.**
- **There should be a training session held annually on each campus for search committee chairs.**
- **Departments should be encouraged to prepare recruiting brochures to mail to Ph.D. granting institutions in the disciplines they are recruiting. Such brochures should focus on the benefits of a career in the department.**
- **In hard to hire disciplines, campuses should seriously consider advertising positions with an open rank.**
- **Campuses should provide adequate resources to assist in obtaining work visa for international faculty who have been offered employment.**

Retirements

Having a better idea about future need allows for better planning to meet the hiring needs of the future. If a department projects its future needs based on demographic data, it can hire ahead of needs. When appropriate, a department could reduce time and costs associated with hiring by carrying out two or more searches simultaneously, in anticipation of future vacancies through retirements.

In the present circumstances, the escalating service workload for declining numbers of senior tenured faculty is a major concern — and not only in the conduct of faculty searches. Moreover, as the percentage of part-time faculty increases, the workload of both tenure-track and tenured faculty increases, as fewer are left to fill committees and other critical service and governance needs of the university. It is not helpful that present policy on many campuses prohibits emeritus faculty and participants in FERP from participating in service activities and governance.

The following "best practice" is suggested to address these problems:

- **Campuses should collect data on a discipline basis to project hiring needs for a department over each upcoming five-year period.**

Retention

The CSU needs to maximize the results of present searches and guard against the loss of newly-recruited faculty, as well as to understand why faculty choose to leave the CSU. Such information would help campuses formulate programs to increase faculty retention. Anecdotal evidence indicates that this is an increasing problem on many campuses.

To address this issue, the Faculty Flow Committee suggests the following as a "best practice":

- **Campuses should undertake exit interviews/ surveys of departing faculty members to identify the reasons why they are leaving the campus.**

Campus Views on These Practices

To gauge the campus views on these suggested actions, a survey was sent to campus Academic Vice Presidents/Provosts (AVP/P) asking for their views and whether they were satisfied with current campus practices. In total 18 campuses responded to the survey. This survey was also given to members of the CSU Academic Senate to obtain faculty viewpoints on these issues. In total, 35 Senators responded to the survey. It should be noted, however, that the Senator responses may be limited to knowledge about their specific departments rather than the campus as a whole. The following are the results of the two surveys.

Practices Related to Search Committee Operations

- **Departments should be given their hiring allocations prior to May of the year preceding the search.**

77.8% of the campus AVP/P group strongly agreed or agreed with this suggestion. **94.1%** of Senators strongly agreed or agreed with this suggestion. Some of the concerns raised by AVP/P's include that budgets may not be known by spring and that departments do not begin their recruitment until the fall. Not surprisingly, 88.9% of the responding

AVP/P's believed that the current practice in use on their campus was effective. This compares, however, with only 34.6% of the Senators who responded and expressed a view.

- **Search Committees should be formed during the spring term of the year prior to the search.**

55.6% of the campus AVP/P group strongly agreed or agreed with this suggestion and yet only 22% of the campuses reported that this is the actual practice for most searches on their campus. A majority of the campuses (15 of 18) reported that search committees are formed in the fall semester. Some of the reasons given for this include that searches are still active in the spring, there may be retirements in the summer prompting the need to reorganize committees, positions are not available in the spring, new faculty get to vote on the committee structure, and departments have other priorities in the spring. Of the Senators responding, **73.5%** agreed or strongly agreed with this suggestion, however only 16.7% of the Senators reported that this was the case for their campus. 77.8% of the AVP/P's felt that the current practice on their campus was effective while only 52% of the Senators shared this belief.

- **Campuses should prepare an easily understandable workbook describing the recruitment process. This workbook should be given to all selection committee members.**

88.9% of the AVP/P group strongly agreed or agreed with this suggestion and 67% reported that their campus currently has such a workbook. **88.2%** of the Senators strongly agreed or agreed with this suggestion with 57.7% of the Senators reporting that this was the practice on their campus. 77.8% of AVP/P's reported that they believed current practices are effective while only 58.3% of the Senators felt this way.

- **There should be a training session held annually on the campus for search committee chairs.**

83.3% of AVP/P's responding either strongly agreed or agreed with this suggestion, but only 50% of the campuses indicated that this was their practice. **76.5%** of Senators responding either strongly agreed or agreed with this suggestion, but only 37% believed that this was the practice on their campus. 72.2% of the AVP/P's felt that their current process was effective, while 63.2% of the Senators felt this way.

Practices Related to Media/Communications and Process

- **Departments should develop recruiting literature to mail to doctoral degree granting institutions in the disciplines for which they are recruiting. These brochures should focus on items such as: strengths of the departments, benefits of a career in the departments, and interests and accomplishments of the faculty.**

61.1% of AVP/P's strongly agreed or agreed that departments should develop recruiting brochures, however only 22.2% report that this is currently being done for most searches on their campus. One argument given against development of such brochures was that information is available on the department website. **62.5%** of the Senators agreed that departments should develop such brochures while only 14.3% reported that this is currently being done for most searches on their campus. 61.1% of AVP/P's felt that the current practice on their campus was effective while only 50% of the Senators shared this opinion.

- **Positions should, wherever possible, be advertised with an open rank to provide flexibility in hiring an outstanding individual at any rank.**

83.3% of the AVP/P's either **somewhat disagreed or disagreed** with this suggestion and only 11.1% indicated that this was the approach taken on their campus. Objections given to this idea included the fact that hiring is budget driven, positions are approved for a specific rank, a concern about inflation of entry-level ranks, and advertising for positions with an open rank creates an uneven playing field. **58.8%** of the Senators responding either **strongly agreed or agreed** with this suggestion but only 3.6% indicated that this was the approach taken on their campus. 100% of the AVP/P's believed their process was effective, but only 39.1% of the Senators felt this way.

Given the mixed reaction of the two groups, the Faculty Flow Committee has revised this recommendation to be: **In demonstrably hard to hire disciplines, campuses should seriously consider advertising positions with an open rank to provide flexibility in hiring.** The motivation for this is that it is possible a department may be attractive to an individual who is already at the rank of associate or full professor. By limiting a position announcement to a specific rank (e.g. assistant professor) this effectively precludes any faculty who are at a higher rank from applying for that position.

- **Campuses should attempt to limit to 10 days or less the time between a department recommendation and sending an offer letter.**

100% of AVP/P's strongly agreed or agreed that campuses should meet this goal. 88.9% of the campuses reported that they regularly accomplish this goal. **93.9%** of the Senators responding either strongly agreed or agreed with this suggestion but only 52.4% felt that

this was regularly accomplished on their campus. 83.3% of the AVP/P's felt that the practice on their campus was effective, while only 48% of the Senators felt this way.

Practices Related to Planning

- **Campuses should collect data on a discipline specific basis to project retirements and FERP's for the upcoming five-year period.**

76.5% of AVP/P's responding either strongly agreed or agreed with this recommendation, however only 64.7% of the campuses reported that they actually do so. **100%** of the Senators responding either strongly agreed or agreed with this recommendation, but only 36% of respondents believed that this was done on their campus. Only 47.0% of the AVP/P's and 52.2% of the Senators responding believed that the current practice on their campus was effective.

- **Campuses should conduct surveys of departing faculty members to identify the reasons why they are leaving the campus.**

82.4% of the AVP/P's responding either strongly agreed or agreed with this idea, however only 33.3% report that they regularly do this. **85.3%** of Senators responding either strongly agreed or agreed with having exit interviews, but only 39.1% believed that this was done on their campus. 66.7% of AVP/P's report that they believe the practice on their campus is effective while only 47.4% of Senators share this opinion.

Practices Related to Recruitment Assistance

- **Campuses should provide adequate resources to assist in obtaining work visa for international faculty who have been offered employment.**

76.5% of the AVP/P's responding either strongly agreed or agreed with this suggestion and 76.5% of respondents indicated that this was the case on their campus. **87.5%** of Senators responding either strongly agreed or agreed with this suggestion and 61.5% of the Senators believed that this was the practice on their campus. 76.5% of the AVP/P's and 75% of the Senators responding believed that the practice on their campus was adequate.

- **Other issues:**

Reimbursement for moving expenses:

All but one campus responding indicated that there is an allowance for moving expenses. These allowances ranged from $1,000 to $5,000.

Housing assistance:

Only four of the campuses indicated that they provided any type of housing assistance and only 23.5% of Senators responding believed that this was the case on their campus.

Assistance in connection with spousal or partner employment:

61.1% of the campuses indicated that they have provided some assistance in connection with spousal employment, normally on a case by case basis.

Suggestions from Campuses

The survey conducted by the Faculty Flow Committee also asked for campuses to make suggestions that would improve the recruitment process. Among the suggestions made by campus AVP/P's were as follows:

- **Campuses should have an informational website for prospective faculty.**
- **Campuses should obtain lists of Forgivable Loan recipients in the discipline being advertised.**
- **Provide new faculty with departmental mentors.**
- **Campuses should offer newly hired faculty a reduced teaching load.**

Conclusions Related to Recommended "Best Practices"

Nearly all of the suggestions made by the Faculty Flow Committee seem to have widespread endorsement and appear to be the current practice on most campuses. Specifically, with the exception of the suggestion that positions should, wherever possible, be advertised with an open rank, a majority of the AVP/P's either strongly agreed or agreed with the suggestions made by the Faculty Flow Committee. For all suggestions made, a majority of Senators either strongly agreed or agreed with the suggestions made by the Faculty Flow Committee.

For all suggestions with the exception of collecting data over an upcoming five-year period relative to projecting retirements and FERP's, a majority of AVP/P's indicated that they believe that the current practice on their campus is effective. From the standpoint of the faculty (as measured by Senators responses), the picture does not look as positive. Specific areas where a majority of the Senators felt that the current practice was not effective include: the timing of when hiring allocations are given to departments, hiring flexibility in terms of rank, the time required to process an offer, and the information gathering as to why individuals leave campus employment.

Every campus has a unique size, location, atmosphere, etc. Hence, we recognize that each of the campuses must personalize their recruiting practices and policies to their particular circumstances. Thus we recognize that our recommended list of "best practices" may not be universally endorsed by all campuses. Our hope is that campuses will review their policies and procedures in light of the above analysis to determine what elements of their recruitment programs reduce their effectiveness and that they will then develop positive approaches to improve their recruiting endeavors.

Section 4 -- CSU System Office Action

Much of what can be done to improve the recruitment and retention process can be accomplished by actions taken at the system level. The following paragraphs discuss issues that are of concern to the process and actions that can be taken at the system level to assist in improving success.

Recruitment Process

One of the challenges facing a department in recruiting faculty is in getting its position announcements advertised. While the Chronicle of Higher Education may be an appropriate vehicle for advertising administrative jobs as well as some more senior faculty positions, many departments believe that a better form of advertising positions rest in professional society publications. Unfortunately, such publications are fairly expensive to advertise in and departments may be reluctant to pay for such outlets. One possible approach, for those hard-to hire disciplines would be for the CSU to purchase professional society advertisements listing all campuses for which there are academic openings. The advertisements could give a brief description of the positions available for each campus together with URL links giving further details.

To give an indication of the potential savings/benefit from such an activity, a one quarter-page advertisement in Decision Line, a newsletter of the Decision Sciences Institute, in 2002 cost $308, an amount many departments would be reluctant to spend for a placement ad. A full- page advertisement, which could be used to list all CSU positions in business, would have cost $704.

Along similar lines, the CSU could sponsor an information table or a reception at major conferences in fields for which recruitment has been challenging. This seems particularly worthwhile for conferences that are being held in California, as conference attendees will already have had an opportunity to see our state. Such activities could be useful in disseminating useful information about teaching at the CSU. While the success of such endeavors must be assessed, it is important to realize that the results of such activities may take some time to become apparent. For example a booth at the national Decision Sciences conference (held in California in 2002) cost $690.

We note that the CSU is already doing some system-wide advertising. Specifically, the system has taken out an advertisement in the Chronicle of Higher Education listing the campuses that have positions open. Additionally, links to job opportunities on each campus can be found on the Internet at the web site maintained by the Chancellors Office, http://www.calstate.edu/faculty_staff/employment.shtml. The CSU also funds a CSU Employment Bulletin Board web site, http://csueb.sfsu.edu/, with job announcements for faculty and upper-level administrative positions at all 23 campuses, searchable by campus and by discipline. The Employment Bulletin Board received 446,007 hits and 113,478 pages were viewed in September 2002. In October 2002, the Bulletin Board received 436,551 hits and 118,136 pages were viewed. On-line advertisements have also been placed at http://higheredjobs.com/. Postings on HigherEdJobs.com came up in 5770 searches and were viewed by 340 unique visitors in September 2002.

Another area in which recruitment is affected is the dual career family. In such cases a department may be interested in one spouse and there may be no work available for the other spouse. This is frequently the case where both spouses have academic careers. In some cases, an accommodation has been made between departments within the same campus. An expansion of such efforts to the system level would certainly be feasible for campuses in the Los Angeles, San Diego, or Bay Area. This type of effort may require a modification of affirmative action hiring policies to give preference to spouses. It may also require some incentive provided by the system to facilitate such a program.

Given the comments made by individuals who accepted as well as rejected offers from CSU campuses, it seems worthwhile that the CSU Human Resources Department publish a brochure listing faculty benefits specifically targeted for faculty recruits.

In summary, the Faculty Flow Committee recommends the system office undertake the following actions with respect to recruitment:

- **For disciplines in which there is low success rate in recruiting, have CSU take out advertisements in appropriate professional journals. These ads would list the campuses for which openings are available with a brief description of such openings and a URL giving further details. This would be a cost effective way in which departments could publicize openings.**

- **For disciplines in which there is low success rate in recruiting, have CSU, on an experimental basis, sponsor an information table and/or reception at major national conferences on an experimental basis. There should be sufficient follow up to determine whether these activities have been successful in the recruiting effort.**

- **Departments should work with other CSU departments (including those on sister campuses) in placement of faculty spouses looking for university employment. Affirmative action policies should be modified to give priority to the hiring of faculty spouses.**

- **CSU should publish a brochure highlighting faculty benefits that would be targeted to individuals being recruited on CSU campuses.**

Retirements

The large number of faculty members who will be retiring over the next ten-year period presents a wonderful opportunity for the CSU to utilize a wealth of talent. While faculty are generally interested in retirement because it provides an opportunity to pursue options unavailable during the normal work period (e.g. travel), it is believed that many faculty would be interested in participating in short duration projects that would engage them creatively. Such projects could consist of the development of distance learning courses (or even teaching such courses) or other forms of curriculum development. Perhaps retired faculty might be interested in becoming visiting faculty members for a semester on a sister campus. Certainly, it is anticipated that many faculty members would be willing to provide service to their home campus if asked to do so.

To get a sense of the extent to which retired faculty would be interested in being engaged in CSU related activities, it is recommended that the system and individual campuses work with ERFA in publicizing possible initiatives that could involve retired faculty members.

- **The Chancellor's Office and individual campuses should work with ERFA in engaging emeriti faculty in activities that would be of benefit to both the CSU and the individual faculty member.**

Section 5 – Actions for Consideration by CSU Trustee Committees

Based on the surveys completed, as well as discussions with administrators and faculty, the Faculty Flow Committee has identified several factors that affect recruitment, retirements, and retention which would require action by the CSU Board of Trustees. They require action by the Trustees due to the fact they involve bargaining with representative unions and/or legislative reform. These are as follows:

Workload:

Workload is the most often cited reason faculty candidates give for rejecting offers from CSU campuses. The joint Senate, CSU, and CFA Taskforce on Workload as well as the ACR 73 Task Force acknowledged this concern. While workload can be defined in many dimensions (e.g. total number of hours worked, number of course preparations, classroom size, etc.), it appears that based on any reasonable measure, faculty in the CSU have a significantly higher workload than those faculty in peer institutions.

For example, according to the Comparable Faculty Workload Report, faculty in the CSU spend, on average, significantly more hours in on-campus work than those in peer institutions (50.28 versus 47.25). This same report shows that CSU faculty in comparison to those in peer institutions, teach, on average, significantly more classes (3.41 versus 2.74), significantly more units (9.35 versus 7.05), significantly more student credit units (264.99 versus 227.55 for the fall term and 232.16 versus 174.29 for the spring term), and significantly more students (102.29 versus 86.34 for the spring and 104.35 versus 80.40 for the fall). Additionally, on average CSU faculty teach a significantly greater number of different as well as new course preparations than those in peer institutions.

- **Because the CSU competes for faculty on a national basis, it is critical that its workload be comparable with national norms. The Faculty Flow Committee recommends that the Trustees take an active role in reforming how the system defines a normal workload and work towards reducing the current normal teaching load of 12 WTU's so that it is in line with the norms of our peer institutions**.

Salaries:

If the CSU is going to maintain a quality faculty then they must be willing to pay competitive salaries. The preliminary parity figures projected by the California Postsecondary Education Commission for 2003-04 shows that CSU faculty salaries

are currently 8% behind the established comparison institutions and that the lag projected for 2003-2004 is 12%, assuming an increase for the comparison institutions and none for the CSU. In the survey of faculty who accepted and rejected offers from CSU campuses it is noted that 55.41% of the applicants who turned down an offer of employment in the CSU indicated that they had been offered a higher salary elsewhere. This same survey indicated that a higher salary elsewhere was cited as a reason for declining an offer by a CSU campus by 22.32% of respondents. When coupled with the 19.24% of respondents who cited that the cost of living was too high and the 23.21% of respondents who cited that they had received a better offer elsewhere, it is clear that salary is a major factor in recruiting success rates.

Because of the cap placed on salaries at the assistant and associate professor levels, in some hard to hire disciplines, faculty recruits have received an offer at associate rather than assistant (or full rather than associate) in order to offer compensation at a comparable level to peer institutions. The Faculty Flow Committee believes that this devaluation of rank is not healthy and could be avoided by removing salary caps for all faculty ranks.

- **As with workload, because we are competing on a national basis, salaries must be comparable to those offered by peer institutions. It is not enough that starting salaries be competitive, salaries must be competitive for all ranks. The Faculty Flow Committee recommends that the Trustees work to increase CSU faculty salaries to a level at which they are comparable with those offered faculty in peer institutions.**

- **The Faculty Flow Committee also recommends that salary caps should be eliminated for all ranks. This will provide departments and colleges with the flexibility to offer competitive salaries without the need to devalue rank.**

Housing:

While the analysis of housing costs compared to recruiting success indicated that campuses in high housing cost areas do not have a significantly different success rate in recruiting than campuses in low housing cost areas, one should not draw the conclusion that the cost of housing is not an important factor in recruiting success. For example, while location was the most frequently cited reason given by candidates who accepted offers (60.77%), 19.64% of candidates who rejected offers gave the high cost of living and 18.75% of such candidates cited location as a reason. An important explanation for these attitudes is that approximately half the respondents who accepted offers from CSU campuses were already living in California. For example, we note that in the four year period of 1998-2001, between 16.1% and 22.7% of new CSU hires came from the lecturer rank on the same campus. Hence, while housing costs may not be perceived as a significant employment barrier to

individuals already living in California, it appears that California's high housing costs do play a significant role in an out of state candidate's decision regarding whether to accept an offer from a CSU campus. Therefore, if the CSU wishes to be successful in competing on a national basis, it appears that some type of housing assistance program is needed. While a number of individual campuses should be commended for their attempts to develop faculty housing programs, the Faculty Flow Committee believes that a comprehensive systemwide program is necessary.

The Faculty Flow Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees develop a comprehensive program to assist faculty in addressing the high cost of housing in many regions of California. Such a program may include low-cost loans to cover down payments for home purchase and subsidized mortgages.

Benefits:

A variety of improvements in benefits are utilized in the private sector to enhance recruitment and retention. While the CSU generally has good benefits, the Faculty Flow Committee believes that there are certain benefits offered employees that may impair recruiting success. For example, faculty who are initially hired into the CSU must wait a month before they are eligible for health insurance. Also, the fact that faculty in the CSU are forced into the PERS retirement system may be detrimental in attracting faculty who have a substantial investment made in a portable retirement system such as TIAA/CREF. Additionally, while faculty who are being recruited for a new position may not be thinking about sabbatical and other leaves, it is important that the CSU follow national norms with regards to such leaves so that we are successful in our retention efforts.

In looking at the overall benefit package offered to faculty in the CSU, the Faculty Flow Committee recommends that the Trustees consider the following possible modifications as means to enhance recruitment and retention efforts in the CSU.

- **Provide support for campus based childcare and eldercare facilities.**
- **Provide health insurance for new faculty immediately upon date of appointment.**
- **Develop more attractive benefits for faculty and dependents. Such benefits might include an enhanced college finance program for faculty dependents, subsidies for child care or elder care, greater maternity and paternity leave, and enhanced health, vision, dental, and long term care over and above those currently being offered by PERS.**
- **Provide new hires with the option of going into either PERS or a defined contribution plan such as TIAACREF.**
- **Create an enhanced leaves program for faculty.**

Bibliography

Academic Senate Documents

"The California State University at the Beginning of the 21st Century", September 7, 2001.

CSU Documents

"An Analysis of the Use of Tenured and Tenure-Track and Lecturer Faculty in the California State University", February 2002.
"Comparable Faculty Workload Report", January, 2003.
"CSU Analysis of Staffing Changes and Program Expenditures 1995 – 2000" February 2002.
"CSU Faculty Flow Survey Report", January 2003.
"CSU Housing Needs Assistance Survey".
"Profile of CSU Employees", Fall 2000.
"Report on Faculty Recruitment Survey 1998 & 1999", November 2000.
"Report on Faculty Recruitment Survey 2000", September 2001.
"Report on Faculty Recruitment Survey 2001", May 2002.
"Response to ACR 73 (Strom-Martin) A Plan to Increase the Percentage of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty in the California State University", July 2002.
"Support Budget 2002-2003, The California State University".

Other

Abhold, R., Dutton, B., Fasse, W., Hanna, M., Henson, C., Nordstrom, R., Shaw, J., and Shipley, K., "Rebuilding the Faculty – A Report to the Academic Senate from the University Budget Committee (CSU Fresno), May 2000.
"CSUF Faculty – A Statistical Snapshot", August 2002.
"Faculty Retirement: Loss or Opportunity", NEA Higher Education Research Center Update, Vol. 7, No. 5, December 2001.
"Faculty Salaries at California's Public Universities, 2002-03", Higher Education Update Number UP/02-1, California Postsecondary Education Commission, February 2002.
Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M.D., and Austin, A. E., "Heeding New Voices – Academic Careers for a New Generation", Inquiry # 7, AAHE, 2000.
Vidoli, V., "Draft Concept Paper on Instructional Post-Doctoral Fellowship Program: A Joint CSU/UC Initiative", 2000.