

University of California
Report on
Faculty Recruitment (2004-05) and Retention (2003-04) Survey

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 January 2005 the campuses were notified of the impending electronic survey and asked to provide lists of all faculty hires and resignations meeting the survey criteria. The data were then obtained via secure web-based survey instruments completed by department chairs, department staff, and occasionally deans or academic personnel officers whose responsibilities include academic recruitment and retention.

Faculty included in the recruitment survey were all ladder-rank hires reported by the campuses whose appointments would become effective between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005, most of whom were recruited during the 2003-04 academic year.¹ 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 543 hires; a significant increase from the 319 hires in the last recruitment survey. A response rate of 82% provides information for 447 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 would become effective between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005, most of whom were recruited during the 2003-2004 academic year. A list of hires was provided by each campus' Academic Personnel Office. Departments whose appointments were effective in the latter part of the 2004-2005 academic year may not have been on the list and therefore would not have been included in the report.

The retention survey included all ladder-rank faculty reported by the campuses whose resignation from the UC system was effective between July 1, 2003 and June 30, 2004.² In surveys prior to the 1996-97 report, the retention population included only resignations from the tenured ranks. To continue 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 this year's retention survey included 104 faculty, of which 80 were resignations from the tenured ranks. A response rate of 88 percent provided information (on retention efforts, reasons for leaving, and destinations) for 91 resignations, of which 70 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.

2004-05 Recruitment Profile³

There were 543 new ladder-rank faculty recruitments included in the 2004-05 recruitment survey, significantly more than the 319 reported in the 1999-00 survey. Of these new hires:

- 64 percent were men and 36 percent were women, a higher percentage (increase from 23 percent) of women than in 1999-00. (Table 1A)

² The target population for the retention survey was all ladder rank faculty whose resignation was effective between July 1, 2003 and June 30, 2004. 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, 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.

- 68 percent (an increase of 8 percent from the prior survey) were hired as assistant professors, 10 percent as associate professors, and 23 percent as full professors. Tenured appointments were a smaller percentage of the total in 2004-05 (32 percent) than in the prior two survey years (40 percent in 1990-00, 37 percent in 1997-98). (Table 1A)
- 73 percent of the new hires at the professor rank in 2004-05 were men, as were 60 percent of new hires at the associate level. Men also accounted for 62 percent of new hires at the assistant level. As compared to the prior survey in 1999-00, the percentage of women new hires at the professor rank increased by 10 percent, at the associate level by 8 percent, and at the assistant level by 14 percent. (Table 1B)
- Arts and humanities accounted for the largest share of new hires (24 percent), followed by social science (21 percent). In 1999-00, arts and humanities accounted for only 12 percent of new hires, (behind social sciences with 23 percent and engineering and computer science with 21 percent), but has increased to become the largest share of new hires in 2004-05. (Table 2A)
- The percentage of new hires increased in health sciences from 7 percent in 1999-00 to 12 percent in 2004-05. As noted above, the percentage share of new hires increased in the arts and humanities from 12 percent in 1999-00 to 24 percent in 2004-05. The largest decline occurred in engineering and computer science where the percentage decreased from 21 percent in 1999-00 to 12 percent in 2004-05. Smaller declines may be observed in the percentage share of new hires in the life sciences and the professional schools. (Table 2A)
- Women accounted for 48 percent of new hires in the arts and humanities, 46 percent of new hires in the social sciences, and 33 percent of new hires in the professional schools. Only 20 percent of new hires in engineering and computer science and 25 percent in the physical sciences were women. Overall, 36 percent of new hires were women. (Table 2B)
- Of the new hires, 68 percent were white; 27 percent were from other ethnic groups, an increase from 25 percent in the previous report; and 5 percent were of unknown ethnicity. The largest single group included in the non-white category was Asian Americans, accounting for 18 percent of all new hires; this is similar to the 1999-00 report of 19 percent. (Table 3A)

First-Choice Hires, 2004-05

As a means to continue to assess how competitive the University is in hiring faculty of the highest caliber, survey respondents were asked whether the person hired was the department's first choice candidate. Faculty hired into a position for which a search was waived were also designated as first choice hires. 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 formal offers could be presented. The percentage of new faculty identified as first-choice hires was 89 percent in 2004-05, up from 84 percent in 1999-00 (Table 4).

The percentage of first-choice hires continue to vary by discipline, ranging from 86 percent in the social sciences to 94 percent in the life sciences (Table 5). The percentage of first-choice hires increased in all disciplines except arts and humanities between 1999-00 and 2004-05, where it fell from 100 percent to 89 percent. In the life sciences, the rate of first-choice hires increased from 79 percent to 94 percent; the rate of first-choice hires increased from 77 percent to 89 percent in the professional schools, from 81 percent to 91 percent in the engineering and computer sciences, and small incremental increases in the physical sciences and health sciences.

Hiring Incentives Offered for Appointments Effective 2004-05

Information on recruitment incentives was available for 447 hires. Survey respondents in all disciplines continue to report that the market for faculty is very competitive. As in previous years, a variety of recruitment incentives were used to attract new faculty. (Table 6A)

Research Support and Enhanced Salary. The most popular incentive was research support, received by 85 percent of new hires, similar to the 86 percent in 1999-00. Additionally, a very large percentage of new faculty hires continue to receive some type of enhanced salary (81 percent in 2004-05). Over 60 percent of all new faculty hires in 2004-05 received an above or off-scale salary, 46 percent of new hires received some type of summer salary, and 3 percent received a stipend of some sort (Table 6B).

Computers and Other Equipment. The most significant decline involved provision of a computer or equipment, a fall from 87 percent in 1999-00 to 60 percent in 2004-05. (Table 6A)

Moving Expenses. Moving expenses declined from 85.8 percent in 1999-00 to 69 percent in 2004-05.

Course Relief. Course relief was offered to 60 percent of new faculty hires in 2004-05, a decline from 68 percent in 1999-00.

Housing Assistance. Housing assistance was offered to 59 percent of all new hires in 2004-05, similar to the 1999-00 report.

Spousal Employment Assistance. The percentage of new faculty receiving spousal employment assistance (18 percent of new hires) was approximately the same as in 1999-00.

Reasons First Offer Candidates Declined Offer

Forty-nine first-offer candidates declined an offer from UC for appointments effective 2004-05. Among the reasons cited for not coming to UC were a better salary offer elsewhere, family reasons, geographical considerations and lack of affordable housing. These reasons were also cited among previous reports (Table 7).

2003-04 Retention Profile

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

The campuses reported 104 faculty resignations from the UC in 2003-04; this is slightly less than the 111 resignations reported in 1998-99. Of these, 24 were assistant professors (23 percent), 22 were associate professors (21 percent), and 58 were full professors (56 percent) (Tables 8A and 8B).

About two-thirds of the tenured faculty who resigned from the UC in 2003-04 were men, and one-third were women⁴ (Table 8A). The largest share of resignations was in the social sciences (34 percent), followed by arts and humanities (19 percent) and the physical sciences (19 percent).

Detailed information on reasons for leaving, retention efforts, and destinations was available for 91 resignations, of which 70 were separations from the tenure ranks.

Reasons given for leaving the UC in 2003-04 contrast with some of the trends observed in 1998-99 (Table 9A). For example, 40 percent of the tenured faculty who resigned in 2003-04 did so because of low salaries, compared to 22 percent who left for this reason in 1998-99 and 33 percent in 1996-97.

In almost all cases, survey respondents reported that tenured faculty members chose to leave for a combination of reasons, and often for reasons not strictly related to resources (Table 9A). Although 40 percent of the tenured faculty were reported to have left mainly due to low pay or a better offer elsewhere, 20 percent of tenured faculty left primarily for family reasons, 19 percent left because of problems with their spouse's employment and 16 percent left due to the perceived lack of support from the university. Also according to survey respondents, 59 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 31 (44 percent) of the retention cases⁵, down from 62 percent in 1998-99 (Table 10A). The faculty member's departure was rated as a moderate or serious loss in 66 cases (94 percent). A number of respondents indicated that retention efforts would have been futile given the personal nature of the departure (e.g. family considerations).

Of the tenured faculty who left the UC in 2003-04, 81 percent went to other universities, a slight decrease compared to the 87 percent reported in the prior survey year (Table 11).

⁴ About two-thirds of the tenured faculty who resigned from the UC in 2003-04 were men, and one-third were women. It is important to note the disproportionate resignations of women faculty in relation to women incumbent faculty. One-third (33 percent) of resignations in 2003-04 were women, but only 24 percent of incumbent faculty were women. Thus, the rate of women resignations in 2003-2004 exceeded the percentage of women faculty members at the time.

⁵ Efforts were made to retain tenured faculty in 31 (44 percent) of the retention cases, down from 62 percent in 1998-99. This study evaluates only instances where a faculty member left. It does not include successful retention efforts.

Nineteen percent of the tenured faculty who left the UC in 2003-04 went to another public institution in the United States, compared to 25 percent of those who resigned in 1998-99, and the percentage of tenured faculty choosing to leave the UC for a private institution in the United States did not change, 38 percent in 1998-99 and 37 percent in 2003-04. In 1998-99, nine tenured faculty members chose to move between the campuses (15 percent of tenured resignations); in 2003-04 that number had increased to 14 tenured faculty (25 percent). (Table 11)

Slight differences can be noted in comparing the reasons given for tenured faculty intercampus movement with the reasons given by those faculty who left the UC altogether (Table 13). Tenured faculty who moved from one UC campus to another were reported to have left mainly due to a better salary offer (43 percent compared to 39 percent of those who left the UC). Faculty who moved from one campus to another were also reported to have identified too much administration at their campus as a reason for the change (14 percent compared to 11 percent of those who left the UC). By contrast, the faculty who left the UC were more likely to cite the perceived lack of support from the university or housing problems as reasons for leaving than were those who moved between UC campuses.

UC Recruitment and Retention: Impediments and Strengths

Department chairs were also asked about their department's strengths and impediments in the recruitment and retention process. Several key issues were mentioned:

Location. Geographical location continues to be viewed as 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. The high cost of housing continues to be a concern, and many chairs identified housing impediments as one of the primary reasons affecting recruitment and retention.

Academic Support. The high academic national rankings of UC departments continue to be a primary strength in recruitment. And Chairs continue to identify 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, survey respondents cite that current funding problems may

limit the university's ability to attract quality graduate students. 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 continue to note the difficulties of competing over salary with other academic institutions and with industry. The current UC faculty salary scale is non-competitive and there are increased demands to hire faculty off-scale. For retention purposes, many chairs identified limited funding and resource allocation as primary impediments. Other identified problems include lack of staff support, deteriorating campus buildings and laboratories, and lack of space on campus.

Spousal/Domestic Partner and Other Family Issues. One of the frequently mentioned impediments involved spousal/domestic partner employment. Chairs identified this as a major issue, whether the spouse/domestic partner was seeking academic or non-academic professional work. They continue to acknowledge that the issue of spousal hiring is complex, involving issues of fairness and maintenance of program quality. UC's awareness of spousal employment needs has helped them in recruitment and retention, and local campus programs continue to assist in finding spousal/domestic partner employment for new hires.

List of Tables

- Table 1A: Faculty Recruitment Profile, by Gender and Rank, 1995-96 through 2004-05.
- Table 1B: Percentage of New Women Faculty Hired at Each Rank, 1999-00 through 2004-05.
- Table 2A: Percentage of New Faculty Hired by Discipline, 1995-96 through 2004-05.
- Table 2B: Percentage of New Faculty Hired in Each Discipline, by Gender, 2004-05.
- Table 3A: Percentage of New Faculty, by Ethnicity and Gender, 2004-05.
- Table 3B: Percentage of New Faculty, by Ethnicity and Gender, 1999-00.
- Table 4: Number and Percentage of New Faculty Hired as the First Choice for Their Position, 1982-83 through 2004-05.
- Table 5: Percentage of First Choice Hires, by Discipline, 1995-96 through 2004-05.
- Table 6A: Percentage of New Faculty Hires Offered Various Recruitment Incentives, 1995-96 through 2004-05.
- Table 6B: Percentage of New Faculty Hires Offered Various Types of Enhanced Salary, 2004-05.
- Table 7: Reasons First-Offer Candidates Declined Appointments Effective 1995-96 through 2004-05.
- Table 8A: Tenured Faculty Resignations Profile, by Gender, Rank, and Discipline, 1996-97 through 2003-04.
- Table 8B: Tenured and Non-Tenured Faculty Resignations Profile, by Gender, Rank, and Discipline, 2003-04.
- Table 9A: Percentage of Tenured Faculty Citing Various Reasons for Leaving the UC, 1982-83 through 2003-04.
- Table 9B: Percentage of Tenured and Non-Tenured Faculty Citing Various Reasons for Leaving the UC, 2003-04.
- Table 10A: Efforts Made to Retain Tenured Faculty Who Left the UC, 1996-97 through 2003-04.
- Table 10B: Efforts Made to Retain Tenured and Non-Tenured Faculty Who Left the UC, 2003-04.
- Table 11: Destinations of Faculty Who Left the UC, 1998-99 and 2003-04.
- Table 12: Percentage of Tenured Faculty Who Left the UC for the Specified Destinations, 1982-83 through 2003-04.
- Table 13: Comparison of the Reasons for Leaving Given by Tenured Faculty Who Left the UC Versus Those Who Moved from One UC Campus to Another, 2003-04.

Table 1A: Faculty Recruitment Profile, by Gender and Rank, 1995-96 through 2004-05

	<u>1995-96</u>		<u>1997-98</u>		<u>1999-00</u>		<u>2004-05</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender								
Men	227	67.4	216	68.8	246	77.1	349	64.3
Women	110	32.6	98	31.2	73	22.9	194	35.7
TOTAL	337	100.0	314	00.0	319	100.0	543	100.0
Rank								
Professor	75	22.3	76	24.2	88	27.6	124	22.8
Associate professor	26	7.7	40	12.7	41	12.8	52	9.6
Assistant professor	236	70.0	198	63.1	190	59.6	367	67.6
TOTAL	337	100.0	314	00.0	319	100.0	543	100.0

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Table 1B: Percentage of New Women Faculty Hired at Each Rank, 1999-00 through 2004-2005

Rank	<u>1999-00</u>				<u>2004-05</u>			
	Women		Total		Women		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Professor	15	17.0	88	27.6	34	27.4	124	22.8
Associate professor	13	31.7	41	12.8	21	40.4	52	9.6
Assistant professor	45	23.7	190	59.6	139	37.9	367	67.6
TOTAL	73	22.9	319	00.0	194	35.7	543	100.0

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Table 2A: Percentage of New Faculty Hired by Discipline, 1995-96 through 2004-05

Discipline	<u>1995-96</u>		<u>1997-98</u>		<u>1999-00</u>		<u>2004-05</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Engineering and C.S.	34	10.1	34	10.8	66	20.7	66	12.2
Arts and Humanities	88	26.1	76	24.2	39	12.2	132	24.3
Social Sciences	61	18.1	50	15.9	72	22.6	112	20.6
Life Sciences	48	14.2	45	14.3	36	11.3	41	7.6
Physical Sciences	50	14.8	39	12.4	37	11.6	76	14.0
Professional Schools	33	9.8	42	13.4	46	14.4	49	9.0
Health Sciences	23	6.8	28	8.9	23	7.2	67	12.3
TOTAL	337	100.0	314	100.0	319	100.0	543	100.0

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Table 2B: Percentage of New Faculty Hired in Each Discipline, by Gender, 2004-05

Discipline	<u>Men</u>		<u>Women</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Engineering and C.S.	53	80.3	13	19.7	66	12.2
Arts and Humanities	69	52.3	63	47.7	132	24.3
Social Sciences	61	54.5	51	45.5	112	20.6
Life Sciences	28	68.3	13	31.7	41	7.6
Physical Sciences	57	75.0	19	25.0	76	14.0
Professional Schools	33	67.3	16	32.7	49	9.0
Health Sciences	48	71.6	19	28.4	67	12.3
TOTAL	349	64.3	194	35.7	543	100.0

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Table 3A: Percentage of New Faculty, by Ethnicity and Gender, 2004-05

Ethnicity	Percentage by Gender					
	<u>Men</u>		<u>Women</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	33.3	2	66.7	3	0.6
African American	10	55.6	8	44.4	18	3.3
Chicano/Latino/Other Spanish American	16	59.3	11	40.7	27	5.0
Asian American	59	59.6	40	40.4	99	18.2
Total Non-White	86	58.5	61	41.5	147	27.1
White	244	66.3	124	33.7	368	67.8
Unknown	19	67.9	9	32.1	28	5.2
TOTAL	349	64.3	194	35.7	543	100.0

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Table 3B: Percentage of New Faculty, by Ethnicity and Gender, 1990-00

Ethnicity	Percentage by Gender					
	<u>Men</u>		<u>Women</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	100.0	0	0	1	0.3
African American	4	50.0	4	50.0	8	2.5
Chicano/Latino/Other Spanish American	4	50.0	4	50.0	8	2.5
Asian American	49	80.3	12	19.7	61	19.1
Total Non-White	58	74.4	20	25.6	78	24.5
White	182	77.8	52	22.2	234	73.4
Unknown	6	85.7	1	14.3	7	2.2
TOTAL	246	77.1	73	22.9	319	100.0

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Table 4: Number and Percentage of New Faculty Hired as the First Choice for Their Position, 1982-83 through 2004-05

	<u>1982-83</u>	<u>1984-85</u>	<u>1985-86</u>	<u>1986-87</u>	<u>1987-88</u>	<u>1988-89</u>	<u>1990-91</u>	<u>1991-92</u>	<u>1993-94</u>	<u>1995-96</u>	<u>1997-98</u>	<u>1999-00</u>	<u>2004-05</u>
First Choice Hires*													
Number	211	151	187	206	212	283	421	317	209	302	288	205	398
Percentage of all hires	72%	83%	89%	85%	84%	89%	91%	85%	88%	90%	92%	84%	89%

*Note: First choice percentage is based on the total number of responses received to the question and not on the total number of new appointments

Table 5: Percentage of First Choice Hires, by Discipline, 1995-96 through 2004-05

Discipline	<u>1995-96</u>		<u>1997-98</u>		<u>1999-00</u>		<u>2004-05</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Engineering and C.S.	32	94.0	30	88.2	38	80.9	48	90.6
Arts and Humanities	78	88.6	70	92.1	31	100.0	93	89.4
Social Sciences	53	86.9	46	92.0	46	83.6	79	85.9
Life Sciences	40	83.3	39	86.7	23	79.3	33	94.3
Physical Sciences	46	92.0	37	94.9	25	86.2	57	89.1
Professional Schools	33	100.0	39	92.9	30	76.9	49	89.1
Health Sciences	20	87.0	27	96.4	12	85.7	39	88.6
TOTAL	302	89.6	288	91.7	205	84.0	398	89.0

Table 6A: Percentage of New Faculty Hires Offered Various Recruitment Incentives, 1995-96 through 2004-05

Type of Incentive	1995-96		1997-98		1999-00		2004-05	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Research support	314	93.2	263	83.8	201	86.3	378	84.6
Enhanced salaries	308	91.4	261	83.1	188	80.7	363	81.2
Moving expenses	305	90.5	286	91.1	200	85.8	309	69.1
Course relief	238	70.6	180	57.3	159	68.2	267	59.7
Computers/equipment	323	95.8	292	93.0	203	87.1	266	59.5
Housing assistance	170	50.4	155	49.4	141	60.5	265	59.3
Facility renovation	98	29.1	101	32.2	77	33.1	95	21.3
Spousal employment assistance	86	25.5	52	16.6	40	17.2	79	17.7
Joint Appointments	34	10.1	36	11.5	12	5.2	27	6.0
Total N	337		314		233		447	

Table 6B: Percentage of New Faculty Hires Offered Various Types of Enhanced Salary, 2004-05

Type of enhanced salary	N	%
Above- or off-scale salary	277	62.0
Summer salary	207	46.3
Stipend	13	2.9
All types of enhanced salary*	363	81.2
Total N	447	

*many cases were offered more than one enhanced salary

Table 7: Reasons First-Offer Candidates Declined Appointments, 1995-96 through 2004-05

	<u>1995-96</u>		<u>1999-00</u>		<u>2004-05</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Better salary offer elsewhere	15	42.9	8	23.5	16	32.7
Family reasons	10	28.6	0	0.0	16	32.7
Geography	--	--	6	17.6	15	30.6
Housing problems	4	11.4	3	8.8	11	22.4
Inadequate facilities	2	5.7	2	5.9	7	14.3
Perceived lack of public support for UC	1	2.9	0	0.0	7	14.3
Spousal employment	8	22.9	4	11.8	6	12.2
More research money	8	22.9	1	2.9	6	12.2
Offer not made soon enough	3	8.6	2	5.9	5	10.2
Cost living other than housing	4	11.4	2	5.9	5	10.2
Too much administrative work	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	8.2
Too much teaching	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.0
Other reasons	23	65.7	7	20.6	16	32.7
TOTAL	35	100.0	34	100.0	49	100.0

Table 8A: Tenured Faculty Resignations Profile, by Gender, Rank and Discipline, 1996-97 through 2003-04

	<u>1996-97</u>		<u>1998-99</u>		<u>2003-04</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender						
Men	54	65.1	69	77.5	53	66.3
Women	29	34.9	20	22.5	27	33.8
Rank						
Professor	52	62.7	52	58.4	58	72.5
Associate Professor	31	37.3	37	41.6	22	27.5
Discipline						
Engineering and C.S.	6	7.2	5	5.6	5	6.3
Arts and Humanities	15	18.1	15	16.9	15	18.8
Social Sciences	19	22.9	26	29.2	27	33.8
Life Sciences	10	12.0	8	9.0	3	3.8
Physical Sciences	11	13.3	11	12.4	15	18.8
Professional Schools	12	14.5	11	12.4	5	6.3
Health Sciences	10	12.0	13	14.6	10	12.5
TOTAL	83	100.0	89	100.0	80	100.0

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Table 8B: Tenured and Non-Tenured Faculty Resignations Profile, by Gender, Rank, and Discipline, 2003-04

	<u>2003-04</u>	
	N	%
Gender		
Men	69	66.3
Women	35	33.7
Rank		
Professor	58	55.8
Associate Professor	22	21.2
Assistant Professor	24	23.1
Discipline		
Engineering and C.S.	6	5.8
Arts and Humanities	19	18.3
Social Sciences	36	34.6
Life Sciences	5	4.8
Physical Sciences	20	19.2
Professional Schools	7	6.7
Health Sciences	11	10.6
TOTAL	104	100.0

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Table 9A: Percentage of Tenured Faculty Citing Various Reasons for Leaving the UC, 1982-83 through 2003-04

	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1989-90	1990-91	1992-93	1994-95	1996-97	1998-99	2003-04
Low salary	59	29	44	51	31	44	38	37	48	56	33	22	40
Family reasons	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	18	23	20
Spousal employment problems	19	5	7	16	13	22	32	11	11	10	13	20	19
Perceived lack of support for UC	35	2	4	7	8	2	2	4	11	22	1	2	16
Housing problems	19	9	9	18	15	12	7	4	6	16	1	0	13
Lack of research money	33	7	9	13	15	18	11	13	14	24	4	8	11
Too much administration	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	3	11
Geography	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	16	23	11
Too much teaching	28	--	--	--	--	8	4	2	10	13	5	12	9
Better facilities elsewhere	44	10	19	33	26	12	7	6	6	21	4	5	7
Cost of living other than housing	--	--	--	--	--	2	4	2	6	16	0	8	6
Other reasons*	57	47	65	69	79	78	80	62	48	84	90	63	59

*Other reasons include acceptance of administrative office (chair, dean, provost), time off, department specialization, etc.

Table 9B: Percentage of Tenured and Non-Tenured
Faculty Citing Various Reasons for Leaving the UC, 2003-04

Low salary	37
Family reasons	18
Spousal employment problems	9
Perceived lack of support for UC	12
Housing problems	13
Lack of research money	9
Too much administration	10
Geography	4
Too much teaching	10
Better facilities elsewhere	7
Cost of living other than housing	7
Other reasons*	57

*Other reasons include accelerated promotion,
time off, department specialization, negative tenure, etc.

Table 10A: Efforts Made to Retain Tenured Faculty Who Left the UC, 1996-97 through 2003-04

	<u>1996-97</u>		<u>1998-99</u>		<u>2003-04</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total number of resignations	83	100.0	60	100.0	70	100.0
Efforts made to retain	45	54.2	37	61.7	31	44.3
Loss to department	61	73.5	39	65.0	66	94.3
Moderate loss	17	20.5	15	25.0	28	40.0
Serious Loss	44	53.0	24	40.0	38	54.3
Incentives offered to keep faculty who left*						
Enhanced salary	12	14.5	24	40.0	29	41.4
Research support	9	10.8	4	6.7	13	18.6
Accelerated promotion	13	15.7	15	25.0	9	12.9
Spousal employment	6	7.2	5	8.3	7	10.0
Housing	1	1.2	1	1.7	4	5.7
Facility renovation	1	1.2	2	3.3	3	4.3
New equipment	2	2.4	4	6.7	3	4.3
Course relief	2	2.4	5	8.3	0	0
Other	19	22.9	3	5.0	1	1.4

* many cases were offered more than one incentive

Table 10B: Efforts Made to Retain Tenured and Non-Tenured Faculty Who Left the UC, 2003-04

	<u>2003-04</u>	
	N	%
Total number of resignations	91	100.0
Efforts made to retain	36	39.6
Loss to department	79	86.9
Moderate loss	37	40.7
Serious Loss	42	46.2
Incentives offered to keep faculty who left*		
Enhanced salary	33	36.3
Research support	16	17.6
Accelerated promotion	10	11.0
Spousal employment	8	8.8
Housing	4	4.4
New equipment	4	4.4
Facility renovation	3	3.3
Course relief	0	0
Other	1	1.1

* See note, Table 11A

Table 11: Destinations of Faculty Who Left the UC, 1998-99 and 2003-04

	<u>Tenured Faculty</u>				<u>Tenured and Non-Tenured Faculty</u>	
	<u>1998-99</u>		<u>2003-04</u>		<u>2003-04</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Other universities	52	86.7	46	80.7	62	82.7
US public	15	25.0	11	19.3	19	25.3
US private	23	38.3	21	36.8	27	36.0
Other UC	9	15.0	14	24.6	16	21.3
Foreign	5	8.3	--	--	--	--
Industry	1	1.7	5	8.8	5	6.7
Other (self, government, etc.)	7	11.7	6	10.5	8	10.7
TOTAL	60	100.0	57	100.0	75	100.0

Note: Information is based on those having a known destination.

In 2003-2004, unknown destinations were reported for 16 faculty members of which 13 were tenured.

Table 12: Percentage of Tenured Faculty Who Left the UC for the Specified Destinations, 1982-83 through 2003-04

	<u>1982-83</u>	<u>1983-84</u>	<u>1984-85</u>	<u>1985-86</u>	<u>1986-87</u>	<u>1987-88</u>	<u>1989-90</u>	<u>1990-91</u>	<u>1992-93</u>	<u>1994-95</u>	<u>1996-97</u>	<u>1998-99</u>	<u>2003-04</u>
Other universities	71%	65%	62%	87%	79%	80%	75%	83%	93%	81%	82%	87%	81%
US public	31	37	17	44	33	42	43	44	48	32	19	25	19
US private	29	24	40	36	31	34	27	33	33	35	30	38	37
Other UC	11	4	6	7	15	4	5	11	9	4	21	15	25
Foreign	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	9	12	8	--
Industry	20	22	6	4	8	8	14	7	6	9	10	2	9
Other (self, government, etc.)	18	20	33	13	13	12	11	11	--	10	8	12	11
Total number of resignations	45	49	52	45	39	50	44	57	32	68	83	60	57

Note: Percentages are based on those having a known destination

Table 13: Comparison of the Reasons for Leaving Given by Tenured Faculty Who Left the UC Versus Those Who Moved from One UC Campus to Another, 2003-04

	Percentage Who Left UC	Percentage who moved between UC campuses
Reasons for Moving		
Low salary	39.3	42.9
Family reasons	21.4	14.3
Spousal employment problems	19.6	14.3
Perceived lack of support for UC	19.6	0
Housing problems	16.1	0
Lack of research money	12.5	7.1
Geography	12.5	7.1
Too much administration	10.7	14.3
Better facilities elsewhere	8.9	0
Too much teaching	8.9	7.1
Cost of living other than housing	7.1	0
Other reasons*	57.1	64.3
Total N	56	14

*Other reasons include administrative office (chair, dean, provost), time off, department specialization, etc.