

The Regents of the University of California

**COMMITTEE ON LONG RANGE PLANNING  
COMMITTEE ON COMPENSATION**

March 18, 2009

The Committees on Long Range Planning and Compensation met on the above date at the Commons, Riverside Campus.

Members present:     Representing the Committee on Long Range Planning: Regents Kozberg, Marcus, Reiss, Schilling, Scorza, and Shewmake; Ex officio members Blum and Yudof; Advisory members Croughan and Nunn Gorman; Staff Advisors Abeyta and Johansen  
Representing the Committee on Compensation: Regents Cole, Johnson, Kozberg, Lozano, Pattiz, and Varner; Ex officio members Blum and Yudof; Advisory members Croughan and Stovitz

In attendance:       Regents Bass, De La Peña, Gould, Makarechian, and Ruiz, Regent-designate Bernal, Faculty Representative Powell, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Investment Officer Berggren, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Vacca, Interim Provost Pitts, Executive Vice Presidents Darling and Lapp, Senior Vice President Stobo, Vice Presidents Dooley and Sakaki, Chancellors Birgeneau, Bishop, Block, Blumenthal, Fox, Kang, Vanderhoef, White, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Smith

The meeting convened at 1:40 p.m. with Committee on Long Range Planning Chair Kozberg presiding.

**ANNUAL ACCOUNTABILITY SUB-REPORT ON FACULTY COMPETITIVENESS**

[Background material was mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Interim Provost Pitts stated that this accountability sub-report on faculty competitiveness is one in a series of accountability reports to be presented to Regents on an annual basis. Dr. Pitts observed that the University has superb faculty at each campus and believed that this level of quality will be maintained, at least for the time being. The number of UC faculty in prestigious societies and who have won the world's highest prizes in academia remains high.

Dr. Pitts discussed the top 20 schools from which the University recruits its faculty. The top four schools are the private institutions that are included in the University's top eight comparison institutions: Stanford, Harvard, Yale, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The remaining 16 are among the finest institutions in the country, indicating that the University is sufficiently sought by top flight faculty. Faculty are attracted to the University for a variety of reasons. They are drawn by UC's centers of excellence and its outstanding faculty and students. It is widely

believed that the state of California values the University and that the California Master Plan for Higher Education is a beneficial arrangement for the University. The system of shared governance between the faculty and administration is viewed as strong and considered a valuable feature of a faculty appointment. Employment benefits at the University are good. Finally, the locations of UC campuses and the intellectual stimulation that exists both on the campuses and in their surroundings contribute to a rich life for faculty.

Faculty Representative Croughan discussed how the shared governance structure between the Regents, the President, and the Academic Senate is one of the main building blocks of quality at the University and contributes to UC's ability to both recruit and retain faculty. A second building block of quality at the University is a faculty salary scale program that is common across the campuses, which allows the campuses to strive for the same level of excellence but also to adjust as needed in consideration of market forces. The University is unique among most institutions in that it requires repeated post-tenure review. Ms. Croughan explained that faculty are reviewed every two years prior to tenure and every three years once they have reached the status of full Professor. A third building block of quality is a common academic personnel manual used by all the campuses to advise on faculty procedures.

Dr. Pitts next discussed faculty titles, noting that of the almost 19,000 faculty members at the University, approximately 11,700 are in the professorial range and members of the Academic Senate, and just over one-third are in the health sciences. Ms. Croughan described the various categories within the faculty series, which are a common source of confusion. Academic Senate members are comprised of the following categories: Professor, Professor – Recalled, Lecturer with Security of Employment, Acting Professor, Acting Associate Professor, Professor in Residence, and Professor of Clinical "X." The first two categories are tenured, ladder-rank faculty, and Lecturer with Security is similar to a tenured position; the remaining titles do not confer tenure. She noted that the number of tenured faculty varies across the campuses, and tenured faculty are in the minority within the health sciences. All Academic Senate members are evaluated on and expected to excel in the three areas of research or other scholarly activities, teaching, and public service. Ms. Croughan described the experience of a typical UC faculty member, expounding on how the University's faculty system is highly flexible in its ability to accommodate faculty members' diverse interests and activities and to fulfill the University's diverse needs.

Ms. Croughan turned to the issue of faculty salaries. The current average faculty salary on the general campuses is \$113,226, which lags the "comparison eight" institutions by 9.5 percent and the four private institutions within that group more considerably. Recalling that it is mostly from the top four private institutions that UC recruits, she argued that these institutions' salary packages are the most relevant in understanding the University's recruitment and retention challenges.

Dr. Pitts observed that UC salaries have drifted lower than the comparison eight salaries, resulting in a gap that began around 2001 and that has continued to widen. He called attention to the four-year faculty salary plan approved by Regents in 2007, which was not funded beyond the first year, noting that this lack of funding exacerbates the gap between the University and the comparison eight institutions. While the extent of the gap is not clear at this time because the

other institutions are also instituting salary freezes, the University is still substantially below the comparison eight institutions and there is no immediate plan to address the gap.

Dr. Pitts described the funding for faculty salaries, over half of which comes from State sources, approximately one-third from clinical services, and approximately ten percent from government contracts. While funding for faculty salaries comes from multiple sources, funding from the State is absolutely essential. Further, faculty leverage State funds in order to secure other sources of funding, such as grants; in this way, the State receives a good return for the funding it provides for faculty salaries.

Ladder-rank faculty teach approximately half of the University's lower-division undergraduate courses, over half of the upper-division courses, and the vast majority of graduate courses. Ms. Croughan stated that this faculty workload allocation data has been consistent for over 20 years, but may change in the future. Dr. Pitts explained that lecturers' salaries are not guaranteed beyond a one-year contract, thus making lecturers a vulnerable population as the campuses seek to reduce budgets. Employing fewer lecturers on the campuses would change significantly the faculty workload allocation. While the campuses are addressing faculty hiring in different ways, Dr. Pitts noted that virtually all campuses have instituted a freeze or a substantial reduction in faculty hiring, which poses a risk for ladder-rank faculty numbers as well.

Regarding the age distribution of faculty, the data from 1990 to 2007 reveal that many faculty members will be retiring soon, resulting in a need to replace a substantial number of faculty members in the next decade. While in the past it was cost-effective to allow a faculty member to retire and replace him or her with an assistant professor at a lower salary, in the current environment faculty recruitment packages are very expensive, as noted by Chancellor Birgeneau in his earlier presentation on UC Berkeley's strategic plan. Ms. Croughan called attention to the fact that the baby boom cohort of retiring faculty also will be entering the University of California Retirement Plan in the next 10 to 15 years. On the positive side, however, the fact that many faculty members will retire soon affords the University an opportunity to increase faculty diversity.

Dr. Pitts stated that faculty diversity remains something of a challenge. Many campuses have put forth initiatives to increase diversity, including devoting resources and personnel to address diversity issues. Noting that approximately 70 percent of the University's faculty are men and 8 percent are underrepresented minorities, he recognized that Regents have expressed their concern over the issue of diversity and interest in the direction being taken. He assured Regents that the University is taking this concern seriously. Faculty diversity is a problem that is addressed over many years and improves slowly. The University has the same proportion of male and female faculty members as the approximately 75 institutions in the American Association of Universities (AAU). Over time, the University slowly has increased the proportion of faculty who are women, but more improvement needs to be made. Regarding underrepresented minorities, the University fares marginally better than other AAU institutions, and its proportion of Asian American faculty is higher on average than at those institutions. Marginal but real gains have been made over the decades in the representation of underrepresented minorities. While recognizing, then, that the University is better than its peers on this measure, Dr. Pitts questioned whether the benchmark is too low and believed that UC can

and should make further progress. Dr. Pitts discussed the limited educational pipeline for minority faculty, noting that for some disciplines UC's rate of hiring women and minorities is slightly better than the pipeline from which it draws, but that in other disciplines it is not as good.

Ms. Croughan then discussed the reasons why tenured faculty leave the University, using data from annual surveys conducted with department chairs. The top reasons include the acceptance of an administrative position outside UC, the opportunity to work with faculty in areas of specialization at other institutions, low UC salaries, family issues such as spousal employment or the desire to send children to private schools in view of the poor K-12 system in California, and the perceived lack of State support for the University. She stated that the Academic Senate's priorities for the University are the health of the retirement program, graduate student support, implementation of the faculty salary plan, and diversity among faculty, staff, and students.

Ms. Croughan expressed her desire to acknowledge publicly the following people from the division of Academic Affairs in the Office of the President who did considerable work to assemble the data and metrics for the presentation: Vice Provost Daniel Greenstein, Interim Executive Director Patricia Price, Coordinator James Litrownik, Associate Director Janet Lockwood, and Director Todd Greenspan.

Regent Bass asked which groups were included in the category of underrepresented minorities and if the data is disaggregated. Dr. Pitts responded that the group is comprised of African Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans; he will provide the disaggregated information to her.

Committee on Compensation Chair Varner expressed his concern about the future and asked for Ms. Croughan's analysis of the situation, assuming that there are not major changes to the level of State support. She observed that all institutions are facing the same national financial crisis and that many are instituting hiring or salary freezes, which may be positive in that UC faculty will not find better opportunities at other institutions easily. She recalled that the salary reductions of the 1990s caused many faculty members to leave the University, but she does not envision that same scenario now.

Committee on Long Range Planning Chair Kozberg asked for data broken down by discipline regarding faculty retention and whether there is migration from some disciplines to others. Dr. Pitts stated that the deans of the graduate schools have noticed that the University is beginning to change; for example, the size of the faculty and the foci of humanities, which were the traditional components of a university education, are smaller now. In recognizing the need for graduates in certain areas, campus resources have slowly shifted to some areas; he will provide specific data on this. Ms. Croughan added that federal funding also contributes to the shift from some departments to others, pointing out that more significant declines are happening in the humanities than in other areas. Dr. Pitts explained that in a time of growth overall at an institution, some programs may not grow or may grow at a slower rate. During very difficult economic times, a program that is already marginal in size may not endure the loss of one or two faculty members. He reported that in this financial environment, campuses are questioning the viability of some programs and may choose to devote more resources to a program if its loss were a possibility. President Yudof suggested looking at attrition rates by discipline over a

20-year period to assess whether there is a marked decrease recently or whether declines are linked to salary differentials.

Ms. Croughan pointed out that tuition programs are a significant factor contributing to attrition rates; other universities offer tuition coverage for dependents of faculty members at their institution or an equivalent or lesser amount at another institution. She stated that she would provide information in response to Committee Chair Kozberg's question as to whether other public institutions offer tuition programs.

Regent Scorza asked what progress has been made on the implementation of the recommendations made by the Study Group on University Diversity. Dr. Pitts explained that because faculty turnover is very slow, changing the overall number of faculty from diverse backgrounds is harder than changing processes. Campus practices are shifting at a more rapid rate than the numbers indicate. For example, at the Berkeley campus, resources have been clustered for diversity efforts into one office under the Vice Chancellor – Equity and Inclusion. A cadre of people on each campus is focusing on diversity issues differently and is working to create an environment where change is possible; tools are in place now to address diversity issues that did not exist several years ago. Regent Scorza asked if a plan were in place to show, by measurable factors, progress in diversity and how the University is improving. Dr. Pitts replied that he intends to ask the campuses to put metrics on their diversity plans in order to begin to measure changes in performance, such as what proportion of women and underrepresented minorities are in the pool for faculty searches.

Regent Ruiz recalled that there were no candidates of Latino descent for any of the three chancellor searches in which he participated. He expressed his strong opinion that the issue of diversity at the University is a serious concern and that progress must be made. In response, Ms. Croughan discussed pipeline issues, noting that the poor high school graduation rates among Hispanic and African American males limits their numbers in the undergraduate population and ultimately the pipeline for faculty positions. The University's efforts in K-12 reach are targeted for those groups. She stated the importance of support services for underrepresented faculty members who are at risk of burning out early in their careers due, in part, to the pressure on them to be role models and mentors for minority students. Further, minority faculty members are in high demand nationally and so are some of the hardest to retain. She agreed with the Regents' comments that diversity is a crucial and difficult issue, and affirmed that the University is working to address it.

Committee Chair Kozberg asked that the University work with recruiters to ensure that the faculty search pools are large enough to ensure greater diversity.

Regent Reiss stated that there is a strong public perception that the reason the University is so exceptional is due to its high-quality faculty. Recalling that one of the reasons for faculty attrition is the poor quality of K-12 in California, she suggested that the campuses start K-12 charter schools, which could be offered as an option for faculty members' children and for students in the poor neighborhoods of the region that do not have quality public schools. Regarding diversity of faculty and the pools available, she suggested that it may be helpful to survey the institutions that are more successful at recruiting minorities to enter the pool as well

as underrepresented minority faculty members regarding why they are selecting those institutions over the University.

Ms. Croughan stated that similar surveys were conducted five years ago. The number one reason cited for selecting other institutions at that time was that there were more minorities at other institutions than at UC. Hence, universities must create a critical mass of underrepresented minorities. The second reason was recruitment packages. Most universities are not under the limits imposed by Proposition 209, which does not allow offering some racial groups better packages than others. Ms. Croughan indicated that Regent Emeritus Preuss was instrumental in starting the charter school at the San Diego campus; she believed that the Irvine and Los Angeles campuses were also in the process of starting charter schools, or at minimum are undertaking considerable outreach in the community as an initial step.

Faculty Representative Powell added that the graduates from the Preuss School are highly sought by other higher education institutions across the country, illustrating a systemic problem with diversity when there is a small pool of available people who are immensely competitive.

Regent Makarechian inquired about the age distribution of faculty and whether the high number of faculty around age 50 is of concern, especially given that they may be distinguished faculty. Dr. Pitts replied that it is a concern, particularly the potential loss in their value as distinguished faculty. He explained that while, on average, retirement is a positive step for faculty members whose productivity may be diminishing with age, many faculty in the older age group represent a very valuable part of the University's overall faculty. Dr. Pitts noted also that retiring faculty are not always replaced by assistant professors; often tenured faculty are recruited who may be only 10 years younger than the faculty members they are replacing. Overall, the demographics indicate that the University will need to undertake a great deal of faculty hiring in the next 10 to 15 years at a time when funding to sponsor new hires is more difficult to secure.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff