

Office of the President

TO MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEES ON LONG RANGE PLANNING AND COMPENSATION:

DISCUSSION ITEM

For Meeting of March 18, 2009

ANNUAL ACCOUNTABILITY SUB-REPORT ON FACULTY COMPETITIVENESS

This presentation by the Office of the President and the Academic Council is part of the series that the Long Range Planning Committee has established in order to:

- review accountability sub-reports, each dealing in detail with key areas of the University
- discuss some of the strategic choices that need to be made for the University's future in those areas
- inform the Board's deliberations about important policy and budget questions
- achieve a richer understanding of the nature of the University's federal system

Collectively, these presentations will provide oversight and detail a comprehensive accountability framework for the University and lay the groundwork for future long-range planning that the Committee may engage in after the Board hears directly from the chancellors about the campuses' strategic plans. This presentation will highlight issues of faculty compensation and competitiveness – thus, this presentation is in a joint meeting of the Committees on Long Range Planning and Compensation.

The University of California consists of ten distinct and unique campuses; one of its historic strengths is a single faculty with a common system of hiring, promotion, and tenure criteria, a common salary scale, a common system of on-going post-tenure review, a single Academic Personnel Manual, and a long tradition of highly effective shared governance.

The role faculty undertake in their work embodies the University's missions of teaching, research, and service. The research advances scholarly knowledge. They provide service to the University, California, and the nation. Their teaching offers students a unique brand of research-oriented undergraduate, professional, and graduate education. This creation, transmission, and dissemination of knowledge by the faculty is crucial to the economic, social, and cultural development of the State and the nation.

To provide the committees with advance material prior to the presentation, a number of figures are included at the end of this item. Given time constraints, not all of these figures will be used in the actual presentation.

In addition, there are online resources that the Regents can review in advance of this presentation:

- The UC Faculty Handbook: <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/handbook/>
- The UC Academic Personnel Manual:
<http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/welcome.html>
- The draft UC Accountability Framework chapter on Faculty (Sept. 2008):
http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/documents/af_faculty.pdf

**Description of the Figures 1-25 appended to this item
(note that a glossary of terms is included in Figure 25)**

Figure 1. Number and type of faculty. There are nearly 19,000 faculty members, 12,000 Senate members, and 9,400 faculty in the professorial series (most, but not all, ladder rank faculty are in this series).

Figure 2. Relative size of the faculty by campus. There are many non-Senate faculty at campuses with large health sciences programs.

Figure 3. Faculty by discipline. UC has a high proportion of faculty in the Sciences and Engineering but a small proportion in Education compared to other public research institutions.

Figure 4. Faculty salaries by sources of support. More than half (56 percent) of faculty salaries are funded by UC's core State support, but substantial portions of support come from other sources including clinical income, research grants, and private support.

Figure 5. Student and faculty growth. UC has been experiencing substantial growth in the last decade. Students have increased by 29 percent but the size of the ladder rank faculty has increased by only 13 percent – or about 1,000 new professors. These increases actually reflect many more hires because of the need to replace retirees and faculty who leave for other institutions. During the same time period, the number of lecturers and the number of faculty in other titles has grown by over 50 percent.

Figure 6. Faculty FTE, General Campus and Health Sciences. Since 1990, the proportion of lecturers overall has remained relatively constant. There has been larger proportional growth in the “other” category, primarily in the Health Sciences.

Figure 7. Faculty FTE, General Campus. However, excluding Health Sciences and looking only at General Campus faculty, the proportion of lecturers has grown from 14 percent to about 18 percent since 1990.

Figure 8. Faculty FTE, Health Sciences. Looking only at the Health Sciences, the number of traditional faculty positions has remained relatively constant since 1990 but the number of clinical and other faculty has almost doubled. This is due in great measure to the large growth of UC's patient care and research revenues (non-state) in the Health Sciences during this period.

Figure 9. Student credit hours by faculty type and course level. This figure shows which category of faculty deliver instruction at the lower division, upper division, and graduate levels. Upper division students and graduate students tend to receive more of their direct instruction from ladder rank faculty, but the ladder rank faculty still deliver a substantial proportion of the teaching in the lower division.

Figure 10. Recruitment of new faculty. About 65 percent of UC's newly-hired faculty come from UC campuses plus about 20 other of the nation's most prestigious universities. Note that only five of the 20 institutions are public institutions, but the UC salary comparison group for Sacramento purposes is equally divided among publics and privates.

Figure 11. Retention and loss of existing faculty. Of the *tenured* faculty who leave UC before retirement, 62 percent take jobs at a very similar set of 24 institutions and other UCs. Seven of 24 are public institutions.

Figure 12. Most common reasons tenured faculty leave UC. This figure is based on a survey of new and departing faculty. Anecdotal comments suggest that the quality of the institutions is a key factor in decisions either to stay or leave.

Figure 13. Recruitment incentives offered by other institutions. This figure is based on the same survey as above. It used to be that fewer incentives were required to recruit new faculty, but now many more faculty prospects are requesting many of these and other incentives.

Figure 14. Average faculty salaries. This figure shows that the salary gap between UC and the eight comparison institutions is widening again. UC is doing particularly poorly compared to the four private institutions that used for comparison.

Figure 15. Four-year salary plan to return salaries to market. This figure shows the results of the first year of the four-year plan that was adopted to return UC faculty salaries to market. The first year adjustment reduced the salary gap according to plan. However, without additional resources this year, faculty salaries may slip back to levels similar to two years ago. The graph assumes a 1.5 percent salary increase at the other institutions. Given the current financial climate, that now may turn out to be a high estimate. If the 1.5 percent estimate proves accurate, the UC faculty salary lag would be 11.2 percent in 2009-10. Note that this figure shows salary data only because a new total remuneration study has not yet been completed.

Figure 16. Trend in faculty age distribution. The average age distribution of UC faculty has moved up substantially as the “baby boom” cohort has aged. While the 1990s early retirement incentives were designed in part to make opportunity for younger faculty, the 2007 faculty age distribution is now weighted even more heavily toward older faculty than it was in 1990. 36 percent of UC faculty members are now age 56 and older. This illustrates the major challenges facing UC in succession planning (the need to recruit large numbers of new faculty to replace retiring faculty) and in addressing retirement system issues.

Figure 17. Faculty by gender. About one-third of new hires since 1998 have been women. In the most recent two years (2006-07 and 2007-08), the proportion of female hires is 34 percent, compared to 26 percent in the two years 1998-99 and 1999-00.

Figure 18. Faculty by gender by discipline. The proportion of the current faculty who are female varies substantially by discipline, with 50 percent in Education but only 13 percent in Math, Engineering, and Computer Science.

Figure 19. Faculty hires by race and ethnicity. There has been very slight progress in the number of new faculty members hired from underrepresented groups at UC. Of the 1,130 faculty hired in the last two years with complete data, only 102 – or 9 percent – were from underrepresented groups.

Figure 20. Faculty by race and ethnicity by discipline. Of the total ladder rank faculty, about 8 percent are from underrepresented groups, but there is variation by discipline – from less than 4 percent in Math and the Physical Sciences to almost 18 percent in Education.

Figures 21 to 23. Faculty promotion and review process. In addition to rigorous reviews prior to obtaining tenure, UC has one of the most rigorous post-tenure review processes of major universities in the U.S.

Figure 24. Faculty awards and honors. A sampling of the indicators of excellence of the UC faculty.

Figure 25. Glossary of terms used in this item.

(Attachment)