

The University of Arizona, Office of the Provost
George H. Davis, Sr. Vice President and Provost



The University of Arizona
Peter Likins, President

Faculty Retention/Loss Report 2001

Prepared by Elizabeth Ervin
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

Office of Decision and Planning Support
John, Wilson, Director
Wendy Miley
William Walsh

August, 2001

Introduction

Contents of the Report

- FY 2001 Faculty Retention Survey Results
- FY 2001 Faculty Retention Data by College

Intent of the Report

This is the fourth report surveying faculty retention and losses at the University of Arizona. The report is broadly intended to interpret data on faculty retention and loss in order to track our competitiveness with other institutions. The data and anecdotes on why we lose faculty in the retention process support our discussions on faculty salaries and other resources with ABOR and the Legislature.

Perhaps the greatest value of the information contained in the report comes from a general sense of what is contained in the anecdotes, and from the roster of institutions to whom we lose faculty, as well as the differences in salaries between those at UA and in the new positions. All of these data enable us to provide stronger arguments to reinforce our efforts to achieve more competitive faculty salaries at the UA, and to make decisions related to non-salary resources and campus climate

Concerns

It is normal for a number of people to leave the University, to follow their own career paths and to move on to new positions elsewhere. Every faculty loss, whether through an unsuccessful recruitment or failed retention, is not necessarily unusual or bad. We are trying to assess the UA's competitive health, beyond what would be *normal* attrition. By studying the individual cases in this year's report, we see that, as was learned from last year's report, many of our younger, highly productive and better-paid faculty are being successfully headhunted by other institutions. This is cause for alarm, since we have a considerable financial and personal investment in these faculty, and need to retain them.

The UA retention problem reflects the history of declining state support for competitive salaries. In 1989, faculty salaries were at market. By 2001 they were 9% below the national AAUDE peer average and the gap is projected to grow if state legislated salary increases fail to keep pace with market growth. State legislated 5% salary increases for FY 2002 and FY 2003 will help stem the escalation of the salary gap but without continued above-market salary increases the gap will continue to grow to 12% by 2005.

During the four fiscal years 1996-1999, the UA reallocated approximately \$4,152,500 to faculty salaries, attempting to slow the growing gap between our salaries and those of our competitive peers. Using an average faculty salary of \$66,000, the reallocations represent a permanent sacrifice of 63 positions in attempts to retain quality faculty. Such erosion of our institutional fiscal infrastructure cannot continue.

Conclusions

It is disturbing to note that the number of retention cases has increased this year, by 8%. Although it is encouraging to see that the success/failure rate has reversed dramatically [the university succeeded in retaining 50% of the cases this year as opposed to only 36% last year], the price we pay through reallocation is increasingly harmful and unsustainable. The quality of institutions to whom we lose faculty testifies to the quality of our faculty. The magnitude of reallocation numbers dedicated to retaining our faculty also testifies to their quality and importance. The trends shown in our retention reports simply cannot continue and must be reversed if the UA is to remain a quality university.

E. Ervin
August, 2001

The University of Arizona
Faculty Retention Survey Results¹
FY 2001

How many retention cases occurred in FY 2001?	Total	Faculty Recruited Away	Faculty Retained (includes pending)
Number of Cases that were Tenure/Continuing Track	90	45	45
Number of Cases that were in Clinical Medicine Departments	1	1	0
Number of Cases that were Deans or Year-to-Year	7	2	5
Number of Cases in Survey	98	48	50
Percentage of Cases that were Tenure/Continuing Track	100%	50%	50%
Number of Cases that were in Clinical Medicine Departments	100%	100%	0%
Number of Cases that were Deans or Year-to-Year	100%	29%	71%
Number of Cases in Survey	100%	49%	51%

Which Colleges had retention cases in FY 2001?

- Every college, except for Arizona International College, negotiated retention cases during FY 2001.
- The colleges of Agriculture, Architecture, Business & Public Administration, Education, Nursing, Science, Social & Behavioral Sciences, the Libraries and UA South all dealt with retention issues for 5% or greater of their total faculty.
- All colleges were unable to retain some of the faculty who were recruited elsewhere.
- Half of the colleges were able to successfully retain some of their faculty who had better offers elsewhere.

Key Points:

- The number of retention cases increased slightly in 2001 compared to 2000 (90 compared to 83, or an 8% increase). However, the UA was able to successfully retain a much larger percentage of faculty in 2001: 45 of 90, or 50%, as contrasted with 2000, when the retention success ratio was just 30 of 83, or 36%.
- For those cases in which there was information on outside salary offers, outside agencies and institutions offered an average 32% more in salary in efforts to recruit UA faculty away.
- For those cases where there was information on UA counter salary offers, the UA offered on average 11% more in salary, trying to retain faculty.
- For those cases where there was information on both the outside offers and UA counter offers, the salary gap between the two offers was slightly higher for those we lost than for those we retained.

¹There were an additional 36 Faculty in the survey where activity occurred during FY2001, but events were not recorded until FY2002. Data for these faculty members will be incorporated into next year's survey.

Source: FY 2001 Faculty Retention Survey, University of Arizona

**The University of Arizona
Faculty Retention Survey Results
FY 2001**

Where known, what were the average percentage salary increases offered to University of Arizona faculty¹?

For those cases where there was information on outside salary offers, outside agencies and institutions offered on average 32% more in salary trying to recruit away University faculty.

Outside Salary Offer Compared to Faculty's Prior Salary					
	N	Prior UA Salary	Outside Salary Offer	Dollar Difference	Percent Salary Increase
Faculty Recruited Away	17	\$ 73,579	\$ 99,428	\$ 26,000	35%
Faculty Retained (includes pending)	21	\$ 74,665	\$ 96,374	\$ 22,000	29%
Known Cases Total	38	\$ 74,179	\$ 97,740	\$ 24,000	32%
Unknown Outside Salary Offers	52	--	--	--	--
Total	90	--	--	--	--

For those cases where there was information on UA counter offers, the University offered on average 11% more in salary trying to retain faculty.

UA Counter Salary Offer Compared to Faculty's Prior Salary					
	N	Prior UA Salary	UA Counter Salary Offer	Dollar Difference	Percent Salary Increase
Faculty Recruited Away	29	\$ 65,992	\$ 71,870	\$ 6,000	9%
Faculty Retained (includes pending)	43	\$ 65,976	\$ 74,616	\$ 9,000	13%
Known Cases Total	72	\$ 65,982	\$ 73,510	\$ 8,000	11%
Unknown UA Counter Salary Offers	18	--	--	--	--
Total	90	--	--	--	--

For those cases where there was information on both outside and UA counter offers, the salary gap between both offers was slightly higher for those we lost versus those we were successful in retaining.

Outside and UA Counter Offer Compared to Faculty's Prior Salary							
	N	Prior UA Salary	Outside Offer Salary	UA Counter Offer	Percent Salary Increase Outside Offers	Percent Salary Increase of UA Salary Counter Offers	Outside Salary Offers are What Percent Higher than UA Salary Counter Offers
Faculty Recruited Away	12	\$ 75,301	\$ 105,913	\$ 88,369	41%	17%	20%
Faculty Retained (includes pending)	21	\$ 74,665	\$ 96,374	\$ 84,666	29%	13%	14%
Known Cases Total	33	\$ 74,896	\$ 99,843	\$ 86,013	33%	15%	16%
Unknown Outside or Counter Salary Offers	57	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	90	--	--	--	--	--	--

¹ Analysis includes tenure/continuing track faculty and professionals in all departments except those in clinical medicine. Clinical medicine faculty were excluded from the salary offer comparisons because their income proportions are very different from non-clinical faculty. Clinical faculty have additional income from private practice and the outside salary offers reported were from sole, private-practice providers.

² All salaries are academic equivalent.

Source: FY 2001 Faculty Retention Survey, University of Arizona

**The University of Arizona
Faculty Retention Survey Results
FY 2001**

Overall, 6% of UA faculty and academic professionals were actively recruited by outside institutions or organizations.

	Total Retention	Faculty Recruited Away		Faculty Retained (includes pending)		Total College	Percent Retention Issues
	N	N	%	N	%	N	
College of Agriculture	17	7	41%	10	59%	239	7%
College of Architecture	2	1	50%	1	50%	21	10%
College of Business & Public Administration	6	5	83%	1	17%	80	8%
College of Education	3	3	100%			64	5%
College of Engineering & Mines	2	1	50%	1	50%	136	1%
College of Fine Arts	3	2	67%	1	33%	121	2%
College of Humanities	2	2	100%			128	2%
College of Law						31	0%
College of Nursing	1	1	100%			20	5%
College of Pharmacy						29	0%
College of Public Health						9	0%
College of Science	19	8	42%	11	58%	273	7%
College of Social & Behavioral Sciences	23	8	35%	15	65%	231	10%
Health Professions	1	1	100%			1	100%
Sierra Vista Campus	2	2	100%			11	18%
University Libraries	7	3	43%	4	57%	48	15%
College of Medicine (Basic Science)						66	0%
Non College Units:							
Provost	1		0%	1	100%	31	3%
Research & Graduate	1	1	100%			48	2%
Undergraduate Education						10	0%
Administrative Units						2	0%
Total	90	45	50%	45	50%	1,599	6%

Note: Includes Tenure and Continuing track faculty and academic professionals in all departments except those in clinical medicine.

The University of Arizona

Faculty Retention Survey Results, 2001

Are these losses normal, or is there a pattern of targeting particular faculty?

This is not normal turnover. There is a pattern of hiring away substantially younger than average faculty. The targeted faculty average almost 6 years younger than the norm for their ranks, and have on average 4 years less experience than their peers at The University of Arizona.

What are the implications of these data?

The data imply that other institutions are "raiding" faculty who are building their careers at each rank, and who may be entering their most productive years. The UA has made large investments in recruiting and promoting these faculty, and needs to retain them.

Retention Outcome by Rank				
FY 2001				
	Lost		Retained	
	N	%	N	%
Tenure Track Faculty				
Professor	10	34%	19	66%
Professor/Associate	13	57%	10	43%
Professor/Assistant	16	62%	10	38%
Other	6	50%	6	50%
Total	45	50%	45	50%

	Age of UA Faculty							
	FY2001				3-year Total FY's 1999, 2000, 2001			
	Retention Survey	All Faculty	Retention Faculty	Age Difference	Retention Survey	All Faculty	Retention Faculty	Age Difference
Tenure Track Faculty	N	Mean	Mean	Mean	N	Mean	Mean	Mean
All Ranks	78	50	42.9	(7.1)	243	50	44.3	(5.7)
Professor	29	56	47.9	(8.1)	92	56	50.0	(6.0)
Associate Professor	23	47	44.0	(3.0)	79	47	43.9	(3.1)
Assistant Professor*	26	39	36.5	(2.5)	72	39	37.5	(1.5)

	Years of Experience of UA Faculty							
	FY2001				Total			
	Retention Survey	All Faculty	Retention Faculty	Experience Difference	Retention Survey	All Faculty	Retention Faculty	Experience Difference
Tenure Track Faculty	N	Mean	Mean	Mean	N	Mean	Mean	Mean
All Ranks	78	13	7.5	(5.5)	243	13	8.6	(4.4)
Professor	29	18	11.8	(6.2)	92	18	13.4	(4.6)
Associate Professor	23	11	7.7	(3.4)	79	11	8.0	(3.0)
Assistant Professor*	26	3	2.7	(0.3)	72	3	3.0	0.0

* Not statistically or in the case of assistant professor ages not practically significant at $p \leq 0.05$.

The University of Arizona Faculty Retention Survey Results FY 2001

Where did our Faculty Go?

The University of Arizona lost faculty to public and private universities as well as to the private sector.

- Some of the universities include: Amherst, The Eastman School, George Mason U, Georgia Tech, Harvard University, Indiana U, UC Davis, UC Irvine, UC San Diego, U of Colorado, U of Illinois, U of Maryland, U Massachusetts, U of Missouri, SUNY-Albany, SUNY-Stonybrook.
- Some of the private sector and other institutions include: The Academy of Natural Sciences, California Seed Co., Celera Corp., National Cancer Institute, NGO, Qualcomm, and private medical and pharmacy practice.

Why did our faculty go?

Whether salary was the primary factor in leaving, the great majority of those who left went to higher salaries and/or greater resources. Some reasons for leaving include:

- an additional \$4,000 summer stipend offer to last until future promotion & tenure action
- UA salaries at \$20,000 to \$25,000 below the current market in discipline
- a \$15,000 per-year operating budget for 3 years
- more synthesis hood space
- higher salary, a discretionary research fund of \$4,000 per year for 5 years, a computer budget
- a \$50,000 startup fund, a new computer, and a 20%
- a retirement benefit contribution of 10%
- a large amount of stock in the company, substantial synthesis hood space, and a spouse position
- \$30,000 in research funding over 2 years, 1/9 salary in Summer for 3 years, 2 fully equipped offices
- \$50,000 start up package to spend as wanted/needed, basic travel money

What did they say?

Fully three-quarters of the respondents expressed concerns of various kinds regarding the UA's compensation system.¹

- One departing faculty expressed dissatisfaction at how the gap between her salary and research stature had consistently increased over the years²
- Another stated, "It is well known that faculty salaries in Arizona are not good...and that contributes to low morale and people talking about whether to leave. It makes people feel less valued."³
- One interviewee for whom salary was a principal reason for leaving concluded that the Legislature is out of tune with what the people of the state want by way of investment in higher education; "if I could have held up significant hope that it could ever become a serious political issue, I might not have left."⁴

Sources: FY 2001 Faculty Retention Survey, University of Arizona
Armandroff, Liz: REPORT ON EXIT INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED WITH FACULTY WHO LEFT TENURED/TENURE-TRACK POSITIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA IN 1999 AND 2000, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, AUGUST 2001

¹ Armandroff

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.