

The CSUSB Crisis:  
The Declining Number of Tenure-Track Faculty

Report of Tenure-Track Committee

Robert Carlson  
Dorothy Chen-Maynard  
Ron Chen  
Jose Hernandez  
Pat McInturff  
Terri Nelson  
Margaret Perry  
Peter Robertshaw  
Peter Williams

Submitted to the Provost and the Faculty Senate

June, 2005

## **General Introduction:**

In April 2005, the Provost and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, under the President's direction, formed the "Tenure-Track" Committee. This Committee was charged with determining appropriate goals regarding the number of tenure-track faculty at CSUSB. The Committee was also asked to consider how to bring the campus into compliance with ACR 73 (Strom-Martin, 2001) — a resolution calling for a 75% percentage of tenure-track to adjunct faculty in the CSU. The Committee was appointed by the Provost and EC (with the exception of the CFA representative). The Committee members and their representative units are:

- Robert Carlson, Dean of Natural Sciences, Academic Affairs representative
- Ron Chen, Arts & Letters representative
- Juan Hernandez, Education representative
- Pat McInturff, Business & Public Administration representative
- Peter Robertshaw, Social & Behavioral Sciences representative
- Peter Williams, Natural Sciences representative
- Dorothy Chen-Maynard, EPRC representative
- Margaret Perry, FAC representative
- Terri Nelson, CFA representative

The Committee met regularly during Spring Quarter 2005. The Committee reviewed the Response to ACR 73 (Strom-Martin) written by the Office of the Chancellor, the Academic Senate of the CSU, and the California Faculty Association (July 2002).<sup>1</sup> Then, two sub-committees were formed. The first, composed of Robert Carlson and Terri Nelson, gathered data related to tenure-track faculty currently on campus. The second, composed of Pat McInturff, Margaret Perry and Peter Williams, considered issues regarding the hiring and retention of new tenure-track faculty. The subcommittees shared their work with the Tenure-Track Committee as a whole on a regular basis for feedback. This final report is the summary of the Committee's findings.

---

<sup>1</sup> This report, entitled "A Plan to Increase the Percentage of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty in the California State University" outlines an 8 year plan to increase the ratio of tenure-track faculty to 75% while simultaneously reducing the Student/Faculty Ratio (SFR) to 18:1. The decreased SFR was deemed necessary to "reflect increases in the CSU base budget necessary to provide long-term improvements in workload expectations." The report is attached in Appendix A.

## **Data Related To Tenure-Track Faculty**

### **Sources of Data Regarding Tenure-Track Faculty:**

While many different data sets might exist to provide insight into the balance between tenure-track faculty and lecturers, two data sets emerged as most reasonable. The first data set is based upon the allocation of **baseline faculty resources** allocated to the Colleges at the beginning of each year. This data set considers the serial positions filled by tenure-track faculty as well as full-time lecturers. Funds are made available for hiring part-time faculty. These funds are converted to FTEF positions by dividing the funding by \$60,000, the amount the University currently allocates for a faculty position.

The second data set is extracted from the **FAD report** that is based upon the resources assigned to teach classes and assigned time. This data set is acknowledged to contain errors, particularly in the amounts of assigned time. However, the assignments to class responsibilities are considered to be accurate.

### **Data:**

Attached are three tables: Table 1: *Comparison of Colleges (Resource Model and FAD Model)*, Table 2: *Comparison of Five Years (Resource Model and FAD Model)*, and Table 3: *Future FTES, SFR, and FTEF Goals*. A legend follows each table describing each item in the tables and how it is calculated. The electronic spreadsheet can be made available to anyone who would like to further analyze the data.

### **Data Analysis:**

Given the different ways that the data sets were constructed, one should not focus on the absolute numbers, for they will be different in most cases. However, the trends are consistent as one examines the different attributes of the data. For instance in Table 2, the Tenured/Tenure Track FTEF (lines 1 and 11) show that in Fall, 2004 there were 488 and 376 respectively. The absolute values are different. However, the trend lines for this variable indicate that we have peaked in tenure-track appointments and are experiencing a significant reduction in tenure-track faculty. Actually, this trend in loss of faculty is occurring in all categories: Tenured/Tenure Track FTEF, Full-time Lecturers, and Temporary Faculty. At the same time, the trend line for FTES targets are increasing for the campus (line 14). Therefore, one should not be surprised by the SFR trend line (lines 10 and 18) that shows a sharp upturn in 2004 and a general increase over time.

In Table 3, the Committee has projected what would need to be done to achieve a targeted SFR of 20:1 by 2011. Although the report in ACR 73 calls for an SFR of 18:1 by 2011, the committee believes that goal is unrealistic at this time for our campus given the current budget situation. At the same time, we have projected the number of faculty positions required if the percentage of tenure track faculty were to be 75% of the faculty positions. Separating these two goals would allow a more rapid achievement of either goal, but the Committee thinks that both need to be attained.

Table 1 presents data for the five academic colleges for the Fall, 2004 quarter only. This table shows no trends, but serves to illustrate the differences between the

colleges and even suggests different approaches to the hiring of faculty. Committees reviewing this report should be cautious in adopting generalizations prescribing targets for the University, Colleges, and Departments given the diversity in approaches that have emerged over time.

At the bottom of Table 1, the Committee has projected what would need to be done to achieve a targeted SFR of 23:1 in Fall, 2005. **This analysis assumes no resignations or retirements of tenure-track faculty.** The 23:1 SFR ratio is the ratio we expect for Fall, 2005, not what we think to be appropriate for quality instruction as defined at CSUSB by the faculty and the facilities.

**Goals:**

The committee has set two goals for CSU, San Bernardino:

- Achieve a ratio of 75% tenure-track faculty (based on FTEF)
- Achieve an SFR of 20:1 by 2011 (using the FAD model)

The goal of 75% tenure-track faculty will bring the campus into compliance with ACR 73.

Even though the report in Appendix A is based upon an SFR of 18:1 for the CSU by 2011, the committee recommends a minimum SFR of 20:1 by 2011 as more realistic for our campus at the present time. We set this goal by assuming a 23:1 SFR for 2005, then decreasing the SFR by 0.5 per year. This goal will allow the campus, in the space of the next 6 years, to return to approximately the SFR of 2002. However, it must be noted that graduate programs, accreditation requirements, professional development expectations and/or increased external funding expectations all demand more tenure-track faculty and, hence, a lower SFR.

Using a projected 2% enrollment increase per year, the campus enrollment in 2011 is expected to reach 15920 FTES. In order to achieve a SFR of 20:1, the campus must employ a total of 796.01 FTEF (full-time equivalent faculty). If the additional 203.16 FTEF needed is used to hire tenure-track faculty and **if all current tenure-track faculty lines are replaced, the campus will come close to meeting the ACR 73 goal.**

	<b>FTES</b>	<b>FTEF</b>	<b>Tenure-Track FTEF</b>	<b>SFR</b>
<b>2004 (Fall)</b>	13099.57	592.85	376.25 (63.46%)	22.1:1
<b>2011</b>	15920	796.01	597.41 (72.79%)	20:1
<i>Difference</i>	<i>2820.43</i>	<i>203.16</i>		

Approximately 30 new tenure-track lines each year, beginning in 2006, will be needed to achieve this goal (plus the replacement of any retiring, non-retained or non-returning faculty).

Each college should meet the SFR goal of 20:1 and achieve a ratio of 75% tenure-track faculty by 2011 but also be allowed to make accommodations within the colleges. Depending on accreditation requirements and the presence of graduate programs, for

example, some departments may need to have a higher percentage of tenure-track faculty and/or a lower SFR. In other cases—especially professional programs like Nursing or Social Work, a department may be better served by having a lower percentage of tenure-track faculty and engage professionals active in the field to teach occasionally as adjuncts. By giving some flexibility within the colleges, Deans can work with the departments to find the appropriate balance to meet both the college's goals (SFR and tenure-track) and the departments' educational mission.

The success of California State University San Bernardino in achieving:

- A 75% tenure-track faculty ratio
- A 20:1 overall student-to-faculty ratio

is dependent upon the provision of new resources and the reallocation of existing resources. Therefore, the campus must make the hiring of new tenure-track faculty lines a very high budget priority.

## **Hiring of Tenure-Track Faculty**

The committee sought input from CSUSB department chairs and others. While many chairs thought they were successful in filling advertised positions, several concerns were raised. Some of these concerns cannot be immediately resolved by the University since they are State issues or bargaining issues and so we shall limit discussion to those issues we feel the University can resolve.

### **Problems:**

The major problem we see is the timeline involved in the search process. Often searches are approved in August and, by the time returning faculty have a chance to discuss department needs, ads might not be placed until September or even October. Interviews might then not be concluded until February or March. By this time, top candidates may already have received offers and are no longer interested in CSUSB. The committee recommends approving searches in Spring in order to conclude the search by the Winter break. We are aware that there may be hesitation in approving a search so early but feel that it would be better to cancel it if there was a lack of funding rather than lose the top candidates. Departments should make preparations in Spring quarter to proceed as soon as possible. For example, ads should be prepared for approval by the dean and by Academic Affairs in Spring quarter, and allowed to be published once approval is given. In addition, departments should elect their recruiting committees in the Spring so that their work would not be hindered by the time needed to elect a committee.

Teaching load is a substantial problem. While many new hires are assigned between four and eight WTUs for non-teaching duties in their first year, some still encounter a heavy teaching load due to teaching large classes. There is usually no assigned time in subsequent years. The heavy teaching load along with the professional growth and service expectations leads to top candidates taking positions elsewhere. The committee recommends that new faculty receive at least one course assigned time per year in each of the first three probationary years. We also recommend a commitment to fund travel to conferences and purchase research materials through the first four probationary years.

The sudden rise in house prices is also a concern. The University could always boast that the area had affordable housing but as the median house price is now over \$400,000 that is no longer true. We recognize this is a statewide problem which is worse in some other areas of the State, and that two income families are the only ones likely to be able to afford reasonable housing. However, this area may not provide the job opportunities for a candidate and spouse to be a two-income family (unlike larger communities such as the Los Angeles Basin, San Diego, and the Bay Area). We also note that CSU Fullerton made faculty housing available (University Gables) over two years ago. This has allowed their faculty to buy houses as much as \$200,000 under market prices. The CSU recently approved a 69-unit staff and faculty housing unit at Cal Poly which should be available in 2007. CSU Sacramento is currently in negotiations to provide faculty housing. We recommend that the University provide a faculty housing program.

The amount of money provided for recruiting, \$3,000 per position, is too restrictive. One candidate coming from far away could easily use up most of this amount. This encourages departments to be overly frugal and invite mainly candidates within a reasonable (flying) distance to interview. This could result in legal issues for the University. Supplementing recruiting costs from department budgets is an option but for small departments this is not feasible. We recommend a minimum of \$5,000 per position for the purpose of recruiting.

Relocation costs are also problematic. University guidelines range from \$1,000 for faculty relocating within California and the Pacific States to \$5,000 for faculty relocating from the East Coast. Relocation costs are the responsibility of the college and the amount of money that can be offered may depend on budget years and the number of faculty the college is hiring. Candidates who live near to the area but intend to relocate are usually not offered any help in relocation. We recommend that these amounts be reviewed and adjusted accordingly on an annual basis.

Starting salaries are problematic because of competition from industry, private colleges, and sister CSU campuses, especially in certain disciplines. Several campuses offer starting salaries much higher than ours, not including designated market disciplines. The committee recognizes a critical need for SSI for probationary tenure-track faculty and urges the University to look into the possibility of some compensation even if the budget and contract do not provide for one. In times of tight budgets, where pay raises are rare, there is a temptation to attract candidates by appointing at a higher salary. However, this would probably raise equity pay issues within a department. In light of this, we would suggest that we try to be more competitive in a variety of other ways such as increasing relocation expenses and increasing start-up money to support professional development. The teaching load of 12 WTUs a quarter in some departments, together with the low starting salary, has had a negative impact on the hiring and retention of quality tenure-track faculty in those departments.

We should continue to review whether or not we present ourselves as an attractive employer and present ourselves as a university that goes out of our its way to be inviting. For example, the benefits package we have is very good. In a similar vein, we recommend that we should create a welcome package that gives information on area housing and schools, provides area maps, provide campus and grant funding opportunities, provide a bulletin, provide a list of faculty achievements, provide a list of student achievements, and so on.

## Recommendations

### Percentage of Tenure-Track Faculty and Student Faculty Ratio

- The President needs to acknowledge the important role of faculty, particularly tenure-track faculty, by making the hiring of tenure-track faculty a very high budget priority.
- The Provost should use the data provided in this report to impact decisions regarding the allocations of new faculty lines.
- The Provost should provide an updated *data table* each year to the Faculty Senate, college Deans and other interested parties.
- Each college Dean should provide an updated report to the Provost regarding the SFR for the college by the beginning of the Spring Quarter, along with any requests for new tenure-track lines. The Provost should then make decisions regarding the expected allocation of new tenure-track lines by May 1 (pending final budget allocations).
- The CSUSB Strategic Planning committee should receive a copy of this report and use the information provided herein when deciding upon the campus's goals. If the campus changes its orientation from being primarily a teaching institution dedicated to undergraduate instruction, then the SFR goal will need to be changed.
- The Faculty Affairs committee (Faculty Senate) should receive a copy of this report and consider how this information may impact RPT expectations.
- The SFR goals for the campus should be reviewed on a regular basis to determine if the goals are in line with the mission and strategic plan of the university. We suggest that the Provost work in collaboration with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and the Academic Affairs Council to determine if the goals are appropriate. Alternatively, another ad hoc Tenure-Track committee can be formed on a short-term basis to write an updated report.
- Deans should work closely with department chairs to verify the information in the FAD report. As the data in this report becomes more accurate, the report will help us to better understand how FTEF resources are being used on our campus.

### Hiring and Retention of Tenure-Track Faculty

- Begin the hiring process early
  - a. Elect recruiting committees in Spring
  - b. Position advertisements approved in Spring
  - c. Advertisements submitted at earliest date possible after position approved
  - d. Plan to complete process and hire by December or January
- Extend start-up package to four years. In addition to the usual start-up package of an office, lab (if applicable), computer, printer, etc., increase the package to allow for
  - a. Guaranteed teaching load reduction of at least one course per year for three years

- b. Assistance for professional development over four years to cover conference travel and research materials
- Develop a faculty housing program
- Increase recruitment monies to \$5,000 per position
- Review relocation assistance money annually
- Create a welcome package for new hires. Packages could include things such as
  - a. University listing; who to contact for what
  - b. University grant opportunities
  - c. University facilities
  - d. Area maps
  - e. Local and regional attractions, parks, etc.
- Future Studies
  - a. Look at colleague support systems that best retain faculty
  - b. Look at the adequacy of campus child care
  - c. How best to create a community of faculty such as providing a faculty lounge