AIMÉE DORR  
PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  

Re: Support for Ongoing Funding of Faculty Exit Surveys  

Dear Aimée:  

At its November 30 meeting, the Academic Council endorsed the attached letter from the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) in support of ongoing funding for exit surveys of departing UC faculty.  

Council shares UCFW’s view that the longitudinal data provided through an ongoing exit survey instrument will help the University draw more definitive conclusions about the factors influencing faculty decisions to remain at UC or to accept external offers. We believe that over time, the longitudinal data will help UC reduce recruitment and retention costs. Diversifying the faculty pipeline will be another longer-term benefit flowing from data illuminating climate issues that may hinder or aid the successful recruitment and retention of women and underrepresented minority faculty.  

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.  

Sincerely,  

Jim Chalfant, Chair  
Academic Council  

Encl: UCFW Letter on Faculty Exit Surveys  

Cc: Academic Council  
Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Academic Senate  
Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel and Programs  
Senate Executive Directors
JIM CHALFANT, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: Faculty Exit Survey

Dear Jim,

As you know, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Programs Susan Carlson worked closely last year with Harvard’s Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) to develop and administer a pilot faculty exit survey for the UC system. This pilot marked the first time UC, as an enterprise, attempted a systematic collection of data from departing faculty, as well as those who were known to have been successfully retained. While the data were slim from a one-year pilot, they do indicate support for long-held anecdotes, such as that outside offers are often needed to secure pay raises and that minor salary increases can have significant effects, especially when balanced against the local cost of living. Of course, to draw definitive conclusions, both a larger number of surveys must be administered and evaluated, and longitudinal data are needed.

The cost of extending the pilot or of subscribing to an expanded survey is minimal when weighed against the benefits greater knowledge of the recruitment and retention process and the salient factors involved in them would bring. Vice Provost Carlson suggests annual costs would run approximately $400K ($15K/campus/year plus $100/contacted individual assuming about 200 contacts per year). The cost of a single start-up package outweighs this total, and the cumulative costs of failed recruitments must surely rival it.

Thus UCFW requests the Academic Council ask the administration to fund this worthwhile project on an on-going basis. Internally, we believe this project can be made saleable on the bases of efficiency and of diversifying the faculty pipeline. We thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Lori Lubin, UCFW Chair

Copy: UCFW
Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel and Programs