

CSU Faculty Flow Survey Report

Conducted for:

The California State University Chancellor's Office

Prepared by:

The Social and Behavioral Research Institute

California State University, San Marcos

Study Team:

Richard T. Serpe, Ph.D.; Director
Allen J. Risley, M.A.; Associate Director
Michael D. Large, Ph.D.; Study Director
Lori Brown Large, M.A.; Survey Study Director
Kimberly D. Brown, B.A.; Field Research Coordinator
Tami Thompson, M.A.; Research Assistant

January, 2003

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
DATA	2
RESULTS FOR PROSPECTS WHO ACCEPTED OFFERS	3
Demographics	3
Reasons for Decision to Accept Offer	6
Recruiting Process	10
Recruitment Process Aspects	10
Tenure and Promotion	11
Suggestions and Comments	11
Suggestions	11
Comments	13
Offers	14
RESULTS FOR PROSPECTS WHO DECLINED OFFERS	20
Demographics	20
Reasons for Decision to Decline Offer	23

Reasons	23
Importance	24
Recruiting Process	27
Recruitment Process Aspects	27
Tenure and Promotion	28
Suggestions and Comments	28
Suggestions	28
Comments	30
Employment	31
Academic Jobs	31
Non-Academic Jobs	33
Offers	35
 SUMMARY	 40
 APPENDIX A	 42

CSU Faculty Flow Report

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the results of the CSU Faculty Flow Survey. This study used telephone surveys conducted with recipients of faculty job offers from CSU campuses as well as individuals who had resigned a CSU faculty position in the 2001-02 academic year. The survey was conducted for the California State University Chancellor's Office by the Social and Behavioral Research Institute at California State University, San Marcos.

The questionnaire for offer recipients addressed issues related to the recruiting process at the CSU campuses as well as the reasons people had for the decision they made to accept or decline the offer from a CSU campus. The questionnaire for people resigning their CSU position focused on the reasons they had for resigning their position at a CSU campus. The report contains a description of the data, an elaboration of the results of the survey, and a brief summary. Appendix A contains the questionnaire items.

DATA

The data presented in this report came from telephone interviews with 534 individuals that received job offers from CSU system campuses in 2001-02 for fall 2002 appointments, conducted between May 22nd and August 10th, 2002. This number includes 420 respondents who accepted offers and 114 respondents who declined offers. These faculty come from 22 campuses in the CSU system. Interviews were conducted with faculty at each of the campuses except the Maritime Academy, which has faculty that is not characteristic of the larger CSU population. The response rate was 83.0 percent for those accepting offers and 69.1 percent for those declining offers, combining for an overall response rate of 79.6 percent. An attempt was made to survey those who had resigned their positions at CSU campuses. However, the number of people responding was too small to provide meaningful results.

The interview questions addressed attitudes about respondents' experience with the recruiting process in the CSU system campuses, the offers they received, and factors affecting their decisions to accept or decline offers.

RESULTS FOR PROSPECTS WHO ACCEPTED OFFERS

Demographics

Of the 420 respondents that had accepted job offers, over half (54.0%) were female and 46.0 percent were male. More than two-thirds (71.5%) of the respondents were white, as indicated in Table 1. The table also shows that 15.8 percent were Asian or Pacific Islander and 6.8 percent were Hispanic.

Table 1: Accepting Respondents' Race/Ethnicity.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 American Indian/Alaska Native	8	1.9	2.0	2.0
	2 Asian or Pacific Islander	63	15.0	15.8	17.8
	3 African American	8	1.9	2.0	19.8
	4 Hispanic	27	6.4	6.8	26.5
	5 White	286	68.1	71.5	98.0
	6 Other	8	1.9	2.0	100.0
	Total	400	95.2	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't Know	3	.7		
	9 Refused	17	4.0		
	Total	20	4.8		
Total		420	100.0		

Table 2 shows the highest degree or certificate held by the respondents. Four out of five (79.8%) of the respondents had a doctorate, while 9.8 percent were ABD and 10.2 percent held master's degrees.

Table 2: Highest Degree or Certificate Accepting Respondent Holds.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Masters	43	10.2	10.2	10.2
	2 ABD	41	9.8	9.8	20.0
	3 Doctorate	335	79.8	79.8	99.8
	4 Other	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	420	100.0	100.0	

The discipline of the degree received is displayed in Table 3. Over a third (35.6%) of the respondents had or would receive degrees in the behavioral and social sciences.

Table 3: Discipline of Degree for Accepting Respondents.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Art	19	4.5	4.6	4.6
	2 Business	28	6.7	6.7	11.3
	3 Education	66	15.7	15.9	27.2
	4 Engineering/Computer Science	33	7.9	7.9	35.1
	5 Humanities	43	10.2	10.3	45.4
	6 Science & Math	59	14.0	14.2	59.6
	7 Behavioral/Social Sciences	148	35.2	35.6	95.2
	8 Professional/Technical	20	4.8	4.8	100.0
	Total	416	99.0	100.0	
Missing	9 Refused	4	1.0		
Total		420	100.0		

Respondents indicated when they received their degree and their experience teaching. Table 4 shows the number of years of full-time teaching experience respondents had, and the number of years since they obtained their highest degree. On average, those accepting jobs at CSU campuses averaged 4.91 years since they received their degree, and had 4.79 years of full-time teaching experience. However, the distribution is positively skewed, with a modal response of zero for both years of full-time teaching and years since highest degree. Twenty percent of the accepting respondents indicated zero years since receiving their highest degree and 23.3 percent reported zero years of teaching experience.

Table 4: Years Since Receiving Degree and Teaching Experience for Accepting Respondents.

	SINCDEG Years Since Receiving Degree	Q25 Number of Years of Full-time Teaching Experience
Mean	4.91	4.79
Median	3.00	3.00
Mode	0	0
Std. Deviation	5.84	6.005
Minimum	0	0
Maximum	29.00	30

Reasons for Decision to Accept Offer

Reasons

Respondents were asked to name the top three reasons why they accepted the offer from the CSU campus. The open-ended reasons given by people were coded into the categories displayed in Table 5. Location was by far the most commonly mentioned reason, identified by 60.5 percent of the respondents, for accepting the job offer from the CSU campus. Additionally, 49.3 percent reported either colleagues/faculty or the department as one of their top reasons why they accepted the job offer.

Table 5: Reasons Given for Accepting an Offer from a CSU Campus.

	1 Yes	
	Count	%
Location	254	60.8%
Colleagues/Faculty	115	27.5%
Department	99	23.7%
Job Respondent Wanted/Perfect Fit	64	15.3%
Emphasis on Teaching/Opportunities for Teaching	54	12.9%
Good Offer	52	12.4%
Quality of Institution	50	12.0%
Salary	49	11.7%
Advancement of Career	47	11.2%
Academic Program	43	10.3%
Combination of Research/Teaching	38	9.1%
Familiarity with Campus/Previous Teaching/Schooling Experience with University	38	9.1%
Positive Experience with Recruiting Process	35	8.4%
Area of Research	31	7.4%
Diversity of Student Body	27	6.5%
Tenure Track Position/Opportunity for Tenure	27	6.5%
Timing/First Offer/Only Offer	25	6.0%
Family in Area	24	5.7%
Helping Department Develop	21	5.0%
Compatibility of Respondent's Goals/Philosophy with University/Department	19	4.5%
Flexibility in Position	12	2.9%
Spouse's Career	12	2.9%
Other	37	8.9%

Importance

Those who selected a given reason for accepting the job offer were asked to rate how important that reason was in their decision to accept the offer. These importance ratings ranged from zero to ten with higher numbers indicating greater importance. Table 6 shows the average importance ratings for each of these factors. These averages are based only on those that offered the particular reason. The importance ratings for all of these factors was at least somewhat high. The lowest rating (for having family in the area) was 7.21 on the zero-to-ten scale.

Table 6: Importance of Reasons Given to Accept Offer from a CSU Campus.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Importance of Location	254	2	10	7.75	1.65
Importance of Colleagues/Faculty	115	3	10	8.30	1.54
Importance of Department	99	5	10	8.71	1.32
Importance of Job Respondent Wanted/Perfect Fit	64	6	10	8.98	1.12
Importance of Emphasis on Teaching/Opportunities for Teaching	53	5	10	8.91	1.38
Importance of Good Offer	51	4	10	8.04	1.55
Importance of Quality of Institution	50	3	10	7.96	1.65
Importance of Salary	49	4	10	7.37	1.41
Importance of Advancement of Career	47	5	10	8.40	1.33
Importance of Academic Program	43	2	10	8.09	1.73
Importance of Combination of Research/Teaching	38	2	10	8.32	1.73
Importance of Familiarity with Campus/Previous Teaching/Schooling Experience with University	38	4	10	8.00	1.80
Importance of Positive Experience with Recruiting Process	35	6	10	8.54	1.31
Importance of Area of Research	31	5	10	8.45	1.29
Importance of Diversity of Student Body	27	6	10	8.52	1.48
Importance of Tenure Track Position/Opportunity for Tenure	27	6	10	8.56	1.25
Importance of Timing/First Offer/Only Offer	25	3	10	7.84	2.06
Importance of Family in Area	24	3	10	7.21	2.11
Importance of Helping Department Develop	21	7	10	8.95	1.12
Importance of Compatiblity of Goals/Philosophy with University/Department	19	7	10	9.11	.99
Importance of Flexibility in Position	12	7	10	9.00	1.04
Importance of Spouse's Career	12	6	10	8.67	1.37
Importance of Other	37	3	10	8.03	1.66
Valid N (listwise)	0				

Recruiting Process

Recruitment Process Aspects

Several aspects of the recruitment process were assessed. Respondents were read statements regarding the recruitment process and were asked the extent to which they agreed to those statements.

Table 7: Ratings of Recruiting Process by Accepting Respondents.

		1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Strongly Agree
The Interview Allowed Me to Ask All the Questions I Had	Count	2	11	96	310
	%	.5%	2.6%	22.9%	74.0%
The Interview Allowed Me to Demonstrate Competence	Count		11	141	268
	%		2.6%	33.6%	63.8%
The Process Was Fair	Count		8	156	236
	%		2.0%	39.0%	59.0%
Teaching Expectations Were Clear	Count	1	16	180	222
	%	.2%	3.8%	43.0%	53.0%
The Process Was Timely	Count	6	42	174	195
	%	1.4%	10.1%	41.7%	46.8%
Scholarship and Creative Activity Expectations Were Clear	Count	3	40	206	168
	%	.7%	9.6%	49.4%	40.3%
Faculty Compensation Questions Were Answered Completely	Count	3	37	217	154
	%	.7%	9.0%	52.8%	37.5%
Faculty Benefits Questions Were Answered Completely	Count	4	48	215	135
	%	1.0%	11.9%	53.5%	33.6%
Service Expectations Were Clear	Count	4	75	228	110
	%	1.0%	18.0%	54.7%	26.4%

Their responses are summarized in Table 7. Generally, there was agreement with all the statements. In particular, almost everyone agreed that the process was fair, that it allowed them to demonstrate their competence, and that it allowed them to ask all the questions they had about the job. The surprising finding here is that there was not a greater proportion of people indicating that they strongly agreed with statements to the effect that benefits questions were fully answered, given that this is likely to be a strong selling point in the CSU.

Tenure and Promotion

Respondents were asked about discussions of the tenure and promotion process. The vast majority (92.8%) of respondents said the tenure and promotion process was discussed in the interview process. Those who reported that it was discussed were asked if they received enough information on the tenure and promotion process to make an informed decision on the job offer. Almost all (97.6%) of those respondents stated that they did get enough information on the tenure and promotion process.

Suggestions and Comments

Suggestions. Offer recipients accepting offers provided a number of suggestions and comments regarding the recruiting process. These suggestions are summarized in Table 8. The most common suggestions involved making the interview process proceed in a more timely manner and providing more information regarding the position expectations and compensation.

Table 8: Suggestions for Improving the Recruiting Process by Accepting Respondents.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Increased Salary	13	3.1	3.2	3.2
	2 Details of Position Package-Expectations/ Compensation	47	11.2	11.6	14.9
	3 Compensate for Housing and Relocation Expenses	13	3.1	3.2	18.1
	5 Provide the Opportunity to Meet Students	8	1.9	2.0	20.0
	6 Meet More Faculty/More One-on-One Time with Faculty	13	3.1	3.2	23.3
	8 Interview Each Candidate Separately and in Person	8	1.9	2.0	25.2
	9 Process Should Be Longer than One Day	17	4.0	4.2	29.5
	10 Opportunity to View/Teach a Class or Present Research	8	1.9	2.0	31.4
	11 Compensation for and Faster Reimbursement for Travel Expense	11	2.6	2.7	34.2
	12 The Process Should Be More Timely	48	11.4	11.9	46.0
	13 Recruit Earlier in the Year	9	2.1	2.2	48.3
	14 Provide More Information	7	1.7	1.7	50.0
	15 Thought the Recruiting Process Was Good	45	10.7	11.1	61.1
	16 Other	40	9.5	9.9	71.0
	17 None/No Comment	117	27.9	29.0	100.0
	Total	404	96.2	100.0	
Missing	98 Don't Know	9	2.1		
	99 Refused	7	1.7		
	Total	16	3.8		
Total		420	100.0		

Comments. Additional comments regarding the recruitment process were also solicited. The responses are displayed in Table 9. By far the most common response, reported by 18.7 percent of those responding, was that the interview experience was a positive one.

Table 9: Other Comments about the Recruiting Process from Accepting Respondents.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Staff Were Friendly, Helpful, and Welcoming	24	5.7	5.7	5.7
	2 The Recruiting Process Was a Positive Experience	78	18.6	18.7	24.4
	3 Wanted More Time on Campus/More Faculty Involvement	4	1.0	1.0	25.4
	4 Impressed with Department	7	1.7	1.7	27.0
	5 Wanted Communication with Students	4	1.0	1.0	28.0
	7 Timing Was Not Good/Not Given Enough Time to Make Decision	3	.7	.7	28.7
	8 Wanted More Information on Housing/Health Benefits	3	.7	.7	29.4
	9 Process Was Slow	7	1.7	1.7	31.1
	10 Confusion or Dissatisfaction about Requirements/Salary	9	2.1	2.2	33.3
	11 Other	33	7.9	7.9	41.1
	12 None/No Comment	246	58.6	58.9	100.0
	Total	418	99.5	100.0	
Missing	98 Don't Know	2	.5		
Total		420	100.0		

Offers

Those accepting offers from CSU campuses were asked about the number of other offers they received. Over half (54.3%) of the respondents received at least one other offer. On average, respondents received 1.10 other offers. Those receiving at least one other offer were asked if the offer they had accepted from the CSU campus was higher, lower, or the same as the best offer they received from other institutions. Table 10 shows that for more than a third (37.4%) of those accepting CSU offers, the offer they received from that CSU was higher than the best other offer they had received.

Table 10: Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Other Offers Received.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Higher	80	19.0	37.4	37.4
	2 The Same	62	14.8	29.0	66.4
	3 Lower	72	17.1	33.6	100.0
	Total	214	51.0	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't Know	9	2.1		
	9 Refused	2	.5		
	System	195	46.4		
	Total	206	49.0		
Total		420	100.0		

Respondents receiving offers that differed from the one that they had accepted were asked about the size of the difference. Table 11 shows how other offers differed from the one they accepted from the CSU both for those receiving higher offers and those receiving lower offers from the CSU campus. Overall, the magnitude of the difference did not differ depending on whether it was greater or less than that offered by the CSU.

Table 11: Difference of Salary between Accepted Offer and Other Offers Respondent Received for Accepted Offers that Are Higher or Lower.

			QA20 Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Other Offers Received		
			1 Higher	3 Lower	Total
QA21 Difference of Salary between Accepted Offer and Other Offers Respondent Received	1 Less than \$2,500	Count	13	9	22
		% within QA20 Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Other Offers Received	17.1%	13.0%	15.2%
	2 From \$2,500 to under \$5,000	Count	23	18	41
		% within QA20 Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Other Offers Received	30.3%	26.1%	28.3%
	3 From \$5,000 to under \$10,000	Count	23	22	45
		% within QA20 Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Other Offers Received	30.3%	31.9%	31.0%
	4 From \$10,000 to under \$15,000	Count	9	9	18
		% within QA20 Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Other Offers Received	11.8%	13.0%	12.4%
	5 From \$15,000 to under \$20,000	Count	4	3	7
		% within QA20 Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Other Offers Received	5.3%	4.3%	4.8%
	6 \$20,000 or more	Count	4	8	12
		% within QA20 Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Other Offers Received	5.3%	11.6%	8.3%
Total		Count	76	69	145
		% within QA20 Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Other Offers Received	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Respondent Characteristics

Prior Residence

Some of the characteristics of the respondents are considered in this section. Whether or not the respondent lived in California at the time of application was of interest. This was determined by the respondent's phone number. If the phone number had a California area code, it was assumed that the individual was living in California at the time they applied for the CSU position. Half (50.2%) of the respondents were living in California at the time of their application. This sheds some light on the finding described above that location was listed by 60.5 percent of the respondents as one of the top reasons for accepting the job offer from the CSU campus.

Rank Offered

The rank that was offered to those accepting CSU faculty positions is displayed in Table 12. This table shows that by far the majority (85.4%) of the offers accepted were at the assistant professor rank. Additionally, 10.3 percent of the accepted offers were at the associate professor rank, and 3.8 percent were at full professor.

Table 12: Rank Offered to Accepting Respondents.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Lecturer	2	.5	.5	.5
	2 Assistant Professor	358	85.2	85.4	85.9
	3 Associate Professor	43	10.2	10.3	96.2
	4 Professor	16	3.8	3.8	100.0
	Total	419	99.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't Know	1	.2		
Total		420	100.0		

Salary Offered

The salary offered to accepting respondents was assessed. These offers ranged from about \$42,000.00 for the lowest assistant professor to \$125,000.00 for the highest offer to a full professor. This is seen in Table 13, which also shows the average salary offered by rank. This table reveals wide ranges for salary within ranks. It should be noted that some of these salaries may reflect 12-month contracts or department chairs.

Table 13: Salary Offered to Accepting Respondents.

RANKOFF		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean*	Std. Deviation
2 Assistant Professor	SALOFF Salary Offered	356	\$41,940.00	\$82,500.00	\$53,893.28	8916.76
	Valid N (listwise)	356				
3 Associate Professor	SALOFF Salary Offered	43	\$50,568.00	\$85,008.00	\$66,955.02	9153.91
	Valid N (listwise)	43				
4 Professor	SALOFF Salary Offered	16	\$70,500.00	\$125,004.00	\$92,381.25	14480.72
	Valid N (listwise)	16				

*Means may include 12-month salaries.

RESULTS FOR PROSPECTS WHO DECLINED OFFERS

Demographics

Of the 114 respondents that declined job offers from CSU campuses, 19 reported that they would be working at another CSU campus. Exactly half (50.0%) of the respondents were female and half (50.0%) were male. As Table 14 shows, seven out of ten of the respondents were white. The table also shows that 13.6 percent were Asian or Pacific Islander, 7.3 percent were Hispanic, and 5.5 percent were African American.

Table 14: Declining Respondents' Race/Ethnicity.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 American Indian/Alaska Native	1	.9	.9	.9
	2 Asian or Pacific Islander	15	13.2	13.6	14.5
	3 African American	6	5.3	5.5	20.0
	4 Hispanic	8	7.0	7.3	27.3
	5 White	77	67.5	70.0	97.3
	6 Other	3	2.6	2.7	100.0
	Total	110	96.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't Know	1	.9		
	9 Refused	3	2.6		
	Total	4	3.5		
Total		114	100.0		

Table 15 shows the highest degree or certificate held by the respondents. The vast majority (88.5%) of the respondents had a doctorate, while 7.1 percent were ABD and 4.4 percent held master's degrees.

Table 15: Highest Degree or Certificate Declining Respondent Holds.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Masters	5	4.4	4.4	4.4
	2 ABD	8	7.0	7.1	11.5
	3 Doctorate	100	87.7	88.5	100.0
	Total	113	99.1	100.0	
Missing	9 Refused	1	.9		
Total		114	100.0		

The discipline of the degree received is displayed in Table 16. Almost a third (32.1%) of the respondents had or would receive degrees in the behavioral and social sciences, and a quarter (24.1%) had or would receive degrees in science and math.

Table 16: Discipline of Degree for Declining Respondents.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Art	1	.9	.9	.9
	2 Business	7	6.1	6.3	7.1
	3 Education	17	14.9	15.2	22.3
	4 Engineering/Computer Science	4	3.5	3.6	25.9
	5 Humanities	19	16.7	17.0	42.9
	6 Science & Math	27	23.7	24.1	67.0
	7 Behavioral/Social Sciences	36	31.6	32.1	99.1
	8 Professional/Technical	1	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	112	98.2	100.0	
Missing	9 Refused	2	1.8		
Total		114	100.0		

Table 17 shows the number of years of full time teaching experience respondents had, and the number of years since they obtained their highest degree. Those declining jobs at CSU campuses averaged 4.12 years since they received their degree, and had 5.58 years of full-time teaching experience.

Table 17: Years Since Receiving Degree and Teaching Experience for Declining Respondents.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
SINCDEG Years Since Receiving Degree	111	.00	18.00	4.1171	3.9789
Q25 Number of Years of Full-time Teaching Experience	114	0	25	5.58	5.46
Valid N (listwise)	111				

Reasons for Decision to Decline Offer

Reasons

Respondents indicated the top three reasons for declining offers from CSU campuses. The reasons people provided are displayed in Table 18. As the table shows, many of the reasons offered related to a comparison to other offers. Two of the most common reasons given involve receiving a better offer (23.2%) or a higher salary (22.3%) elsewhere. Further, 8.0 percent of the respondents said they received a counteroffer from their current employer and 4.5 percent cited more opportunities to grow or attain career goals elsewhere as a reason for declining the CSU offer. Over half (53.6%) of the respondents mentioned at least one of these reasons. The teaching load was also a common issue. A quarter (25.9%) of the respondents said one of the top reasons they declined an offer from a CSU was that the teaching load was too high.

Table 18: Reasons Given for Declining an Offer from a CSU Campus.

	1 Yes	
	Count	%
Teaching Load too Great	29	25.9%
Better Offer Elsewhere	26	23.2%
Higher Salary Elsewhere	25	22.3%
Spouse's Career	23	20.5%
Cost of Living too High	22	19.6%
Location	21	18.8%
Not a Good Fit/Not in My Field	10	8.9%
Quality of Institution/Academic Program	10	8.9%
Negative Experience with Campus/Faculty/Staff	9	8.0%
Present Employment Changed/Counter Offer	9	8.0%
Did Not Want to Move	8	7.1%
Lack of Research Funding	8	7.1%
Cost of Moving	6	5.4%
Timing	6	5.4%
More Opportunity to Grow/Attain Career Goals Elsewhere	5	4.5%
No Opportunity for Tenure	4	3.6%
Personal Reasons	4	3.6%
Other	12	10.7%

Importance

Those offering a given reason for declining the job offer were asked to rate how important that reason was in their decision. The average zero-to-ten importance ratings are displayed in Table 19. These averages are based only on those that offered the particular reason. The importance ratings for all of these factors was at least somewhat high. The lowest rating (for not wanting to move) was 6.50 on the zero-to-ten scale.

Table 19: Importance of Reasons Given to Decline Offer from a CSU Campus.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Importance of Teaching Load too Great	29	3	10	7.90	1.88
Importance of Better Offer Elsewhere	26	4	10	8.65	1.77
Importance of Higher Salary Elsewhere	25	3	10	7.28	2.09
Importance of Cost of Living too High	22	3	10	7.64	1.89
Importance of Spouse's Career	22	5	10	8.73	1.28
Importance of Location	20	4	10	7.45	1.67
Importance of Not a Good Fit/Not in my Field	10	5	10	7.70	2.00
Importance of Quality of Institution/Academic Program	10	6	10	7.60	1.26
Importance of Negative Experience with Campus/Faculty/Staff	9	5	10	7.44	2.19
Importance of Present Employment Changed/Counter Offer	9	5	10	7.89	1.90
Importance of Did Not Want to Move	8	3	9	6.50	2.00
Importance of Lack of Research Funding	8	4	10	8.25	2.05
Importance of Cost of Moving	6	5	9	7.83	1.47
Importance of Timing	6	8	10	9.33	1.03
Importance of More Opportunity to Grow/Attain Career Goals Elsewhere	5	4	10	6.80	2.39
Importance of Personal Reasons	4	4	10	8.00	2.83
Importance of No Opportunity for Tenure	4	9	10	9.50	.58
Importance of Other	12	4	10	6.83	1.85
Valid N (listwise)	0				

Recruiting Process

Recruitment Process Aspects

The same aspects of the recruitment process were assessed for those declining offers as for those who accepted. The responses of those declining are summarized in Table 20. Generally, there

Table 20: Ratings of Recruiting Process Characteristics by Declining Respondents.

		1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Strongly Agree
The Process Was Timely	Count	8	16	42	48
	%	7.0%	14.0%	36.8%	42.1%
The Process Was Fair	Count	1		37	73
	%	.9%		33.3%	65.8%
The Interview Allowed Me to Demonstrate Competence	Count	1	7	34	72
	%	.9%	6.1%	29.8%	63.2%
The Interview Allowed Me to Ask All the Questions I Had	Count	1	3	28	82
	%	.9%	2.6%	24.6%	71.9%
Faculty Compensation Questions Were Answered Completely	Count	2	12	49	49
	%	1.8%	10.7%	43.8%	43.8%
Faculty Benefits Questions Were Answered Completely	Count		12	55	45
	%		10.7%	49.1%	40.2%
Teaching Expectations Were Clear	Count	1	10	47	56
	%	.9%	8.8%	41.2%	49.1%
Scholarship and Creative Activity Expectations Were Clear	Count		11	62	40
	%		9.7%	54.9%	35.4%
Service Expectations Were Clear	Count	1	30	55	27
	%	.9%	26.5%	48.7%	23.9%

was agreement with all the statements. Consistent with those accepting offers, almost everyone declining offers agreed that the process was fair, that it allowed them to demonstrate their competence, and that it allowed them to ask all the questions they had about the job.

Tenure and Promotion

Declining respondents were also asked about discussions they might have had in their interview regarding the tenure and promotion process. Almost all (95.6%) of respondents said the tenure and promotion process was discussed in the interview process. Those reporting that the tenure and promotion process was discussed were asked if they received enough information on the tenure and promotion process to make an informed decision on the job offer. Almost all (97.2%) of those respondents stated that they did get enough information on the tenure and promotion process.

Suggestions and Comments

Suggestions. Respondents who had declined a job offer extended from a CSU campus were asked if they had any suggestions or comments regarding the recruitment process. Their suggestions were coded using the same categories used for those accepting offers, and are summarized in Table 21. As with those accepting offers, making the interview process proceed in a more timely manner was the most common suggestion given. Increasing the salary was the second most common suggestion.

Table 21: Suggestions for Improving the Recruiting Process by Declining Respondents.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Increased Salary	11	9.6	9.7	9.7
	2 Details of Position Package-Expectations/ Compensation	7	6.1	6.2	15.9
	3 Compensate for Housing and Relocation Expenses	2	1.8	1.8	17.7
	5 Provide the Opportunity to Meet Students	2	1.8	1.8	19.5
	6 Meet More Faculty/More One-on-One Time with Faculty	4	3.5	3.5	23.0
	8 Interview Each Candidate Separately and in Person	3	2.6	2.7	25.7
	9 Process Should Be Longer Than One Day (Two Days Suggested)	4	3.5	3.5	29.2
	10 Opportunity to View/Teach a Class or Present on Research	2	1.8	1.8	31.0
	11 Compensation for and Faster Reimbursement for Travel Expense	1	.9	.9	31.9
	12 The Process Should Be More Timely	16	14.0	14.2	46.0
	13 Recruit Earlier in the Year	6	5.3	5.3	51.3
	15 Thought the Recruiting Process Was Good	12	10.5	10.6	61.9
	16 Other	14	12.3	12.4	74.3
	17 None/No Comment	29	25.4	25.7	100.0
	Total	113	99.1	100.0	
Missing	99 Refused	1	.9		
Total		114	100.0		

Comments. Additional comments regarding the recruitment process were also solicited from those declining offers. Table 22 contains their responses. Respondents commented positively about the interview process; 15.0 percent said that staff members were friendly, helpful, and welcoming, and 10.6 percent said the recruiting process was a positive experience.

Table 22: Other Comments about the Recruiting Process from Declining Respondents.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Staff Were Friendly, Helpful, and Welcoming	17	14.9	15.0	15.0
	2 The Recruiting Process Was a Positive Experience	12	10.5	10.6	25.7
	3 Wanted More Time on Campus/More Faculty Involvement	2	1.8	1.8	27.4
	4 Impressed with Department	3	2.6	2.7	30.1
	5 Wanted Dialogue/Communication with Students	1	.9	.9	31.0
	7 Timing Was Not Good/Not Given Enough Time to Make Decision	2	1.8	1.8	32.7
	8 Wanted More Info on Housing/Health Benefits	1	.9	.9	33.6
	9 Process Was Slow	1	.9	.9	34.5
	10 Confusion or Dissatisfaction about Requirements/Salary	6	5.3	5.3	39.8
	11 Other	11	9.6	9.7	49.6
	12 None/No Comment	57	50.0	50.4	100.0
	Total	113	99.1	100.0	
Missing	99 Refused	1	.9		
Total		114	100.0		

Employment

People who declined offers from CSU campuses were asked whether they had taken a new job or remaining in their current position. More than half (60.7%) of those declining offers said they took a new job, while 39.3 percent remained in their current job. Of the jobs that respondents took or retained, 92.9 percent were in academia and 7.1 percent were not.

Academic Jobs

Table 23 shows the rank at which these other jobs are or will be held. Two-thirds (65.7%) of the respondents accepted or kept jobs at the rank of assistant professor, while 10.5 percent were at associate professor and 2.9 percent were at full professor.

Table 23: Rank of Current or Accepted Job for Those Declining CSU Offers.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Lecturer	8	7.0	7.6	7.6
	2 Assistant Professor	69	60.5	65.7	73.3
	3 Associate Professor	11	9.6	10.5	83.8
	4 Full Professor	3	2.6	2.9	86.7
	5 Post-Doctoral Fellow	7	6.1	6.7	93.3
	6 Other	7	6.1	6.7	100.0
	Total		105	92.1	100.0
Missing	9 Refused	1	.9		
	System	8	7.0		
	Total	9	7.9		
Total		114	100.0		

The institution at which jobs were accepted or retained are displayed in Table 24. About 1 in 5 (18.8%) will be working at other CSU campuses. Additionally, 5.9 percent have positions at University of California campuses and 2.0 percent have positions at other California institutions.

Table 24: Institution Where Respondent Will Be Working.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Cal State University	19	16.7	18.8	18.8
	2 UC School	6	5.3	5.9	24.8
	3 Other US University	58	50.9	57.4	82.2
	4 Other California University	2	1.8	2.0	84.2
	5 International University	3	2.6	3.0	87.1
	6 Junior College	8	7.0	7.9	95.0
	7 Other	5	4.4	5.0	100.0
	Total		101	88.6	100.0
Missing	9 Refused	5	4.4		
	System	8	7.0		
	Total	13	11.4		
Total		114	100.0		

Non-Academic Jobs

Those few people reporting that the job they took or retained was not in academia were asked the organization at which they would be working, and their job title. Table 25 shows the organizations for which declining respondents not working in academia will be working. The job titles for those people are displayed in Table 26.

Table 25: Organization Where Respondent Will Be Working.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adzantek	1	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Federal Government	2	25.0	25.0	37.5
	Hospital	1	12.5	12.5	50.0
	NASA Research Center, Associated with John Hopkins.	1	12.5	12.5	62.5
	Pasadena School District	1	12.5	12.5	75.0
	State Agency	1	12.5	12.5	87.5
	Transportation Security Administration	1	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	8	100.0	100.0	

Table 26: Respondent's Job Title.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Administrator	2	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Agricultural Economist	1	12.5	12.5	37.5
	Associate Chief Council	1	12.5	12.5	50.0
	Registered Nurse	1	12.5	12.5	62.5
	Senior Analyst	1	12.5	12.5	75.0
	Statistician-Demographer	1	12.5	12.5	87.5
	Tenure Track Assistant Astromoner	1	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	8	100.0	100.0	

Offers

People who declined offers from CSU campuses were asked about the number of other offers they received. The number of other offers the declining respondents received ranged from zero to eight. Over two-thirds (69.9%) of the respondents received at least one other offer, and received an average of 1.76 other offers. Those receiving at least one other offer were asked if the offer they had accepted from the other institution was higher, lower, or the same as the offer they received from the

Table 27: Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Declined CSU Offer.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Higher	41	36.0	55.4	55.4
	2 The Same	12	10.5	16.2	71.6
	3 Lower	21	18.4	28.4	100.0
	Total	74	64.9	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't Know	4	3.5		
	9 Refused	1	.9		
	System	35	30.7		
	Total	40	35.1		
Total		114	100.0		

CSU campus. Table 27 shows that over half (55.4%) of those declining CSU offers accepted offers from other institutions that were higher than the offer they had received from the CSU campus.

Respondents receiving offers from the CSU campus that differed from the one that they had accepted were asked about the size of the difference. Table 28 shows how the offers they accepted differed from the one they received from the CSU both for those receiving higher offers and those receiving lower offers from the CSU campus. The magnitude of the difference did not differ depending on whether it was greater or less than that offered by the CSU.

Table 28: Difference in Salary between Accepted Offer and Declined CSU Offer for Offers That Were Higher or Lower Than the CSU Offer.

		QR20 Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Declined CSU Offer			
		1 Higher	3 Lower	Total	
Difference in Salary between Accepted Offer and Declined CSU Offer	1 Less than \$2,500	Count	5	4	9
		% within Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Declined CSU Offer	12.5%	20.0%	15.0%
	2 From \$2,500 to under \$5,000	Count	8	2	10
		% within Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Declined CSU Offer	20.0%	10.0%	16.7%
	3 From \$5,000 to under \$10,000	Count	9	9	18
		% within Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Declined CSU Offer	22.5%	45.0%	30.0%
	4 From \$10,000 to under \$15,000	Count	7	2	9
		% within Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Declined CSU Offer	17.5%	10.0%	15.0%
	5 From \$15,000 to under \$20,000	Count	3	1	4
		% within Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Declined CSU Offer	7.5%	5.0%	6.7%
	6 \$20,000 or more	Count	8	2	10
		% within Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Declined CSU Offer	20.0%	10.0%	16.7%
Total		Count	40	20	60
		% within Salary of Accepted Offer Compared to Declined CSU Offer	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Respondent Characteristics

Prior Residence

The residence of the respondents at the time of application was given attention. In particular, whether or not the respondent lived in California was of interest. Just over a quarter (27.2%) of the respondents who declined offers were living in California at the time of their application.

Rank Offered

The rank offered to declining respondents is displayed in Table 29. As with accepting respondents the majority (84.2%) of the offers declined were at the assistant professor rank. Offers extended at the associate professor rank constituted 15.8 percent of the offers declined.

Table 29: Rank Offered to Declining Respondents.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2 Assistant Professor	96	84.2	84.2	84.2
	3 Associate Professor	18	15.8	15.8	100.0
	Total	114	100.0	100.0	

Salary Offered

The salary offered to declining respondents is shown in Table 30. These offers averaged \$51,538.93 for assistant professor positions, and averaged \$66,161.07 for associate professor positions.

Table 30: Salary Offered to Declining Respondents.

RANKOFF		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
2 Assistant Professor	SALOFF Salary Offered	95	\$41,940.00	\$78,000.00	\$51,538.93	7872.04
	Valid N (listwise)	95				
3 Associate Professor	SALOFF Salary Offered	15	\$51,684.00	\$90,000.00	\$66,161.07	11379.29
	Valid N (listwise)	15				

SUMMARY

This CSU Faculty Flow report has considered the results of surveys of people accepting offers from CSU campuses and declining offers from CSU campuses. Generally, the recruiting process was evaluated positively by offer recipients. Some of the key findings are noted below.

- Location, colleagues/faculty, and the department were the most commonly mentioned reasons given for accepting the job offer from the CSU campus.
- Those accepting offers from CSU campuses evaluated the recruiting process favorably.
- Almost all (92.8%) of those accepting offers said the tenure and promotion process was discussed in the interview.
- The most common suggestions from those accepting offers were (1) making the interview process proceed in a more timely manner and (2) providing more information regarding the position expectations and compensation.
- For those accepting CSU offers, more than a third (37.4%) received salary offers from that CSU that were higher than the best other offer they had received.
- Half of those accepting offers were California residents when they applied for the CSU position.
- The most common reasons given for declining offers from CSU campuses involve receiving a better offer (23.2%) or a higher salary (22.3%) elsewhere.
- Those declining offers from CSU campuses evaluated the recruiting process favorably.

- Almost all (95.6%) of those declining offers said the tenure and promotion process was discussed in the interview.
- Making the interview process proceed in a more timely manner and increasing the salary were the most common suggestions given by those declining CSU offers.
- More than half (60.7%) of those declining offers said they took a new job, while 39.3 percent remained in their current job, and of the jobs that respondents took or retained, 92.9 percent were in academia.
- Over half (55.4%) of those declining CSU offers accepted offers from other institutions that were higher than the offer they had received from the CSU campus.
- Just over a quarter (27.2%) of those declining offers were California residents at the time of application.

APPENDIX A

CSU Faculty Flow Questionnaire

Offer Recipients

A - Reasons

[ASK IF <DECISION> = 1 (Accept), ELSE SKIP TO <QR1>]

<QA1RSN> Please tell me the top three reasons why you accepted this offer:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

<QA1IMP1> On a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not at all important, and ten equals extremely important, how important would you say <QA1_1> was in your decision to accept this offer?

- _____
98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<QA1IMP2> Using the same scale, how important would you say <QA1_2> was in your decision to accept this offer?

- _____
98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<QA1IMP3> Using the same scale, how important would you say <QA1_3> was in your decision to accept this offer?

- 98. DON'T KNOW
- 99. REFUSED

[ASK IF <DECISION> = 2 (Decline), ELSE SKIP TO <Q2>]

<QR1> Please tell me the top three reasons why you declined this offer:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

<QR1IMP1> On a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not at all important, and ten equals extremely important, how important would you say <QR1_1> was in your decision to decline this offer?

- _____
- 98. DON'T KNOW
 - 99. REFUSED

<QR1IMP2> Using the same scale, how important would you say <QR1_2> was in your decision to decline this offer?

- _____
- 98. DON'T KNOW
 - 99. REFUSED

<QR1IMP3> Using the same scale, how important would you say <QR1_3> was in your decision to decline this offer?

- _____
- 98. DON'T KNOW
 - 99. REFUSED

B - Recruiting Process

<T2> Please rate the following processes or characteristics of the recruiting process at <CSU CAMPUS> by indicating whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with each statement.

<Q2> The recruiting process was timely.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<Q3> The recruiting process was fair.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<Q4> The interview process allowed me to demonstrate my competence.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<Q5> The interview process allowed me to ask all the questions I had about the job.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<Q6> My questions about faculty compensation were answered completely.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<Q7> My questions about faculty benefits were answered completely.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<Q8> The expectations for teaching were clear.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<Q9> The expectations for scholarship and creative activity were clear.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<Q10> The expectations for service were clear.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<Q11> Was the tenure and promotion process discussed?

1. YES
0. NO [SKIP TO Q13]

8. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO Q13]
9. REFUSED [SKIP TO Q13]

<Q12> Did you get enough information on the tenure and promotion process to make an informed decision on whether to accept or decline the job?

- 1. YES
- 0. NO

- 8. DON'T KNOW
- 9. REFUSED

<Q13> What suggestions do you have for improving the recruiting process?

<Q14> Do you have any other comments about the recruiting process:

C - Employment

<QR15> Did you take a new job, or are you remaining at your current place of employment?

- 1. NEW JOB
- 2. REMAINING IN CURRENT POSITION

- 8. DON'T KNOW
- 9. REFUSED

<QR16> [IF QR15= 1] Is this new job in academia?
[IF QR15= 2] Is your current job in academia?

- 1. YES
- 0. NO [SKIP TO <QR18a>]

- 8. DON'T KNOW
- 9. REFUSED

<QR17a> At what institution is this job?

- 98. DON'T KNOW
- 99. REFUSED

<QR17b> And what rank is this job?

- 1. Lecturer
- 2. Assistant Professor
- 3. Associate Professor
- 4. Full Professor
- 5. Other

- 8. DON'T KNOW
- 9. REFUSED

<QR18a> At what organization will you be working?

<QR18b> What is your job title? _____

D - Offers

<Q19> Aside from the offer from <CSU CAMPUS>, how many other offers did you receive?

- 98. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO T4]
- 99. REFUSED [SKIP TO T4]

Think about the best other offer you received.

<QA20> Was the salary offered by <CSU CAMPUS> higher than, the same as, or lower than the other offer you received?

1. HIGHER
2. THE SAME [SKIP TO T4]
3. LOWER

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<QA21> Was the salary difference between the other offer you received and the offer you accepted from <CSU CAMPUS>:

1. Less than \$2,500
2. From \$2,500 to under \$5,000
3. From \$5,000 to under \$10,000
4. From \$10,000 to under \$15,000
5. From \$15,000 to under \$20,000
6. \$20,000 or more

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<QR20> Was the salary offer you accepted higher, the same as, or lower than the salary offered by <CSU CAMPUS>?

1. HIGHER
2. THE SAME [SKIP TO T4]
3. LOWER

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<QR21> Was the salary difference between the salary offer you accepted and the one offered by <CSU CAMPUS>:

1. Less than \$2,500
2. From \$2,500 to under \$5,000
3. From \$5,000 to under \$10,000
4. From \$10,000 to under \$15,000
5. From \$15,000 to under \$20,000
6. \$20,000 or more

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

E - Demographics

<Q22> What is the highest degree or certificate that you hold?

1. Masters
2. ABD
3. Doctorate
4. Other

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<Q23> In what year did you receive that degree/become ABD?

-
9998. DON'T KNOW
 9999. REFUSED

<Q24> In what discipline did you receive that degree/will your doctorate be in?

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q25> How many years of full-time teaching experience have you had? _____

98. DON'T KNOW

99. REFUSED

<Qrace> What is your race?

1. American Indian/Alaska Native

2. Asian or Pacific Islander

3. African American

4. Hispanic

5. White

6. Other

8. DON'T KNOW

9. REFUSED