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I. Committee Charge

University of Illinois
At Urbana-Champaign

Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor
for Academic Affairs
Stebbins Administration Building
601 East John Street
Champaign, IL 61820

October 12, 2007

Provost’s Committee on Retention:

Greg Girolami, Chair
Ralph Brubaker
Mary Eamon
Jennifer Greene
Christine Jenkins
Charissa Lansing
Robert Markley
Joseph Martocchio
Michael Murphy
Nicholas Petruzzi
Peter Bauer

Leslie Struble
Joseph W. Stucki
H. Fred Trout
Steven Williams
Barbara Wilson
Beth Woodard
Jill Zager
Deborah Stone, Ex-Officio
John Ory, Ex-Officio
Elyne Cole, Ex-Officio

Dear Colleagues:

Retention of excellent faculty is one of the key elements necessary in attaining our strategic goal of recognition as a premier public research institution. I write therefore, to ask your assistance and participation in assessing ways in which we can best retain faculty. I am pleased to invite you to serve on the Provost’s Committee on Retention.

In prior years, similar committees have conducted exit interviews, in addition to securing written comments from those who have left our campus. I wish to broaden our perspectives by not only assessing the factors that contributed to the departures but to turn our attention to the insights of current faculty as well. I would like to be more forward-looking and assess how our environment can be one in which faculty wish to remain.

As such, I ask this committee to recommend a method in which a subset of our faculty can be periodically surveyed for the purpose of understanding key elements of faculty satisfaction or concerns. I envision this survey as a tool which we could use on a periodic basis to inform us of critical issues for retaining faculty. Again, I look forward to your input on the process, method and other recommendations.
Greg Girolami, Professor of Chemistry, has agreed to chair this important committee. Please accept my appreciation for your willingness to assist him and me as we work to make the University of Illinois at Urbana a campus that draws and sustains the best faculty.

Best wishes,

Linda Katehi
Provost and Vice Chancellor
for Academic Affairs

cc: Richard Herman
Ruth Watkins
II. Executive Summary and Recommendations

Provost Linda Katehi charged this Committee with the important task of analyzing and making suggestions to improve faculty retention. To do so, during Summer 2008 and Spring 2009 the Committee conducted one-on-one interviews with eight Deans, and held interview sessions with seventeen focus groups involving a representative sample of approximately 100 faculty members and 30 Department Heads (see Section VII for details of the constitution of the focus groups). The Committee’s conclusions and recommendations reflect pervasive and systematic patterns in the views of the faculty community, including those with administrative roles. Detailed summaries of the comments collected during the interviews are given in Appendices A-C.

This executive summary is organized as follows. First, we address factors consistently identified by interviewees that encourage faculty members to seek employment elsewhere. Second, we address factors consistently identified by interviewees that encourage faculty members to remain at Illinois. Third, we offer additional recommendations for addressing the issue of faculty retention.

The need for greater transparency underlies many issues we discuss below. Faculty members often do not understand the rationale for various administrative decisions within their departments, schools, and colleges. Most of the faculty members interviewed want greater communication between themselves and their campus administration.

Factors Contributing to Faculty Departures

1. “Counter offer” culture

Faculty members clearly stated that offers from other universities, regardless of institutional quality, are perceived to be the primary means to receive substantial pay increases and additional resources such as discretionary research funds and laboratory renovations.

For three reasons, this practice raises resentment between beneficiaries of counter offers and those who choose not to seek outside offers. First, many faculty do not understand how and why their colleagues do or do not receive counter offers. Second, all faculty members feel that seeking outside offers detracts from their productivity. Third, outside offers exacerbate pay and resource inequity.

Faculty members expressed concern that campus administration, Deans, and Department Heads rely too heavily on signals from the external market (that is, outside offers) to judge their value to Illinois rather than relying on periodic, systematic performance reviews.

Faculty expressed a concern that lucrative counter offers come at the expense of meaningful merit pay increases.

Faculty members believe that excellent colleagues often leave as a result of seeking the outside offers
necessary to secure internal rewards, either because they discover opportunities, or because they are dissatisfied by the University’s subsequent response.

**Recommendations**

a. Clearly inform faculty members that counter-offers come from campus, college, and departmental budgets, and not solely from set-aside campus funds.

b. Develop a campus standard of what circumstances justify formulating a counter-offer and then adhere to it consistently across campus.

c. Require Deans and Department Heads to make the policies governing counter-offer negotiations transparent to the faculty. To do so, college and departmental administrators should establish guidelines to determine whether a faculty member with an outside offer should be given a counter offer. These guidelines should be based on reliable and valid performance criteria appropriate for their faculty that are assessed through systematic performance reviews.

d. Require systematic, annual performance reviews to be substantive with rewards that are more than across-the-board small increments. Whenever possible, rewards should include a combination of a salary increase, discretionary research funds, and appropriate non-monetary recognition.

e. Encourage Deans and Department Heads to develop and implement pre-emptive mechanisms such as off-cycle recognition of “unusual and exemplary” faculty accomplishments.

f. Discourage upper campus administration from undermining counter-offer decisions made by Deans and Department Heads.

2. University bureaucracy

The University has a number of regulatory bodies that interact with research and teaching missions. These agencies are mandated by Federal Regulations and are important to the orderly conduct of the University. However, faculty and administrators interviewed consistently believed that some of these agencies, as well as the University, have made responding to the requirements onerous and unnecessarily cumbersome.

Additionally, all focus groups expressed, to some degree, concerns regarding an increasing amount of administrative requirements and activities. The perception exists that there is an emerging culture of micromanaging-bureaucracy that conflicts with routine operational duties and, indeed, the usual chain of authority. Department Heads believe the increases in restrictions and requirements were negatively impacting their ability to lead. They want to be trusted they can manage their departments better
Recommendations

a. Appoint an ad hoc faculty committee to ascertain if the processes and procedures of regulatory committees, especially the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), can be streamlined and made less intrusive.

b. Develop a process to screen and prioritize administrative requests for information and data from departments and colleges to minimize redundancy and eliminate inefficiencies.

c. Commission a third party (outside of the Office of the Provost) to regularly seek from Deans and Department Heads examples of “excessive” administrative requirements.

d. Encourage interdisciplinary collaborations by reducing the number of bureaucratic barriers involving departmental appointments, allocation of instructional units (IUs), and sharing of direct and indirect costs from grants.

3. “Have” and “Have not” faculty

Faculty members noted a substantial disparity of resources across colleges and schools at Illinois, particularly now that fewer resources are available from the campus Research Board. Most noteworthy are lower salaries, lower levels of research and travel support, and lower quality of facilities in the humanities and social sciences as compared to the natural sciences, engineering, and professional schools.

Many of the humanities faculty appreciated the Provost granting each faculty member $1,000 for research and professional travel and encouraged more efforts to help faculty in disciplines with fewer resources.

Recommendations

a. Enhance opportunities for seed money to fund faculty research in the humanities and social sciences where external funding is scarce.

b. Increase funding to help faculty members in the humanities and social sciences travel to professional conferences and meetings without using personal funds to meet expenses.

4. Morale and recognition of the faculty

Faculty members want to be valued, respected, and recognized at both the department and campus levels. Most of the individuals interviewed want greater communication between themselves and campus administration. They want to hear a consistent and positive voice about the university. Many
believed messages from campus administration should be more about seeking excellence and less about hearing “how bad things are.” Science and engineering faculty members believe the quality of their colleges is eroding due to across the board cuts and rising research overhead rates imposed without sufficient consultation or advance notice, while the humanities professors feel underappreciated for the amount of teaching they offer.

**Recommendations**

a. Do more to keep faculty members informed about and involved in key campus decisions, throughout the decision making process.

b. Continue the practice of having the Provost meet with faculty in their schools and colleges. Faculty participants viewed these Provost’s visits favorably.

c. Highlight ALL of the colleges and disciplines more evenly in university publications and promotions.

5. **Institutional and community areas of concern**

In addition to the concerns listed above, several aspects of the University and C-U community were consistently cited as factors encouraging faculty to leave or to think about leaving Illinois. The University-related factors most often mentioned were salary and poor leadership. Compensation concerns include declining salary competitiveness relative to peer institutions, years of little or no annual increases, and salary compression. Leadership issues center on lack of communication and transparency in campus, college, and departmental activities. The community-related factors mentioned were lack of day care, the declining quality of the schools, and limited airport service.

**Recommendations**

a. Develop and implement documents and methods (such as informational meetings) to help prepare Department Heads, especially in the areas of recruitment and retention of faculty.

b. Provide funds to colleges to enable an effective merit salary program and to address severe cases of salary compression.

c. Continue to work with the local community on development issues.

**Factors Contributing to Faculty Retention**

1. **Institutional and community assets**

Several aspects of the University and C-U community were consistently cited as contributors that help keep faculty from leaving. The University-related factors were its reputation and overall excellence,
the Library and its resources, campus computing and IT resources, and the Krannert Center. Also cited were faculty colleagues, and graduate and undergraduate students. The University gives faculty members the autonomy “to do their work” and a sense of appreciation for their efforts. Features of the C-U community most often cited were its small town atmosphere and schools.

**Recommendations**

a. Maintain and enhance campus-wide resources that are highly valued by the faculty.

**2. Dual career program**

Several of the interviewed faculty were hired as part of the dual career hiring program and clearly indicated the program is an important tool for retention as well as recruitment. Most indicated the dual career hiring program was a key factor in selecting Illinois as a place of employment and in deciding to stay at Illinois. Nevertheless, a small segment of these individuals pointed to disparities in treatment or slow decision making, which seemed to be limited to particular Deans and Department Heads in the form of false or broken promises. Accordingly, the program may be enhanced in at least two ways.

**Recommendations**

a. Continue to invest additional resources to expand the recruitment and retention of academic couples.

b. Review the current policy and procedures, and revise accordingly to avoid contributing to perceptions of false or broken promises when a partner is not accommodated as anticipated during discussions at the recruitment stage.

**Additional Recommendations to Promote Faculty Retention**

a. Faculty participants indicated that the Committee’s Report on Faculty Retention should be distributed to all faculty members and unit executive officers. The suggested avenues of communication are as follows:

   - Give a presentation to the Council of Deans;
   - Post the report on the Provost’s Web site;
   - Send an email to all faculty members that the report has been posted; and
   - Conduct presentations in colleges for unit executive officers.

b. Charge the 2009-10 Provost’s Committee on Retention with the task of proposing specific programs and policies to promote faculty recruitment and retention.

c. Repeat focus group interviews of faculty members at regular (e.g., 5 year) intervals.
III. Current Faculty Demographics

In 2008-9, the Urbana campus of the University of Illinois employed 2096 tenured or tenure-track faculty members (Campus Profile from www.dmi.illinois.edu). Currently, about 45% of the tenure system faculty are full professors, 30% are associate professors, and 25% are assistant professors. Since the 2000-1 academic year, there has been an increase of 265 in faculty headcount, distributed over all three ranks: full professors (up by 80 to 940), associate professors (up by 95 to 610), and assistant professors (up by 90 to 525).

About 30% of all faculty members are women, up from 24% in 2000-1. The representation of women is greater in the associate and assistant professor ranks (39%) than among full professors (20%, up from 13% in 2000-1). Members of underrepresented minority groups (U.S. citizens and permanent residents self-identified as Native American, African American, or Hispanic/Latino) constitute 9% of all faculty members, up from 4% in 2000-1. Again, the representation is greater among associate and assistant professors (11 and 15%, respectively) than among full professors (5%, up from 2% in 2000-1).

Faculty excellence plays a significant role in rankings of universities. In its 2009 rankings, U.S. News & World Report's America's Best Colleges rated the Urbana campus as the number 10 public university and the number 40 national university (illinois.edu/about/about.html). The 2008 Washington Monthly College National Rankings listed Illinois as 11th in the nation, and in 2007 the Institute for Higher Education at Shanghai Jia Tong University ranked Illinois as the 26th best university in the world and the 19th best university in America.

150 members of the current faculty are members of the National Academy of Science, the National Academy of Engineering, or the American Association of Arts and Sciences. Two current faculty members have won Pulitzer Prizes, and one current faculty member is a Nobel Laureate.

IV. Statistics and Trends related to Faculty Retention

1. Internally Generated Data

In each of the past 28 years, John Ory has compiled an “Annual Report of UIUC Faculty Resignations,” which contains detailed quantitative data about faculty retention. From 1981 to 2001 only faculty members choosing to leave the university were covered in the report, but since 2002 the reports have also included data about retirees and those denied tenure, and the results of telephone interviews of all those who left. The reports also contain the results of two written surveys. One survey was filled out by the departing faculty members, for which the average response rate is 55%. The second survey was filled out by their departmental administrators, who were asked to describe their understanding of the reason for the departure and the type of job taken, and to rank the contribution of each departing faculty member to teaching, research, and service. The response rate of the latter survey is typically
close to 100%. The following summarized the general findings of the reports.

- On average, campus-wide, approximately 50 faculty members leave Illinois voluntarily each year; these numbers exclude retirees and tenure denials (Figure 1). This number corresponds to about 3% of the faculty, but the attrition rate may be larger for minorities. The highest percentage was 3.7% in 1988, and the lowest was 1.9% in 1993.

**Fig. 1. Number of Faculty Members Leaving (excluding retirements & tenure denials), 1981-2008.**

- Assistant professors make up a significant majority of those departing voluntarily; i.e., for reasons other than retirement or denial of tenure. 60% of those leaving voluntarily are assistant professors, about 20% are full professors, and 20% are associate professors.

- Over the past 10 years, average annual faculty attrition rates for most colleges are between 2.5 and 5%. Outside this range are Medicine (0.8%), ACES (2.0%), Engineering (2.1%), Business (5.9%), Vet Med (6.5%), and the Aviation Institute (8.4%).

- Of the 340 departing faculty who left for jobs in academia in the last 10 years, many went to other Big Ten universities (Table 1).

**Table 1. Institutions Hiring the Largest Number of Departing Faculty, 1998-2008.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Number hired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston U.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California - San Diego</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• In fiscal years 2005 and 2006, Illinois tenured faculty members received 126 and 124 outside offers, respectively, and more than 50 percent of those who received outside offers resigned (news.illinois.edu/ii/06/1116/bot.html). Fifty-two percent of outside offers were not matched with counter offers, although this number is deceptive because counter offers often are not made if the faculty member has clearly decided to leave.

• Over the past 10 years, about 55% of the departing faculty members left to accept other faculty positions, about 20% took administrative positions within academe, and about 20% left for jobs in government or private industry.

• Faculty members who left were asked to rate 18 reasons for leaving. The most common self-reported reason is a desire for a different geographic location, but all of the eight next-most cited reasons relate to the faculty member’s relationship with the University (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avg Rating</th>
<th>Reason for Leaving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Desire for a different geographic location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Increase in salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Not appreciated here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>My opportunities for advancement are limited at UIUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Lack of rapport with departmental leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Opportunity to work more closely with colleagues in my field of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Opportunity to accelerate my career (promotion in rank or added responsibilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>New professional challenge within academe (e.g., administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Lack of cultural and social opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• When administrators are asked why their faculty left the University, they typically cited personal reasons, excellent offers, or a desire for a new location. According to the administrators approximately 20% of those who leave do so for spousal/partner reasons and about 20% because they preferred not to go through the tenure process.

• On average, about 8% of those who leave each year are “stars” who we very much would like to keep, and about an equal number are “emerging stars”, according to EO ratings.

• EO ratings of departing faculty members rate teaching higher than research or service.

• Faculty who left, including retirees and non-retirees, were asked to rate their level of satisfaction in 30 different areas relating to the University. Both retirees and non-retirees were most satisfied with their professional autonomy, quality of the library services, and quality of computing resources. They were most dissatisfied with rewards for service, rewards for teaching, and the social climate within their department.
• Retirees were more satisfied than non-retirees in 28 of the 30 areas surveyed. Both groups rated university services to support instructional development and employee benefits the same. The greatest discrepancies between the two groups were usefulness of the third-year review, balanced overall workload, mentoring of junior faculty, and the recruitment/retention of quality graduate students.

• The overall climate of the Illinois campus was given an average rating by departing faculty of 3.7 on a 4 point scale (1 = very unaccepting; 4 = very accepting). Typically, men gave higher ratings than women, and retirees gave higher ratings than non-retirees. Approximately 80-90% of all departing faculty members rate campus efforts to address climate issues as either somewhat effective or effective, on a 6 point scale (1= very ineffective; 6 = very effective). However, each year several departing faculty members rate the climate items on the low end of the scale and describe their concerns.

2. Externally Generated Data

In addition to these internally-generated data, there are external sources of data relevant to faculty retention. In 2007, the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) surveyed almost 7,000 non-tenured faculty members across the nation about their satisfaction with the workplace. Many high quality schools are missing among the 55 universities in the study, although the participating institutions included, among others, Harvard, Stanford, Virginia, Dartmouth, and North Carolina-Chapel Hill, and Illinois, Indiana, Michigan State, Minnesota, and Ohio State in the Big Ten. This study of non-tenured faculty is particularly relevant to the concerns in the present report, because the statistics above show that attrition rates are largest among this subgroup.

In several categories, Illinois junior faculty members ranked among the most satisfied in the nation. In this survey, “exemplar” universities achieved scores that were notably higher than similar institutions. Of the 56 universities that participated, two (Brown and Stanford) achieved exemplar status in 8 out of 12 categories, one (Duke) in 7 categories, one (Dartmouth) in 6 categories, and two (Illinois and Notre Dame) in 4 categories. The four categories in which Illinois excelled were: research environment, overall policy effectiveness, work and family, and global satisfaction.

In one question, junior faculty members were asked whether they would accept the job again if they had to do it over. The responses of the roughly 200 Illinois faculty members who participated in the survey averaged 4.24 on a 5-point scale, where 5 meant “strongly agree,” vs. a nationwide average of 4.07. When asked how satisfied they were overall with the institution as a place to work, Illinois averaged 3.99 on the 5 point scale, vs. a nationwide average for universities of 3.67.

The survey found that, by far, the primary complaint about Illinois is geographic location, which 44% of junior faculty members listed as the university’s worst aspect. Survey respondents listed the top four
positive aspects of Illinois as, in order, quality of colleagues, cost of living, support for research, and a sense of “fit” at the university.

See: isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic355124.files/Exemplar_06-07_Press_Release_FINAL.pdf and news.illinois.edu/ii/08/0207/facultyfriendly.html.


Over 2300 qualified responses were received, and a total of 54 U.S. institutions were represented. As in the COACHE study, many high-quality institutions did not participate, and the results should be interpreted accordingly. Survey respondents were asked to assess their working environments by indicating their level of agreement with 41 criteria in 8 different areas. Categories included the quality of mentoring, infrastructure & environment, pay, research resources and tenure. The most important factor in a strong work environment cited in the 2008 survey was the relationship with coworkers and mentors.

V. Previous Actions of the Committee

Beginning in 1982, at the direction of then Vice Chancellor Ned Goldwasser, and continuing today, John Ory of the Center for Teaching Excellence has constructed annual reports of faculty members who left the University for other appointments. The reports contained information about the number of departures analyzed by rank, college, and type of new position accepted, average ratings of the faculty members by their unit EOs, and self-reported reasons for leaving.

In 2001, Provost Richard Herman, at the urging of the Board of Trustees and the Committee on the Status of Women, appointed a committee to design an exit interview program for departing faculty, in order to augment the annual reports prepared by John Ory. The Committee designed a process using Pennsylvania State University’s exit interview program as a model. To implement the recommendations of this Committee, the Provost requested that the Deans provide names of faculty members willing to serve on the Provost’s Committee on Retention. The Committee was appointed for the first time in the spring of 2002. The Provost charged the Committee to

- Conduct confidential telephone and face to face interviews with departing faculty members;
- Review aggregate data from the written exit survey instrument;
- Identify areas of success and areas of concern as they relate to retaining a diverse faculty; and
- Develop recommendations to address any problems identified through the written surveys and instruments.
By January 2005, a total of 264 faculty members had been contacted and offered exit interviews, and 106 interviews had actually taken place. Of those faculty members interviewed, 41 had retired, 5 had been denied tenure, and 60 had relocated voluntarily. At that time, a report from the Committee was submitted by Mary Ellen O’Shaughnessy, Associate Director of Academic Human Resources, to Interim Chancellor Richard Herman and Interim Provost Jesse Delia.

The January 2005 report concluded that some of the reasons faculty leave are ones the university should have a vested interest in addressing. These reasons included salary, lack of departmental leadership, limited opportunities for advancement, lack of cultural and social opportunities, lack of mentoring, and spousal/partner hire issues. The exit interviews, in particular, highlighted the importance of leadership at the departmental level. The environment created by the Department Head or Chair is critical to the health and atmosphere of the department and the success of the faculty members within the department. Lack of mentoring was clearly a problem in several of the cases in which the faculty member was denied tenure or was counseled to leave before going up for tenure.

In the January 2005 report, the Committee made several recommendations.

- The exit interview program should continue.
- The results of the annual faculty retention reports should be made available in a more timely fashion to Deans and department EOs, especially when a cluster of concerns is identified in a particular department.
- The Campus should design a series of seminars for Department Heads that would focus on leadership issues that would improve retention, and an overview of “best practices” as they relate to faculty retention should be included in the Allerton New Administrator Fall Orientation.
- Because the hiring opportunities within the surrounding community are limited, the Dual Career program should be better coordinated.

Telephone interviews continued through the spring of 2007, but were suspended when the Provost’s Committee on Retention began conducting the present study. In direct consequence of the third recommendation, a workshop on recruitment and retention for Department Heads was held on 29 April 2005. The participants engaged in a round table discussion with John Ory, who presented the findings from his most recent annual report, and a panel of four other members of the Provost’s Committee on Retention, all of whom had served as Department Heads. No such workshops have been offered since 2005.

To date, the Allerton Senior Leadership Retreat has not incorporated written information about best practices for faculty retention.
VI. Construction of this Report

The current Committee consists of a representative group of fourteen faculty members from across the Campus, and four *ex officio* University administrators.

The Committee was given a special charge by the Provost in 2007 to identify the reasons that senior faculty members come to Illinois, the key drivers of faculty satisfaction and loyalty to the university, the key reasons that faculty leave, and recommendations for both reactive and proactive measures to improve faculty retention.

The Committee considered several alternative paths to construct its Report. One path, to assemble the collective views of the committee members, was ultimately rejected on the grounds that the 2005 report had already done this, and on the grounds that this specially commissioned Report should be based on data rather than opinions. Consequently, the Committee decided that the Report was best constructed from numerical data on faculty retention, from the results of focus group sessions conducted with a broad cross section of faculty and Department Heads, and from individual interviews conducted with Deans.

At the beginning of the summer of 2008, the Committee’s plan was presented to the Council of Deans, who endorsed the plan and provided helpful suggestions. Later that summer, three focus group sessions were conducted with approximately 30 Department Heads; in Fall 2008 individual interviews were held with eight Deans, and in the spring of 2009 fifteen focus group sessions were held with faculty members.

Interviews and focus groups were tape recorded, and comments were captured by volunteers from the committee. The reports from each focus group were evaluated by a core team of writers, who wrote this report in concurrence with the Committee as a whole. The recommendations in this Report are derived from an analysis of systematic patterns found in the comments received. For this reason, we believe that, as far as is possible, the recommendations herein are based on, and substantiated by, factual data. Because the recommendations in this report are not derived from individual observations and opinions, we have refrained from including individual comments in the main body of this report. They can, however, be found in the Appendices.

The core team of writers included Greg Girolami, Joe Martocchio, John Ory, Fred Troutt, and Leslie Struble, with Nick Petruzzi acting as a reader.

VII. Design of the Focus Groups and Interviews

To collect data for this Report, the Committee conducted twenty five separate interview sessions with individuals or with small groups of invited faculty members or administrators. The small groups involved faculty members or administrators who shared certain demographic characteristics, so as to enable the identification of issues in common to that demographic.
1. Faculty Members

Fourteen sessions were held with approximately 100 faculty members. For a detailed summary of comments received from the faculty members, see Appendix A. These sessions were organized around the following four focus groups:

- Faculty members who recently had outside offers but stayed
- Full professors with long experience (15+ years) at the University
- Newly tenured associate professors
- Target of opportunity and excellence hires

For each of the focus groups above, separate sessions were organized for each of four discipline-related subgroups. The discipline-related subgroups were:

- Physical and life sciences, engineering, and ACES
- Humanities and fine arts
- Social and behavioral sciences (including Education and Applied Health Studies).
- Professional schools (Law, Labor and Employment Relations, the Graduate School of Library and Information Science, Business, and Veterinary Medicine).

Two pairs of subgroups met together owing to the smaller numbers of faculty members in the campus pool: the TOP/Excellence hires from the social sciences and professional schools met together, as did faculty members from these same departments who recently had outside offers but stayed.

Faculty members who recently had outside offers but stayed were identified by their Deans. Faculty members for the other focus groups were selected at random based on criteria for discipline, rank, or employment history, but under the constraint that each group should contain a gender- and racially-representative sampling of faculty members within that group. For each faculty focus group, 20 faculty members were invited to attend the round-table discussion sessions, with the expectation that 6 to 12 of those invited would participate. In practice, this expectation was fulfilled: the sessions were all well attended, with 4 or more attending each session. Feedback from after the meetings suggested that faculty members were pleased to be invited to participate.

2. Department Heads

Because of the smaller numbers, the Committee met with approximately 30 Department Heads in three separate discipline-related subgroups similar to those described above for the faculty. For a detailed summary of comments received from the Department Heads, see Appendix B.

3. Deans

Eight separate one-on-one interviews were conducted with Deans. For a detailed summary of comments received from the Deans, see Appendix C.
Appendix A. Summary of Interviews with Faculty Members

All focus group interviews were led by Joseph Martocchio. Each was attended by one or two other members of the committee who took notes that formed the basis for these summaries.

1. Mid Career Faculty in Engineering and Science

Notes were taken by Nicholas Petruzzi and John Ory. There were 4 participants, 2 women and 2 men, with no one from an underrepresented minority.

**Why do you choose to remain at the UIUC?**

Collegiality, access to excellent students, and access to excellent resources, especially the library, were cited by many. The small town atmosphere is important to many. Independence and freedom as well as resources and support to do one’s own work. Opportunities for a spouse/partner.

**How do you describe your ideal employment as a faculty member at your rank and in your field?**

Proper balance between research, teaching, and service obligations or expectations is important. Freedom to do research one wants to do. Having one’s own research valued and appreciated for its merits (in contrast to having it defined by someone else’s agenda) is desirable.

“*We have a reasonable distribution of research, teaching, and service.*”

“This is a place where my skills are best used.”

“I have no ideal, I am just happy here.”

**What here is not matching your ideal?**

Salaries are lower here (2 of 4 people).

“I know we are not competitive here because those who leave get a lot more.”

Graduate student tuition costs keep some better students away.

“Hard to get good graduate students here because of tuition costs.”

More research support is needed.

“[University/college bureaucracy] can cut the legs out from under you on getting grants.”

The current economic situation is certainly a negative.

“Increases in student numbers lower the quality of students, and ups our workload.”

“Fewer resources [are available] to teach larger classes.”

“Need to help to tide faculty over in-between grants…Research Board used to help when they had more to give.”

Little things do make a difference.

“Doesn’t take much to make a difference…very simple things like getting help copying, stocking shelves.”

“Nickel and diming is increasing.”

“Why can’t phones be on my grants?”

Increasing paper work is a problem (2 of 4 saw it as a bigger problem here than elsewhere).

“Ethics [training] is monumental waste of time.”

 “[Getting approval of] MTAs [materials transfer agreements is] a big impediment.”

There is so much more burden on the faculty.

“The administration used to hold an umbrella over the faculty, helping them with all the unnecessary paperwork and bureaucracy. This is just the opposite now.”
“We didn’t have to take this upward slope.”

What is your experience with spousal hires?
University does a good job here.
“Better than other schools.”
“Need to keep doing well.”

Do you intend to seek opportunities to leave the UIUC in the near future?
One is seeking to leave because of broken promises within the unit. Another feels compelled to be “on the market” just to keep discretionary resources and salary compensation competitive with free-market value. The perceived culture here is reactive, so it is important to seek external opportunities if one wants to maintain a fair level of tangible rewards and benefits for one’s work. Seeking does not mean initiating to the faculty.

“Every time you give a guest talk somewhere you are on trial for a hire.”
Many opportunities exist for most faculty members. A counter offer is perceived as the only way to get ahead. For the most part faculty members don’t like the counter offer game.

“I see rewards accrue to those who play the game.”
 “[The counter offer culture is our] biggest problem.”
“Even in good financial times the system is set up for those who game the system.”

How do we fix the counter offer problem?
Make funds available for proactive support.

“Have campus funds [available] for keeping faculty, not just matching offers.”
Do a better job of evaluating faculty performance.

“Merit raises do not exist when so little is given out.”

“It must be better to trust our own evaluation than to rely on outside offer evaluations.”

Is the UIUC competitive in terms of research support with peer and better departments in your field?
Grad tuition has gone up relative to peers, a major disadvantage because grant money does not go as far thus making it more difficult to secure best research talent.

Is the UIUC competitive in terms of faculty salaries with peer and better departments in your field?
Salary compression (or even inversion) makes it challenging to maintain quality mid-career senior faculty. Competitive salaries are a function of the reactionary “game” model described above.

“If you play that game, then, yes, salaries are competitive. However, if you do not, then salaries are not so competitive.”

Are there attributes of your position at the UIUC that you find particularly negative relative to positions that you might obtain elsewhere?
As external economic pressures are countered by raising class sizes, educational quality suffers. Smaller classes mean less revenue, but they create greater efficiencies in the sense that it is MUCH easier (takes much less time and energy) to teach a small smaller group of superior-quality students then to teach a large group of mediocre-quality students.

Depletion of Research Board funds and opportunities is becoming an issue.

Do you feel that your contributions to your unit/department are appreciated by your faculty colleagues?
Faculty members feel appreciated by colleagues, but it’s not clear to many if they are appreciated by administration. “Appreciation” by administration is interpreted to mean tangible rewards. A major reason for feeling underappreciated is when faculty members have to perform support services on their
own, which is not a good use of faculty’s time. The administration should provide services and infrastructure so that faculty can spend their time on core mission activities. Faculty members do not want to be “nickel-and-dimed” - not with respect to their funds, and not with respect to their time.

Do you feel that you can succeed as well in your research career by staying at the UIUC as you could at any other institution that may wish to hire you?

Three respondents said, “yes”, “yes”, and “not sure”. For the “not sure” the concern was lack of good graduate students.

Aside from financial matters such as salaries and research support, what steps should the UIUC administration take in the future in order to retain its most valuable faculty members?

Spousal hire program and opportunities therein are vital, and we need to keep doing this BETTER than any other place.

Retention is tied to attraction - when recruiting, don’t oversell the institution. Promote what we ARE and what we are good at and what we care about (what are our core values) and go for fit. Don’t promote what we are not in hopes of landing a star at any cost (do we want a star whose core values are different than ours?). This means understanding exactly what makes us (a given unit) GREAT and then sharing that with recruits rather than saying what we think a given recruit wants to hear.

Remember new recruits want to see that our faculty members are happy here.

Department heads need to even out workloads.

“Some people get away with doing nothing because they are not good at something so they are not asked to do it again.”

“Some get rewarded for being a crappy teacher by getting a reduced teaching load...no mechanism to stop this.”

There is too much bean counting here. Remember that little things matter.

Help the state better understand what we do so the “state values us more”. Help find places on campus for faculty discipline mismatches or “eclectics”.

“Don’t make me have to threaten to leave to get ahead.”

2. Mid Career Faculty in Humanities

Notes by Leslie Struble and Fred Troutt. There were 7 participants, 5 women and 2 men, with 1 person from an underrepresented minority.

Why do you choose to remain at UIUC?

Most said they believe in public (vs. private) education. This is a top department and university, though reputation may be in jeopardy with diminishing resources. Colleagues are great and provide important intellectual dialog.

The research support is important, including a relatively low teaching load. People who assign course schedules can make this a good place or an awful place. Faculty members value the intellectual freedom and creativity. They value the opportunity to merge teaching and research interests. They value the collegiality of their department. One said he/she is able to attract great students, and UIUC has TA/RA support that helps in this regard.

Mobility is not common in their discipline. One likes his/her office.

It is easy to live here, minimal commuting. The Urbana-Champaign community has gotten better over the years.

How do you describe your ideal employment?

The ideal employment environment provides freedom to find your own research topics, which UIUC does, though this may be precarious. It has sufficient specialized facilities for creative research (in example, enough grand pianos), though these are increasingly lacking at UIUC. It has adequate
endowments for student scholarships, and gives faculty control over such money. It has few committee assignments. This is a diversity issue: when your demographic does not have enough critical mass, you end up with a disproportionate number of assignments, and women are not educated to decline such assignments. Therefore, it is important to have a reasonable number of faculty members in each area.

“As a woman I’m on all sorts of committees; [the resulting time demands can] cause women to be stuck at the associate professor level; I need time for scholarship.”

Collegiality and intellectual interchange are very important. Research support, including funding to attend meetings, is important. It was noted that research support in the humanities is a $25 allocation per person per year and support to attend one conference per year.

“I spend more and more of my own money on conference travel and my salary isn’t growing.”

The ideal employment environment has teaching that is aligned with research. It has good infrastructure (office furniture, computers, classrooms without broken chairs, classrooms with integrated technology support). The issue of office furniture generated much discussion, it was noted that high school teachers have better furniture, secretaries here have better. Availability of university-provided computers is a big issue. An effective and communicative unit head is critical.

What makes you unhappy here?

Large and growing bureaucracy, rapid and unplanned hiring, and too many people leaving. The quality of public schools is poor, with unsavory histories and unresolved issues, including safety. Higher salary elsewhere is tempting. Salary differential and catch up are issues. Salary issues are morale issues.

“I abhor the way we go to get a raise - get an outside offer - play the game - it aborts loyalty.”

“The idea that retention money comes out of the raise pool is obscene.”

“We are underpaid here especially in the upper ranks.”

Do you intend to seek opportunities to leave in the near future?

The current fragile marketplace makes this unlikely. Salary compression means that people with far less ability are hired here at salaries that dwarf those in the unit. The only way to get a raise is to get an outside offer. Men are more likely to play this game than women. It is damaging to morale and a drain on the administrative resources. This game is hugely prevalent, and the attendees said that they could not overstate the extent to which it occupies people’s energies. It is obscene when retention resources come out of the raise pool. Service and teaching are generally not rewarded. There was much more concern about salary than about promotion.

Is UIUC competitive in terms of faculty salaries?

Starting salaries compare well, but salary for faculty members who have stayed here for some time is low. The fact that salaries vary by discipline causes huge disparities. Salary compression is a huge issue.

What other steps should the UIUC administration take to retain its most valuable faculty members?

Making faculty members feel valued and recognized goes a long way. New titles might help to recognize contribution. But salary is important to a lot of people. Retention should address the salary compression issue, not just match offers. The University’s commitments to being a Research I University and to excellence across all domains, including humanities and fine and applied arts, need to be reaffirmed. The group expressed appreciation for activities of the Provost and of former Chancellor Nancy Cantor to promote diversity here.

Do you have any general comments?

High speed rail to Chicago would transform the view of UIUC.

The unit head is enormously important in retention and in promotion and tenure. The structure around
the head (selection, review) is really important. People want to know they are loved, and Deans often control what heads can do.

Excellence hires need to be handled carefully, broadly consulting faculty, to maintain good morale. The way Excellence hires are handled coming in can have an impact on the morale of faculty here.

The goal of the department is often not well articulated, when expectations are clear, the environment is healthier.

Dual career hiring is a huge issue, but was not discussed much.

The climate for gay and lesbian faculty has improved a lot, but the climate for racial minorities has not, though the decision to abolish the Chief was a big help.

3. Mid Career Faculty in Professional Schools

Notes taken by Leslie StrUBLE and Charissa Lansing. There were 6 participants, all men, with no underrepresented minority.

**Why do you choose to remain at UIUC?**

The quality of the university and its national reputation are critical. Also important are how people are treated as faculty members, freedom or autonomy in teaching, and autonomy in research (problems arise when administration imposes a research agenda).

“I’d add that flexibility in choosing research areas and allowing professors to independently choose collaboration rather than being directed by administrators.”

Research support is good.

It is easy to live here and this is a good place to raise a family.

Excellent colleagues and students (especially PhD students). Support for interdisciplinary work (though this is diminishing and not necessarily supported when you look more closely). The university is supportive of outside consulting activities. The university is flexible in part-time appointments. Academic staff members are a terrific asset and resource.

“My wife and I are involved in the community projects and social activities that are important to us.”

“I’ve been here a long time and have many friends.”

“The community is a good place to raise a family.”

The Krannert Center for Performing Arts is very important, both as an activity and as a symbol. With Krannert, cultural activity and access are options in the community.

**How do you describe ideal employment?**

Competitive financing is important (salary, supplements such as research and summer appointments). There is unlimited summer support for junior faculty (the norm in some units in the college). Some saw salary as ok, others did not. Autonomy, freedom to advance career are seen as good. A unit that addresses issues proactively is desirable. Low turnover is important.

“In an ideal job, there is not lots of turnover. [Not ideal] is when colleagues are poached by other universities, and we lose as many as stay!”

The ideal university would recognize excellence and reward it, match not match outside offers. Annual reviews are not about raises but about value, contributions, future.

“In business, the strategy is often to not match outside offers but rather to reward excellence and focus on development, resulting in less turnover, better retention, and a healthier atmosphere.”

“We have great camaraderie and great academic talent.”

Location, natural setting, and cultural opportunities are all important. Transportation issues are
important (high speed rail, airline service). It is critical that the University demonstrates a tangible commitment to meritocracy.

**What makes you unhappy here?**

Public schools are a disappointment, in part probably reflecting national trends. The University Laboratory schools are great but enrollment is limited and it averages one police call per day. Middle schools are atrocious here. Limited funds and what they produce reflect that and there is a strong reason to enroll children in private school.

The increase in administrative paperwork (ethics, P&T, IRB, etc.) reduces the time for creative thinking and for interacting with students.

Compensation, freedom, and resources are all important. We do poorly on salary, with 30% less salary compared to other schools.

"Lost 26 faculty in 11 years."

"We are low hanging fruit for other schools."

We are losing hires because packages are not competitive. Because we don’t match salary, fringe benefits become very important, and these are under pressure from the state and not being protected by the administration.

University administrative requirements are a huge and unnecessary burden (P&T, ethics, IRB were specifically mentioned). University administration has increased a lot in the last 2 years without improving the University.

The likely budget cuts will probably be made across the board, whereas we need to stop doing things that we don’t do well and in order to put resources where they will make a difference. The University is reactive rather than proactive with regard to budget and has been that way for decades.

To be competitive in the future, we must be willing to make difficult decisions. We need to consider the cost of meetings.

Global Campus is a big negative. It illustrates a very disheartening dismissal of faculty governance. The administration has a very poor record in this regard.

There is a growing gulf between faculty and administration. Faculty governance is not supported and the campus administration appears to be acting independently.

**Do you intend to seek opportunities to leave in the near future?**

One said he/she had offers recently but stayed only because of ancillary issues (family, local roots) and would probably have left if he/she were younger. It is especially difficult to attract and retain young, single faculty members because locale offers very little social opportunities. Geographical attractions and culture and natural settings (New England examples) are better elsewhere.

"East and West coast are more attractive places to live."

Camaraderie and good colleagues will trump compensation. Paying attention to human development counseling will and could make a bigger difference than salary. Dual career issues are difficult, the University should be more active in the community to help spouses.

Transportation is important, e.g., direct flight to Chicago, transportation is now marginal but if lost would be detrimental.

**What is the climate here for diversity?**

One said his/her department had struggled with diversity and recently been more successful by setting clear goals and objectives and by effective mentoring. Climate is spotty on campus, but there have been notable successes. Students are culturally diverse, but we especially lack domestic black male students, and the overall atmosphere in the University is not welcoming.

"The absence of a north-facing door on the Beckman is an example."

This is a continuing challenge, and it is tied to retention, in that the market is competitive and diversity hires are heavily recruited. We are less sensitized to the need for research diversity. We need
to be reminded to respect opinions of others and avoid disciplinary bias, whether by the administration or by faculty in a unit. This is especially likely when directions or objectives change. We must be committed to intellectual diversity, to have give and take, and to not drown out voices that create dissonance. It was noted that

“John Dewey said that uniformity is the enemy of unity and that hearing different voices allows us to develop a common purpose.”

There is tension between identity (or stability) and diversity. It is important to build a core competency, but we may lose it when people leave. It is hard to recruit for intellectual diversity. This is an issue that requires continual reexamination.

“Should we have a core competency or should we recruit to have an intellectually diverse place? But then critical mass at another university may be seen as more attractive.”

What other steps should the UIUC administration take to retain its most valuable faculty members?

The University needs a better business model: our current financial expectations are unrealistic, we can’t reduce students, we can’t increase tuition, and we can’t hire more people.

We should value faculty time and support faculty development. We can learn much from private industry.

There is always money to match outside offers but never enough money to give raises. Using outside offers to get raises is a game that punishes loyalty. To keep our best people, we need to pay attention to the full set of issues (including community issues).

Treat the University like a living organism, not a collection of isolated parts. It is a mistake to try to be all things to all people.

4. Mid Career in Social Sciences

Notes were taken by Leslie Struble and Fred Troutt. There were 4 participants, 3 women and 1 man, with no one from an underrepresented minority.

Why do you choose to remain at UIUC?

They said the answer is obvious: this is an excellent university, great colleagues, good graduate students, and an easy town to live in. All 4 had spouses (or former spouses) who were also in the University (faculty and administrative positions). Two were spousal hires, and they noted that the atmosphere for spousal hires had improved considerably in the intervening time. One said he/she was here because he/she had not had a better offer.

“If a University approached me and I could do my research easier I’d really consider leaving. A little-bit better is not worth moving.”

All noted that it is now (given their personal situations) difficult to move, and that having 2 faculty in the family helps them stay here. The larger community is an important factor for all 4, and Krannert was specifically mentioned. They reported good experience with public schools, particularly with the University Laboratory high school, but noted that their children are grown now. One said she had been given what she called a preemptive retention package when she was being recruited by another school. Such a package might be salary increase, teaching relief, bridge money, or the promise of back-up research funds in case a proposal failed. Retention packages are generally less expensive at that stage than after an offer has been made. This retention effort was important because the Head thereby acknowledged his/her contributions.

There was much discussion about salary levels. They noted that salary, while not so important in mid career, is often important for younger colleagues and often important as a symbol. One said that raises are not important in the face of economic hardships for colleagues.

“Salary discrepancies really need correction.”

“All-in-all people want appreciation and respect.”
“This campus should be doing better but personally I’m in an ideal situation, I teach my courses, do my research and enjoy my connection to the students.”

**How do you describe ideal employment?**

This question did not really resonate. The first response was that any situation has pluses and minuses. Another was that another school might look better, but when you see it up close you realize that UIUC is pretty good. One point is that if the campus does better, then everyone is happier. Autonomy in research and teaching was mentioned by several. Opportunities for interdisciplinary work (non departmental interdisciplinary spaces) were also important. Spousal satisfaction is important in retention.

**Is it harder now or easier now to get your job done?**

It is harder for faculty to do their jobs now because the University is acting more like a business, and less like a community of scholars. It was also noted that administration (deans and up) now tend more to come and go, lasting only 4-5 years, making the department heads more important. Lack of transparency in University administration is a problem. The administration culture shows no commitment to students; rather, they are feeding themselves (the example cited was the decision to build Swanland and more recently the announced decision to build a new stadium when Lincoln Hall is in such bad shape). Faculty members question the commitment of some administration to this University.

**What other steps should the UIUC administration take to retain its most valuable faculty members?**

Retention would be enhanced if every area of study feels it has a place and is appreciated. This includes departments that do not bring in outside funding. Be selective about whom you attempt to retain, reward good citizenship and cultivate a culture that supports the greater good. Do not try to imitate other schools. Do not use salary increases to retain people, be prepared to let them go. Salary disparities between disciplines are not fair; a better system would be if all departments had the same salary scale.

“Difference in salaries between disciplines is embarrassing and tends to devalue some faculty.”

Be creative in retention. Encourage administrators to teach classes.

**5. Newly Tenured Faculty in Engineering and Sciences**

Notes were taken by John Ory. There were 11 participants, 4 men and 7 women, with no one from an underrepresented minority.

**Why do you stay here?**

The quality of life in Urbana-Champaign is good: reasonable housing, small town. This is an excellent University environment (colleagues, resources). Certainly salary is not a reason to stay. One said he/she feels appreciated. Some faculty members stay only because of their spouse has employment here.

**What is not matching ideal here?**

Salaries are low.

“Once looked at salary book but never again.”

“Merit raises are ridiculous.”

One needs to get counter offers to get ahead (covered later). Post docs and graduate students are treated poorly.

“I love it here but this issue really makes me angry and may be the main issue why I leave...I can only bring good post docs here off of my grants but tuition and benefits are pricing us out of the market...if we claim to be preeminent then we need to compete with others for post docs and we are not.”
Indirect costs are high.

“I’ve been here nine years bringing in over $1M in indirect costs, and I have yet to see where the indirect money goes…where do we get our fair-share back?”

“Indirect costs plus no tuition waiver makes grad students too expensive.”

The campus does not do enough to support grant work.

“Not a helpful culture!”

“Where is the vision here?...once my department made me turn down a large grant because of some policy...there appears to be no connection to a big picture.”

There are too many layers of bureaucracy.

“Make [applying for grants] more user friendly...got to get better.”

“In my ten years there has been mission creep...IRB is ridiculous...Always taking too much time by constantly saying no, no, no to everything we write.”

“IRB takes a lot of time and energy...no alternatives ways are ever allowed...other places I have have been much more helpful.” “Constant back and forth, lots of gate keeping going on.” “2-3 week delays for nothing.” “Once you get an approval you feel as though you earned a publication already.”

It is often difficult to pay for things.

“P-cards have so many restrictions.”

“Why can’t I give people on my grants salary increases that may differ from the university’s?”

There should be more communication between faculty and higher administration.

“So many policy changes without our inputs.”

“I was submitting a grant when they changed the indirect costs without telling us.”

“Seems to be more in-house [among administrators] communication now than before.”

“Our decision process is often erratic.”

The University could do more for mid-career faculty (examples included letting them organize symposia and not cutting off their travel funds because they haven’t been doing enough).

“I see a lot [of resources] for young assistant professors but don’t forget the mid-career faculty.”

“Engage them...ask them what they may need to be more productive.”

Department heads need to spread service work around the faculty.

“Doers do more.”

“No penalty for big granters who blow off service work.”

Do you feel valued here?

Most said yes with some reservations.

Are you seeking outside offers?

It is common knowledge to go get outside offers to get ahead, sometimes spoken by the head but always suggested by the culture.

“My chair said to me, ‘as a friend, the only way I can help you is to get an outside offer.’”

“One people think of leaving they are gone.”

“The administration is prepared to act retrospectively.”

Faculty members dislike having to get outside offers.

“Waste of my time.”

“Threatening to leave is a bit of a game I don’t like, would rather the university hit the issue
The counter-offer process often proves to be distrustful. Whether they stay or not, faculty members often are angered by the process.

“My friend asked for help before seeking an outside offer and was turned down...He later had so much offered to him to stay after getting an outside offer that he realized he was being lied to so he left because of that.”

“I don’t like having to defend why I choose to stay.”

How do we fix the counter-offer problem?

Be preemptive with parity and compression with transparency.

“There is a lack of parity between those who play the counter-offer game and those who don’t.”

Have a reasonable merit system.

“A reasonable merit system would do wonders.”

Use counter-offer pool of money (which always seems to appear) for a merit pool instead.

“Isn’t retrospective spending [after an offer] more expensive than otherwise?”

“Reallocate money for real merit raises instead of counter offers.”

How important is spousal hiring?

It is good for recruitment but not as good as it used to be.

Do you have any other suggestions?

Reduce size of administration.

“I have never seen the administration shrink.”

Administration can lead by example.

“The president at Penn State pledged $1M of his own money. Are our administrators willing to do likewise?...They ask us to make sacrifices; are they?”

6. Newly Tenured Faculty in Humanities

Notes taken by Leslie Struble and Fred Troutt. There were 7 participants plus 1 observer, 2 women and 5 men, with one person from an underrepresented minority.

Why do you choose to remain at UIUC?

Location is important for some, though not for all, and one said it is close to family. One reported remarkable growth and improved quality in his/her school. Another, who was hired with his/her spouse, is very satisfied here. The difficulties in moving a two-faculty unit keep some here. One described a shrinking department, with loss of faculty slots and reduction in academic infrastructure and concluded:

“Now I’m actually looking to leave because of infrastructure that was here is no longer here; people leave and are not replaced.”

Up to now, these faculty members had focused on obtaining tenure, now they see themselves as very mobile.

“I got tenure; a competitive salary for my field.”

“Family structure, old parents who need [my] help and now I also have tenure plus I like my job here.”

Autonomy in creative activities and in the classroom is important. Low housing costs, family-friendly
community help. Retention is seen as a dire issue.

**What are the negatives here?**

Salaries are so low as to be embarrassing.

“Administrators say we need to do something about the pay but nothing happens. I received a retention offer and my salary did improve.”

Faculty members feel undervalued and underappreciated. One reported he now has a reasonable salary but only after seeking another position and obtaining a counter offer. Salaries are higher even at non peer institutions. The administration ignores faculty unless they have an outside offer.

“We are really involved in market atmosphere that turns one into a commodity.”

“The message we get is, ‘if you want a raise, got get an offer’.”

Untenured faculty members are exploited. There is too much of a market atmosphere here for an academic institution. The message from department heads is quite clear: if you want a raise, you must get an outside offer.

Salary compression is a real issue. Our graduate students are often starting at higher salaries. Some departments function in a poverty mode.

Hosting international events here is difficult. It is embarrassing to show one’s office, the libraries, and facilities. Krannert is overrated. It was not built for teaching.

**Have you been treated with fairness, especially with respect to diversity?**

We are working on diversity with respect to race and gender, but it needs improvement.

“Conversation about diversity is in its infancy.”

It is in the air, but not a major focus. TOPS hires improve the diversity.

“TOPS hires in some areas do not seem to stay; not sure if it is because of tenure issues or the hire wasn’t a good fit.”

It is difficult to achieve diversity when people are leaving and not being replaced. And it is difficult to achieve diversity when department heads are mainly older white males. Salary offers are often inadequate to recruit faculty that increase diversity.

“Our offers are often embarrassing. We don’t seem to put our money where our mouth is. To complete for the best, we need to raise our sights.”

“We go 3 steps forward and then 3 steps back.”

All domains of the University are not treated equally. Humanities are at the bottom, in both salary and research support--buildings are in dire need of refurbishment, offices are poor, furniture is poor.

“The inequalities are glaring.”

“The impression given to faculty is that you don’t really matter, they can do what they want but you will still come to work next week.”

**Have you been treated with honesty by University administrators?**

Sometimes not, but yes overall. There is a parent-child dynamic. The perception of dishonesty can come with a lack of transparency. There needs to be a structure for salary decisions and more uniformity in how merit is assessed. Faculty members do much staff work, and we have inadequate staff. The service load has increased.

**Is mentoring effective?**

This varies a lot from unit to unit. A system is often there, but there is sometimes ambiguity or confusion.

“[Different mentors too often provide] different opinions/advice on the same subject.”
Has the University become more complex?
Certainly there are more committees. Before tenure, faculty members are somewhat sheltered. After tenure they are overwhelmed with service work. Also, high staff turnover means that faculty are often doing staff work.

One’s first book is generally well underway on being hired. But difficulties were noted in starting a second book, making a second promotion less likely. Much depends on the unit head.

Are there attributes of your position that you find particularly attractive?
The opportunities to collaborate are very important. This is especially true in smaller colleges that are in a single building.

The reputation of the institution and of specific areas is attractive. International colleagues recognize the institution. The Library is a critical asset in hiring and retention of humanities scholars. This does not seem to be appreciated by administrators.

The Humanities Scholars program is important.

What other steps should the UIUC administration take to retain its most valuable faculty members?
There is a lot here that is good, most participants were very happy here. But there is a systematic gap in infrastructure funding with peer institutions. The current negative economic climate is a huge issue.

The Library our most precious resource yet seems undervalued by administration.

Living in U-C means limited things you can do with diminishing resources [personal] and it is difficult to obtain cultural diversity. It would help if U-C would grow. Life is becoming culturally bare. Loss of faculty has diminished capacity to collaborate.

Salary and salary compression need to be addressed.
Get out the message, indicate the value of faculty, there are ways of showing appreciations besides raises.

“As departments act in a poverty mode, it is easy to stop caring.”

There seems to be some kind of a funding-structure problem between us and the sister institutions.

7. Newly Tenured Faculty in Professional Schools
Notes were taken by Leslie Struble and Greg Girolami. There were 6 participants, 2 women and 4 men, with no one from an underrepresented minority.

Why do you choose to remain at UIUC?
They listed the quality of students and colleagues, highly collegial atmosphere, our strong reputation, generally strong intellectual atmosphere, sense of community in the University. The University has a strong research focus and the administration is committed to attracting and supporting PhD students. The work environment is pleasant. One noted good relationships with Dean (library science).

“Little pushes me out, although higher salaries might pull me out.” “It is astounding how many doors are opened by being here.”

The location keeps some here: it’s an easy city to live in, and is very family oriented. The number of international colleagues and students in the community is important. Support from the local business community is a positive element. However, you can get stuck in the Midwest because housing prices are low.

The spousal hiring practice is fantastic. UI is doing more than most institutions in this regard. The maternity leave policy is good.

The University’s responsiveness to outside offers keeps faculty here. Sometimes this is an issue of salary, sometimes an issue of attention from the department head.

What are the negatives here?
Faculty are supposed to be officers of the university, but are treated like employees.
The years with little or no salary increase are definitely demoralizing.

Reimbursements near the July 1 fiscal year start are sometimes too troublesome to file. Policy on P-cards should be changed so they can be used to hold travel reservations.

Many on support staff are inflexible and as unhelpful as possible (campus parking cited as an example). They view their primary role as implementing rules, rather than helping faculty and students.

It’s hard to get here and there is no convenient transportation to the airport. Trains are unreliable, buses are a joke, the airport gets worse and worse, taxis are awful, and the shuttle to O’Hare is not sufficient.

Reductions in IMPE program have diminished its importance. The community lacks resources and support for parents of young children. It lacks sufficient school choices for older students, University High is good but that is generally the only option.

We lack a senior common room or faculty club, there is no such culture here for faculty who want to avoid students in their personal life.

We lack a place to bring prestigious international visitors, and it is difficult to organize meetings here; the Illini Union has too few rooms, although the new I-Hotel may help.

**Is research well supported here?**

Deans and EOs are very supportive of faculty and research. Mentoring of assistant professors at other universities is better: two mentors are assigned rather than one, giving assistant professors a better chance to find a good mentor. Without a mentor, there is no effective way to learn how to teach, deal with university administration, or deal with graduate students. Quality and quantity of support staff is poor. In one unit, there are two support staff people for 65 faculty members.

**Have you sought outside offers?**

The only way to get a significant salary increase is to threaten to leave. When people go looking for offers to increase salary, they have one foot out of the university.

EOs are responsive to outside offers; interested in responding to faculty needs, not just matching outside offer. It is important for EO to ask about outside offer and whether professor could create something equivalent at UIUC.

Salary compression is a big problem. A pay raise that is less than inflation is not a merit raise. At the University of Minnesota, they explicitly carry out a market-based recalibration of faculty salaries every three years.

Sometimes it is impossible to find jobs for spouses.

**Have you been treated with fairness, especially with respect to diversity?**

One said this was a concern he had about the community when he moved here but found it to not be the case unless he goes outside Champaign-Urbana.

We are increasing chaired professorships, which creates competition and disgruntlement and high-achieving faculty tend to look elsewhere.

Women in units with few women bear a large burden - department puts subtle and not so subtle pressure on them to attend every reception, serve on every committee, etc. There are many departments with no tenured women faculty. “I do not want to be a full professor because I would have to serve on too many committees.”

Disparities in teaching loads were noted.

The upper administration is excessively dominated by engineering and science. University policies have helped to create a more diverse faculty but we still have a long way to go. The climate of the university reflects the particular unit head, but pressure from the Provost helps. There are still a lot of traditional senior faculty members who are not welcoming to nontraditional family units, specifically families where both parents are on the faculty.
“Meetings should not be called after 5 pm, faculty with children and no spouse keeping house need to leave at a reasonable hour.”

“The common discussion of sports, both specific events and as metaphors, is offensive and exclusive to those who are not interested or knowledgeable.”

The Women in Engineering program and similar programs need to be expanded. One panelist was the first woman to receive tenure in her unit.

**Are you satisfied with governance of the university?**

Top university administration seems to be dominated by engineers and chemists. This affects teaching loads, which are lighter in these fields.

There seems to be a growth in the size of administration, but reduction in services to faculty. There is hostility south of Green Street to providing secretarial support to faculty. As a result, faculty members spend huge amounts of time on trivial things.

IMPE used to be family-friendly, but process has changed since CRCE, now you must be a member to get your child involved, and the membership fee for a family is now large. If you’re not a member, then your access is essentially zero.

Maternity leave policy is good, but there is no follow-up with day-care or other assistance such as baby sitter referral service.

**What other steps should the UIUC administration take to retain its most valuable faculty members?**

There needs to be a better procedure for awarding salary increases, such as an explicit recalibration every few years, so faculty members do not need to go to the outside market. Seeking outside offers to get a raise is unfair to colleagues at other institutions. When you have one foot outside the University, you are likely to put the other foot out and leave. We have to be creative with compensation, not just salaries but also other forms.

The University can be an important resource to the community, and the program to interest girls in engineering was cited as a specific example.

Mentoring is seen as very important. A formal mentoring program helps retention. The quality and quantity of support staff is important.

There has been a general reduction in support services at the same time there has been a growth in support staff.

Staff members often demonstrate hostility to faculty needs. Faculty members often give up on travel reimbursements because they do not want to argue with staff members. The subtext is that faculty time has no value. Autonomy can allow bad practices as well as encourage good practices.

Parking is a perennial problem.

It would help if department P-cards were easier to get.

Make it easier to travel in and out of C-U. Develop bus service to Willard airport.

Few good choices for high school students if they don’t get into Uni. Can Uni be made larger to increase access? Area schools are not as good as they could be: UI could provide better leadership for schools and mentoring for students, especially those ‘at risk’. Not a lot for kids to do in C-U.

A faculty club would be nice.

Add more rooms at the Illini Union.

8. Newly Tenured Faculty in Social Sciences

Notes taken by Leslie Struble and John Ory. There were 6 participants, mixed gender, with no one from an underrepresented minority.

**Why do you choose to remain at UIUC?**
This is a good place to raise children, an easy place to live, pretty good schools, a safe environment, low cost of living. Program strength and collegiality were both mentioned.

“There is a good climate in my area. No other school does what I do.”

“All colleagues contribute, the department works very well.”

Shared interests with faculty in other departments and research centers are especially important. It was noted that cross-disciplinary research requires financial support and the Research Board is an important resource in that regard.

Some spouses were also faculty members (5 were part of a spousal hire). Midwestern universities are more proactive in spousal hires. One person reported a negative experience, in which his/her department feels pressured to take spousal hires.

**What is not ideal here?**

Mutual respect is often lacking, especially from the dean and the provost.

“The Dean doesn’t respond to invitations to our events.”

“Often feel humiliated by higher ups...I don’t think they care for me or my colleagues.”

“Lack of support in promotion and tenure decisions from dean.”

“We get pretty attractive offers all the time and my dean said if you don’t want to be here than leave...he said he was quoting the provost.”

“It shows in many campus policies they don’t respect faculty, like the global campus.”

The effectiveness of the department head is especially important in developing tenure cases. The issue of outside offers in retention was raised.

“Why do you have to do this to get a raise? This is a reverse way of thinking. UIUC is not the only school with this culture.”

A department can be proactive (undertake preemptive retention) but no one has seen that happen. Even responding to outside interest for the purpose of getting a matching offer is insulting to one's colleagues. Many said they had been told by department head that this is how the game is played.

We need more campus opportunities to do research because it is scarce out there for the humanities.

We need better communication between administration and faculty. Communications should be in writing. When promises to departments are not kept, faculty feel demoralized and cheated.

“It’s so one-directional, I only get to hear [not respond to] things...that’s why I am here at this focus group.”

“It doesn’t seem to be a priority here as evidenced by the global campus thing.”

College deans don’t seem to know what faculty members are doing.

“Based on some feedback I have gotten, it’s obvious the dean doesn’t know what I do.”

“When they don’t know what we do, that’s when we often get forced into taking spousal hires.”

“Strong EOs have to represent us to the dean and the deans to the provost...We aren’t all blessed with good EOs so we need other channels.”

“Seven years ago we were told to get more faculty lines we needed to generate more IUs. We did, but our rankings plummeted and we still didn’t get more hires...now we are demoralized.”

**How might we change this culture?**

We need to identify people who are more marketable. The issue of respect came up here also, several cited examples of promises made but not kept. The University scholars program helps. Be more proactive.

“Should make available a boatload of money for not interviewing.”
“There’s no money to make this thing more equitable.”
But the process should also acknowledge that it might be best to let some people leave.

**How is the climate here with respect to diversity?**
While there could be a more diverse faculty and student body, diversity issues do not seem to be affecting retention for this group. Some departments struggle to get diversity in their graduate student population. Diversity in the community was said to be more important than diversity in the institution.
The importance of diversity is not uniform across campus. Recruiting for diversity seems to be working well. But the Chief issue made it difficult to attract faculty here.

One person reported that he/she is the only non white faculty in his/her department and finds it interesting that different units in the university define diversity differently, sometimes narrowly (black, Latino, American Indian).
The internationalization of the university is seen as a strong positive.

**What are barriers here to your research?**
IRB is a problem; research with human subjects is difficult.
Despite the emphasis on getting grants, there is a need for more university assistance (some units did and some did not have research support personnel). Better support could be offered to people in areas where external funding is difficult. Several people noted problems with Grants and Contracts in proposal preparation and grant administration. One cited clerical errors that were made there.

“We need more support at the college and university levels.”

“Increasing centralization in grant administration is a problem; it means that more work falls to the faculty.”

“It would be nice to be able to concentrate teaching in alternating semesters.” “Matching money for RA support would be helpful.”

**Is loyalty an issue in retention?**
Some feel loyalty to students and to colleagues and to the discipline. But most said they do not feel loyalty to the University, that the University as a corporate entity does not merit loyalty. It’s better stated as pride than loyalty, pride in their students, their unit, and their colleagues.

“The university is not on much of a moral high ground for loyalty.”

“Too many signs of corruption such as friends of administrators being ‘bumped upstairs’ undeservingly to be loyal.”

Several cited the Chief issue and the Coca Cola contract as examples. One cited cases in which sexual harassment charges were not investigated because the people were “friends of the Chancellor”.

Lack of respect on the part of the administration erodes faculty loyalty.
All feel a sense of pride in the institution. It was noted that senior faculty are important in developing and encouraging loyalty and a sense of community.

**What other steps should the UIUC administration take to retain its most valuable faculty members?**
One suggested teaching relief to study in a second discipline. They appreciated the opportunity to express their opinions.

“I think of this provost as a retention provost [which is a good thing].”
Send an occasional survey to check on these and other retention issues.

---

9. Retained Faculty in Engineering and Sciences
Notes taken by Leslie Struble, Nicholas Petruzzi, and Beth Woodward. The group was divided into two sections and interviewed separately. There were 8 participants in one group, with 6 men and 2 women,
and no one from an underrepresented minority. There were 6 participants in the other group, 2 women and 4 men, with no one from an underrepresented minority.

**Why do you choose to remain at the UIUC?**

Collegiality and cultural fit (quality and excellence of colleagues) is very important. Spousal connections (opportunities for spouse) are also important.

*“Other offers didn’t include spousal hires.”*

Quality of facilities and academic reputation are important.

*“Being in a top department is key.”*

*“Salaries are average to others (Texas, Penn State).”*

*“Teaching what I want to teach.”*

**How do you describe ideal employment as a faculty member at your rank and in your field?**

The “fit” (between personal and institutional values, goals, and philosophies) is a dominating consideration. Availability of endowed chairs and recognitions is important. Reasonable (not onerous) teaching and service loads are important.

*“I stay because I feel cared for and loved.”*

**Do you intend to seek opportunities to leave the UIUC in the near future?**

Five out of 6 participants indicated no, but one said he/she will certainly be seeking out opportunities. The problem, as articulated by this person, is that the compensation model he sees seems to be based not on market value, but rather on comparison among peers within unit.

*“The treatment last time I had an outside offer makes me more likely to leave.”*

*“I do not feel appreciated here.”*

Some would leave for better salary and opportunities, some for more assistance in grant writing, some for more AP assistance, and some for places with lower teaching loads.

**Have you actively sought opportunities to leave the UIUC?**

Several have sought opportunities. Most were approached by someone else outside the university, sometimes at alma maters, sometimes by a smaller institution. A key issue is that raises in some units don’t take performance into consideration, which makes other institutions attractive. Annual increases are laughable. Another issue is not feeling appreciated.

**What were the circumstances of your retention offer and why did you choose to remain at UIUC?**

Several had preemptive counter offers. For some this was pre tenure. All said they wanted to stay here, and loyalty to the institution was considered a valuable trait. For some the salary increase was nominal but the gesture was valued. Some said that the speed with which a counter offer was made was a factor in retention. It was broadly agreed that faculty here are not rewarded by the administration unless there has been an outside offer.

Salary was important but making salary equitable in the unit was more important than matching or exceeding salary offered by another institution. The fact that new hires have higher salary than faculty members who have been here some years was seen as a major problem. All faculty compare salaries as a way to assess their value and the respect shown to them by the institution.

There was much discussion of preemptive (or proactive) retention versus reactive. Many of the people in this group had preemptive retention offers.

Retention is a black hole. Faculty should be told that there are no rules about retention.

It is broadly recognized that having an outside offer is the only way to get a raise or other improvements (e.g., lab renovation, which probably helps other faculty in the unit). Several had been told this explicitly by unit heads.

The retention game implies that the administration is dismissing its duty to discuss and reward merit.
The game is inefficient: it wastes time and it wastes resources (especially the start-up packages).

One stayed here because person and professional support was very strong and because of the quality of his/her colleagues.

There was some discussion about loyalty. Someone said loyalty should be rewarded, but only when combined with productivity. One person was recruited by a friend, so felt torn in loyalty to this University and to the other institution. Loyalty is especially important at lower ranks; one can leave as a full professor and still be loyal to this University.

Salary was often not the primary concern in considering outside offers. Our culture says that an outside offer strengthens one’s promotion package. An outside offer demonstrated one’s value (some were comfortable with this culture and some did not like it).

**Are there attributes of your position at the UIUC that you find particularly attractive or distinctive relative to positions that you might obtain elsewhere?**

People here are high quality. Personal relationships are good. The key retention issue is that most individuals felt that they FIT with the culture here, which gives Illinois a big advantage; colleagues at other institutions didn’t always measure up.

**Are there attributes of your position at the UIUC that you find particularly negative relative to positions that you might obtain elsewhere?**

There are people who are here because they cannot leave. They are often difficult to work with, and not as productive. It is frustrating because they cannot hire new people.

**Do you feel that your contributions to your unit/department are appreciated?**

The majority felt appreciated by the unit head and by their colleagues. Faculty goal is to minimize the time they spend on overhead (i.e., indirect) activities. Thus, expectation is that administration should provide services and infrastructure to eliminate overhead from faculty’s day so that faculty can spend their days on core mission activities rather than on the activities that support their core-mission activities. Faculty members do not want to be “nickel-and-dimed” - not with respect to their funds, and not with respect to their time.

“**Colleagues you can collaborate with are KEY.”**

“**Spousal hires are sand in the gears.”**

**Any other suggestions to administration for retention?**

Unit heads need firmer guidance on the issue. They should regularly assess salaries in the unit and work to correct disparities. An outside offer should not be the only trigger for this process. We need to get to the stage where any response to an outside offer is modest. Large responses are disruptive.

“**An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.”**

“**One thing that Illinois does especially well is spousal hires. This creates an environment where families do well and definitely enhances retention.”**

The issue is mainly the faculty need to feel valued, to have continued recognition of their contributions.

“**Does the [large] number of retention cases mean that administration is not responding to faculty, or that faculty understand that retention is the only way to be stroked?”**

The salary issue is just within the unit, not in the institution broadly and not at other schools. Disparities in the unit lead to unrest. Annual reviews are very important. This is often a detailed evaluation, sometimes by a committee. But often after such review the same raises (by %) are given to all faculty at all ranks. It is smart to spread the retention offer over several years. We need a system by which we invest in people here on an ongoing basis. We make no investment in faculty after the initial hire.

The Dual Career Program and opportunities therein are vital - keep doing this BETTER than any other place.
Faculty should not have to get an outside offer to be awarded an endowed chair. It would be a much more positive and significant recognition if endowed chairs were awarded “preemptively.”

Retention has two dimensions, substance and process. Financial matters constitute substance, and these are constrained by practical realities (like resources available). However, “process” has no such constraints. In this context, “process” refers to the skills, knowledge, and communication brought to bear by the administrators to cultivate moral and loyalty.

“Show me the love -- not only after I get an offer somewhere else, but beginning with my arrival. Then, I’ll fall in love with this place; thus, I’ll be much less ‘poachable.’”

The number of counter offers is going up and the University approach won’t keep people here. Compensation is based on your perceived market value (especially when the unit has people from disparate disciplines). Often you are compared with others within your own unit. The process at the senior faculty level is problematic. When the unit head is sharp and creative at protecting individuals, and can make pre-emptive adjustments before someone gets too far down the interview process, and looks for legitimate threats (as in doesn’t wait for an offer to be made), the individual feels valued. If not done well, it can damage the morale for the individual and the department. They were uniformly frustrated with how slowly things move here.

“It took 2 weeks for Michigan to get a full-blown spousal offer together while UIUC took 2 ½ months.”

A good set of instructions is needed for retention issues for department heads. Flow of information to the dean is critical, especially between the dean and the department head. Use of peer institutions as benchmark is misleading; sometimes the working environment at a non-peer institution is more attractive.

Department heads should tap into excellence funds EVERY year.

Some institutions with large departments, such as Minnesota, rank their faculty for salaries based on performance every year.

There are not enough chairs, fellows, scholar positions to go around, and they only seem to be used when someone threatens to leave. Several noted that endowed chairs aren’t as meaningful if they are used in retention cases. It is better if they are offered out of the blue.

Personal involvement of the dean, including calls, emails, coming to the office, etc, is critical in retention.

“I did not meet my dean until after 6 year mark.”

While it was recognized that the substance of retention packages cannot always be addressed, the group suggested that there is no reason why the PROCESS cannot be first rate in every case, and is dependent upon the skill, ability and communication of the unit leader and the dean.

10. Retained Faculty in Humanities

Notes taken by Christine Jenkins. There were 9 participants, 3 women and 6 men.

Why did you choose to remain at the UIUC?

One was a spousal hire.

“Campus understood that we were a unit and realized that if they wanted us they would have to keep us both.”

Infrastructure is important (library resources, leaves, travel money).

“Library budget is the very first thing that affects my thinking.”

Why might you choose to leave?

Salary seems small after a while (salary compression), and seeing new hires get hired in at larger salaries than you have after several years here is discouraging. Salaries are very disparate in FAA, with
a range of $55 to $110 in music, for example. Retention is about salary, and is very negotiable. The differences between LAS and all others are impossible. When you are brought in to create something new and there are economic problems, then it may be that what you were originally brought in for doesn’t have the support (financial, infrastructure, etc.) to take shape and grow.

“I don’t have the infrastructure, so I’m going somewhere else where what I want to do will receive the support I need.”

**What was your experience with retention?**

The way to get a raise is to get a counter offer, that way you can negotiate from a position of power.

“Not all retention cases involve counter offers.”

So much depends on the party who is doing the negotiating.

“The College of Media was very nimble, responsive to my needs.”

“The head of ICR met with me, led the effort for my retention, and got people to talk to each other.”

“The dean’s office in College of Media responded quickly and effectively.”

It is important that the negotiating partners are accessible. At some point it should be possible for faculty to speak directly face to face with administration.

“Can you go beyond your chair?”

“Communication can be difficult, and signals [can be] read wrongly.”

“Is the department head negotiating on your behalf? Not necessarily!”

For some, a lack of knowledge contributed to their leaving. There should be a system that will ensure that if the head or dean doesn’t want the faculty member, the faculty member could know if the head represented a broad consensus or if everyone else wanted the faculty member to stay.

“Could there be a mediator, an ombudsperson, who could help with the communication process?”

It’s not always about money, it’s about appreciation.

“When peers outside your institution value you, and those inside don’t, of course you want to move.”

“How to get a raise IS to get another offer, that’s how the game is played, there IS no other way to get a raise.”

“The sad thing is that this is wasting everyone’s time. Someone is interviewing but they don’t really want the job, they just want an offer they can use for negotiating with their own institution. This wastes the time of the candidate and the faculty interviewing candidate.”

“All schools aren’t like this, some places everything is ‘on scale’, less disparity, you get cost of living raises.”

The quality of the counter offer is important.

“If it’s just a couple hundred more and no appreciation, you end up with a resentful faculty member.”

“You can slightly outbid someone but then meet someone’s needs for a spousal hire, and that makes a HUGE difference.”

It is important to feel valued. Research grants and publications are important, but teaching and service should also be valued. The faculty member’s interaction with the department chair is important.

“Don’t department heads get evaluated on retention?”

There should be more transparency about retention.

“Faculty are involved in hiring and promotion but when it comes to retention, they are entirely in the dark.”
 Raises impact everyone in the department. Funds for salaries are separate from money for retention.  

“I’d like to think that as my salary goes up, other colleague’s salaries do as well, but this isn’t necessarily the case. In effect, faculty whose salaries are compressed subsidize others who are not compressed.”

**What could help you in the future?**

Spousal hires are important.

“My dean has left. Who do I see to get the university to keep its promises?”

“When promises are put in writing, then the spousal AP position is permanent, but when promises are not put into writing, then it goes.”

“The problem is that we’re losing people in advanced assistant professor, early associate professor, and early full professor.”

**Is diversity important?**

There is a group on campus that is concerned about diversity. The African American program, for example, had to go out and get an offer in order to get a raise and advancement. There are vast differences between departments.

**What advice do you have regarding retaining faculty?**

“I’ve been told if I want resources I should go on the job market and I DON’T want to do this.”

Faculty members want to shape things, to know that our efforts make a difference.

“A new associate professor said to me: all you have to do is to pat me on the head and I’ll perform.”

It is important to have institutional support, the opportunity to build things and to make things grow.

“The message we want from the institution is to not make it necessary to go outside to keep a position.”

Faculty members want recognition. Faculty members want leave time. Faculty members want some power. During negotiations it’s not about money.

Spousal hires are VERY important, dual career is KEY; this program should be continued and bolstered.

**11. Retained Faculty in Professional Schools and Social Sciences**

Notes were taken by Leslie Struble. There were 6 participants, 4 men and 2 women, one underrepresented minority.

**What were the circumstances of your retention offer and why did you choose to remain at UIUC?**

One person said it was primarily the community (academic and outside), that it would be difficult to reestablish a comparable community somewhere else. Another said that the community is not so important but the university resources are, in particular interdisciplinary research groups.

Another had been here only 7 years at the time of his/her offer. An important issue was for the University to strengthen his/her area of interest, which was promised as part of the retention. One said he/she was looking for a reason to let him/her stay, and similarly the University agreed to strength (add more faculty) his/her area.

Another was recruited for a chaired position that would mean more opportunities but at a University that is not as prestigious as ours.

Another had academic initiatives here that he/she did not want to give up.

One doesn’t like the public schools here, which were agreed to have deteriorated in recent years.

One noted how hard it is for middle and upper class African Americans to be connected to the community. Pay is a factor in retention but so is community.
**Did you seek outside offers or did they find you?**

The response to this question was mixed. It is generally recognized that the only way to advance yourself (increase your salary) is to bring an offer to the table. Several said they have a problem with this model. It is not equitable. Advances should be based on scholarship or merit. The model causes some tension and unhappiness in a unit. It was agreed that faculty should not have to get an offer from somewhere else to determine their market value. Once you start checking out the competition, you are more likely to leave.

The University administration should make its own determinations of market value, and should work to make people happy that they want to keep. However, it was noted that the University has few rewards. Salary level is not all that important unless it is way below the market level (that being the academic market). Most of the participants noted how important it is to promote their field.

**How important is the unit head in recognizing status?**

It is important to have good lines of communication between the unit head and the dean. The high degree of specialization here makes it difficult for the head to assess value of individual faculty. Someone noted that the unit head matters a lot, that it is easier to leave if morale is low or if the unit head is ineffective. But this is a marginal issue. It is easier to consider leaving when there is a change in leadership at the unit level.

**Have you been treated with fairness?**

The two women in the group clearly felt they have not been treated fairly. One noted that half promises were made in her retention and she was skeptical that they will be met. Another does feel fairly treated, even with a large pay disparity, because constraints in setting salary cannot be overcome, that entry level salaries have increased substantially.

**Is organizational stability a factor in retention?**

One said not if he/she is unhappy with the status quo. Another in an unstable unit indicated that the instability was a factor in seeking outside offers. Stability of the community is also important. University connections (i.e., community) are critical.

“When you think about moving to another institution, you need to be skeptical that you can recreate that stability there.”

**What are important ways to retain faculty?**

Make intellectual life more rewarding. Make salaries equitable. Retention counter offers make discrepancies greater.

Assess conditions regularly in colleges and departments, not just budgets but also academic and cultural conditions, develop ways to systematically improve conditions.

Establish specific criteria for retention. By the time an offer has been made, it is too late.

Retention decisions need to be made case-by-case, a one size policy will miss the mark. Different policies are needed for faculty at different ages.

It is important for the University to evaluate faculty and recognize and reward quality. Chairs are one way to do this, but there is no hope to generate chairs in many units.

Use some of the retention budget for preemptive actions. The retention game is wasteful on both ends (here and the other institution); it is better to address it preemptively.

**Are there more impediments now than in the past for doing a good job?**

They generally answered this in the affirmative. Class sizes are larger. Teaching load is greater. There is less time for research. It takes more time to get large external funding grants. Some of these changes may be due to increasing rank. There is an expectation of more service as faculty advance in rank.

Assistant professors are sheltered on service. People with large research budgets are also sheltered. Some areas are really underfunded, with no opportunity for external funding. One said he/she gets
$500 for research (e.g., travel to meetings), which is just not enough.

12. TOP and Excellence Hires in Engineering and Science
Notes were taken by Nicholas Petruzzi and Christine Jenkins. There were 11 attendees, including 7 women, 4 men, and 1 underrepresented minority.

Why did you choose to come to UIUC?
A very important reason is collegiality and a (very) nurturing environment in the department, particularly that everyone looks out for junior faculty.

“I started here as a postdoc and have continued.”

“I worried that I would feel isolated here (in Champaign-Urbana), but I don’t.”

Independence and freedom are also important, as are resources and support to do interdisciplinary work with colleagues across campus. In a similar vein, UIUC is very supportive of work with external constituents (including constituents in industry). Spousal connections (opportunities for spouse) are important...

“I was recruited from an institution that had fiscal problems and was lax in retention, especially didn’t have a good dual career program.”

Teaching load is good.

“I feel lucky to be here.”

How do you describe ideal employment as a faculty member at your rank and in your field?
Important aspects include reasonable (i.e., relatively low) teaching loads, the freedom to do research that one wants to do, and having one’s research valued and appreciated for its merits (in contrast to having it defined by someone else’s agenda).

Mentoring for junior faculty is important, to help set priorities and to provide systematic, formalized infrastructure to support engagement with colleagues within and beyond campus borders).

“I have good colleagues who are just ahead of me in the tenure process. This is very helpful!”

“Junior faculty need an ally (senior faculty) to help you say no; pretenure faculty especially need this.”

Senior faculty need to be insulated from too many meetings.

“Please leave me alone so that I can do work; not many meetings/service obligations, please.”

“Leave me alone and get out of my way.”

What don’t you see here that you would like to see?
More systematic efforts to inform junior faculty of early career grants.

Engagement in the local community.

Getting pulled into meetings and talks is difficult. It is hard to keep track of who’s doing what. Consensus decision making can take too much time.

One person has never met one-on-one with the department head.

We need more options for child care. It comes as a surprise (for newer faculty) that there are not more child-care resources available. CDL is wonderful, but capacity is severely limited.

“As it is now you have to get your child on a waiting list when they are born!”

For those in medical sciences, we need connections to local hospitals. The MD-PhD program builds bridges, but then they leave for internships.

An early sabbatical program would be nice. Having an administration with honesty is key to morale.

Make promotion and tenure more transparent, especially during the probationary years. The
perception is that this is not by design, but rather that standards seem so ambiguous that it often is hard to interpret signals correctly in terms of whether or not adequate progress is being made. Yearly evaluations would be better than only a 3-year review. Communication #9 is not brought up proactively.

It's very important that grad students near completion be supervised, but junior faculty can be too busy to do this supervision.

“My Department chair meets with junior faculty every year and that's great.”

Is UIUC competitive in terms of faculty salaries with peer and better departments in your field?

UIUC is somewhat in the middle. Starting salaries and start-up packages are competitive (especially considering the low costs of living and of doing business characteristic of this location), but salary compression (or even inversion) makes it challenging to maintain quality mid-career senior faculty. Salary compression means that there is not room for merit, not room for moving up. Some schools offer help buying a house. Salary isn't the only instrument for reward.

“Salary is not the determining factor.”

Other resources include access to outside money via the Research Board, course release, low teaching load, and spousal hires.

“Dual career support is CRUCIAL.”

It is sometimes good, sometimes not good, but being in CU, there are so few other options for employment.

How is the climate for minorities?

We could do a lot more to attract high-quality under-represented student populations, for example, in urban Chicago. We could be much more proactive in recruiting efforts, etc. Peer institutions are more aggressive in recruiting minority students.

“It is amazing that we’re two hours from Chicago and the student body is so un-diverse.”

Georgia Tech has a weekend for recruiting undergrads and grad students. UIUC is outspent by peer institutions on recruiting minority students. There are things that can be done, such as having speakers from different groups, and making sure [prospective] students know about our diversity.

A unit needs to have an active development office, and need development officer who is very familiar with the department.

What steps should the UIUC administration take to retain its most valuable faculty members?

We need to have a clean relationship with state government.

We need events to meet colleagues in other departments. Make sure that people see CU as a livable community.

Make it easier for faculty to travel.

“Why is Bloomington Airport better than Willard?”

“We need direct flights to Washington DC!”

We need better support for cross-disciplinary, cross-unit, and interdepartmental research and collaboration.

“If you get involved in Beckman, your department doesn’t get credit!”

“Spousal Program and opportunities therein are vital - keep doing this BETTER than any other place.”

Early sabbatical opportunities or other opportunities to help junior faculty get a semester off from teaching would be nice. Heal the strained relationship between University of Illinois and Illinois State Government (state legislature).
13. TOP and Excellence Hires in Humanities

Notes taken by Greg Girolami. There were 12 participants, including 6 underrepresented minorities.

Why did you choose to come to UIUC?

There is a strong intellectual community across disciplines. UIUC allows a good integration of work and life.

The cost of living is low.

We have a good climate for funding. There are internal funds that support professor’s activities (lectures, events).

The University allows flexible work arrangements, such as split appointments.

The teaching loads are low (2-1 loads here, vs 2-2 or 2-3 at other places). The small community means a short commute.

How does your employment at UIUC compare with your ideal?

Chairs are told to make their third year reviews of assistant professors pessimistic and negative. This practice has led to one panelist to go onto the market. The goal should be to make a fair assessment, not a pessimistic one.

How is research support here?

EOs are unsupportive of potentially controversial events. Reasons cited by EOs are both lack of community acceptance and lack of financial resources.

There needs to be support for faculty besides research support (e.g., travel funds, UIUC-paid long distance phones).

Creative administrators can find ways to attract faculty with strong regional biases against midwest/small cities.

Sometimes funds are given to support faculty activities (good), but when funds expire, faculty members are sometimes expected to continue activity anyway (bad).

What is your experience with outside offers?

We don’t have an effective mechanism for adjusting salaries in absence of an outside offer. Rewards only flow to faculty in response to outside offers. Stars get most of the “plums”. UIUC shouldn’t identify ‘best faculty’ by who gets outside offers. We need to support all faculty members, in addition to those at risk of leaving.

“We want to be in a unit and at a university where people are continually raided, but where we win and successfully fight off the attempt ~75% of the time.”

Salary compression is the greatest source of faculty dissatisfaction. In some schools there is a job grade system for faculty (e.g., 5 grades of assistant professors, etc), with automatic pay increases for an increase in grade. A committee independent of the chancellors and deans reviews faculty to decide on pay grades. One problem is when non-faculty members are paid more than faculty members.

Salaries are roughly comparable to those at peer institutions. Faculty members recognize that salaries cannot be divorced from cost of living.

A travel budget helps to offset salary differentials with respect to other institutions.

Have you been treated fairly?

There is less diversity here than at many other places. There are obstacles in talking about the issue. There needs to be more than one underrepresented faculty member in each unit. Otherwise it places an unfair burden on the one person. At the administration level, diversity is often viewed as tokenism by the faculty. The administration must encourage diversity by setting uncomfortable goals for diversity, not only in terms of numbers, but also for quality.

There are some benefits at UIUC (extra resources) of being a member of an underrepresented group.
Some faculty members commit “microagression” against students with differing views/backgrounds. It often is not malicious, but stems from ignorance or insensitivity. This should be addressed through diversity training.

There should be more geographic diversity among UIUC undergraduate population. Some faculty members would love to see older students, who are more satisfying to teach.

By pushing to limit night classes, the Provost is making it more difficult to teach adults.

Student evaluations of non-white faculty are often disappointing; there is not enough of an administrative stand on this issue. It is disturbing that the UI administration was slow to take action on the Chief issue.

Burdens undertaken by joint appointees are not appreciated/understood by colleagues. EOs should take joint appointments into account when assigning duties. There should be a college-level advisory committee to look at problems associated with overburdening joint appointees.

Important to have an EO who opens lines of communication, and is respectful and appreciative of faculty, especially with respect to diversity of approaches.

**Are you satisfied with the governance of the university?**

UIUC is intellectually conservative. It is harder to cross traditional boundaries, especially between colleges. Often there is the attitude from administration is, “We’re interested if you bring the dollars first.” The university should be more supportive of innovative efforts.

The only mechanism for hiring associate professors is the excellence programs, but these set expectations far too high, essentially looking for senior-level accomplishment from junior faculty members. Deans are not willing to commit salary dollars for associate professor hires.

Lots of rewards for faculty come from outside the department (e.g., HRT?), making faculty view the department as a “vampire” that makes demands but provides little/no return.

In some units, there is no tradition of shared governance, so faculty members don’t feel they have “buy-in”. Need to create the feeling that the department is a home, but often there is no infrastructure to do this. This problem is related to the decentralized nature of UIUC. Factionalization within departments is a problem - people need to think about the department’s work in a collective way.

In some department, the teaching load is placed disproportionately on junior faculty. Some senior faculty are absent from their offices much of the time. Older faculty members are out of touch with new trends in the discipline, often excluding colleagues (or potential colleagues) because “you’re not really in our field”.

A good mechanism for building bridges and establishing commonalities between departments is to have faculty members from two departments observe each other’s teaching, as part of a curriculum review.

There is sometimes unhealthy competition among faculty members to mentor talented undergraduates.

**What other steps should the administration take?**

UIUC needs to develop more hubris about itself - “strut our stuff.”

There needs to be more direct air travel destinations than just O’Hare or DFW. At Purdue, if 5 or more people are going to the same destination, they can charter a flight through the aviation school.

Some faculty members seem to value ego/reputation over teaching and building excellence.

**14. TOP and Excellence Hires in Professional Schools and Social Sciences**

Notes were taken by John Ory. There were 6 participants, 2 men and 4 women, including one underrepresented minority.

**Why do you stay at UIUC?**

The response was mixed. One stays only because his/her spouse has an appointment.
“We had a bad experience with my spouse’s hire that caused unnecessary stress.”

One is very happy despite problems with the department head. One just received a counter-offer to stay, providing higher salary, more flexible teaching load, and more research resources. Another comes from a department where a proactive head gave additional resources each time he/she asked.

“As a result of the counter offer, I don’t need to look for a new position.”

One will be looking for a position elsewhere because faculty members in the college are underpaid compared to friends in the Engineering College.”

What is your experience with counter offers?

One person received a counter-offer but signed a letter stating he/she wouldn’t ask again for two years. Another person said the head told everyone not to ask this year. Another was told by others in the department to avoid asking. They are just part of the system.

“There is a culture of outside offers…I’m very happy here but it seems like I will have to get an outside offer to get ahead…it’s a shame this is the case.”

“…if it weren’t for the current recession I had expected to go each year to my department with a new offer.”

We could avoid counter-offers altogether if we did a better job of performance evaluation.

“Compared to where I came from [overseas] retention here is driven by process [counter-offer] rather than performance.”

How is UIUC compared to other universities?

Things are pretty good here compared to other places. Salaries, research support, start-up funds are competitive.

“In my college the Bureau of Educational Research is a big help.”

Are you being treated fairly by the university?

With the exception of one individual who said he/she was battling with the department head, there was no indication that people were being treated unfairly. No diversity concerns were identified in relation to retention. Some would like to see more women in higher administrative positions, more internationalism of the university, and more done on LGBT issues in general.

What could the university do to keep you here?

Allow faculty to rearrange teaching loads. Redistribute monies across disciplines (more equalization). Provide a mechanism for faculty to speak directly with deans or higher (could be a committee). Enhance community life.

“Childcare is limited and not an easy option in this town.”

Make it easier for faculty to use p-cards on grants.

“I always have to spend my own money and then get reimbursed.”

Provide more opportunities for faculty to interact socially.

“This is a family-focused community…do more to help those who are not married.”

“Maybe have a Facebook for faculty.”

“It is great the Chancellor comes to most minority events; he should keep it up.”

What is your experience with spousal hires?

Two individuals had bad experiences with spousal hires and believed the university does not do a good job of fulfilling their promises.

“My concern is when a spouse is tenured but the other isn’t.”

“Cross-campus hires are often difficult.” “Maybe you should interview the spousal hires.”

More help should be provided to find spouses jobs in the community.
Appendix B. Summary of Interviews with Department Heads

During Summer 2008 three focus groups were conducted with Department Heads to ask them about their problems and concerns involving faculty retention and to learn what they do to retain their faculty. One focus group consisted largely of Heads from the humanities, another of Heads from the social sciences, and a third of Heads from the sciences and engineering.

The focus groups were conducted by John Ory and Chris Migotsky from the Center for Teaching Excellence and a representative from the Committee. Focus group procedures received approval from the campus Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Individual summaries of the three focus groups are presented below. Within each summary participant comments were grouped into categories with representative quotes provided. The participants in each of the focus groups were eager to discuss their concerns about faculty retention and to share how they attempt to retain their faculty.

They definitely see faculty retention as a major problem for the university and often expressed strong opinions about what needs to be done to address the issue. We strongly encourage the reader to review the comments in this section before advancing to the summary section of this appendix to get a full sense of the concerns expressed by the Department Heads.

1. Department Heads from the Humanities

9 participants (Philosophy, French, German, Theater, Music, Art & Design, English, and Communications; also Agricultural & Bio Engineering)

Spousal hires and dual-career opportunities.

The opportunity to offer spouses positions at the University is a great recruitment tool and the dual-career program allows units to both recruit and retain important faculty. In many cases, our program here is better than at peer institutions. Unfortunately, with several other factors, UIUC is behind peer institutions as will be seen below. Once a faculty member becomes “known to the world” it is hard to fight off Head-hunters and keep them on campus.

“As a Department Head of a smaller department in the humanities, I have been at the receiving end of several spousal hiring agreements which by and large have greatly benefited my department. This has been a win-win situation”

“It’s hell to move. The more supportive the University is of spousal hires, the better. First, we can get people in that we might not have been able to and second it’s easier to retain them once they are here. We are a step ahead of everyone else. If we make both parties feel welcomed it goes a long way to retaining them. You need to be aggressive in wooing BOTH parties.”

Funding & Resources.

The general salary structure in the Humanities and Arts are below competitors. In addition to salary, general funding for travel, research, and teaching are sub-par. Faculty members frequently pay for their own conference travel, long distance phone calls, office supplies, and other equipment that other institutions cover. Often the only way to obtain a salary increase or other support is to get a counter-offer. The Library is seen as a huge positive in respect to retaining faculty, but there were concerns that faculty have not been consulted on changes to the Library, including the merging of several disciplinary libraries.

“I have faculty members who have received the message loud and clear that the only way to get a decent salary increase is to go out and get an offer. I find that extremely demoralizing for myself and the whole department.”

“In some cases I give them a semester or a year off for writing and research. I some times don’t have a choice. I just have to scrape the bottom of the barrel and find somebody from under a bridge to cover those courses.”
“We have a very low level of support for research in our department. We are dead last in the CIC in the amount of teaching we require our grad students to do, in the start up money for faculty, and research support provided by the department. My faculty pay for most travel and long distance phone calls. This breeds attentiveness to the market—people don’t want to worry about how they will fund things.”

“We have good studio space compared to other schools, but now with the energy crunch, if we are charged for it, I’m not sure we’ll be able to afford the spaces.”

“The other big factor that comes up in retention talks is support for graduate students. It’s lacking here. This has a huge impact on morale. People invest a lot in their grad students. I’ve had a number of faculty members saying I’m going to go to this place even though it’s not as good a department but they have so much better support for their grad students.”

“The University needs to attend very carefully to what is going on in the Library. That is our laboratory.”

Morale, Respect, & Recognition.

While morale among the “creative classes” is generally high, it is difficult to maintain high spirits and feel valued when most of the recognition and respect seems to be centered on the science and engineering parts of campus. News coverage is focused on the high tech areas and the humanities and arts are somewhat ignored. Similarly, there appears to be a lack of appreciation for the large teaching load/service that is provided to the entire campus by the departments represented by humanities and arts.

“In our area there is built-in morale because we are in a creative place and there is a great deal of creative energy that helps morale. The morale helps buffer faculty from outside offers. People need to feel invested in our department, in the college, and invested in the campus. The more we can do that the better.”

“The position of the arts and humanities on this campus is problematic. People generally feel that fine arts and humanities are undervalued and under supported. There is a complete lack of understanding about what the humanities do, what a good bargain we are, the load of teaching that we bear. We are sick of being considered a scab on the back of the scientists. We are not valued.”

“It’s the relative support. Faculty see new buildings going up and new things going on and they hear about people getting big grants and yet they have to pay for their long distance. Or they are operating in a classroom that has not been improved in 30 some years. That differential is a problem.”

“I have some very well known faculty in my department—nation-wide and world-wide—but not really known here. They are invited to go all over the world; there is a lot more recognition outside than on our own campus.”

“We are so technologically and scientifically oriented on this campus. The people who make the news have done something in the sciences. How often do you see a humanist in the news? The News Bureau should be contacting us.”

“We sponsor a major conference every year which involves people from our department and people from the outside. We are getting groups together and allowing faculty to shine and be recognized.”

Community.

In general, the local community is a plus for recruiting and retaining faculty due to the low cost of living, safe neighborhoods, and family-friendly atmosphere. There are some concerns that the schools are not as good as they once were and the airport is a hindrance to conducting business and doing research. The lack of childcare and tuition support for younger faculty families is a drawback in both recruiting and retaining people.

“Northwestern pays up to half of tuition for kids anywhere. Not just Northwestern! Here we have to put in 5 years of equity before you get a dime and you get nothing anywhere else.”
“I’ve had faculty ask for better child care. There aren’t enough spaces.”
“The airport is a downer. It used to be you could do your work and then get out and do other things. You can’t say that anymore. You are stuck.”
“The community is a positive retention issue in general, especially for people with children. It’s easy to live here and buy a house.”

**Interdisciplinary connections.**
Illinois has a fairly strong interdisciplinary approach and there are many opportunities to collaborate across departments. One worry has been the lack of credit given for collaborative research and publications during annual reviews, tenure, and promotion cases.

“Collaborative articles are not taken seriously. You are hurting yourself to collaborate and publish together. It’s hard to build collegiality without common projects.”

“IPRH (Illinois Program for Research in the Humanities) and the Unit for Criticism are huge resources for us in recruiting people. They link us across the humanities.”

### 2. Department Heads from the Social Sciences

8 participants (Labor & Industrial Relations, Advertising, Educational Psychology, Political Science, Economics, Special Education; also Mathematics and LAS Admin)

**Salaries.**
Departments don’t have enough budget discretion to reward people on merit. Cost of living increases are rarely allotted to departments, much less extra funding for retention issues. There is a lack of understanding among the faculty about how money for salaries (including retention cases) is generally unavailable. It would be a great help if more foundation funds could be unrestricted or dedicated to general department use.

“In our department it really is a salary issue. The salaries nationally are hard to keep pace with, and we have not been able to do it.”

“We need to be backed-up by the Provost Office when we make a decision, instead of a faculty member going around us to the Provost Office and negotiating a deal. That undercuts me completely. We put serious effort into looking at the CV and record of accomplishment.”

“If we had development money going to quality of life and salary, that would be much more valuable. I don’t need another scholarship—that’s the last thing I need. I could use that money more wisely and effectively.”

“Faculty need to understand that we don’t just have this pool of money sitting over here waiting for you to come and tell us you need more money. If I take money to give you a raise, I’m taking money away from the rest of the faculty. They need to understand that we are all in this together.”

**Morale & Support.**
Faculty members feel they are not valued because there is little support for basic necessities such as travel, graduate students, office space and supplies, etc. It is demoralizing to both faculty and Department Heads that they need to cover the cost of basic necessities such as painting, plumbing, phones, and energy without adequate support from the University.

“Morale is an issue. It’s quality of life. You have no resources. No space. Things are being cut. That gets people thinking about leaving. It’s worse now than it was 10 or 15 years ago.”

“We also have less choice. Even in what you teach. How you conduct your day-to-day business. We have too many constraints.”

“This climate of metrics we are in is tough. Get another grant, then another grant, then another one so you’ll look better in your profile.”
“We lose people who say ‘Wouldn’t it be nice to go to someplace where I didn’t have to buy my own office supplies, and I have long distance phone service and money to travel to a conference?’ It’s a travesty. I don’t have the resources. We need a minimum quality of life for all of our faculty.”

“Intangibles are also important. The money is important, but I might retain someone without meeting the full salary demands. Recently I set up a research fund to hold a special conference in their area of expertise bringing in experts and letting them achieve prominence in their work. This was of much more value than a few extra dollars in their salary.”

“It’s important to say ‘thank you’ to people. Be nice. It’s important to be proactive and not wait until there is an offer.”

“We try to reduce teaching loads and give people time off. But we have increased our student numbers. Who is going to teach those students?”

“I’m always shocked when someone says I have to pay for a toilet. It’s part of your unit so you have to pay for it. Excuse me, but I would think that’s what the University provides to us. How does the University value us?”

Counter-offers are not equal.
Faculty members come to Department Heads with offers just to get a raise. In many instances, the offer is not from a peer institution and thus it’s hard to justify a counter-offer. In a similar vein, some faculty members may not be “worth” a counter-offer.

“When they approach you with an offer, you step onto this roller-coaster. The first decision is whether you are going to try and retain them. Is this a start that we are going to go all out for or is this someone we are going to engage? Or is it a case where we are not going to play?”

“I’ve had people come to me with counter-offers from institutions that are not even vaguely considered peers. And I know they are just doing it for the salary. And then they are furious when I say we aren’t going to match the offer. They don’t want to go there; they are only doing it for a raise.”

“We have evolved into a system where the way people have value shown to them is going to the market and getting an offer. There is an incentive to shop. It’s a flawed system.”

“Joint appointment cases are very complicated. There are a lot of cooks involved with the soup! There are different unit objectives. We need a better mechanism to immediately get unit Heads together on these cases.”

“There is a talent war that we are in. Part of it is the rankings issue. We are under pressure to improve our national rankings and we do it by buying talent rather than making talent. So there are incentives to go out and find a star to transform the department.”

Campus Connections & Community.
Many faculty members feel disenfranchised from the campus and administration. The strategic plan seems to be developed and implemented without true faculty input. The sense of a joint academic community and purpose has disappeared.

“You need to have a sense of mission, vision, and purpose. If people feel the larger enterprise has a sense of purpose and they can contribute and their contributions are deeply valued, then the creativity and forces that get let lose are extraordinary.”

“What’s missing in my unit is that people feel disenfranchised by the campus strategic plan.”

“At the end of every year, I have thirty minute meetings with each faculty individually. I ask them what their concerns are what their expectations were, what can I do for you? How are you feeling? How do you fit in? I do this whether there is a retention issue or not. The faculty have never been asked before.”

“The campus puts administrators in a tough position. We are constantly asked to be cutting and being more efficient. At the same time we have pressure to retain our best people and
take on more students.”

3. **Department Heads from Science and Engineering**


**Transparency & Communications.**

The University needs to do a more thorough job of communicating with faculty and Department Heads on all issues. Faculty need to be kept in the loop and involved with key decisions. Also, the tone coming from the upper administration should be one of seeking excellence and not simply “things are bad.”

“Faculty need hope. It’s a cheap thing for our administrators to talk about their vision and how we are going to enable that vision across the campus rather than just talking about how we don’t have money.”

“Too much negativity from the top. Where’s the light at the end of the tunnel?”

“Changes [like the research tax] are often brought about with no discussion...no reasons given. No explanation of where the money will go. We don’t have enough transparency.”

“We need to maintain a steady degree of communication.”

“The messages from on top are so negative. It’s getting to the faculty. It never used to. Even if there are tough times at the moment we want to hear that we’ve got a plan that is going to change that and we are positioning ourselves well so we will emerge as a better entity. Young faculty are asking whether this is where I want to build my future? There is no long range vision.”

“The easy answer for retention is more money. But the culture of the University needs to change. The President said a few years ago that he wants a leaner, meaner, more efficient machine. And yet everything we see on campus is going in the opposite direction. We have more difficulty getting things done. The Provost and Chancellor can make it clear to their people that they are a service unit and they should be helpful...not to get in the way.”

“There doesn’t seem to be a vision at the top. We meet and all we hear about are energy costs. ‘Turn off the lights.’ Our faculty keep hearing about this and are asking themselves why should I stay if that is what’s driving us.”

**Department Control.**

More decisions should be at the discretion of the unit Heads. There needs to be a sense of trust in the Department Heads that they can manage their departments better than distant administrators. The trend toward micro-managing is disruptive to daily activities and the work of faculty.

“It should be the Department Head’s discretion on how they want to run a department. Why do I have to justify it to people who have no idea what the situation is and can’t make a judgment.”

“It’s now gotten more and more difficult just to get through this stuff...to get a proposal out the door, to get funding in place, to get reimbursed, to get things built, get space taken care of; it’s gotten a whole lot more complicated. Things go more smoothly at other campuses.”

“The campus has made a conscious decision to become micro-managers. They hire more bureaucrats and don’t let the faculty do their work.”

“The lesson is that micromanagement is a bad thing. Growth of useless administration is a bad thing. This is a danger to quality.”

“Every situation is an individual case with individual needs and desires. Our administration has tried to codify packages like a tenure or promotion package. This is what you get. I’ve
argued with my administration that this isn’t the way to go. It’s easy and plays to a sense of fairness, but it doesn’t work. People have specific needs. They are all special and individual.”

“Over the last 50 years the Engineering College has been one of the best in the world. So do we play to that strength and look to that history and what made it great so we can keep it great? Or do we change it? We are changing the way the college is run: not to retain its greatness but to bring it into conformity. We are eliminating the aspects that made it great. We are removing decision making from the faculty.”

**Offers and Counter-Offeres.**

There needs to be a way for departments to be pro-active in rewarding excellence in their faculty. A culture of rewarding quality should be reinforced and emphasized rather than the current notion that outside offers are the only avenue to pay raises.

“Many of my faculty, maybe all of them, have the perception that the only way they can get significant raises and improve their position is by getting an outside offer. I don’t want people to be entertaining the idea of outside offers. Once they consider that, we may lose them no matter what. The biggest issue of retention really is taking care of faculty before they have those outside offers. That’s very difficult to do with present resources.”

“We reward disloyalty and don’t appreciate loyalty. Those who don’t seek outside offers winds up getting their 2.5% raises and those that seek offers get the lion’s share of raises. That’s absolutely backwards!”

“Administrators have told faculty to get outside offers. They have told them ‘Show me a letter with an outside offer with an increased salary and we’ll match it.’ Once the faculty have that letter they start to think about taking the offer. This happens routinely.”

“You need to be proactive. Knowing ahead of time is critical. If there is an issue you can act on it well before they get an offer.”

**Morale & Recognition.**

Faculty members want to be valued, respected, and recognized at both the department and campus levels. In the last few years there has been a trend toward taking choices away from faculty and putting roadblocks in their way. Part of respecting faculty is paying them for a job well done, but it goes beyond pure salary issues.

“Faculty need to feel appreciated. Make sure they are happy. It’s more than just money.”

“We have a bloated bureaucracy on this campus. The most important members of the University are the faculty. The purpose of the Department Heads is to enable the faculty to do their work. And the purpose of the administration is to enable the Department Heads to serve their faculty. In the last 2-3 years it’s completely reversed. Upper level administration are now driving faculty out by their rudeness, their hostility, and their refusal to cooperate with the faculties’ wishes. Even demeaning remarks are made toward faculty. Administrative staff is bloated at every level of the campus and those people need to justify their jobs by attacking the faculty.”

“The compensation for promotion is not a quantum leap that would make a person say ‘I’m really valuable.’ It basically just makes up for the little bit you got along the line and gets you back to the cost of living. Older faculty have not kept up with the cost of inflation. Junior faculty are coming in with salaries that match those that have been here 20 years!”

“It comes down to the way people feel they are treated. When the unit has leadership that does not empower people, which micro-manages them, which taxes the successful people more than the less successful people then morale goes down very quickly.”

“It’s always about respect. It’s not just money.”

“Department Heads need to promote our faculty as often as possible. By promoting I mean ‘blowing their horn.’ Every time someone gets a grant, I send an e-mail out to the entire
department and out it on the web. Those kinds of things make a person feel good and respected. Everyone likes to be patted on the back. The university should do that all the way up the line. You shouldn’t have to get the Noble Prize to get your face on the university website.”

“We need to do a better job of respecting faculty.”

**Spousal Programs.**

Our spousal hiring programs are a good start, but they need to be expanded and made more timely and efficient. They should extend to retention cases as well as new recruits.

“There aren’t any opportunities for spouses here. Maybe more can be done with regard to the spouse program. I know we have a program but it’s not nearly as successful as it needs to be. We lose faculty constantly on this issue.”

“We have tried to get a spousal package together once the person is already here and they’ve been here for a while. We approach administration for help and it isn’t easy getting that through the campus. They say ‘Why are you doing this? They are already here.’ We are doing it as a retention case ahead of time before they leave.”

4. **Summary**

As would be expected, there were both differences and similarities about faculty retention voiced by the Heads, especially across disciplines. But all agree it is a problem they must address. When counter offers are made, the Heads never win. When they match an offer, “the others” are sometimes envious and search for their own. If they refrain from making an offer, or give one less than requested, they are stuck with a disgruntled colleague.

Differences were found more in the Heads’ needs for campus assistance than in their actions to retain faculty. Most often the differences reflected the disparities of available support and resources across disciplines. We will attempt to present the similarities and differences by summarizing comments under two headings: needs for campus assistance and departmental actions taken to retain faculty.

**Need for Campus Assistance.**

All Heads want greater communication between the campus administration and themselves and their faculty. They need faculty to hear a consistent and positive voice about the university to help them develop loyalty and a desire to be a part of this great university.

Science and engineering faculty believe the quality of their college is eroding due to across the board cuts and rising research overhead while the humanities professors feel underappreciated for the amount of teaching they offer.

The Heads need faculty to get the message from the university there is no set-aside pool of money available for retention cases. And, when a unit Head makes a difficult decision not to retain, the decision needs to be supported as much as possible from the administration, not undermined.

All Heads want less bureaucracy for themselves and their faculty making everyday work-life less of a hassle and freeing up valuable time to do what they need to do. The Heads from the sciences and engineering were especially adamant how much their day is filled with administrivia. They want to spend less time pushing papers and more time leading their units. The layers of paperwork are hindering their ability to be more proactive in trying to keep faculty. Stories were told of special permissions needed for Heads to take action when it shouldn’t be anyone’s decision but the Heads’.

The Heads appreciate the campus spousal and dual-career program but are disappointed they are limited more to hiring than retaining faculty.

The Heads of the less-endowed departments expressed strong needs for additional resources to provide a better quality of work-life for their faculty. They asked for set-aside funds for faculty travel, for long-distance phone calls, and everyday work items. With the higher demand for grants, larger teaching loads, and bigger classes, faculty don’t need one more reason to pursue “greener pastures.”
Actions Taken to Retain Faculty.

The Heads described how their faculty members are constantly being courted by other institutions. So much so, younger faculty members “are actually being hired twice, with offers coming so often in the 3rd and 4th years.” The Heads respond to the challenge of retention in similar ways emphasizing the importance of “good hiring,” being proactive, and keeping their “troops happy.” They attempt the latter by:

- listening to faculty concerns with an open door policy,
- continually informing faculty of departmental and campus business,
- keeping “an ear to the ground” to respond early to outside offers,
- handling each retention case as a unique negotiation (“recognizing no one shoe fits all”) with fairness and honesty in all,
- giving praise when earned and rewards when possible with a variety of carrots, including salary, release time, reduced or restructured teaching loads, course selections, routine expenses, bridge monies between grants, space, staging conferences to showcase faculty work, etc.
- establishing a unit culture that faculty want to be a part of and loyal to,
- treating each faculty member with respect but differently based on individual personalities and needs,
- trying to “buffer” the faculty from burdensome bureaucracy by handling it for them whenever possible,
- offering excellent start-up packages (easier for sciences and engineering units!),
- providing mentors to younger faculty,
- “staying on top” of available campus awards and resources, and making an effort to help faculty acquire them (submit applications and nominations)

We conclude this section by repeating how pleased the Heads were to share their comments with the Provost. They face retention issues everyday and would appreciate any help offered by the campus administration.
Appendix C. Summary of Interviews with Deans

John C. Ory and H. Fred Troutt, Jr., interviewed Deans from eight colleges.

1. Nature of the Problem

Retention is certainly a problem for everyone, but is:

- worse for units without many resources to respond to retention cases,
- worse when salaries vary considerably within a unit, e.g., units with faculty from professional and academic backgrounds, and
- most difficult in poor economic times when small salary increases are the norm.

The loss of mid-career faculty hurts the most, losing both start-up dollars and invested time and energy nurturing future contributors.

- “It’s just debilitating losing good mid-career people.”
- “Most frustrating for me is losing faculty right after tenure, after investing so much in them.”
- “[Mid-career faculty] losses are more costly so we try hard not to have them.”

Many University of Illinois faculty members are highly sought after by other schools, with more pressure coming from private rather than public institutions.

- “I am used to offers at about 20-30% more salary but we have been seeing 50% or more.”

The Deans believe more outside offers are unsolicited than solicited by the faculty, but they realize part of the “University culture” is to seek outside offers to improve current salary, support, and perks. The Deans do not believe their faculty members are being told to seek outside offers, but they hear stories of the practice at the university. Some colleges are less willing to make counter-offers than others. Several Deans encourage the university to “push back” on the issue, including giving a message to faculty there is no pool of money set aside for counteroffers.

- “I don’t know how to break cycle... we need a robust salary increase to off-set the problem...short of that I don’t know how to get out of this.”
- “It’s a downhill slide if the faculty think they have to get an offer to get ahead.”
- “We have a massive salary compression issue within my college.”

Retaining good faculty is not solely about money but “in the end money speaks loudest.” In addition to a salary increase, faculty often want just as much to be recognized or appreciated through the counteroffer process.

Several Deans reported a growing sense of entitlement among the younger faculty, thus causing them to constantly look elsewhere for more resources and support. One Dean explained how “some of our faculty are now expecting administrative bumps for activities that used to be considered departmental service.”

2. Avoiding a counter-offer: Proactive strategies

Similar to the focus group comments made by their Department Heads, the Deans spoke about being proactive in keeping faculty “happy and appreciated” in their current job. Retention is about the “health and well being of the faculty.” They mentioned the following “proactive” offerings to their faculty:

- provide start-up research packages to new faculty
- give Dean or college awards and/or recognition monies
- offer additional internal research support

- “I am investing all of our ICR back into the research needs of the faculty.”
• sponsor events to showcase faculty and their work
• publicize faculty accomplishments
• assign reduced teaching loads
• “channel” gift money to faculty needs such as travel or equipment
• provide P&T support

In addition to these college-level efforts several campus-wide units were cited for their contributions to retaining faculty. The Research Board travel funds are extremely helpful, as is the support provided by the Center for Advanced Study and the Beckman Institute.

One Dean believed the latter two units could do even more to promote and support faculty research.

The Deans try to ward off possible retention problems whenever possible by “keeping their ear to the ground” and staying in close touch with their unit Heads.

“I’m pretty close to my Heads.”

“My Heads will say to me at salary time, ‘I’m worried about so and so...’ and we do something together to fix it.”

“I let the faculty know we are doing everything we can to make their salaries work...including multi-year plans for advancement.”

“We try to head them off at the pass...easier to do when there was more money.”

The Deans try to help with “daily needs” such as travel expenses, supplies and equipment, etc. but “there is only so much we can do.” The availability of such funds varies considerably across campus, depending on available “pots of money.” Several of the Deans identified specific pools of money they use for these purposes. Another Dean believed the Vice Chancellor for Research also helped by providing an additional support person for the humanities.

“It just hasn’t caught on as much in the humanities that if you don’t write grants you don’t help yourself.”

In addition to feeling appreciated faculty need to know their unit and college is valued. “No one wants to be part of a sinking ship,” said one Dean. Several Deans believed this was their own responsibility and volunteered they could be doing more. Some described efforts to build collegiality through college programs, awards, and outings. All of the Deans were more than satisfied with the Provost’s support of their college and her efforts to be visible to their faculty.

“Faculty can never hear enough positive things about their college and the university.”

“To be quite honest we need to keep people positive.”

The Deans spoke of developing “a sense of community within their faculty” and trying to get the message across that “it’s about us...we are in this together.” It’s more about faculty morale than loyalty. Using baseball terminology, one Dean explained, “There really is no home premium [for most faculty members].” When there is loyalty, in order of importance, it is most likely to a project - to a unit - to a college - to the university as a whole.

“Loyalty to a school is declining but loyalty to a project is what retains people.”

Making the right hires in the beginning can help reduce retention problems later on. Deans spoke of the importance of considering how candidates will fit into the community as well as the university.

3. Reacting to outside offers.

In general, the Deans work closely with the units in responding to external offers. Resources for making a counter offer are typically split between the unit and the college, with the provost helping whenever possible.

The Deans report being rather successful in retaining faculty except in cases involving family and spousal drivers, or career changes into administrative positions.

“Most want to stay and we are about 80-90% successful.”
“We have been pretty successful matching offers but it’s getting harder with less funds.”

The handling of counteroffers was described as “pretty transparent,” so the Deans stressed the need to be as fair as possible. The big challenge is “to balance the money” being “careful not to skew money to a few.” Typically unit funds are “taken from other salaries” or from “lines being given up.” Both situations can cause faculty tension.

“Nothing can be more poisonous to a unit than when other faculty get agitated about not being treated fairly and then go looking for their own outside offer.”

Most agreed with one Dean’s statement,

“You must deal with them case by case with no template for handling them.” “It is interesting how each case is so different from another.”

The challenge is knowing what incentives will work best. One Dean described how additional research support “speaks more to some than to others.”

It is “not automatic” a counter-offer will be made. “Sometimes it is best to let some people go,” said a Dean. To be taken seriously, most colleges require external offers to be “in hand” and from a peer institution. The faculty need to be careful about appearing to be on a “fishing expedition” and “going to the well too often.” Said one Dean,

“Nothing frustrates me more than serial repeaters.”

4. Hindrances to retaining faculty

MONEY

Retaining good faculty is harder in tough financial times. Small salary increases and fewer resources can make faculty wonder if this is the best place for them. Constantly asking for help to meet daily needs “wears down the faculty.” A scarcity of funds is also problematic when having to match outside offers. Sometimes financial problems also get in the way of good practice as some unit Heads are reluctant to let some faculty go for fear of losing the line.

ADMINISTRIVIA

As did their unit Heads, the Deans spoke about the ever-increasing demand on faculty time dealing with campus bureaucracy and requests for information. Added layers of campus, state, and federal requirements have increased at the same time we are asking faculty to seek more grants and teach larger classes. Too often the campus asks faculty for information which has already been requested (and received) by another campus unit. Not only does it take considerable faculty time to respond to such requests, but too often faculty have no idea how, or if, the information is being used. “It gets in the way of faculty work and gives them the wrong message.” “We try to help,” but college efforts to hire additional staff “are costly” or prohibitive.

“More onerous here than any place I have seen...an overreaction to the Chicago incident...no common sense to much of it.”

“The amount of administrative details has been ratcheted up considerably.”

“My assistant can’t believe the amount of paper work coming our way.”

“Administrivia is not unimportant... we no longer have clerical staff so faculty must fend for themselves...take just the work to handle student visas.”

“Campus hasn’t figured out how to shift a decentralized campus to a more centralized one when it comes to this issue.”

UNEVEN PROMOTION OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Several Deans expressed concerned over how much the university publicizes or highlights accomplishments in the sciences and engineering at the expense of the other disciplines.

“It should be about ALL the points of light here at the university rather than a one note song about the same old things.”

“We are a bit uneven in highlighting our faculty achievements...it seems to always be about
sciences and computers.”

CONCERNS EXPRESSED BY INDIVIDUALS

“The university doesn’t do enough for retiring faculty...what is there to look forward to if they stay loyal for a long time?”

“The existence of the Global Campus [without much faculty support] gives a bad message to the faculty.”

“We have always had a history of strong departments, but our emphasis on interdisciplinary work really weakens department loyalty....I know we are doing the right thing, but where is one’s allegiance?”

“The quality of the public school systems is becoming problematic.”

“It used to be clearer in the past about what constitutes a valid outside offer, including needing to be in writing and from a true peer institution...the administration could help us by once again making it clear to the faculty.”

“The small town atmosphere just doesn’t make it for some young faculty from the coasts.”

“Things like the Chancellor’s bubble-gum cards created a ‘star-system’ problem...several of my faculty wondered where was their card?”

“Spousal issues and child care needs will always be a concern.”

“The university might consider a systematic program for mentoring young faculty which might help their retention.”
Appendix D. Focus Group Invitation Letter

PROVOST’S COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RETENTION

FACULTY FOCUS GROUP CONSENT FORM

You are invited to participate in focused group interview conducted by members of Provost Katehi’s Committee on Faculty Retention. Your name was selected at random by the Academic Human Resource Department based on criteria for discipline, rank, or employment history to broadly represent faculty expertise on the UIUC campus.* The purpose of the interview is to obtain information about how and what department administrators are doing to retain their faculty.

A moderator will be present to facilitate discussion during the 60-90 minute focused group interview. A note taker will type notes on his/her computer and an audiotape will be made for transcription purposes only. (Below we are asking your permission for us to use audio-recording.) After each interview the note taker and moderator will create a summary report by content analyzing the comments found in the note-taker’s notes supported by comments present in the audio recording. The content analysis will identify themes and provide examples of each. The content summaries will be written to keep the identity of the participants unknown. Summary results will be given to the Office of the Provost, and for possible dissemination to the campus, at professional meetings and in professional publications.

We will ask that all participants respect each other’s confidentiality and avoid disclosing identifying information and personal information with individuals who did not participate in their focus group. However, as is the nature of focus groups, the researchers can’t guarantee all group members will respect this request for confidentiality of the session.

The potential benefit of this research is to deepen our understanding of the factors associated with retaining valued faculty and promoting an environment that enhances excellence at the University of Illinois. In addition, sharing information with others and their response to this information may be useful in identifying best practices for faculty retention. No payment or other compensation will be made to individuals participating in this study. No funds have been set aside to compensate you in the event of problems associated with this study.

Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your future relations with the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Academic Human Resources, or the Office of the Provost. You are under no obligation to participate in the study. You are free to discontinue participation in the study at any time, and, if we are audio-recording, request the audio-recorder be turned off at any time.

************************************************************************************
I agree to participate in the focus group.

_____ Yes

_____ No

_____ Initials

* For interviews of executive officers, this sentence was replaced with “You were randomly selected from all department Chairs or Heads serving for two or more years.”
I agree to allow audio-recording of this session for transcription purposes only. We will not record the session if any individual fails to grant permission.

_____ Yes
_____ No
_____ Initials

If a retention practice that I describe is later identified as a ‘best practice’ then I grant permission for the investigators to use my name and the name of my unit when sharing this information.

_____ Yes
_____ No
_____ Initials

Any notes and audiotapes will remain the property of the principal investigator, Dr. John Ory, and will not be copied or distributed.

__________________________________                 _________________________
Signature of Participant      Date

If you have any questions, please direct them to Dr. John Ory ory@illinois.edu, telephone: (217) 333-3370, Office: 249 Armory Bldg, 505 E Armory, Champaign, IL 61820 (M/C 528). If you have any additional questions later, he will be happy to answer them. Should you have any questions concerning research subject's rights, you can contact the University of Illinois Institutional Review Board Office, (217) 333-2670; e-mail: irb@uiuc.edu. You are welcome to call collect if you identify yourself as a research participant.
Appendix E. Focus Group Interview Questions

1. Why do you choose to remain at the UIUC? Describe as many reasons as you feel are relevant.

2. How do you describe ideal employment as a faculty member at your rank and in your field? Compare your employment at UIUC with the ideals you just described.

3. Do you intend to seek opportunities to leave the UIUC in the near future? If so, why?

4. Have you actively sought opportunities to leave the UIUC? If so, why?

5. Is the UIUC competitive in terms of research support with peer and better departments in your field?

6. Is the UIUC competitive in terms of faculty salaries with peer and better departments in your field?

7. Are there attributes of your position at the UIUC that you find particularly attractive or distinctive relative to positions that you might obtain elsewhere? If so, what are they? Could they be replicated elsewhere?

8. Are there attributes of your position at the UIUC that you find particularly negative relative to positions that you might obtain elsewhere? If so, what are they?

9. Do you feel that your contributions to your unit/department are appreciated by your faculty colleagues? By the university administration, including your unit Head/Chair?

10. Have you been treated with fairness as a member of your unit?

11. Have you been treated with honesty by university administrators, including your unit Head/Chair?

12. Do you feel that you can succeed as well in your research career by staying at the UIUC as you could at any other institution that may wish to hire you?

13. Are you satisfied with the administration of your unit by its Head/Chair?

14. Are you satisfied with the governance of the university by its administrative units?

15. Aside from financial matters such as salaries and research support, what steps should the UIUC administration take in the future in order to retain its most valuable faculty members? Are there policies and procedures that you would like to recommend?