

Report of the Campus Affairs Committee on “The Graying of the Faculty”

Presented to the Faculty Senate, August 2008

By the Campus Affairs Committee
“Graying of the Faculty” Subcommittee

Sub-committee Members:

Jodi Herzik

Ted Oleson

Grant Stitt, Committee Chair

Part I - Introduction

The Campus Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate was charged with investigating the situation known as the “graying of the faculty” at UNR and compiling statistics and information bearing on what this forthcoming exodus of the “baby boomers” will mean to the institution, its colleges, departments and the individual faculty members. The Campus Affairs Committee wants to point out that in no way should this report be construed as intending to coerce or threaten faculty to retire before they are individually motivated to do so. We realize that retirement is a major event in people’s lives and a step that should be taken very carefully.

It has been recognized that the changing demographics of the American workforce will have dramatic effects on both the public and private sectors. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the number of people aged 55 and older will increase to 73% by 2020, while the number of younger workers will grow only 5%. The issues of changing labor force demographics and discussions of the impacts on business and government budgets have recently received heightened attention. One article (Reeves 2005) suggests that the growth of the labor force has slowed dramatically from 30% during the 1970’s to only 3% during the first decade of the 21st century. Meanwhile, by 2010, the portion of the workforce over age 55 is expected to increase by 52%. According to Reeves (2005), this poses issues of concern for employers:

The aging workforce creates a challenge for employers seeking to retain top-notch people, and an opportunity for workers who may want to earn a few extra bucks in retirement. About 76 million baby boomers, or those born between 1946 and 1964, are set to retire in large numbers by the end of the decade. Boomers make up about one-third of the U.S. workforce, and there aren't enough younger workers to replace them. Labor shortages in key industries will force a radical rethinking of recruitment, retention, flexible work schedules and retirement. (Reeves, 2005)

A recent article by Sugar, Pruitt, Anstee, and Harris (2005: 407) notes that these same demographic changes also affect the postsecondary educational labor force in substantial ways. As they note:

America is graying and the professoriate is no exception. The age structure of faculty has changed over time. In 1979 the greatest proportion of faculty were 36-40 years of age; in 1989 the greatest proportion were 46-50 years of age; and in 1999 the greatest proportion were 51-65 years of age.

According to the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics survey of postsecondary staff, in 2003 approximately 16% of full-time instructional faculty were age 60 years or over (2003).

The next section of this report will examine this graying of the faculty phenomenon at UNR.

Part II – UNR Statistics on the Graying of the Faculty

It has been recognized that approximately 31% of UNR's faculty is 55 years of age and over. Broken down further 35.2% of academic faculty and 25.3% of administrative faculty are 55 years of age or older. This means that within the next 20-25 years a significant number of retirements will take place. Since some departments currently have greater than 50% of their faculty within six years of the current average age of retirement (65.2 for academic faculty and 59.5 for administrative faculty) they could be hit very hard by multiple retirements. Clearly there will be differential effects with some departments and units being hit with 100% of their faculty retiring and others significantly less. Similarly, colleges will be differentially affected as well. Table 1 below shows percentages of faculty aged 58 and over by college or similar unit. Obviously, there is wide variation by unit with percentages ranging from a low of 6% to a high of 63%. Units with higher percentages of faculty in older cohorts will face different challenges than those with younger faculty.

Table 1 – Faculty 58 and Above by College or Similar Unit

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Percent Age 58 or Over</u>
CABNR	19%
Business	19%
Education	38%
Engineering	26%
Graduate School	63%
Health & Human Sciences	24%
Intercollegiate Athletics	6%
Journalism	44%
Liberal Arts	31%
Science	30%
Libraries	30%
Medicine	22%
Cooperative Extension	37%
Development & Alumni	16%
President's Office	23%
Provost's Office	26%
VP Student Services	30%
VP Admin & Finance	33%
VP Information Tech	17%
VP Marketing & Comm	50%
VP Research	22%

Source: UNR Office of Institutional Analysis

To further understand the impact the retirements of the “baby boomer” generation will have on UNR, an analysis of the comparison of academic versus administrative faculty is presented next. Table 2 below presents an age comparison of these two groups whose ages were 57 and above as of Fall of 2007.

Table 2 – Academic versus Administrative Faculty Aged 57 and Above

Age	# of Employees	Academic Faculty	Administrative Faculty
78	3	2	1
77	3	2	1
76	2	2	
74	3	3	
73	4	4	
72	4	4	
71	6	4	2
70	7	7	
69	12	10	2
68	18	14	4
67	15	13	2
66	11	8	3
65	25	18	7
64	29	21	8
63	17	10	7
62	35	25	10
61	33	22	11
60	45	30	15
59	48	38	10
58	54	35	19
57	66	41	25
Total	440	313	127

This table indicates that there are 450 faculty over the age of 57. The number represents approximately 25% of the total combined academic and administrative faculty. Upon reviewing this table it appears academic faculty put off retirement longer than do administrative faculty. In order to understand what these numbers might mean in terms of future retirements the best predictor of future retirements is probably the ages of past retirees. Examining retirement ages of faculty for the last five years yields an average retirement age of 65.2 years for academic faculty and 59.5 years for administrative faculty. Utilizing these numbers as predictors is by no means going to yield accurate forecasts for the future, especially give current economic conditions with apparent signs of recession, the plummeting of the housing market, and the cost of health care three factors which will likely cause a number of individuals to postpone retirement beyond their previously planned dates. However, the University as a whole would be wise to begin to plan for the consequences of this inevitable turnover.

Part III - The Phase-in Retirement Program at UNR

The current phase-in retirement plan available to all NSHE faculty and professional staff came into existence in December of 2001. The following is a description of the program.

This program allows faculty and professional staff to phase-in their retirement (generally between a .50 and .75 FTE course load or work assignment) over an agreed-upon period of time, not to exceed 5 years. During the phase-in, the institution and employee will continue contributing to their retirement plan as if they were employed 100% FTE.

The phase-in process is governed by a formal contract between the employee and the NSHE. The basic provisions of the program are outlined below. If you have further questions about the phased-in retirement program, please contact the Human Resources Office on campus.

Eligibility

The employee must have attained the age of 65 and completed at least 5 years of service with the institution at the expiration of the term of the agreement;

OR

have attained the age of 60 and completed at least 10 years of service with the institution at the expiration of the term of the agreement;

OR

at any age have completed 30 or more years of service with the institution at the expiration of the term of the agreement.

Process

- The employee requests an application form from the institution’s Human Resource office.
- The employee completes the application and forwards it through the chain of command for signatures from the employee’s chairperson, dean, provost/vice president, and president.
- The completed and signed form is sent to the Human Resources office, which officially determines eligibility.
- Human Resources notifies the employee of the status of their application.
- If the application is approved, the Human Resources office types the formal agreement and sends the agreement through the chain of command for signatures.
- No contract exists until such time as the agreement has been fully executed by the president of the institution.
- Any changes to the agreement, once executed, must be endorsed by the president and approved by the Chancellor.

Since July 1, 2002 thirty UNR faculty have entered into phase-in retirement agreements. Of those, four have been administrative faculty and the rest have been academic faculty. An analysis by UNR’s Office of Institutional Analysis showed that the number of phased in retirement approvals has ranged from 2-7 per year since 2002 (see Table 3 below).

Table 3 – Phased-in Retirements Approved 2002 -2007

<u>Year</u>	<u>Phased-In Retirements</u>	<u>Regular Retirements</u>
2002	7	17
2003	2	17
2004	5	29
2005	6	37
2006	4	36
2007	7	39

There does not appear to be any recent significant increase in the number approved. However, there has been an increase in retirements beginning in 2004. This is likely a sign of the beginning of the expected increase due to baby-boomers reaching retirement age.

Part III – Surveys of Other Universities

As a portion of our fact finding effort the committee conducted an e-mail survey of 68 top U.S. universities. For a specific point of reference all western land grant universities were included in the mailings. Of the 68 institutions surveyed there were responses from 19 of them. The e-mail sent was sent to Human Resource Directors or the person who seemed most likely to have such duties. In the letter we asked if their institution had a strategy or means for handling these forecasted retirements. Next we asked for documentation in the form of copies of policies, directives, etc. regarding any plans they might have. We also asked if they had any early or phased-in retirement option. If they did say yes, we said that we would be interested in seeing how this is structured at their institution.

The responding institutions were closely divided with 11 universities offering a phased-in retirement program and 8 who do not. However, several institutions acknowledged that with the impending retirement of a large number of their faculty there is concern regarding this issue, and they plan to specifically address the impending retirements within the next year.

Survey responders that offer phase-in retirement options include:

- ❖ University of North Dakota
- ❖ Arizona State University
- ❖ University of Arizona
- ❖ Utah State University
- ❖ University of Vermont
- ❖ Kansas State University
- ❖ University of Kentucky
- ❖ University of Minnesota
- ❖ University of Iowa
- ❖ University of Michigan
- ❖ West Virginia University

Most of these institutions have phase-in retirement programs like the one currently offered at UNR. The **University of North Dakota** offers a phase-in retirement program and notes “faculty members will be able to plan their retirement with increased options and benefits and with less fear of the unknown. The university can use phase-in retirement as a cost-saving tool but, more importantly, as a vehicle for the infusion of new thoughts, ideas, and skills by the opening up of positions.” Phase-in retirement is not a right but requires mutual agreement and consent of both the faculty member and the administration. However, unlike UNR’s program UND faculty entering into a phase-in retirement

option must resign their tenured position prior to entering into a Phase-in retirement plan allowing for the immediate replacement of the position.

Both **Arizona State University** and **University of Arizona revised** their Optional Retirement Plans (ORP) in January 2008 to include a voluntary phased retirement program for ORP participants. Much like UNR this phase-in retirement program, which falls under the Arizona State Retirement System, includes:

- The phased period will be for no more than three years.
- The phased period may be accelerated upon mutual agreement of the university and the participant; however, the period may not be extended.
- Employment must be no less than 50% FTE, unless otherwise requested by the participant.
- Salary will be reduced according to the participant's FTE rate.
- Both participant and employer retirement plan contributions will continue based on the participant's reduced salary.
- Tenured faculty must relinquish tenure at the end of the phased period. Individuals with continuing status must relinquish continuing status at the end of the phased period.

Utah State has both a phase-in retirement and an early retirement program. Utah State's phase-in retirement program is similar to UNR's, however, an individual may enter a phase-in program, on either a one-year trial basis or a permanent basis. The FTE percentage assignment for that employee must be reduced by at least one-fifth (i.e., to a level of .80 FTE or less, depending on current FTE) over the same or a reduced appointment base period. Their program states the following:

Early Retirement Incentive Program - Entrance into the early retirement incentive program is strictly voluntary and is available to employees who obtain administrative approval and qualify based on certain eligibility requirements. Administrative approval may be granted after determining that the early retirement incentive request is in the mutual best interest of the employee and the university. The policy provides two mutually exclusive early retirement options for eligible employees: a five year option or a six year option. For an employee to be eligible to request participation in the five year option of the early retirement incentive program, the following criteria must be met: the employee must be a benefit-eligible employee, the employee's age must be at least

57, the employee's age and years of service at Utah State must be equal to or greater than 75.

Participants in this program shall be paid a financial incentive that is the lesser of 20% (16.67% for 6 year Early Incentive Program) of the employee's annual earnings for the 12-month period immediately prior to the approved date of early retirement, or the estimated single social security benefit available to the individual at "Full Retirement Age" as defined by social security law. Medical and dental insurance coverage on the university's group plans continues.

The University of Vermont has had a retirement program in place for eight years. Their program includes a phase-in retirement and a retirement incentive program. UVM's faculty phase-in retirement program is similar to UNR's program. It became effective with the ratification of UVM's collective bargaining agreement and will expire automatically on June 30, 2008. Continuation of this phase-in program will then be at the sole discretion of the University. Their program is the following:

Faculty Retirement Incentive Program (FRIP): includes eligible faculty who are tenured, no less than 62 years of age, with a minimum of fifteen (15) years of service as a full-time UVM faculty member. Additionally, the Provost, in consultation with the school or college dean, will select faculty for participation in the FRIP, taking in account (1) the effect of the retirement on the academic program of the department, school or college and/or the University; (2) the consistency of the retirement with academic program and institutional strategic plans; and (3) the financial impact of the departure in view of program staffing needs and available resources.

Kansas State University has a phase-in retirement program that allows for the replacement of the employee immediately. They have a 2% limit on the number of retirees per year that are allowed to participate in the phase-in program. Program features are identical to UNR except a KSU participant's appointment may be reduced as low as .25 FTE. with continued benefits (health insurance, death and disability coverage and retirement contributions).

Similar to UNR, the **University of Kentucky** has a phase-in retirement program that covers both faculty and staff. "KU's phase-in program is designed to provide an opportunity for eligible full-time faculty and staff employees to make an orderly transition to retirement through part-time service."

The **University of Iowa** has had a Phase-in retirement program for many years. However, there was a recent change that has proven beneficial for retirees: “merit system staff members employed by the Board of Regents for a period of at least 15 years and who have attained the age of 57 are now eligible to negotiate with their department a schedule for phasing into retirement. This is a change from the previous requirement of 20 years of employment by the Board of Regents and attaining the age of at least 60. Note: although the policy allows for a phase of up to 5 years, the actual number is at the discretion of the dean – some deans prefer 2 or 3 years at a maximum.”

The **University of Michigan** deans have flexibility in hiring new faculty while a faculty member is on phase-in retirement status. The University of Michigan offers three phase-in retirement plans for faculty and staff who wish to retire gradually. They are: phase-in retirement, retirement furlough and phase-in retirement furlough.

Phase-in Retirement: offers faculty and staff members a reduced appointment fraction, or a schedule of time off with time worked - or a combination of both. Employees can continue to work and have an income, but faculty must work less.

Retirement Furlough: Allows faculty to apply for a terminal furlough year, taken as the last year preceding retirement, or in partial installments over two or three years prior to the effective date of retirement during which time the staff member is relieved of normal responsibilities and may be called upon to act in a consulting capacity to the University or to conduct research in his or her field of interest.

Phase-in Retirement Furlough: Offers faculty the flexibility of a combination of retirement furlough and phase-in retirement plans.

Ten of the responding institutions do not have a phase-in retirement program; however, several utilize something similar. The responding institutions that do not have phase-in programs include:

- ❖ Texas A&M University
- ❖ University of Maryland
- ❖ Colorado State University
- ❖ University of Montana
- ❖ Oklahoma State University
- ❖ Cal State Berkeley
- ❖ Brigham Young University
- ❖ Emory University

Texas A & M will occasionally “buy out” tenure at retirement and have the retiree return part-time to teach or conduct research. They have a special title for such scholars: Senior Professor—non-tenured but recognizing the esteemed, former role. The phase-in retirement approach at Texas A & M isn’t necessary, because, as state employees, faculty can retire (give up tenure) and almost immediately return to work in a 50% capacity. And, even before retirement, a faculty member can reduce effort to 50% and still be benefits-eligible.

Colorado State University does not have a phased-in retirement program for faculty members, instead they have transitional appointments. Transitional appointments are offered to full-time tenured faculty members who have retired but remain interested in working on a part-time basis. The transitional appointment allows for a phased disengagement from full-time teaching, research, and service. During the time of transitional appointment the faculty member continues to be an active, productive member of the academic unit while at the same time having the time and opportunity to prepare for full retirement. The transitional appointment requires that the faculty member continues to participate in the teaching, advising, service, and research activities of the department. (Faculty covered under the federal retirement system are not eligible for transitional appointment due to prohibitive provisions of that retirement system. However, post-retirement employment in a position other than the one requiring a federal appointment is not prohibited.) Transitional appointments are for a specified term of at least one year and not more than four years, and it concludes with the termination of the part-time tenured appointment full retirement. However, this does not preclude subsequent full-time or part-time employment in a non-tenured position subject to the needs and resources of the department and the interest of the faculty member. The percentage of salary and the percentage of effort during the transitional appointment are subject to negotiation between the department and the faculty member. Salary for transitional appointments is usually 50 percent of the faculty member's normal appointment time and 50 percent of a full work load.

Both **University of Montana** and **Oklahoma State University** offer "post-retirement contracts." A faculty member enters into a contract with the University to be placed on a maximum of one-third time appointment for up to three years. The duties for the one-third time appointment are negotiated with the chair and ultimately approved by the administration. Teaching load is usually one course per semester.

The **University of Maryland, Brigham Young University** and **Emory** do not offer retirement transition plans or phase-in retirement proposals. The Provost and Deans of both institutions are beginning work on an impact assessment and detailed planning in 2008.

Part V – Implications at the Individual, Department, College and University Levels

As Sugar, et al. (2005) note, the demographic wave of aging faculty poses challenges to University administrators. In their words, “administrators have two urgent issues to address: defining and maintaining a balance of junior and senior faculty, and designing and implementing effective retirement programs for this new generation of aging faculty (2005, 405). In addressing these issues, there are different implications for different levels in the organizational hierarchy ranging from the individual faculty member to the department and college to the university or system level. These include issues such as: financial planning by faculty for retirement, resource management by departments and colleges, and policies to retain or encourage retirement at the system level.

A) Individual Level:

At the level of an individual faculty member, the issue of aging poses issues of personal and financial transition to retirement. Planning for retirement is a major financial event and requires full and complete analysis of alternatives. While the committee is concerned with these individual issues and encourages faculty to seek out good financial planning, since this is an individual decision, we will not elaborate upon this aspect. We do encourage faculty to utilize financial planning services and note various seminars on financial planning offered by the University Human Resources.

One aspect that does bear mentioning is the effect of macroeconomic conditions, especially recession on retirement. In a recent article in the Wall Street Journal, Levitz (2008) describes how the recent decline in housing and stock values has affected retirement decisions: “As the falling real-estate and stock markets erode their savings, many aging Americans are delaying retirement, electing labor over leisure in uncertain times” (Levitz 2008, A1). Levitz notes that while the aging of the baby boomers will ultimately result in higher levels of retirement, anecdotal evidence from a number of financial advisors has led to an increase in inquiries about retirement and implications of delaying it. Coile and Levine (2006) recently reviewed factors affecting retirement. They found that while recessions often increase the rate of retirement, largely due to layoffs and early retirement incentive programs, people

voluntarily considering retirement may be slightly discouraged from retiring. Lower rates of retirement among those voluntarily choose to retire may occur during recessions due to lower net assets (e.g. housing value or financial portfolio) potentially lowering expected retirement income. Thus, the effect of the current economic conditions may delay any upsurge of faculty retirement especially among the younger members of those demographic cohort that might consider retirement. However, the opposite may also be deduced that when the economy begins to recover, there could be a potential additional increase in retirement.

Other factors to keep in mind when considering the future of faculty retirements include generational influences and the effects of pre-retirees' concerns about health care benefits. Data from previous generations of faculty have been the basis for projections of future retirement patterns for faculty. However, baby boomers have a history of doing things differently from previous generations, and all indications are that this trend will continue into their later years. According to a nationwide survey of 1,200 baby boomers, 79% plan to work at least part-time after the age of 65 (AARP, 2004), which is a dramatically higher percentage than for previous generations. In addition, concerns about continuing health care coverage may also result in delays in faculty retirement. Retirees' health care benefits have always been important in decision making about retirement, and research shows that faculty are concerned that universities and colleges will increase costs for premiums, deductibles, and copayments, or reduce coverage, or both to keep their health care costs in check (³Unequal Progress,² 2003).

B) Department and College Level:

At the departmental and college level, as noted by Sugar et al (2005), aging of the faculty raises concerns over the balance of younger and older faculty, retaining faculty, and replacement of retirees. In all units, but especially those with high proportions of faculty nearing retirement, the first priority is understanding the magnitude of the issue and planning for orderly changes. Units that encounter an unexpected surge in retirements may have difficulty recruiting new faculty or providing a transition that ensures retention of institutional history and knowledge. Retirement of senior faculty members may also pose problems for recruitment of new department chairs or senior managers.

During the 1990's, the debate over ending the mandatory retirement for faculty led to a broad discussion of issues consequent to such a change. There was concern over whether this might increase the proportion of older faculty and the debate focused especially upon the need for a balance between

young and older faculty (National Research Council, 1991). As Sugar et al note, this debate has mostly been silenced by two factors: first, the fact that faculty retirement age has not significantly changed subsequent to passage of the law, and second, a recognition of the need for balance. The goal is to recognize faculty strengths at different points in their career: “obvious strengths of senior faculty include their mentoring of junior faculty, their teaching experience, and their capacity to bring a national if not international reputation to their universities and departments. Junior faculty tend to bring the newest ideas, methodologies, and techniques in their fields; and it is often upon these new ideas that a discipline evolves (2005, 409).

The current concern over a possible impending surge in retirement due to demographic changes bears similarity to the previous debate. In the current instance, the concern is whether large scale turnover due to retirement will create imbalance. According to the UNR office of institutional analysis, there has not been any significant surge in retirements during the past few years, indicating that the effect of the increasing demographic cohort eligible for retirement has not fully been translated into actual retirement. As Sugar et al (2005) note, “faculty in research oriented universities are more likely than faculty in teaching oriented universities to continue working past traditional retirement ages” (2005, 411).

For individual departments, however, the significant number of faculty nearing eligibility for retirement does mean that there should be awareness of potential personnel changes and planning. Planning for future personnel requirements becomes more problematic due to various legal restrictions. State and Federal anti-discrimination laws make questions about future retirement plans sensitive and managers cannot directly pose such questions without extreme caution. However, managers of various units should be aware of the demographic profile of their personnel and any future retirement plans that become public knowledge.

Given the likelihood of increased retirement, departments and other units will face certain challenges including recruitment, retention, and transition to new leadership. For a better understanding of the differences that exist between departments numbers of individuals 58 years and above by department are presented in Appendix A.

Recruitment poses a special challenge to departments due to decreasing supply of qualified applicants and financial costs. In some fields, such as accounting, finance, natural sciences, engineering, the number of PhDs entering the job market is insufficient to meet the demand. Thus, increasing retirements requiring increased recruitment will result in shortages in certain areas. One way in which

this will manifest will be increased salaries for new faculty hires. As noted in the survey of other institutions, some institutions attempted to encourage early faculty retirement as a means of managing the expected surge in retirement. However, this has generally not been successful due to increased costs. Sugar et al (2005) note that the increase in faculty salaries made it cost ineffective to replace older faculty with new faculty due to the fact that new faculty salaries were not significantly lower than current faculty and the startup package costs were often very high.

The second issue that departments will likely face is retention. Given the desire for a balance in faculty demographic characteristics and the costs or difficulty of replacement, there will be some need for policies to encourage retention. One policy that has received widespread usage is some form of phased in retirement. As noted above, this does occur at UNR, although it is not a significant factor at present. In the course of the subcommittee's investigations, some concerns arose from the departmental level about the use of phased in retirement.

Some of the concerns that were voiced included: inability to replace faculty who were phasing in; questions about eligibility for phasing in; and lack of consultation with department level chairs in determining phase in. There was a common perception that faculty who were phasing in had their salaries frozen and the department was prevented from hiring replacements until the end of the phase in period. Thus, in cases where faculty had a three to five year phase-in, the concern was how to meet the resource needs of the department during that period. In a meeting with the Interim Provost, Jannet Vreeland, she indicated that this is not an absolute policy and can be negotiated by the department, college, or unit. She indicated that in some cases salary savings were available during the transition and in other cases, departments were given permission to search before the end of the phase in. Such cases are evaluated on an individual basis according to the needs of the department and financial capacity of the university. One fundamental finding of the subcommittee is that departments should be aware of the potential for such negotiation. For an example of a sample planning request and proposed budget to accommodate phase-in retirements and new faculty for replacements see Appendix B.

In reviewing the Chancellor's policy on phased-in retirement (2001), the eligibility for requesting a phase-in seems to be defined in terms of age and service length. The policy makes clear that while people in certain statuses can apply, their application is not guaranteed and needs approval by various levels of administration and a contract agreed upon by the President of the institution. The process outlined by the policy also requires that "the employee completes the application and forwards it

through the chain of command for signatures from the employee's chairperson, dean, provost/vice president, and president." Thus, it appears that a process is in place whereby all levels should be informed of the application.

The final concern is the issue of transition in leadership and retention of institutional memory. As senior faculty retire, this will increase the burden on junior faculty for service, including administrative activities such as chairing departments. Departments should be mindful of the potential retirements and plan for transitions to younger personnel. This may involve mentoring junior faculty in administrative roles for a period prior to such retirements, therefore, it is essential for long range planning.

C) University and System Level

For the university, the challenge is managing the potential surge in retirements and replacements as well as encouraging a balance in faculty through appropriate retention procedures. The most immediate impact may be the financial impacts from replacing personnel. Given the changing salary structure noted above, the retirement may cause certain areas to experience significant increases in personnel costs due to increased salaries and start-up packages.

In our survey of other institutions, many were aware of the issue of rising retirement rates, but few have elaborated plans for dealing with these issues. As Sugar, et al. summarize their research implications, "administrators need up-to-date data at both the national level and the individual institutions. The data should concern the age demographics of their faculty, model retirement programs in higher education and elsewhere, and the expectations and wishes of those generations of faculty who are rapidly approaching their later years. It is likely that some practices and programs will need to be reexamined" (2005, 416).

Part VI – Summary and Recommendations

The examination of the increasing number of faculty approaching the "senior years" clearly indicates an upcoming significant number of retirements will soon be a reality which departments, colleges and the institution as a whole must confront. In fact, the data presented in Table 3 indicates that the rapid increase in retirements may have begun in 2004. In itself, the aging of the faculty is a harbinger of future changes, but as the data suggests, the surge in retirements has, in fact, already begun. With these factors in mind the following recommendations are presented.

- Allow departments to hire new faculty members when a person begins phase-in retirement. (Kansas State) This allows for a period of mentoring and there is no harm done to the department by an empty position.
- Provide post-retirement contracts and encourage retired faculty to continue teaching on a part-time basis. (University of Montana and Oklahoma State).
- Consider using the Senior Professor title which would be non-tenured but recognize and value the former role (Texas A & M).
- In terms of planning the University would be wise to implement some provisions in the next round of strategic planning to address concerns raised in this report. Further, colleges and departments should be encouraged to begin addressing relevant issues as well.
- Within the guidelines of what is acceptable under provisions of current laws, faculty should be encouraged for the benefit of their departments, colleges and the University as a whole to make their retirement plans known as early in advance as is practicable and reasonable so as to allow for the smoothest transition to what will follow when they retire.

Bibliography:

AARP. (2004, May). Baby boomers envision retirement II: Survey of baby boomers' expectations for retirement. Washington, DC: Author.

Coile, C. C. and P. B. Levine (2006). Labor Market Shocks and Retirement: Do Government Programs Matter?, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Levitz, J. (2008). Americans Delay Retirement As Housing, Stocks Swoon: Nest Eggs Shrink, Deferring Dreams; 'Freaked Out' Elite. Wall Street Journal. New York: A1.

National Research Council Committee on Retirement (1991). Ending Mandatory Retirement for tenured faculty; The consequences for Higher Education. Washington, D.C., National Academy Press.

Reeves, S. (2005). An Aging Workforce's Effect on U.S. Employers. Forbes.

Sugar, J. A., K. Pruitt, et al. (2005). "Academic Administrators and Faculty Retirement in a New Era." Educational Gerontology **31**: 405-418.

Unequal progress. The annual report on the economic status of the profession 2002-03. (2003, March/April). Academe, 89(2), 22-33.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2003) Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall Staff 2003 Survey. Washington D.C.: Department of Education.

Appendix A – Faculty By Age Group and Department/Unit Over Age 58

College	Department	Age Group	Count		Department Total	
CABNR	Animal Biotechnology	58-64	2			
		65-69	1			
		70+	0			
		Percent	17%	Total	18	
	Biochemistry	58-64	3			
		65-69	1			
		70+	0			
		Percent	22%	Total	18	
	Dean's Office	58-64	1			
		65-69	1			
		70+	0			
		Percent	17%	Total	12	
	Nat Res & Env Sci	58-64	3			
		65-69	1			
		70+	0			
		Percent	17%	Total	23	
	Nutrition	58-64	1			
		65-69	1			
70+		1				
Percent		43%	Total	7		
Resource Econ	58-64	1				
	65-69	0				
	70+	0				
	Percent	10%	Total	10		
Business	Accounting & Info Sys	58-64	4			
		65-69	0			
		70+	0			
		Percent	22%	Total	18	
	Economics	58-64	1			
		65-69	1			
		70+	0			
		Percent	13%	Total	15	
	Managerial Sciences	58-64	4			
		65-69	3			
		70+	1			
		Percent	33%	Total	24	
	Small Bus Dev Ctr	58-64	1			
		65-69	0			
		70+	0			
		Percent	5%	Total	20	
	Cooperative Extension	Dean's Office	58-64	2		
			65-69	0		
70+			0			
Percent			25%	Total	8	

College	Department	Age Group	Count		Department Total
Development & Alumni	North Central Office	58-64	6		15
		65-69	0		
		70+	0		
		Percent	40%	Total	
	Southern Office	58-64	7		24
		65-69	0		
		70+	3		
		Percent	42%	Total	
	Western Office	58-64	4		13
		65-69	0		
		70+	0		
		Percent	31%	Total	
Education	Development & Alumni	58-64	5		37
		65-69	0		
		70+	1		
		Percent	16%	Total	
	CEP	58-64	2		12
		65-69	4		
		70+	1		
		Percent	58%	Total	
	CTL	58-64	4		11
		65-69	0		
		70+	0		
		Percent	36%	Total	
Dean's Office	58-64	1		3	
	65-69	0			
	70+	0			
	Percent	33%	Total		
Ed Leadership	58-64	6		9	
	65-69	0			
	70+	1			
	Percent	78%	Total		
Ed Specialties	58-64	4		18	
	65-69	0			
	70+	0			
	Percent	22%	Total		
Learning Resource Ctr	58-64	1		1	
	65-69	0			
	70+	0			
	Percent	100%	Total		
REPC	58-64	1		11	
	65-69	0			
	70+	0			
	Percent	9%	Total		

College	Department	Age Group	Count		Department Total
Engineering	Civil & Env Eng	58-64	2		
		65-69	1		
		70+	0		
		Percent	14%	Total	21
	Chem & Met Eng	58-64	3		
		65-69	4		
		70+	0		
		Percent	33%	Total	21
	Computer Science	58-64	2		
		65-69	0		
		70+	1		
		Percent	21%	Total	14
	Dean's Office	58-64	1		
		65-69	0		
		70+	0		
		Percent	20%	Total	5
	Elec & Biomed Eng	58-64	2		
		65-69	1		
		70+	0		
		Percent	33%	Total	9
	Mech Eng	58-64	2		
65-69		2			
70+		0			
Percent		33%	Total	12	
Graduate School	Dean's Office	58-64	3		
		65-69	1		
		70+	0		
		Percent	80%	Total	5
	Lab Animal Care	58-64	1		
		65-69	0		
Health & Human Sciences	CSAT	58-64	4		
		65-69	0		
		70+	0		
		Percent	14%	Total	28
	Gerontology	58-64	1		
		65-69	0		
		70+	0		
		Percent	50%	Total	2

College	Department	Age Group	Count		Department Total	
	HDFS	58-64	3			
		65-69	3			
		70+	0			
		Percent	33%	Total		18
	Nursing	58-64	5			
		65-69	0			
		70+	0			
		Percent	21%	Total		24
	Public Health	58-64	1			
		65-69	1			
		70+	1			
		Percent	18%	Total		17
Social Work	58-64	4				
	65-69	1				
	70+	0				
	Percent	42%	Total		12	
Intercollegiate Athletics	Intercollegiate Athletics	58-64	4			
		65-69	0			
		70+	0			
		Percent	6%	Total		71
Journalism	Journalism	58-64	4			
		65-69	0			
		70+	3			
		Percent	44%	Total		16
Liberal Arts	Anthropology	58-64	3			
		65-69	3			
		70+	0			
		Percent	75%	Total		8
	Art	Art	58-64	2		
			65-69	2		
			70+	0		
			Percent	31%	Total	
	Basque Studies	Basque Studies	58-64	1		
			65-69	0		
			70+	0		
			Percent	25%	Total	
Core Humanities	Core Humanities	58-64	0			
		65-69	1			
		70+	0			
		Percent	100%	Total		1

College	Department	Age Group	Count		Department Total
	Criminal Justice	58-64	4		8
		65-69	0		
		70+	0		
		Percent	50%	Total	
	Dean's Office	58-64	1		3
		65-69	0		
		70+	0		
		Percent	33%	Total	
	English	58-64	4		48
		65-69	3		
		70+	0		
		Percent	15%	Total	
Foreign Languages	58-64	4		29	
	65-69	1			
	70+	1			
	Percent	21%	Total		
Holocaust Studies	58-64	1		1	
	65-69	0			
	70+	0			
	Percent	100%	Total		
History	58-64	2		17	
	65-69	2			
	70+	1			
	Percent	29%	Total		
Interior Design	58-64	1		1	
	65-69	0			
	70+	0			
	Percent	100%	Total		
Music & Dance	58-64	4		21	
	65-69	1			
	70+	0			
	Percent	24%	Total		
Oral History	58-64	1		2	
	65-69	0			
	70+	0			
	Percent	50%	Total		
Philosophy	58-64	2		9	
	65-69	2			
	70+	0			
	Percent	44%	Total		

College	Department	Age Group	Count		Department Total
	Political Science	58-64	3		
		65-69	2		
		70+	0		
		Percent	38%	Total	
	Psychology	58-64	4		
		65-69	1		
		70+	1		
		Percent	29%	Total	
	School of the Arts	58-64	1		
		65-69	0		
		70+	0		
		Percent	50%	Total	
	Sociology	58-64	1		
		65-69	1		
		70+	0		
Percent		29%	Total	7	
Speech & Theatre	58-64	1			
	65-69	3			
	70+	2			
	Percent	46%	Total		13
Women's Studies	58-64	1			
	65-69	0			
	70+	0			
	Percent	50%	Total		2
Libraries	Libraries	58-64	5		
		65-69	1		
		70+	1		
		Percent	30%	Total	
Medicine	Biochemistry	58-64	1		
		65-69	0		
		70+	0		
		Percent	9%	Total	
	CEHSO	58-64	3		
		65-69	0		
		70+	0		
		Percent	19%	Total	
	Dean's Office	58-64	2		
		65-69	0		
		70+	0		
		Percent	15%	Total	

College	Department	Age Group	Count		Department Total
	Dental Residency	58-64	2		
		65-69	0		
		70+	0		
		Percent	29%	Total	
	Emergency Medicine	58-64	0		
		65-69	1		
		70+	0		
		Percent	33%	Total	
	Family & Comm Med	58-64	6		
		65-69	0		
		70+	2		
		Percent	26%	Total	
Internal Med	58-64	6			
	65-69	2			
	70+	3			
	Percent	16%	Total		70
Medical Education	58-64	1			
	65-69	0			
	70+	0			
	Percent	14%	Total		7
Microbiology	58-64	3			
	65-69	2			
	70+	0			
	Percent	42%	Total		12
Obstetrics/Gynecology	58-64	1			
	65-69	1			
	70+	1			
	Percent	25%	Total		12
Pathology	58-64	3			
	65-69	1			
	70+	1			
	Percent	63%	Total		8
Pediatrics	58-64	6			
	65-69	0			
	70+	2			
	Percent	27%	Total		30
Pharmacology	58-64	3			
	65-69	0			
	70+	0			
	Percent	19%	Total		16

College	Department	Age Group	Count		Department Total
	Physiology & Cell Biol	58-64	3		
		65-69	0		
		70+	1		
		Percent	19%	Total	
	Psychiatry	58-64	2		
		65-69	2		
		70+	1		
		Percent	28%	Total	
	Radiology	58-64	1		
		65-69	0		
		70+	0		
		Percent	100%	Total	
Savitt Medical Library	58-64	1			
	65-69	0			
	70+	0			
	Percent	33%	Total		3
Student Health Svcs	58-64	1			
	65-69	0			
	70+	0			
	Percent	11%	Total		9
Speech Pathology	58-64	2			
	65-69	0			
	70+	0			
	Percent	22%	Total		9
Surgery	58-64	1			
	65-69	1			
	70+	0			
	Percent	10%	Total		21
President's Office	President's Office	58-64	3		
		65-69	0		
		70+	0		
		Percent	23%	Total	
Provost's Office	Excellence in Teaching	58-64	1		
		65-69	0		
		70+	0		
		Percent	50%	Total	
	Extended Studies	58-64	1		
		65-69	1		
		70+	0		
		Percent	14%	Total	

College	Department	Age Group	Count		Department Total	
SCDN	Honors Program	58-64	1			
		65-69	0			
		70+	0			
		Percent	33%	Total	3	
	Nevada Humanities	58-64	0			
		65-69	2			
		70+	0			
		Percent	40%	Total	5	
	Provost's Office	58-64	2			
		65-69	1			
		70+	0			
		Percent	43%	Total	7	
	USAC	58-64	2			
		65-69	1			
		70+	0			
		Percent	19%	Total	16	
	Biology	58-64	9			
		65-69	4			
		70+	0			
		Percent	46%	Total	28	
	Chemistry	58-64	0			
		65-69	4			
		70+	0			
		Percent	16%	Total	25	
	Geography	58-64	1			
		65-69	0			
		70+	0			
Percent		10%	Total	10		
Geological Sciences	58-64	4				
	65-69	2				
	70+	0				
	Percent	32%	Total	19		
Mackay School	58-64	1				
	65-69	0				
	70+	0				
	Percent	33%	Total	3		
Mathematics	58-64	2				
	65-69	4				
	70+	2				
	Percent	24%	Total	33		
Mining Engineering	58-64	4				
	65-69	2				
	70+	0				
	Percent	100%	Total	6		

College	Department	Age Group	Count		Department Total	
VP Student Services	NV Bureau of Mines	58-64	5		18	
		65-69	0			
		70+	0			
		Percent	28%	Total		
	Physics	58-64	3		31	
		65-69	3			
		70+	3			
		Percent	29%	Total		
	Seismology Lab	58-64	1		11	
		65-69	1			
		70+	0			
		Percent	18%	Total		
	VP Admin & Finance	Academic Intervention	58-64	0		2
			65-69	1		
			70+	0		
Percent			50%	Total		
Career Development		58-64	2		6	
		65-69	0			
		70+	0			
		Percent	33%	Total		
Counselling Svcs		58-64	2		9	
		65-69	0			
		70+	1			
		Percent	33%	Total		
Enrollment Svcs	58-64	1		6		
	65-69	0				
	70+	0				
	Percent	17%	Total			
VP Admin & Finance	Business & Finance	58-64	0		4	
		65-69	1			
		70+	0			
		Percent	25%	Total		
	Controller's Office	58-64	1		7	
		65-69	0			
		70+	0			
		Percent	14%	Total		
	Facilities Planning	58-64	0		3	
		65-69	1			
		70+	0			
		Percent	33%	Total		
Facilities Services	58-64	4		15		
	65-69	1				
	70+	1				
	Percent	40%	Total			

College	Department	Age Group	Count		Department Total	
VP Information Tech	PBA	58-64	1			
		65-69	0			
		70+	0			
		Percent	14%	Total	7	
	Purchasing	58-64	2			
		65-69	0			
		70+	0			
		Percent	100%	Total	2	
	VP's Office	58-64	1			
		65-69	0			
		70+	0			
		Percent	100%	Total	1	
	Campus Telecom	58-64	1			
		65-69	0			
		70+	0			
Percent		5%	Total	22		
Teaching & Learning Tech	58-64	4				
	65-69	1				
	70+	0				
	Percent	36%	Total	14		
VP Marketing & Comm Publications	58-64	1				
	65-69	0				
	70+	0				
	Percent	50%	Total	2		
VP Research Enviro Health & Safety	58-64	1				
	65-69	0				
	70+	0				
	Percent	10%	Total	10		
Sanford Center	58-64	2				
	65-69	0				
	70+	0				
	Percent	40%	Total	5		
Sponsored Projects	58-64	0				
	65-69	1				
	70+	0				
	Percent	33%	Total	3		

Mouse	\$125,398.61
Von Sykes	\$46,303.44 @ 50% of \$92,606.97
<hr/>	
Total	\$252,488.67

Even with Von Sykes beginning a phase-in retirement at 50% the changes in staffing will still result in the return of \$212,095 = \$252,488.67 - \$40,393.31 (\$80,786.62 at 50 FTE) to the university's salary resources. And this \$232,095 does not even count the recapture of the 50% of Dr. Mouse's salary that has been unavailable to the department over the past 3 years ago since Dr. Mouse began her phased-in retirement.

The department proposes three replacement hires with searches to take place 2008-2009. The new hires would start effective 7/1/2009. Consistent with departmental needs and the department's strategic plan, the department wishes to hire two cartoonologists (replacing Drs. Rabbit and Mouse) and one developmental animation scientist (replacing Dr. Von Sykes). All positions should be tenure-track to address the need to maintain the department's research vitality. The salary funds that will be freed up next year will be more than sufficient to fund three new hires and still return salary funds to the central administration.

Request for Associate Professor hire to replace Dr. Rabbit

Dr. Roger Rabbit is one the department's best known faculty at the national and international level. He has served as President of the Society for the Preservation of Film, and his prominence in that former role has been instrumental in helping the department be the strongest participant in the highly successful Ink, Watercolor, and Animation Graduate Program. To maintain the stature of that program, the department requests that Dr. Rabbit's position be replaced at the Assistant or Associate Professor level. By opening the search to the associate professor level, the department may be able to recruit a new faculty member who in addition to be an outstanding animator already has strong and established credentials in Cartoonology. Doing so is likely to aid in maintaining the strong funding base that has been directed to UNR in the form of the WD Classics Initiative (a key earmark from Senator Flintstone) for more than a decade. Hence, the department proposes advertising this position at open rank (assistant/associate level).

Note that the other senior faculty in the department do not have the requisite areas of expertise to replace Dr. Rabbit's role. Drs. Pluto, Goofy, and Pan do not work on Animation Art issues. Dr. Ruble, a prominent senior faculty member, works on classic filmology but is extramurally funded, not state funded. Dr. Charming works on animation art but his extensive current commitments preclude his taking on the key role that has been played by Dr. Rabbit.

Research and Office Space.

If this plan is approved, no new space is needed. The replacement hires would occupy the offices and labs of the retiring faculty. The offices and laboratories of Drs. Rabbit and Mouse will be vacated when they retire at the end of June 2009. Dr. Von Sykes’s replacement will be housed in a faculty office on the twenty-seventh floor that is temporarily housing two postdoctoral researchers. Dr. Deville is no longer research active, so her lab could be used by the new hire even while Dr. Deville is on phase-in retirement.

Positions requested, startup needs, and remodeling costs.

Priority, position, estimated startup and remodeling costs for new position

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Startup*</u>	<u>Lab Remodeling costs*</u>
1	Cartoonologist (Assistant or Associate Professor)	\$ 250,000	minimal (~ 0\$)
2	Animationology (Assistant Professor)	\$ 210,000	minimal (~ 0\$)
3	Developmental Toon Creation(Assistant Professor)	\$ 340,000	~ \$ 300,000

* These estimates are approximations that will need to be revisited when specific candidates are selected.

Retirement Planning Strategies- 2008-2012

All amounts requested are in 2008 dollars

2008-2009	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Source of Funds</i>		<i>New Funds</i>	
		<i>Recycled</i>	<i>New Funds</i>	<i>Ongoing</i>	<i>One-time</i>
Cartoonologist	58,000		58,000	58,000	
Developmental Animator	58,000		58,000	58,000	
Faculty Startup	450,000		450,000		450,000
Renovation/Remodeling	175,000		175,000		175,000
Toon Lab Prep	45,000		45,000	45,000	
Increase course supplies	5,000		5,000	5,000	
Four more AP teachers	7,200		7,200	7,200	
Six graduate assistants	84,000		84,000	84,000	
Subtotal	882,200		882,200	257,200	625,000
2009-2010					
Animating Engineer	58,000	58,000			
Animating Technician	58,000	58,000			
Integrative Cartoonist	58,000	19,714	38,286	38,286	
Animatronic Scientist	58,000		58,000	58,000	
Faculty startup	950,000		950,000		950,000
Renovation/Remodeling	650,000		650,000		650,000
Increase course supplies	5,000		5,000	5,000	
Four more AP teachers	7,200		7,200	7,200	
Two graduate assistants	28,000		28,000	28,000	
Subtotal	1,872,200	135,714	1,736,486	136,486	1,600,000
2010-20011					
Film Scientist	58,000		58,000	58,000	
Faculty startup	250,000		250,000		250,000
Renovation/Remodeling	150,000		150,000		150,000
Increase course supplies	5,000		5,000	5,000	
Subtotal	463,000		463,000	63,000	400,000
2011-2012					
Two instructors	90,000		90,000	90,000	
Increase course supplies	5,000		5,000	5,000	
Subtotal	95,000		95,000	95,000	
Grand Total	3,312,400	135,714	3,176,686	551,686	2,625,000