11-9-04
distributed to Senators

Office of the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs
East Carolina University
Spilman Building • Greenville, NC 27858-4353
Phone: 252.328.6242
Fax: 252.328.4010
Web: www.aa.ecu.edu

MEMORANDUM

TO: Deans
FROM: James LeRoy Smith
DATE: September 29, 2004
RE: 2004-2005 Faculty Position Allocations

Here is a chart that conveys the current allocations:

2004-2005 Faculty Position Allocation
Academic Affairs

	Regular Term Positions					DE Positions				Total Allocation		
College	RT Pos. Req. (1)	RT Pos. Alloc. Based on Priority (11 Avail.) (2)	RT Pos. Alloc. Based on Restituion (7 Avail.) (3)	RT Pos. Alloc. Based on SCH Change (7 Avail.) (4)	Total Alloc. (5)	DE Pos. Req (6)	03-04 % Total DE SCH (7)	Pos. Based on 03-04% Total DE SCH (8)	Total DE Pos. Alloc. (43 Avail.) (9)	Total Pos. Alloc. (10)	Fund. @ Avg. College Salary (11)	Total Salary Alloc. (12)
COB	6	0	3	0	3	11	6.09	2.6	3	6	$80,534	$483,204
CFAC	5	0	0	1.5	1.5	4	7.27	3.2	3	4.5	$49,394	$222,273
COE	6	0	0	0	0	15	52.80	22.7	23	23	$54,778	$1,259,894
CHE	15	2	2	3	7	11	7.46	3.2	3	10	$51,425	$514,250
CTCS	10	6	0	.5	6.5	8	9.76	4.2	4	10.5	$59,176	$621,348
CAS	27	0	1.5	0	1.5	7	12.41	5.3	5	6.5	$53,568	$348,192
CHHP	8	2	.5	2	4.5	2	4.21	1.8	2	6.5	$49,321	$320,586
CRM	2	1	0	0	1	0	—	—	—	1		
Totals	79	11	7	7	25	58		43	43	68		

See attachment 1 for individual details

I believe the discussions we have pursued both in and outside of Academic Affairs advance our progress towards a more comprehensive approach to position allocations. We will continue to refine our process for use in coming years and will make this a discussion item at a Deans Group meeting.

Several attachments provide information we used in our discussions. *Attachment 1* is the above chart with additional referenced details. *Attachment 2* conveys some of the factors considered in arriving at a method for allocation. Method #7 was chosen to provide positions for on-campus (RT) considering: institutional priorities, growth, and restitution. Method #7 provides support for DE activities based upon last year's SCH performance. *Attachment 3* conveys the position analysis, starting with the 115 positions originally available this year and arriving at the divisional allocations. Nursing and Allied Health position allocations will be handled by the Division of Health Sciences. *Attachment 4* conveys the overall SCH generation (both RT and DE) that was used for prorated calculations for divisional allocations. *Attachment 5* provides an analysis of RT derived faculty vs. current faculty and provided data on the restitution factor. *Attachment 6* provides an analysis of SCH change from 02-03 to 03-04. *Attachment 7* provides data that allowed dollar amounts for positions to be objectively calculated.

Two concluding points: first, we have reserved a small number of positions for contingencies. Second, the amount of operating monies available for distribution is still unknown due to extra-divisional issues. We have in hand some 4.7 million dollars of permanent operating requests from you, but we may have as little as six hundred thousand dollars to distribute. In addition to your requests, several divisional priorities will be included in those deliberations. We are working to resolve the amount of money available and to determine how to best serve the University with it.

Thanks for your continuing leadership and good stewardship of these important resources. I look forward to our discussions on how we can refine this complex process.

Attachment 1

2004-2005 Faculty Position Allocation with Details
Academic Affairs

	Regular Term Positions					DE Positions				Total Allocation		
College	RT Pos. Req. (1)	RT Pos. Alloc. Based on Priorities (11 Avail.) (2)	RT Position Allocation Based on Restitution (7 Available) (3)	RT Position Allocation Based on SCH Change (7 Available) (4)	Total Regular Term Pos. Alloc. (5)	Positions Requested (6)	03-04 % Total DE SCH (7)	Resulting Positions Based on 03-04% Total DE SCH (8)	Total DE Position Allocation (43 Available) (9)	Total Position Allocation (10)	Funding @ Average College Salary (11)	Total Sal. Alloc. (12)
COB	6	0	3	0	3	11	6.09	2.6	3	6	$80,534	$483,204
CFAC	5	0	0	1.5	1.5	4	7.27	3.2	3	4.5	$49,394	$222,273
COE	6	0	0	0[#]	0	15	52.80	22.7	23	23[a]	$54,778	$1,259,894[b]
CHE	15	2*	2	3	7	11	7.46	3.2	3	10	$51,425	$514,250
CTCS	10	6**	0	.5	6.5	8	9.76	4.2	4	10.5	$59,176	$621,348
CAS	27	0	1.5	0	1.5	7	12.41	5.3	5[##]	6.5[a]	$53,568	$348,192
CHHP	8	2***	.5	2	4.5	2	4.21	1.8	2	6.5	$49,321	$320,586
CRM	2	1	0	0	1	0	—	—	—	1		
Totals	79	11	7	7	25	58		43	43	68		

Details

Column 3 – See attachment 5

Column 4 – See attachment 6

* 1 position for new Master's; 1 position for new doctorate

** $60,000 salary added to 1 position for chair of computer science ($60,000 increase in salary dollars); $20,000 salary added to 5 positions for engineering ($100,000 increase in salary dollars—total salary allocation = $781,348)

*** For service courses

[#] By removing the College of Education from this calculation, we were better able to meet the needs of the other colleges. The College of Education is addressed instead in the DE allotment. Since the College of Education is our biggest producer of DE SCHs, we were able to meet the total COE request from DE positions. The College of Education is in an excellent position to model the use of DE and RT allocations while assuring SCH generation across both areas.

[##] 1 position designated for Children's Literature; 2 positions designated to meet $107,000 request to eliminate converting operating to salary.

[a] College of Education borrowed an empty position from the Harriot College of Arts & Sciences. That empty position will be refunded leaving COE with 22 positions and CAS with 7.5. Total salary dollars will not be affected.

[b] $120,000 borrowed in summer 2004; to be returned to DE central pool.

Attachment 2: Position Allocation Discussion Leading to Adoption of "Method #7" for 2004-2005

RATIONALE:
Premise #1: Actions should be guided by standards/criteria.
Premise #2: Standards/criteria should be justified before used.
Conclusion: So, we should justify standards/criteria before acting

QUALIFICATION: Sometimes actions are required before justifications are *perfected.*

FIVE FACTORS OF SCHS GENERATION *IN RE* POSITION ALLOCATION:
In general, if there were no past oversights in position allocations and if there were no impending divisional and institutional priorities needing attention, all new positions could and should be allocated purely on the basis of increased student credit hour generation. However, neither of those qualifications prevail. Therefore, further analysis is required. Here are five notable factors in that analysis:

Factor #1: (= "the workload factor")
Required attention to each student as a function of "constant quality" faculty workload
(Nursing not equal to accounting not equal to philosophy not equal to education)
(What are the differences, who knows them, how do we quantify them?)
(We should work for greater clarity on this factor)

Factor #2: (= "the restitution factor")
Given the UNC answers (funding formula) to #1 above, what units at ECU are behind and by how much?
(Reliability of the answers = ?)
(We should work toward justified consideration and application of this factor.)

Factor #3: (= "the increased productivity factor")
Given the previous SCHs in the unit, what increases have occurred?
(How do we calculate the best version of "increase?")

Factor #4: (= "the saturation factor")
Given the gravity of factor #2, is the faculty prevented/hampered from increasing SCHs w/o unacceptable loss in pedagogical quality?
(If some are, methods #2 and #4 below are proportionally weak.)

Factor #5: (= "the restriction factor")
Given the physical facilities available to the unit, is the current faculty restricted from incr SCHs?
(We should work toward eliminating this factor.)

Other Factors = (based on further discussions with deans)

Methods of calculation
method #1: sum division SCHs and allocate all positions on prorated unit basis
method #2: sum division SCH increases since last yr and allocate all positions on prorated unit basis
method #3: use method #1, but reserve 25% (or some percentage) of the positions (see below)
method #4: use method #2, but reserve 25% (or some percentage) of the positions (see below) --(done in AA in 2003)
method #5: sum division SCH increases and allocate 75% of positions (see below for 25%) prorated by unit SCH incr/FTE faculty.
method #6: sum division SCH increases and allocate 75% of positions (see below for 25%) prorated by unit SCH incr/FTE incr last yr
method #7: distribute 85% of DE positions on 2003-04 % of total DE SCH & RT positions on 50-50% basis using SCH/other priorities

Regular Term Distribution
50% reserved for priorities:
(a) institution priorities (chancellor)
(b) contingencies
(c) graduate program development and implementation
(d) undergrad program development
(e) research support: faculty development and incentive
(f) teaching quality support: faculty development and incentive
The 50% RT SCH-related allocations divided half and half to:
25% of total RT positions go to restitution factor adjustments (factor #2)
25% of total go to increase in SCHs for 2003-2004

DE Distribution
85% of positions distributed proportional to SCH generation in 03/04
15% of positions held for growth and priorities contingencies

Attachment 3: 2004-2005 Position Analysis

This analysis shows how the 103 positions plus the return of one-time cut of 12 positions from last year were treated this year to give us the resulting available positions.

1. RT: 25.938 + 12 RT reinstated = 37.938 (RT = regular term positions)
   DE: 76.998 (DE = distance education positions)

2. Subtract 18 positions for permanent cut (March Chancellor's memo), prorated on orig ratio:
   So, for RT: 25.2% x 18 = 37.938 - 4.536 = 33.4
   So, for DE: 74.8% x 18 = 76.998 - 13.464 = <u>63.6</u>
   97

3. <u>BSOM factors</u>: We wish to repair the model for funding BSOM faculty providing SCHs for AHS and SON. The Summer School portion is still under discussion, but that will be Summer School dollars, not positions. Additionally, 5.48 positions (=average over 3 yrs, to be examined annually going forward) would be funded at $90K per position = $493,200. These 5.48 positions, allocated at the 25.2%/74.8% RT/DE original position allocation ratio, would be taken "off the top" to preserve opportunities for AHS/SON position allocation at a percentage of allocations received / allocations requested roughly comparable to the colleges in AA (see #5 below). Thus, **BSOM** would receive 25.2% x 5.48 RT positions, or **1.38 RT positions**, and 74.8% x 5.48 DE positions, or **4.10 DE positions**.
(Note: The Office of IPRE corrected this number to 6 positions plus a fraction and we will send the additional position plus a fraction to BSOM out of reserved AA positions in order to avoid recalculation of position allocations, which were already done upon notice of the error.)

4. <u>The AA/HS split</u>: is traditionally based on SCH generation and is 88% (AA) & 12% (HS). (See attachment 4 for an analysis of total SCHs). The data indicate that the traditional 88% -12% split is slightly inaccurate, but last year's significantly increased SCH production by SON & AHS is mitigating. With 97 - 5.48 positions, this would = 91.52 positions divided by the 88/12 divisors:
   Using the original 101/107 ratio, this becomes:
   HS DE = 12% x (63.6 - 4.10) = 12% x 59.50 = 7.14 DE positions
   HS RT = 12% x (33.4 - 1.38) = 12% x 32.02 = 3.84 RT positions/ <u>total of 10.98</u>
   AA DE = 88% x (63.6 - 4.10) = 88% x 59.50 = 52.36 DE positions
   AA RT = 88% x (33.4 - 1.38) = 88% x 32.02 = <u>28.18</u> RT positions/<u>total of 80.54</u>
   91.52

5. <u>Ratio of Net Positions Remaining/Positions Requested</u>:
AHS/SON have requested 23.36 positions, so the ratio = 10.98/23.36 = **47.01%**
AA colleges have requested 137.5 positions, so the ratio = 80.54/137.5 = **58.58%**
AHS/N had greater net % increases in SCH production in 2003-04 than AA.
Noting that increase differential, AA will transfer additional 1.02 positions (DE @$63.7K)to HS
This ratio standard is not priority-based, but all position requests have a reasonable rationale.
Thus the ratios become:
HS (AHS/SON): 12.00 / 23.36 = 51.37%
AA: 79.52/137.5 = 57.84%.

<u>Result</u>:
HS DE = <u>8.16 DE</u> positions
HS RT = <u>3.84</u> RT positions/ <u>total of 12.00 positions</u>
AA DE = <u>51.34</u> DE positions
AA RT = <u>28.18</u> RT positions/ <u>total of 79.52 positions</u>
Totals: 97 - 5.48 = 91.52 equal to: 91.52

ATTACHMENT 4

Analysis of SCH & Derived Faculty Generation for AA vs. Allied Health/Nursing

2003-04

	RT SCHs Generated	Relative %	DE SCHs Generated	Relative %	RT Derived Faculty	Relative %	DE Derived Faculty	Relative %	Combined SCHs Gererated	Relative %	Combined Derived Faculty	Relative %
AA	460,202	94.96%	42,564	84.00%	1035.78	92.11%	160.07	79.92%	502,766	93.92%	1195.85	90.27%
Allied Health	11,819	2.44%	4,405	8.69%	51.81	4.61%	22.74	11.35%	16,224	3.03%	74.55	5.63%
Nursing	12,594	2.60%	3,701	7.30%	36.87	3.28%	17.47	8.72%	16,295	3.04%	54.34	4.10%
Total	484,615	100.00%	50,670	100.00%	1124.46	100.00%	200.28	100.00%	535,285	100.00%	1324.74	100.00%

2002-03

	RT SCHs Generated	Relative %	DE SCHs Generated	Relative %	RT Derived Faculty	Relative %	DE Derived Faculty	Relative %	Combined SCHs Gererated	Relative %	Combined Derived Faculty	Relative %
AA	450,572	94.64%	28,354	93.40%	1012.71	91.40%	112.54	93.09%	478,926	94.57%	1125.25	91.57%
Allied Health	13,189	2.77%	1,307	4.31%	57.07	5.15%	5.69	4.71%	14,496	2.86%	62.76	5.11%
Nursing	12,333	2.59%	695	2.29%	38.22	3.45%	2.67	2.21%	13,028	2.57%	40.89	3.33%
Total	476,094	100.00%	30,356	100.00%	1108.00	100.00%	120.90	100.00%	506,450	100.00%	1228.90	100.00%

SCH Change 02-03 to 03-04

	RT SCH Change	Relative %	DE SCH Change	Relative %	RT Derived Faculty Change	Relative %	DE Derived Faculty Change	Relative %	Combined SCH Change	Relative %	Combined Derived Faculty Change	Relative %
AA	9,630	113.01%	14,210	69.95%	23.06	140.18%	47.53	59.88%	23,840	82.68%	70.59	73.66%
Allied Health	-1,370	-16.08%	3,098	15.25%	-5.26	-31.98%	17.05	21.48%	1,728	5.99%	11.79	12.30%
Nursing	261	3.06%	3,006	14.80%	-1.35	-8.21%	14.80	18.64%	3,267	11.33%	13.45	14.04%
Total	8,521	100.00%	20,314	100.00%	16.45	100.00%	79.38	100.00%	28,835	100.00%	95.83	100.00%

ATTACHMENT 5

Analysis of Regular Term Derived Faculty vs. Current Faculty

Unit	(1) 2003-04 RT SCHs Generated	(2) RT Derived Faculty	(3) Relative %	(4) RT 1310 Salary Base	(5) Index Avg. Assoc. Prof. Salary by Unit	(6) Current 1310 Salary Base/ Assoc. Prof Salary Index	(7) Relative %	(8) Difference Derived vs. Current	(9) % Difference Derived vs. Current	(10) Relative % for the 4 Understaffed Units
College of Business	46,740	121.06	11.70%	7,146,079	87,528	81.64	8.75%	-39.42	-32.56%	45.73%
College of Education	30,704	79.41	7.68%	5,727,806	58,420	98.05	10.51%	18.64	23.47%	-
College of Fine Arts/Comm.	56,153	148.70	14.38%	8,470,559	52,726	160.65	17.21%	11.95	8.04%	-
College of Human Ecology	38,312	91.52	8.85%	4,406,001	58,120	75.81	8.12%	-15.71	-17.17%	24.12%
College of Hlth & Human Perf.	31,553	71.68	6.93%	4,069,670	60,170	67.64	7.25%	-4.04	-5.64%	7.92%
College of Tech./Comp Science	17,256	49.63	4.80%	3,473,701	66,924	51.91	5.56%	2.28	4.58%	-
TH College of Arts & Sciences	238,601	472.41	45.67%	22,169,809	55,757	397.61	42.60%	-74.80	-15.83%	22.23%
Totals	**459,319**	**1,034.41**	**100.00%**	**55,463,625**		**933.31**	**100.00%**	**-101.10**	**-9.77%**	**100.00%**

Application of Relative % of 4 Understaffed Units to 7.0 FTE Positions Available for Restitution

Unit	Relative %	Resulting Restitution Positions	Position Allocation
College of Business	45.73%	3.20	3.00
College of Human Ecology	24.12%	1.69	2.00
College of Hlth & Human Perf.	7.92%	0.55	0.50
College of Arts & Sciences	22.23%	1.56	1.50

Notes:

Column 1 - Derived faculty are positions generated by application of the SCH funding model matrix to SCHs produced

Column 2 - RT 1310 salary base is the budgeted 2003-04 dollar amount of 1310 positions.

Column 5 - Index avg. assoc. prof. salary is the avg salary amount of assoc. prof. positions based on 2003-04 IPRE salary report

Column 6- Current faculty derived by dividing 1310 salary base by avg. associate professor salary

Column 10 - Relative relationship of the negative % differences between derived & current positions for the 4 understaffed units.

ATTACHMENT 6

Analysis of SCH Change from AY 2002-03 to 2003-04

Unit	(1) Reg. Term SCHs 2003-04	(2) Reg. Term SCHs 2002-03	(3) SCH Change	(4) % Total Change	(5) Relative % for Units with Positive Chg	(6) DE SCHs 2003-04	(7) DE SCHs 2002-03	(8) SCH Change	(9) % Total Change	(10) Combined SCHs 2003-04	(11) Combined SCHs 2002-03	(12) SCH Change	(13) % Total Change
College of Business	46,740	47,826	-1,086	-11.28%	-	2,592	1,110	1,482	10.43%	49,332	48,936	396	1.66%
College of Education	30,704	28,045	2,659	27.61%	**	22,474	15,829	6,645	46.76%	53,178	43,874	9,304	39.03%
College of Fine Arts/Comm.	56,153	54,312	1,841	19.12%	21.86%	3,096	1,725	1,371	9.65%	59,249	56,037	3,212	13.47%
College of Human Ecology	38,312	34,513	3,799	39.45%	45.11%	3,174	2,168	1,006	7.08%	41,486	36,681	4,805	20.16%
College of Hlth & Human Perf.	31,553	29,267	2,286	23.74%	27.15%	1,791	1,732	59	0.42%	33,344	30,999	2,345	9.84%
College of Tech./Comp Science	17,256	16,761	495	5.14%	5.88%	4,155	2,906	1,249	8.79%	21,411	19,667	1,744	7.32%
TH College of Arts & Sciences	238,601	238,787	-186	-1.93%	-	5,282	2,884	2,398	16.88%	243,883	241,671	2,212	9.28%
Military Affairs	883	1,061	-178	-1.85%	-	0	0	0	0.00%	883	1,061	-178	-0.75%
Totals	**460,202**	**450,572**	**9,630**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**42,564**	**28,354**	**14,210**	**100.00%**	**502,766**	**478,926**	**23,840**	**100.00%**

Application of Relative % of Units with Positive SCH Change to 7.0 FTE Positions Available Based on SCH Change

	% Change	Resulting SCH Change Positions	Position Allocation
College of Fine Arts/Comm.	21.86%	1.53	1.50
College of Human Ecology	45.12%	3.16	3.00
College of Hlth & Human Perf.	27.15%	1.90	2.00
College of Tech./Comp Science	5.88%	0.41	0.50

Notes:

Column 5 - Relative % of change calculated only for the units having positive change in regular term SCH production

**** College of Education omitted in these calculations, to be adjusted with DE positions**

Average Salary by College
Source: Fall 2003 Personnel Data File—IRPE, May 3, 2004

College of Business ($80,534)
College of Technology and Computer Science ($59,176)
College of Education ($54,778)
College of Arts and Sciences ($53,568)
College of Human Ecology ($51,425)
College of Fine Arts and Communication ($49,394)
College of Health and Human Performance ($49,321)

Position Allocation x Average College Salary

College	RT Allocation	@ Avg. College Salary	RT Salary Pool		DE Allocation	@ Avg. College Salary	DE Salary Pool	Total Salary Pool
COB	3	80,534	241,602		3	80,534	241,602	483,204
CFAC	1.5	49,394	74,091		3	49,394	148,182	222,273
COE	—	54,778	—		23	54,778	1,259,894	1,259,894
CHE	7	51,425	359,975		3	51,425	154,275	514,250
CTCS	6.5	59,176	384,644		4	59,176	236,704	621,348
CAS	1.5	53,568	80,352		5	53,568	267,840	348,192
CHHP	4.5	49,321	221,944		2	49,321	98,642	320,586
Total	24		1,362,608		43		2,407,139	3,769,747