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## Memorandum

To: Deans
From: James LeRoy Smith
Date: October 25, 2005
RE: 2005-2006 Faculty Position and Phase I Permanent Operating Allocations
Here is a chart that conveys the 2005-06 position allocations:
2005-2006 Faculty Position Allocation Academic Affairs


I want to thank you for the work that you accomplished in creating your 2005-2006 budget and personnel allocation requests. You did an excellent job of representing your respective colleges and their financial and human resource needs for success.

We are fortunate again this year to have enrollment increase money and positions to allocate. We have taken your needs into account in making these allocations. I hope that you will see the logic and fairness in what is presented. It is a pleasure to work with such a talented team of deans and directors and it is because of your leadership and the productivity of your faculty and staff that we have these funds and positions available. Please thank your faculty and staff for all they do for our students and this university.

You will find attached several charts with additional allocation information and several intachments to explain these allocations. These attachments provide information we used in making allocation decisions.

Chart 1 indicates the allocation of salary dollars with no assigned FTE.
Chart 2 indicates Phase I permanent operating dollars assigned each unit.
Chart 3 indicates notes for specific schools based on multiple issues related to allocations.

Attachment 1 provides an analysis of the derived faculty change from 2003-04 to 2004-05 for the Colleges, School of Nursing, and School of Allied Health Sciences and serves as the basis for the split of positions/operating between Academic Affairs and Health Sciences. The Division of Health Sciences will handle Nursing and Allied Health position/operating allocations.

Attachment 2 provides an analysis of combined regular term and distance education derived faculty vs. current faculty (based on the BD-119) for the same units and serves as the basis for distributing 20 positions available for restitution.

Attachment 3 provides an analysis of derived faculty change from 2003-04 to 2004-05 for the Colleges and serves as the basis for distributing 41 positions available in AA for derived faculty change.

Attachment 4 has two parts: Part 1 is an analysis of combined regular term and distance education derived faculty vs. adjusted faculty (based on the BD-119 adjusted for derived faculty change and restitution positions) and serves as the basis for allocation adjustments for restitution inequities; Part 2 is a summary statement of combined derived faculty vs. final faculty (based on the BD-119 adjusted to reflect total 05-06 position allocations).

Attachment 5 provides data used to determine the funding level for positions allocated.
Please know that our discussions of 2006-2007 enrollment projections will be crucial to our resource picture next year, as will your responsible use of these new positions to both increase next year's SCH and address our other important priorities.

Thanks for your continuing leadership and good stewardship of these important resources. I look forward to our discussions on how we can continue to improve our process as we approach next year.

The following allocation rationale guided our efforts (See Allocation Rationale).

## Allocation Rationale

What follows are the salient facts, justifying principles, and analyses that we used to make division of faculty position allocations and operating dollars between Health Sciences and academic Affairs and the faculty position allocations in Academic Affairs.

## 2005-2006 Salient Facts:

F1. Total new instructional (faculty) salaries after the $\$ 2.5+$ million cut are at $\$ 7,654,512$ and permanent operating is at $\$ 1,554,342$.
2. Each faculty position is provided by OP at $\$ 67,408$, although reasonable beginning assistant professor salaries vary by discipline.
3. Average salary of $\$ 67,408$ produces $\$ 7,654,512 / \$ 67,408=113.56$ total positions.

F4. Observing P5 below, there are 104.56 DE faculty positions and 9 RT faculty positions to allocate.
F5. Almost all units have used previous RT positions (101) to accomplish DE (107) work. 6. Some differences exist between number of current faculty and number of derived faculty earned by the SCH-based funding formula (other attachments are shared)
F7. The likelihood of new positions continuing at the rate of the last two years is small.
F8. "Derived faculty" differences are based on SCH generation that benefited the University. 9. If SCH increase were the sole position-allocation criterion, ECU would find it difficult to advance new programs and other priorities, especially at the division level.
10. The deans have agreed that SCH increase, restitution, and academic program and other ECU priorities should drive allocations.

## Justifying Principles

P1. We should seek a dependable factual basis from which to make equitable allocations.
P2. We should reward proportionately the hard work (increasing SCHs ) that produced these additional resources
P3. We should improve the allocation processes each year as factual reviews and equity analyses become more accurate and more collaborative.
P4. Faculty positions should be allocated at a salary rate that is reasonable given disciplinary salary differences and competing claims for salary $\$ \$$.
P5. Regular Term Faculty positions should not be used for the budget cut, leaving 9 RT positions.
P6. Operating monies should be shared between HS and AA on the same rationale as best determines the sharing of faculty positions.
P7. Since F5 is true, this year we should allocate positions according to both RT/DE needs so long as units can account for DE-funded productivity
P8. Since the funding formula-based SCH analysis shows differences in "derived positions," restitution should still be a factor in allocation.
P9. Because F7 and F8 are true, a significant number of restitution positions should be "taken off the top" this year

## Analyses:

A1: Last year (see the widely-shared September 29, 2004 memorandum on faculty position allocations, Attachment 3, Item 4), we divided the positions and operating dollars according to the total SCH production for 2003-2004, roughly an $88 \%(A A)$ and $12 \%(H S)$ split. Within AA, we went on to apply three factors: increased SCHs, restitution, and academic program and other priorities. But what applied within AA should have applied to the split also. In effect, we have caused "restitution" issues within SON and AHS by neglecting the FF-functional 2003-2004 SCH increase by those two schools. To compare SCH increases between the divisions fairly, we need to be sensitive to the kind of SCHs those differences contain. Stated differently, SCHs differ as to how much of the enrollment increase dollars they generate, depending on both the level and the "cell number" ( $1,2,3$, or 4 ) where they occur. Therefore, we must calculate the increases in derived faculty per unit and compare them relatively in order to fairly conclude the "position and
dollar weight" of the SCH differences. See 2005-06 Attachment 1, column 12. Using census day as the source for SCHs and the BD-119 (summed to FTEs) as data sources, these percentages encapsulate the SCH changes as a function of the dollar value of the SCHs. The total percentages for AA compared to HS are thus
AHS: $13.77 \%+$ SON: $15.74 \%$ or $29.51 \%$ for HS, leaving a balance of $70.49 \%$ for AA. Let's round this to: HS: 29.5\%, AA: 70.5\%
This means the operating dollars are shared as follows: HS: \$485,531 AA: \$1,095,811
A2: Total faculty positions $=113.56$ (104.56 DE and 9 RT )
Given F7 and F8, we should set aside 20 of the 104.56 DE positions as "general institutional restitution positions."
This would leave 84.56 DE positions and 9 RT positions or 93.56 positions to be split between HS and AA on the basis of $29.5 \% / 70.5 \%$.
HS: $29.5 \% \times 93.56=27.60$ positions (all DE) (some owed back to AA) AA: $70.5 \% \times 93.56=65.96$ positions ( 56.96 DE ; 9 RT)
Both $A A$ and $H S$ should allocate remaining faculty positions in recognition of $O P$ and ECU priorities and $F F$-functional $S C H$ increases.
AA will use approximately a 60-40 split ( $60 \%$ for $F F$-functional SCH increases and 40\% for restitution inequities/priorities/potential SCH increases).

A3: Let's return to the 20 set-aside (DE) institutional restitution positions. To properly judge how to allocate the 20 "institutional restitution positions", we apply derived vs current faculty ratios for all 9 units ( 7 AA colleges and AHS and SON). See Attachment 2 on analysis of current vs. derived faculty and the relative percentages for understaffed units. The "application table" indicates the allocation of the 20 restitution positions, thus giving HS 2 more positions for a total of 30 ( 29.31 rounded up). AA has a total of 84 positions ( 83.25 rounded up).

## Chart 1

This chart indicates the allocation of salary dollars allocated without FTE

| College | Salary funds requested with no FTE | Disposition of funding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COB | \$0 | \$0 |
| COE | \$438,207 | 5 positions @ \$62,000 funded above \# requested @ $\$ 310,000$-may be used for this purpose |
| CFAC | \$78,394 | \$78,394 funded |
| CHE | \$12,600 | \$12,600 funded |
| CHHP | \$153,423 | 5 positions @ $\$ 54,740$ funded above \# requested @ 273,700 - may be used for this purpose |
| CTCS | \$40,000 | \$40,000 funded |
| CA\&S | \$54,000 | \$54,000 funded |

## Chart 2

Below is a chart that conveys the Phase I permanent operating. You will see that $\$ 6,000$ is allocated for each position. It is intended that these operating funds support the associated position.

| College | Position Allocated $\times \$ 6,000$ | Total Phase I <br> Permanent Operating |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| COB | $8 \times \$ 6,000$ |  | $\$ 48,000$ |
| COE | $20 \times \$ 6,000$ |  | $\$ 120,000$ |
| CFAC | $4 \times \$ 6,000$ | $\$ 24,000$ |  |
| CHE | $7 \times \$ 6,000$ | $\$ 42,000$ |  |
| CHHP | $10 \times \$ 6,000$ | $\$ 60,000$ |  |
| CTCS | $11 \times \$ 6,000$ | $\$ 66,000$ |  |
| CA\&S | $14 \times \$ 6,000$ | $\$ 84,000$ |  |

## Chart 3

Below are notes related to positions and salary dollars. This chart indicated positions requested as well as total received.

| College | Request | Allocation | Difference | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BUS | 20 | 8 | -12 | Keep position which was originally borrowed, making 9 positions allocated |
| EDUC | 15 | 20 | +5 | Even with these 5 extra positions, COE is funded below the SCH generated. These should assist in helping COE in increased expectations of SCH generation. Also the funding from these positions may be used to off-set requested salary ( $\$ 438,207$ ) funds (with no FTE). |
| FA/C | 8 | 6 | -2 | Using 4 in new position allocation and keeping 2 positions borrowed earlier. These 2 positions will be repaid to AA next year. |
| HE | 18.5 | 7 | -11.5 | Has 7 positions but will repay borrowed positions previously agreed upon. |
| HHP | 5 | 10 | +5 | Funds from one position should be used to repay AA the funds that were advanced to HHP for salary increases for retention. Also, funds from extra positions should be used for increasing salary pool to hire "world class researcher." Also the funding from these positions may be used to off-set requested salary $(\$ 153,423)$ funds (with no FTE). |
| TCS | 11 | 11 |  | Met position requests (previously discussed). |
| A/S | 36 | 14 | -22 | Allocation includes positions for math needs of engineering and general education courses for COE to ensure Wachovia Partnership East sites meet student needs. Also .5 for biology courses in nursing (formerly borrowed). |





|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2005-06 ATTACHMENT 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part 1-Analysls of Comblined RT 8 | DE Derived Fa | Faculty vs. Ad | diusted Curren | tFaculty |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | ${ }^{(6)}$ | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Plus 05-06 |  |  |  | \% |  |  |  |  | \% |
|  | Total | Total |  | Current | Increase \& | Revised |  | Difference | Difference | Adjustment | Adjusted |  | Difference | Difference |
|  | 04.05 SCHs | Derived | Relative | Faculty FTE | Restitution | Faculty FTE | Relative | Derived vs. | Derived vs. | for Restitution | Faculty Total | Relative | Derived vs. | Derived vs. |
| Unit | Generated | Faculty | \% | per BD-119 | Positions | per BD-119 | \% | Revised | Revised | Inequities | per BD-119 | \% | Adjusted | Adjusted |
| College of Business | 49,470 | 132.45 | 10.69\% | 104.00 | 5.00 | 109.00 | 9.92\% | -23.45 | -17.70\% | 2.00 | 111.00 | 10.06\% | $-21.45$ | -16.19\% |
| College of Education | 61,940 | 189.07 | 15.26\% | 148.65 | 24.00 | 172.65 | 15.71\% | -16.42 | -8.68\% | 5.00 | 167.65 | 15.19\% | - $\mathrm{-21.42}^{\text {a }}$ | -11.33\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| College of Fine Arts/Comm. | 60,269 | 161.04 | 13.00\% | 158.73 | 2.00 | 160.73 | 14.63\% | -0.31 | -0.19\% | 0.00 | 160.73 | 14.56\% | -0.31 | -0.19\% |
| College of Human Ecology | 42,702 | 2106.01 | 8.56\% | 94.00 | 4.00 | 98.00 | 8.92\% | -8.01 | -7.56\% | 0.00 | 98.00 | 8.88\% | -8.01 | -7.56\% |
| College of Hith \& Human Perf. | 37,548 | 86.77 | 7.00\% | 76.76 | 10.00 | 86.76 | 7.90\% | -0.01 | -0.01\% | 0.00 | 86.76 | 7.86\% | -0.01 | -0.01\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| College of Tech.Comp Science | 23,424 | 74.95 | 6.05\% | 74.35 | 7.00 | 81.35 | 7.40\% | 6.40 | 8.54\% | 0.00 | 81,35 | 7.37\% | 6.40 | 8.54\% |
| TH College of Arts \& Sciences | 244,943 | 488.48 | 39.43\% | 384.15 | 6.00 | 390.15 | 35.51\% | -98.33 | -20.13\% | 8.00 | 398.15 | 36.08\% | -90.33 | -18.49\% |
| Totals | 520,296 | 1,238.77 | 100.00\% | 1,040.64 | 58.00 | 1,098.64 | 100.00\% | -140.13 | -11.31\% | 5.00 | 1,103.64 | 100.00\% | -135.13 | -10.91\% |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Column 2-Derived faculty are positions generated by application of the SCH funding model matrix to SCHS produce |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Column 5-Additional $05-$-06 positions allocated on basis of derived faculty increase and restitution (attachments $2 \& 3$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Column 8 - Numerical difference between derived faculy FTE and revised BD-119 faculty FTE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Column 9-\% difference between derived faculty and revised BD-119 faculty FTE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Column 10 - Using column 7 of attachment, 2 shows Colleges of Education, Business, and Arts \& Sciences at negative $21 \%$. This adjustment within these Coileges is to closer equalize the percentages. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Column 11-Adjusted BD-119 amount after column 10 adjustments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Column 13 - Numerical difference between derived faculty FTE and adjusted BD=119 faculty FTE Column 14 - \% difference between derived faculty and adiusted BD-119 faculty FTE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Column 14-\% difference between derived faculty and adjusted BD-119 faculty FTE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Part2-Summary of Derived Faculty vs. $05-06$ Final BD-119 (reflecting all new positions allocated) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | Final | Difference | Difference |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit | Derived | Faculty FTE | Derived vs. | Derived vs. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Faculty | per BD-119 | Final | Final |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| College of Business | 132.45 | 11200 | -20.45 | -15.44\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| College of Education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 189.07 | 168.65 | -20.42 | -10.80\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| College of Fine Ars/ $/$ comm. | 161.04 | 16273 | 1.69 | 1.05\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| College of Human Ecology | 108.01 | 101.00 | 5.01 | 4.73\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| College of Hith \& Human Perf. | 86.77 | 86.76 | -0.01 | -0.01\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| College of Tech./Comp Science | 74.95 | 85.35 | 10.40 | 13.88\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TH Colloge of Arts \& Sciences | 488.48 | 398.15 | -90.33 | -18.49\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 1,238.77 | 1,114.64 | -124.13 | -10.02\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



