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Strategic staffing decisions require more than just counting heads...

• Every UA employee contributes to our collective success; each person has a responsibility to support Vision 2020 and related success strategies

• The number of employees in different job categories varies over time due to:
  – funds availability
  – strategic directions
  – rates of separation and resignation relative to hiring
What the data will tell us...

While staffing levels are always in flux, analysis of workforce data over time supports the following observations:

1) Comparisons at VP/dean/department levels over multi-year timeframes are difficult – and at times misleading – due to significant changes in functions, responsibilities and organizational structure (units moving across units).
What the data will tell us...

2) Throughout years of change, there has been demonstrated and ongoing commitment of resources to instruction during declining and increasing enrollment.
What the data will tell us...

3) During the last 15 years, the University made essential investments in the physical campus (buildings and grounds) to help increase enrollment.

That effort succeeded but it also meant that staffing levels needed to serve a larger student population and to maintain the campus.
Our Employment: A Historical Comparison

- Slight increase in number of total full-time faculty
- Growth in numbers of Contract Professionals
FACULTY

• **Size of Faculty**: University’s annual workforce counts show slight increase in number of total full-time faculty since 1999

• Both national and Ohio data from this period show a similar result
Distribution of Teaching Load

Hiring decisions across different categories of instructional staff are guided by three principles:

1) Appropriate investments should be made in tenure-track faculty as informed by academic program reviews
2) All tenure-track faculty should be working at full capacity
3) Balance of resources available for instruction should be distributed to most effectively meet student demand
Distribution of Teaching Load: Historical Comparison

• Slight increase in the number of FT faculty
  – Net gain of 4% (31 full-time faculty)

• Use of non-tenure track full-time faculty increased

• Use of part-time faculty increased
Historical Comparison: Faculty

- Slight increase in number of full-time faculty
- Increase in part-time faculty
Historical Comparison: Faculty

- Slight increase in full-time faculty
- Decrease in tenure track faculty
- Increase in non-tenure track faculty

*Excludes library faculty
Contract Professionals and Staff

• There has been growth in the numbers of contract professionals and staff since 1999
• Landscape for Learning initiative succeeded in supporting enrollment growth but required more staff
Where have we grown?

• Added **facilities** to support students:
  – Campus housing increased from 1,674 beds in 1997 to 3,249 beds in 2011
  – Student Union and Student Recreation & Wellness Center, Athletic facilities, and extensive green spaces

• Added **services** to support students:
  – Veterans’ Services
  – Advising
  – Commuter/Off-Campus Students Services
  – Transfer Student Services
  – Career Center
  – IT infrastructure and support (e.g. in 1997 there were no laptops or PDA’s)
Some Growth Supported by Fees

• Some staff and contact professional employees supported by designated student fees

• Use of fees designated to support specific student services

• Reassignment requires review and approval through university governance processes, including the Board of Trustees
Student satisfaction

• Administrative review of staffing levels informed by consultation with our students about quality and the value-added of services

• Student satisfaction is the best accountability structure for the use of these resources
Some CPs must perform specific student services as designated by fees.
## Historical Comparison: CPs & Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic/ Administrative Units</th>
<th>Contract Professionals*</th>
<th>Staff*</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A&S                            | 10 19                    | 73 53   | New Home Unit:  
|                                |                          |         | • Bliss Institute - 2008 |
| CBA                            | 6 10                     | 8 8     |          |
| Educ                           | 5 21                     | 73 30   | Reporting Changes:  
|                                |                          |         | • Ocasek Natatorium transferred to Student Affairs in 2002 |
| Engr                           | 2 7                      | 36 31   |          |
| F&AA/C&PA/HS&HS                | 15 21                    | 86 27   | College split - 2009 |
| Honors College                 | - -                      | 3       | New unit as of 2005 |
| Law                            | 8 14                     | 16 18   |          |
| Nursing                        | 5 17                     | 16 13   | Reporting Change:  
|                                |                          |         | • Part of College of Health Professions - 2011 |
| Polymer                        | 7 17                     | 63 48   |          |

*Across many unit leaders over time
# Historical Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic/ Administrative Units</th>
<th>Contract Professionals*</th>
<th>Staff*</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reporting Changes:
- Univ Internal Audit Office - 2011
- EJ Thomas Hall - 2011
- Admissions, Registrar, Financial Aid, Student Srvs Ctr – 2011
- Enrollment Management - 2011
- Student Athlete Academic Srvs - 2010
- Archives of History of American Psych - 2010
- University Press - 2004
- Institutional Research – 2004
- UA Adult Focus – 2003

New Departments:
- Office of Chief Diversity Officer - 2008

*Across many unit leaders over time*
# Historical Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic/ Administrative Units</th>
<th>Contract Professionals*</th>
<th>Staff*</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summit College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne College</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Summit College**
  - Increased Staffing: Added Academic Advisors - 2011
  - Reporting change:
    - Workforce Development – 2004
    - Developmental Programs – 2004

- **University College**
  - Increased Staffing: Added Academic Advisors - 2011
  - New Department(s):
    - Student Academic Success – 2007
    - Service Ctr for Transfer Students- 2009

- **Wayne College**
  - New Department(s):
    - Business Office - 2010
    - Technical Support Services - 2010
    - Community Relations - 2010
    - Academic Affairs – 2010
    - Statistics - 2009

*Across many unit leaders over time*
## Historical Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic/ Administrative Units</th>
<th>Contract Professionals*</th>
<th>Staff*</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT/Libraries</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Planning</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President/TD&amp;HR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>1119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Across many unit leaders over time

- New Department(s):
  - Off-Campus Student Services - 2010
  - Student Judicial Affairs - 2010

- New Departments:
  - Research & Learning Srvs - 2011
  - UL Systems – 2005
  - UL Teaching & Learning – 2005
- Reporting Changes:
  - Telecommunications - 2008

- New Departments:
  - Quaker Square purchased - 2007
  - Auxiliary Administration - 2006
  - Student Financials - 2002

- Reporting Change:
  - Institutional Mktg - 2008
  - HR under President in 1997
Comparisons with Ohio Peers

- Full-time Faculty
- Part-time Faculty
- Executive/Administrative/Managerial
- Clerical and secretarial

*Latest data sets available
Comparison with Ohio Peers
- FT Faculty

Personnel Fall 2009 – Main Campuses

Full-time Faculty (tenure, tenure track and full-time instructors) per 1,000 student FTE

Comparison with Ohio Peers - PT Faculty

Personnel Fall 2009 – Main Campuses

Comparison with Ohio Peers - Administrators

Personnel Fall 2009 – Main Campuses

Full-time Executive, Administrative, and Managerial Personnel per 1,000 student FTE

Comparison with Ohio Peers - Clerical

Personnel Fall 2009 – Main Campuses

Comparisons with National Peers

IPEDS categories:

• Instructional/Research/Public Service
• Executive/Administrative/Managerial
• Other Professional
• Non-professional
Comparison with National Peers

**Similar to peers:**
- Instruction/Research/Public Service (Faculty)

**Fewer employees than peers:**
- Executive/Administrative/Managerial
- Other Professionals (Support/Service)

**More employees than peers:**
- Non-professional
Comparison with National Peers 2010

Figure 12. Full-time equivalent staff, by assigned position: Fall 2009

**NOTE:** Graduate assistants are not included in this figure. For information on the calculation of FTE of staff, see the Methodological Notes. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.

Comparison with National Peers 2011

Figure 12. Full-time equivalent staff, by assigned position: Fall 2010

NOTE: Graduate assistants are not included in this figure. For information on the calculation of FTE of staff, see the Methodological Notes. N is the number of institutions in the comparison group.

Moving Forward - 2013

1. Staffing Analysis at Institutional Level
   – Vision 2020 goals and metrics
   – Academic program reviews and academic support program reviews
   – Comparison of staffing levels with our peer institutions

2. Unit by Unit Analysis / Faculty
   – Guided by Vision 2020 and informed by academic program reviews
   – Increase number of Tenure Track Faculty; decrease number of part-time faculty
   – Strategic faculty hires, supported by appropriate staff – $2 million per year for next 10 years
2. Unit by Unit Analysis/CPs and Staff

– Guided by Vision 2020; informed by program reviews

– VPs and Deans bring Vision 2020 goals to unit level

– Performance Planning will:
  • Assess current capacity (our current level of expertise and talent)
  • Identify the additional talent and skills we need
  • Develop unit-level plans to either hire new talent or develop existing personnel to close the gaps
Annual Reviews to Keep Us on Course...

- Measure performance outcomes for individuals

- Measure performance outcomes at unit level and for Dean/VP areas

- Adjust staffing as appropriate