





Fig 1. There are 3 distinct budgets: General Operating (E&G Unrestricted); Restricted; and, Auxiliary

- Education and General (E&G) Operating Budget: includes unrestricted as well as designated funds, i.e. course/program fees that are retained by the department or program, e.g. lab or art fees.
- Auxiliary Budget: Self-supporting student operations, which include residence and dining halls, Recreation Services, Parking, Student Health Center and Intercollegiate Athletics are budgeted under this category. These university units generate their own revenue from fees like room and board, etc. or may be partially funded through the general fee component to tuition(see slide 13 for more information . Auxiliary operations are generally responsible for the cost to operate, maintain and replace their facilities. For example, none of the cost to remodel or build new residence halls is included in the E&G Unrestricted budget.
- **Restricted**: these funds include sponsored grants, endowments, and other funds that are restricted by the donor or grantor.





E&G	\$376.3M	57%
Auxiliaries	\$122.5M	18%
State Appropriation*	\$ 64.3M	10%
	TOTAL \$563.1M	85%

\*The state appropriation is determined by a formula that is allocated based on enrollment and student graduations.

Only 1 public university in the country has a greater dependence on tuition than Miami (Maryland's online university). Even half of the 100 largest private universities are less dependent on tuition than Miami.



**Fig 3.** Another important characteristic of our unrestricted E&G budget is that almost three-fourths (72%) of non-scholarship spending is for salaries, wages and benefits Improvements to employee compensation is generally the largest new budget expense for the university. Even the "other transfer category," which is mostly comprised of the allocation of the general fee, is used to fund salaries, wages and benefits. So in reality almost 80% of this budget is used for employee salaries, wages and benefits.

NB: Scholarships, which are not shown included for this analysis, are another major driver of spending.



Table 1. FY2018 Key Budget Assum	ptions
Oxford Campus	Budget / Actual
Fall Class - First Time Students	3,775 / 3,801
Fall Class - ACE, Transfer & Relocations	685/693
Enrollment Mix - Non-Resident (first year)	43% / 42%
Tuition Increase - Undergraduate & Graduate Resident	0%
Tuition Increase - Undergraduate & Graduate Non Resident	2%
Tuition Increase - Tuition Promise Resident	1.30%
Tuition Increase - Tuition Promise Non Resident	4.90%
State Share of Instruction - Change from FY17 Actuals	0%
Salary Increment Pool	2%
Strategic Priorities Initiatives	
New Revenue	\$4,376,270
Productivity Improvements	(\$3,942,921)

**Table 1**: The Board of Trustees approved the *projected budget* [denoted Budget in blue text on lines 1,2, and 3] in June 2017. The actual results through the fall semester are shown in black text (lines 1, 2,and 3).

For the third year in a row, there was no tuition increase for returning Ohio residents (line 4), but there was a 2% increase for non-residents (line 5). This is the second year for the Tuition Promise and tuition did increase by 1.3% for these first-year students and by 4.9% increase for non-residents. The reason for the difference in the rate increase for resident students versus non-resident students is that the tuition increase for Ohio resident students was limited to the amount of inflation in the past 60 months. The incoming tuition rate is locked for 4 years for all students under the Miami Tuition Promise program.

The State Share of Instruction was held at the FY17 level in the state budget and will also not increase for fiscal year 2019.

In addition to the salary increment pool of 2%, there was an additional 1% faculty market adjustment budgeted



**Fig 4.** The amount shown in the "red bar" reflects the amount of planned new spending in excess of the amount of the budgeted new revenue.

Commitments:	
Salary & Benefit Commitments	\$ 7,536,306
New Investments:	
New Academic Investments	\$ 3,637,318
University Strategic Initiatives	\$ 2,602,256
Sexual Assault & Student Crisis	\$ 150,000
Banner Implementation	\$ 3,500,000
Student Financial Aid	\$ 8,190,632
FY18 Program Improvements	\$ 25,616,512

 Table 2: This is how the program improvements (new spending) was budgeted for this year.

New academic investments (Permanent) include:

•	Academic 0.5% Productivity Reallocation Investment	\$	723,911
•	Distance Learning Investment	\$1	L,200,010
•	Miami Cluster High Performance Computing	\$	225,000
•	University Library Acquisition	\$	250,000
•	Academic Divisional Programming Improvements (CEC)	<u>\$ 1</u>	1,238,397
		\$3	8,637,318
Ne	ew university strategic initiatives (Permanent) include:		
•	President and Provost Contingency Fund	\$1	L,500,000
•	EMSS Strategic Administration	\$	102,256
•	Convert Advancement Position to E&G	<u>\$ 1</u>	1,000,000

\$ 2,602,256

Unrestricted E&G Revenue Source	Growth Needed to Exclusively Fund
Tuition Increase	6.8%
State Appropriation Increase	39.8%
New Endowment	\$640.4 Million

**Table 3**. This represents what it would take to cover the additional spending increase of \$25.6 M entirely from any of these revenue sources. We do not anticipate any of these occurring individually or collectively and suggests that this amount of new spending is not practical for future budgets.



**Fig 5**. These are the standard budget spending categories that all college and university colleges use. Institutional support includes all administrative categories such as the president, finance and business, office of the provost and advancement operation. The majority of these budgeted expenditures (61%) are for instruction and academic support activities (blue portion of the pie chart). This includes the deans' offices, the library as well as academic departments but not the Office of the provost. The category also includes Academic Support (academic administration, the graduate school, libraries, the honors program, and the museums), Public Service (community partnerships and noncredit programming), and Separately Budgeted Research (research grants, fee waivers and benefits, and a portion of the Ecology and Scripps research centers). The debt service is not all of the university's principal and interest payments toward debt but only the amount charged to the E&G budget to fund past academic building projects. The total annual debt service is approximately \$52M. Most of the remaining debt service is charged to auxiliary budgets, primarily to housing and dining (remember auxiliaries generate their own revenue and they must plan how to fund the cost of the facilities used for these activities).

Revenue/Expense Description	College of Arts & Science	College of Education, Health & Society	Farmer School of Business	College of Engineering & Computing	College of Creative Arts	Total Oxford
Total Revenue Sources	\$174,008,061	\$ 49,129,196	\$ 71,973,728	\$ 25,413,792	\$ 22,310,680	\$ 342,835,457
Total Expenses and Transfers	\$169,070,208	\$ 43,690,525	\$ 68,557,772	\$ 22,275,402	\$ 26,117,773	\$ 329,711,679
Balance Before Subvention	\$ 4,937,854	\$ 5,438,671	\$ 3,415,956	\$ 3,138,390	\$ (3,807,093)	\$ 13,123,778
Subvention	\$ (1,620,398)	\$ (1,642,586)	\$ (1,518,529)	\$-	\$ 4,781,513	\$ -
Ending Balance After Subvention	\$ 3,317,456	\$ 3,796,085	\$ 1,897,427	\$ 3,138,390	\$ 974,421	\$ 13,123,778

**Table 4**. This is how the Oxford RCM budget is allocated to the five academic divisional budgets. The non-committed budget spending, i.e. the "Ending Balance After Subvention" is retained by each of the five academic divisions as shown. Subvention is funding not generated from the activities of each of the academic divisions and is held constant for future budgets. The red subvention dollar amounts from the three academic divisions are provided to the College of Creative Arts in the black subvention dollar amount. Subvention covers the added cost of teaching in the College of Creative Arts where individual or small class instruction is common. The allocation of subvention funding to Creative Arts is consistent with the historical budget support provided to the College of Creative Arts and is common at other universities using an RCM type budget model.

The FY2018 budget includes changes to the RCM budget model recommended by the RCM Budget Committee and Fiscal Priorities Committee and approved by the Provost and the President.



**Fig 6**. Tuition includes an instructional fee and a general fee (blue bar). The segregation of tuition into these two components has been legislated for decades to inform families how their tuition payments are allocated by Ohio's public universities. The general fee covers the cost of student-related activities including Intercollegiate Athletics, student centers, recreation services, health centers and student activities (e.g., student government, student organizations and club sports). Intercollegiate Athletics is the largest beneficiary of the general fee at Miami and at most of Ohio's public universities. In addition to the general fee support provided to some auxiliaries, all auxiliaries generate revenue from sales and services (red bars).

NB: A portion of the general fee that is allocated to ICA is to fund scholarships (blue hatched bar). No general fee is allocated to the residence and dining halls, Marcum Conference Center or the Student Health Center. All of their revenue is from room and board fees or sales and services.



		Pre	liminary & Unaudited
Sum	nmary		
	FY2017	FY2016	<u>Change</u>
Central Funds	(206,331,476)	(201,113,092)	(5,218,384)
Academic Affairs - Oxford	132,806,026	127,171,868	5,634,158
Academic Affairs - Regional	11,176,187	9,030,447	2,145,740
Administrative Units	50,212,664	39,495,887	10,716,777
Quasi-Endowments	113,245,024	86,037,700	27,207,324
Facility Renewal & Replacement - Oxford	13,569,800	6,156,276	7,413,524
Facility Renewal & Replacement - Regionals	15,751,297	16,017,274	(265,977)
Facility Renewal & Replacement - Auxiliary	97,749,469	88,507,127	9,242,342
Capital Projects Funded But Not Expended	56,311,503	79,083,876	(22,772,373)
Total Unrestricted Net Position	284,490,494	250,387,363	34,103,131

#### ((**n** ...

Table 5. The unrestricted net position is sometimes referred to as 'reserves.' The categories summarized on this slide are shown in greater detail in the following slides.

NB: The "Capital Projects Funded but not Expended" is for projects that are planned and dollars or funding have been allocated to these capital projects, but the money has not been spent yet (line 9 in the table).

Mi	ami University		
Aca	ademic Affairs		
		Prelimin	ary & Unaudited
	FY2017	FY2016	<u>Change</u>
Provost	\$23,777,665	\$19,601,297	\$4,176,368
Arts & Science	47,503,878	48,903,063	(1,399,185)
Education, Health & Society	17,711,703	21,781,464	(4,069,761)
Farmer School of Business	28,481,569	24,645,568	3,836,001
Engineering & Computer Service	8,681,281	6,563,203	2,118,078
Creative Arts	6,649,930	5,677,273	972,657
Hamilton Campus	4,794,694	3,581,718	1,212,976
Middletown Campus	6,313,710	5,297,606	1,016,104
Voice of America	67,783	151,123	(83,340)
Total Academic Affairs	\$143.982.213	\$136.202.315	\$7.779.898

**Table 6.** This slide shows in greater detail the allocation of reserves for academic affairs.

Miami University			
Administ	trative Divisions		
		Prelimi	nary & Unaudited
	<u>FY2017</u>	<u>FY2016</u>	<u>Change</u>
President	\$1,427,810	\$1,100,373	\$327,437
Finance & Business Services	5,328,684	3,552,971	1,775,713
Physical Facilities	2,441,167	2,338,265	102,902
Enrollment Mgt & Student Success	2,295,447	2,621,414	(325,967)
Student Affairs	2,298,813	2,725,274	(426,461)
University Advancement	21,154,274	9,409,296	11,744,978
IT Services	6,535,894	8,955,005	(2,419,111)
Central Budget	\$8,730,575	\$8,793,289	(\$62,714)
Total Administrative Units	\$50.212.664	\$39.495.887	\$10,716,777

**Table 7.** This slide shows in greater detail the allocation of the reserves by administrative units. The large amount shown for University Advancement is for the comprehensive gift campaign that is in its early stages.

Miami University Central Fund Balances and Reserves				
	FY2017	FY2016	<u>Change</u>	
Unallocated Fund Balance	8,051,503	5,365,265	2,686,238	
Reserve for Future Budgets	0	12,744,512	(12,744,512)	
Reserve for Investment Fluctuations	42,180,461	14,879,475	27,300,986	
Reserve for Health Care Stabilization	15,000,000	15,000,000	0	
Reserve for Financial Aid	7,715,605	6,735,262	980,343	
Encumbrances	6,233,076	4,335,623	1,897,453	
Miscellaneous Reserves	1,547,525	1,547,953	(428)	
Regional Campuses	10,539,665	10,929,843	(390,178)	
Auxiliary Enterprises	7,941,404	6,543,378	1,398,026	
Subtotal Central Fund Balances & Reserves	99,209,239	78,081,311	21,127,928	
Ohio Pension Liability	(305,540,715)	(279,194,403)	(26,346,312)	
Total Central Fund Balances & Reserves Net	(206,331,476)	(201,113,092)	(5,218,384)	

**Table 8.** This slide shows the break down of the central reserves.

The Ohio Pension Liability represents Miami's contribution to cover STRS and PERS pension funds that are not currently fully funded by the state system. Accounting standards <u>require</u> that the liability be shared proportionally by all schools and Ohio governments that participate in these plans. This amount does not include any shortfall in healthcare that must be reported beginning next year. A 30-year window is what is expected to be funded when calculating the amount needed to fund future demands on the retirement systems. Please note: STRS and PERS primarily offer *defined benefit plans*.

This does not apply to the ARP, which is a *defined contribution plan* – once the employer contributes to the employee under the ARP, their responsibility has been met.

# Strategic Investment – Academic Initiatives

Central Reserves and Administrative Carry Forward :	\$22.3 M
Academic Deans Matching Funds (over 3 years)	\$22.7 M
TOTAL	<b>\$45.0 M</b>
One Time Money with a Goal of \$50 Million to be Cor	nmitted to
<i>Focused and Strategic Investment</i> in Academic Initiat	ives





**Fig 7**. The *annualized* rate of change in tuition between 1977-1990 was slightly more than 10% and the state appropriation increased by 6%. Between 1990-2006, the annualized rate of tuition increases was 8.6% while state appropriation was only 1.4% - a reduction from the previous period as Miami became increasingly dependent on tuition for meeting its operations. Between 2006-2019, tuition will only increase by 1.6% on an annualized basis and the state subsidy will only increase by 0.2% per year based on the recent budget bill. At the same time, our annual expenses for just one year increased by 5.7%. This creates a challenging financial environment for sustaining the university.



**Fig 8**. There has been fluctuations in the state appropriation through out the last three decades. For FY2018 and FY19 the state appropriation is held at FY2017 levels (at the same time resident tuition is frozen). We expect, given the historic data, that the subsidy will continue to experience significant volatility in the future and is as likely to decline as increase.



**Fig 9**. There is a downward trend in state revenues that is alarming. The revenues generated from personal income tax have been stagnant or declining and finding new state revenue sources is challenging in an environment where tax increases are not likely to be considered. At the same time, the state's share of Medicaid costs has increased and is expected to rise even faster in the future as Ohio's populations ages and greater contributions are expected to occur under the current affordable care act. Such trends historically have lead to decreased spending appropriations for higher education.



**Fig 10**. The tuition generated from non-residents is the most significant revenue source for Miami today. In fact, the net tuition revenue from non-resident students (\$196.4M - fourth blue bar) is greater than the combined net revenue (\$146.8M - red bar) from other primary sources, i.e. state appropriation (\$64.3M) + Resident UG Net Tuition (\$78M) + Graduate Net Tuition (\$4.5M) = \$146.8M. Our more national and international recruitment strategies have helped improve the budget, while also increasing the quality and the diversity of our incoming class.



**Fig 11.** This figure illustrates enrollment changes over time. Miami has grown the size, quality, and diversity of its incoming classes but sustaining this growth into the future is unlikely.



**Fig. 12.** The commitment of financial aid that is offered each year is only ¼ of the cost of a 4 year class, so we track the costs associated with the incoming class (blue portion of the bar) and the portion we need to cover the entire 4 years of financial aid (red portion of the bars). Miami does not reduce the amount of financial aid a student is offered when admitted unless criteria set by that award are not met, e.g. maintaining a certain GPA. Additionally, with the implementation of the Tuition Promise, students know their tuition and fees will not change over a 4 year period. As we see more pressure to attract talented students, we will need to continue to provide financial aid.

It is also important to remember that the state has disinvested in student financial aid.



**Fig 13**. Note the leveling off of net tuition revenues from both non-resident and resident tuition per student. This indicates that even if tuition is being increased, no new net tuition may be generated assuming the class size is unchanged.



Fig 14. This figures shows a breakdown of spending. The majority of spending is for salary and benefits.







**Fig 15**. Following the "great recession" in 2008-09, there was a decrease in tenure line faculty from 676 in the fall of 2009 to 659 in the fall of 2010, which is a loss of 17 positions (2.5%). When we examined the change in the number of Tenure/Tenure Track (T/TT) faculty from 2005, prior to the "great recession" to the number of T/TT faculty in 2017, there were 681 faculty in 2005 compared to 618 in 2017; that is a decline of 63 or 9.3% (63/681 = 9.3%). Since 2013, when there were 580 T/TT faculty (the lowest number after the deep recession) until Fall, 2017, we have hired 38 additional T/TT faculty, which is an increase of 6.6%.

In 2005, and with the approval of University Senate, lecturers and clinical faculty (LCPL) were hired to provide additional teaching support and to allow more flexibility and opportunities for T/TT faculty to pursue research, including research leaves, course reductions, etc. As of Fall, 2017, we have 108 LCPL, comprising 17.5% of the T/TT faculty.

Please note: In Fall 2017, T/TT plus LCPL (618 + 108 = 726) were 75.0% of total, full time faculty (618 T/TT+ 108 LCPL + 242 VAP = 968 total; 726/968 = 75.0%)

**Please note:** Some of the numbers shown in the slide presentation data at the Senate meeting were shifted across bars. The data included on the above slide are correct.



**Fig 16**. Over this same period of time, the Deans and Provost have sought to maintain the number of assigned research leaves (ARA) and faculty improvement leaves (FIL). While there have been fluctuations in the number of approved leaves, these numbers have been relatively constant. Also, please note that, with the exception in 2007 and 2009, we have consistently approved leaves for at least 10% of our T/TT faculty (**Fig 17**). In order to continue to meet course demands and teaching needs, chairs do seek approval of visiting faculty in some cases. To date, we have not explored the impact of reduced teaching loads for T/TT faculty on the number of visiting and part time faculty, but we can do that to help make decisions about hiring faculty to achieve the composition that supports our research and teaching missions.

Department faculty, chairs, and deans have taken a great deal of care to hire visiting faculty who are effective teachers. Visiting faculty make important contributions to the teaching mission and provide flexibility and opportunities for T/TT faculty to have teaching load reductions, ARA and/or FIL. They also allow us to adapt to the profile of an incoming class so that we meet course demands and students' needs. Student learning outcomes are evaluated by department faculty, and we have multiple indicators suggesting student learning is very high; there is no evidence of any decrease in student learning. For example, admission to graduate and professional schools are typically well above the national average. Employment opportunities remain high for our students. These outcomes are indications of student success and reflect, in part, the great care the chairs, directors, and deans take when hiring faculty, including visiting faculty.



**Fig 17**. With the exception of 2007 and 2009, approximately 10 % of T/TT faculty have consistently been approved for leaves (**Fig 16**).



**Fig 18**. Another way to examine changes in faculty composition over time is to determine the changes by rank, as shown in this figure. After the severe economic downturn in 2008/09, there were declines in T/TT hiring, resulting in fewer assistant professors (**green bars**). The number of associate professors (**blue bars**) declined, likely due to a decline in the number of assistant professors (**green bars**). The number of full professors (**red bars**), also declined, but not as much.

It is clear that the economic downturn in 2008/09 resulted in fewer faculty at the assistant professor rank, i.e. from 201 in 2007 before the deep recession to 118 in 2013, the lowest number in the 13 year period shown in this figure. This is a reduction of 83 positions, which is a 41.3% decline (83/201 = 41.3%). To try to offset the impact of the recession, while maintaining strong teaching quality and stability, as well as preserving research productivity and opportunities for T/TT faculty to have research leaves (**Figs 16 & 17**), we increased the number of LCPL (**yellow bars**) and visiting faculty (**Figs 15 & 16**).

As we continue to recover from that deep economic recession, we are again increasing the number of assistant professors. Between 2013, when the number of assistant professors was at its lowest point, and 2017, there has been an increase of 67 assistant professors, a 57% increase (67/118 = 57%).



**Fig 19.** In this figure, the solid bars are faculty who are already hired and the hatched bars are searches that were conducted in 2016-17 and those that have been approved for 2017-18.

**Note**: in 2017-18, there were fewer new hires than planned due to the fact that there were 12 failed (yellow portion of the bar) and 5 cancelled searches (gray portion of the bar). As the economy has stabilized and we have had success in recruiting and yielding our classes, we are increasing the number of tenure track hires again (**Fig 18**) and this will continue to increase the number of T/TT faculty. The number of new T/TT faculty has been increasing since 2013 (**Fig 15 & 16**) and this has been intentional. As we develop hiring plans, increasing the number of T/TT faculty is a priority.



**Fig 20.** This slide shows the configuration of Miami University "instructional" staff compared with national data. *Please note:* These are head counts. These data do NOT represent the % of instruction provided by a particular category. The data show the % of individuals in each category. For example, 21% are classified as graduate / teaching assistants, but they deliver only about 4% of our credit hours (**Fig 21**). Credit hour contribution by rank / category is shown in **Figs 21-31**.

T/TT faculty at Miami University comprise 36.1 % (26.4% tenured + 9.7% in the tenure track = 36.1%) of personnel that are categorized as "instructional" staff, which is above the national average of 34.0%

At MU, the "Full Time Non-Tenure Track" category include 6.5% who are LCPL faculty (NB: of the 20.9% who are identified as "Full Time Non-Tenure Track, 6.5% are LCPL). When that 6.5% is added to the % T/TT, 42.6% of our faculty are in the T/TT or LCPL categories (26.4% tenured + 9.7% Tenure Track + 6.5% LCPL) and *no visiting faculty are included in this percent*. In contrast, the national data reported indicate there are 45% T/TT and FT non-tenure track faculty (24.6% Tenured + 9.4% T/T + 11% Full Time Non-Tenure Track) and that includes visiting faculty.

At MU, PT faculty include per credit hour faculty hired by departments as well as staff teaching courses, e.g. Student Affairs staff teaching in EDL, as well as KNH PAL courses.



**Fig 21.** This figure depicts the **total number of student credit hours** generated on the Oxford campus over time. Student credit hours are calculated as follows:

- course credit hours X number of students in the class = Total student credit hours.
- For example, a 3 credit hour course with 25 students equals 75 student credit hours.

In this figure, the solid bars show the total student credit hours taught in even numbered years between 2008-2017, i.e. 2008, 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016, while the hatched bars show the total student credit hours taught in the odd numbered years, i.e. 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, and 2017.

Total credit hours taught by:

- T/TT faculty are shown in red;
- LCPL faculty are shown in dark blue;
- FT instructors are shown in green;
- FT Visiting Assistant Professors (VAP) are shown in purple;
- GA/TA are shown in brown;
- PT faculty are shown in light blue

Total student credit hours (**Black bars**) have increased since 2008. Overall, the number of student credit hours taught by T/TT faculty (**red bars**) has declined, while the number of student credit hours taught by LCPL has increased (**darker blue bars**). The number of student credit hours taught by FT instructors (**green bars**) and GA/TA (**brown bars**) has remained fairly constant. The number of student credit hours taught by FT VAP was fairly constant until the past 4 years, i.e. 2014 - 2017, when it increased.

# NB: Data are for Fall semester only.



**Fig 22.** This figure and the next set of figures are organized in the same way. This figure depicts the *number of student credit hours (see legend of Fig 21 for explanation of Student Credit Hours)* generated by the different categories of instructional staff in the CAS on the Oxford campus over time.

Solid bars show the student credit hours taught in even numbered years between 2008 – 2017, i.e. 2008, 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016 while the hatched bars show the total student credit hours taught in the odd numbered years, i.e. 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, and 2017. The total credit hours taught by:

- T/TT faculty are shown in red;
- LCPL faculty are shown in dark blue;
- FT instructors are shown in green;
- FT Visiting Assistant Professors (VAP) are shown in purple;
- GA/TA are shown in brown;
- PT faculty are shown in light blue

The total number of student credit hours taught by T/TT faculty (red bars) has decreased over time, while the number of credit hours taught by LCPL (dark blue bars) increased. The distribution of student credit hours across other categories is fairly consistent, with increases in credit hours taught by FT VAP in 2014 – 2016, with a slight decrease in 2017.



**Fig 23.** This slide depicts the average student credit hours taught by instructional staff category. For example, average student credit hour per faculty is calculated as follows:

• 50 T/TT faculty teach 2,000 total student credit hours (see legend of **Fig 21** for explanation of Student Credit Hours) resulting in an average of 400 student credit hours per T/TT faculty.

While there is variation from year to year, the average % of student credit hours taught by T/TT faculty has declined since 2008, while the % taught by LCPL and VAP does seem to be fairly consistent, except in 2010 (increased student credit hours were taught by VAP).

Explanation of calculation: In figure 22, the 2017 (hatched red bar) number of credit hours taught by T/TT CAS faculty is 57,115 hours and there are 331 T/TT CAS faculty resulting in **an average of** 172.6 credit hours taught by each faculty member. Divide 172.6 average credit hours taught by each faculty member. Divide 172.6 average credit hours taught by each faculty member by 6 (i.e. two 3 credit hour courses) -> **average** ~ 29 (28.7) students per course for the fall.



**Fig 24.** This figure depicts the *number of student credit hours* generated by the different categories of instructional staff in the EHS on the Oxford campus over time.

Solid bars show the student credit hours taught in even numbered years between 2008 – 2017, i.e. 2008, 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016 while the hatched bars show the total student credit hours taught in the odd numbered years, i.e. 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, and 2017. The total credit hours taught by:

- T/TT faculty are shown in red;
- LCPL faculty are shown in dark blue;
- FT instructors are shown in green;
- FT Visiting Assistant Professors (VAP) are shown in purple;
- GA/TA are shown in brown;
- PT faculty are shown in light blue

The number of student credit hours taught by T/TT faculty (**red bars**) has decreased over time, while the number taught by LCPL (**darker blue bars**) and VAP (**purple bars**) has increased. Other categories have been fairly consistent.

NB: PT/Other category includes PAL courses as well as the EDL and EDP courses that are traditionally taught by Student Affairs staff, GA, other administrative staff.



**Fig 25.** This slide depicts the average student credit hours taught by instructional staff category. For example, average student credit hour per faculty is calculated as follows:

• 50 T/TT faculty teach 2,000 total student credit hours (see legend of **Fig 21** for explanation of *Student Credit Hours*) resulting in an average of 400 student credit hours per T/TT faculty.

On average, the number of student credit hours taught by T/TT faculty has declined; the number taught by LCPL and VAP has varied.

Explanation of calculation: In figure 24, the 2017 (hatched red bar) number of credit hours taught by T/TT EHS faculty is 10,704 hours and there are 69 T/TT EHS faculty resulting in **an average of** 155.1 credit hours taught by each faculty member. Divide 155.1 average credit hours taught by each faculty member by 6 (i.e. two 3 credit hour courses) -> **average** ~ 26 (25.9) students per course for the fall.



**Fig 26.** This figure depicts the *number of student credit hours* generated by the different categories of instructional staff in the CEC on the Oxford campus over time.

In this figure, the solid bars show the student credit hours taught in even numbered years between 2008 – 2017, i.e. 2008, 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016 while the hatched bars show the total student credit hours taught in the odd numbered years, i.e. 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, and 2017. The total credit hours taught by:

- T/TT faculty are shown in red;
- LCPL faculty are shown in dark blue;
- FT instructors are shown in green;
- FT Visiting Assistant Professors (VAP) are shown in purple;
- GA/TA are shown in brown;
- PT faculty are shown in light blue

Coinciding with growth in CEC, the number of student credit hours taught by T/TT faculty, as well as by LCPL, VAP and PT faculty has increased over time as has the number of credit taught by other members of the instructional staff, except the GA/TA.



**Fig 27**. This slide depicts the average student credit hours taught by instructional staff category. For example, average student credit hour per faculty is calculated as follows:

• 50 T/TT faculty teach 2,000 total student credit hours (see legend of **Fig 21** for explanation of *Student Credit Hours*) resulting in an average of 400 student credit hours per T/TT faculty.

In CEC, the number of student credit hours taught by T/TT faculty, as well as LCPL and VAP, has increased.

Explanation of calculation: In figure 26, the 2017 (hatched red bar) number of credit hours taught by T/TT CEC faculty is 6,982 hours and there are 48 T/TT CEC faculty resulting in **an average of** 145.5 credit hours taught by each faculty member. Divide 145.5 average credit hours taught by each faculty member by 6 (i.e. two 3 credit hour courses) -> **average** ~ 24 (24.2) students per course for the fall.



**Fig 28.** This figure depicts the *number of student credit hours* generated by the different categories of instructional staff in the FSB on the Oxford campus over time.

In this figure, the solid bars show the student credit hours taught in even numbered years between 2008 – 2017, i.e. 2008, 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016, while the hatched bars show the total student credit hours taught in the odd numbered years, i.e. 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, and 2017. The total credit hours taught by:

- T/TT faculty are shown in red;
- LCPL faculty are shown in dark blue;
- FT instructors are shown in green;
- FT Visiting Assistant Professors (VAP) are shown in purple;
- GA/TA are shown in brown;
- PT faculty are shown in light blue

The number of student credit hours taught by T/TT faculty is variable, with a decrease in 2011-2013 and an increase starting in 2014. The number of student credit hours taught by LCPL and VAP increased since 2008.



**Fig 29**. This slide depicts the average student credit hours taught by instructional staff category. For example, average student credit hour per faculty is calculated as follows:

• 50 T/TT faculty teach 2,000 total student credit hours (see legend of **Fig 21** for explanation of *Student Credit Hours*) resulting in an average of 400 student credit hours per T/TT faculty.

The number of student credit hours taught by T/TT faculty has declined, while the number taught by LCPL has increased and the number taught by VAP had been relatively constant, but decreased overall since 2008, and especially since 2015.

Explanation of calculation: In figure 28, the 2017 (hatched red bar) number of credit hours taught by T/TT FSB faculty is 20,532 hours and there are 105 T/TT FSB faculty resulting in **an average of** 195.5 credit hours taught by each faculty member. Divide 195.5 average credit hours taught by each faculty member by 6 (i.e. two 3 credit hour courses) -> **average** ~ 33 (32.6) students per course for the fall.



**Fig 30.** This figure depicts the *number of student credit hours* generated by the different categories of instructional staff in the CCA on the Oxford campus over time.

In this figure, the solid bars show the student credit hours taught in even numbered years between 2008 – 2017, i.e. 2008, 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016, while the hatched bars show the total student credit hours taught in the odd numbered years, i.e. 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, and 2017. The total credit hours taught by:

- T/TT faculty are shown in red;
- LCPL faculty are shown in dark blue;
- FT instructors are shown in green;
- FT Visiting Assistant Professors (VAP) are shown in purple;
- GA/TA are shown in brown;
- PT faculty are shown in light blue

The number of credit hours taught by T/TT faculty has remained fairly constant with an increase in 2009 and 2010. The number of student credit hours taught by LCPL increased and has remained fairly constant since 2012. The student credit hours delivered by VAP has been variable.



**Fig 31.** This slide depicts the average student credit hours taught by instructional staff category. For example, average student credit hour per faculty is calculated as follows:

50 T/TT faculty teach 2,000 total student credit hours (see legend of Fig 21 for explanation of Student Credit Hours) resulting in an average of 400 student credit hours per T/TT faculty.

The number of student credit hours taught by T/TT has increased while the number taught by LCPL faculty has been fairly constant. The number of student credit hours taught by VAP has been variable with an increase in 2015.

Explanation of calculation: In figure 30, the 2017 (hatched red bar) for the credit hours taught by T/TT CCA faculty is 11,336 hours and there are 63 T/TT CCA faculty resulting in **an average of** 179.9 credit hours taught by each faculty member. Divide 179.9 average credit hours taught by each faculty member by 6 (i.e. two 3 credit hour courses) -> **average** ~ 30 (30.0) students per course for the fall.





**Fig 32.** The **Red** bars are MU; **Blue** bars are national public doctorals; **Green** bars are OH publics; **2016 salary** is shown in *White text in* each of these bars. The **Yellow** bars show the % change in salary since 2011; it is not the average increment pool. These salaries were impacted by two years in which there was no increment (AY 2009-10 and 2010-11). Since AY 2011-12, there have been increments every year, including four (4) years of additional market adjustments for associate and full professors and this year (spring of 2017 increment) a market adjustment for T/TT faculty regardless of rank.

*When the* % change in average salary is greater than the % change in salary from other Ohio Public institutions, the % change is shown in **Green** text.



### See details in the legend of Figure 32.

**Fig 33.** These associate professor salaries were impacted by two years in which there was no increment (AY 2009-10 and 2010-11). Since AY 2011-12, there have increments every year, including four (4) years of additional market adjustments for associate professors.



# See details in the legend of Figure 32.

**Fig 34.** These salaries were impacted by two years in which there was no increment (AY 2009-10 and 2010-11). Since AY 2011-12, there have increments every year, including one (1) years of additional market adjustments for assistant professors.





# Fig 35. Total FTE lost:

- 252 Finance and Business Services (FSB)
- 57 Information Technology (IT)

309

# Total FTE gained =

- 29 President (Pres)
- 17 Student Affairs (SA)
- 16 Advancement (ADV)
- 1 Enrollment Management and Student Success (EMSS)
- 63 in all vice-president (VP) areas EXCEPT academic affairs (AA)
- 34 Academic Affairs (AA)
- 97 including AA

OVERALL: There were 246 positions (309 lost – 63 gained = 246 positions) of 1878 in "Central Administration", i.e. *support units* that were lost, i.e. a 13% loss.

When considering all units, i.e. including academic affairs (AA), there were a total of 212 FTE (309 lost - 97 gained = 212) of 2264 over entire MU - Oxford (including AA) = **9.3% loss in administrative FTE.** 



**Fig 36.** This slide shows the total number of positions by units. In this case, the data are organized so that all vice president (VP) units are aggregated, EXCEPT the Provost's units, e.g. the Graduate School, OARS, Libraries, Global Initiatives, and e-learning. Additionally, the administrative staff positions that support the Deans and Departments are also shown separately as are the number of permanent, full-time faculty (T/TT and LCPL). The growth in number of staff have occurred in the academic divisions and departments, whereas the total number of positions at the Vice Presidents' levels have decreased.

Summary of NET new positions:

- CAS: 12 new positions
- CCA: 1 new positions
- EHS: 7 new positions
- CEC: 0 new positions
- FSB: 15 new positions



**Fig 37.** Changes in salary are shown across all Vice-Presidents' areas, as well as from academic affairs: Both Finance and Business Services (FBS) and Information Technology (IT) had a decrease in salary expenditures over the past 10 years. This is likely due to the decrease in the number of staff.

Areas that added staff, i.e. President, Student Affairs, Advancement, and EMSS had increased salary expenditure.

Academic Affairs, also saw an increase in the number of positions (**Fig 36**) and salary expenditure. This is an average increase of 4.25% because there were 2 years without increment:

Salary expenditures in AA in 2016	\$ 24.8M
Salary expenditures in AA in 2006	<u>\$ 18.5M</u>
	\$ 34M / 8 years = 4.25% average increase



**Fig 38.** All VP Units (support centers), EXCLUDING Provost's units, had an increase of 8% in salary expenditures from 2006-2016), i.e. 1% (from 2006-2016 is 10 years, but there was no increment in 2010 or 2011, so 8% / 8 = 1%).

- The Provost's units also increased by 17% / 8 years with increment = 2.125%
- Deans and Depts. increased 47% / 8 years with increment = 5.875%
- Permanent Faculty increased by 24% / 8 years with increment = 3%







	Ohio Public Institutions—Participation Varies Year-to-Year	
Bowling Green St	tate University (Bowling Green, OH)	
Kent State Univer	rsity Main Campus (Kent, OH)	
Ohio University (	Athens, OH)	
The Ohio State U	niversity Main Campus (Columbus, OH)	
The University of	Akron, Main Campus (Akron, OH) **	
University of Cine	cinnati Main Campus (Cincinnati, OH) ***	
University of Tole	edo (Toledo, OH)	
Wright State Univ	versity Main Campus (Dayton, OH) ***	
Youngstown State	University (Youngstown, OH)	

Given the limitations associated with comparing faculty using AAUP data (see notes for Figure 25), we analyzed salary using College and University Professional Association (CUPA) for Human Resources data .

The major *advantage* to using CUPA data is that we can compare salaries by discipline and by cognate areas in the CAS. The major disadvantage is that fewer schools participate, although there is a very good representation of Ohio schools in this data set and these are listed in this table (**Table 2**). The complete list of schools that report to CUPA are presented at the end of this slide deck.



51	University of Alabama in Huntsville (Huntsville, AL)	76	University of North Carolina at Charlotte (Charlotte, NC)
52	University of Alaska Fairbanks (Fairbanks, AK)	77	University of North Carolina at Greensboro (Greensboro, NC
53	University of Arkansas at Little Rock (Little Rock, AR)	78	University of North Dakota Main Campus (Grand Forks, ND)
54	University of Arkansas Main Campus (Fayetteville, AR)	79	University of Northern Colorado (Greeley, CO)
55	University of Central Florida (Orlando, FL)	80	University of North Texas (Denton, TX)
56	University of Colorado Denver (Denver, CO)	81	University of South Carolina - Columbia (Columbia, SC)
57	University of Connecticut (Storrs, CT)	82	University of Southern Mississippi (Hattiesburg, MS)
58	University of Georgia (Athens, GA)	83	University of South Florida (Tampa, FL)
59	University of Hewaii at Manoa (Honolulu, HI)	84	University of Texas at Arlington (Arlington, TX)
60	University of Idaho (Moscow, ID)	85	University of Texas at Dallas (Richardson, TX)
61	University of Illinois at Chicago (Chicago II.)	86	University of Virginia (Charlottesville, VA)
	currently of minos at circuit (circuit o, in)	87	University of West Florida (Pensacola, FL)
62	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (Champaign, IL)	88	University of Wyoming (Laramie, WY)
63	University of Kentucky (Lexington, KY)	89	Utah State University (Logan, UT)
64	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Lafayette, LA)	90	Virginia Commonwealth University (Richmond, VA)
65	University of Louisville (Louisville, KY)	91	Wighte State University (Detroit, MI)
66	University of Maryland Baltimore County (Baltimore, MD)	93	Wright State University Main Campus (Dayton, OH)
67	University of Maryland College Park (College Park, MD)		
68	University of Massachusetts (Amherst, MA)		
69	University of Massachusetts Boston (Boston, MA)		
70	University of Massachusetts Lowell (Lowell, MA)		
71	University of Michigan-Ann Arbor (Ann Arbor, MI)		
72	University of Missouri - Kansas City (Kansas City, MO)		
73	University of Missouri - Saint Louis (Saint Louis, MO)		
74	University of Nevada-Las Vegas (Las Vegas, NV)		
75	University of Nevada, Reno (Reno, NV)		