

CHAPTER TWO

FACULTY AND STAFF

Other than our students, our most valuable resource in the COE during the 1991-2004 period was the valuable, talented, and much appreciated faculty and staff. The statistics in this section came from EMU's Office of Institutional Research and Information Management (during the preparation of this material) and its predecessor office during the 1991-2004 period. (It is interesting to note that the same statistic for the same time period sometimes differs between the report that was generated at/near the time of the statistic and the report furnished recently.)

Faculty

Quantitative totals. In 1991-1992, the ranked (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor) faculty of the COE consisted of 124.52 full-time equivalent (FTE) persons. In 1993-1994, this rose to 125.54 FTE, the all-time high (for the 13-year period).⁴⁸ With some "ups and downs," the number of ranked faculty generally declined after 1993-1994. By 2003-2004, the ranked faculty consisted of 115.44 FTE persons⁴⁹, a decline of about seven (7) per cent over the 13-year period.

In 1991-1992, the number of lecturers in the COE consisted of 38.92 FTE. The following year, 1992-1993, the number increased to 45.33, after which it declined for a number of years to a low of 33.5 in 1999-2000. However, by 2003-2004, it had climbed to 50.49 FTE, the high for the 13-year period. The number of FTE lecturers increased by about 30 per cent over the 13-year period.⁵⁰

The total COE FTE faculty—ranked faculty plus lecturers, calculated by simply adding together the numbers given in the previous two paragraphs—was 163.44 FTE in 1991-1992. The following year, 1992-1993, the total COE FTE faculty was 168.82, the largest number for the 13-year period. The range during this time was from a low of 148.6 FTE in 1998-1999 to a high of 168.82 in 1992-93, a difference of about 20 FTEF. The "ups and downs" between student credit hours generated and the number of FTE faculty available seem to have relatively little relationship to each other. In fact, for the 13-year period, the correlation between the total number of student semester hours generated through the COE and the size of the total COE faculty is a modest 0.50, despite the statements of the then Provost (and others) that student credit hour production was the major determiner of resource allocations.

⁴⁸ The numbers in this paragraph are from information furnished to me by central administration during the time I was serving as dean. However, a report furnished to me while preparing this material in 2018 by the EMU Office of Institutional Research and Information Management gives the number of ranked faculty for 1993-1994 as "121."

⁴⁹ See footnote 49 just above. In 2018, this number for 2003-2004 was reported as "111."

⁵⁰ The numbers in this paragraph are from data submitted to me during the 1991-2004 period.

Demographic Concerns. As I was reviewing the demographics of the COE ranked faculty during my first year as dean in 1991-1992, three areas emerged that seemed to need attention. One of these was that a rather large number and proportion of the ranked faculty held their highest degree from either the University of Michigan or Michigan State University. Both are, of course, very fine institutions. In fact, in my previous deanships, both in Southern institutions, new faculty members from both of those institutions were eagerly sought, with only limited success. Nevertheless, I felt that we needed considerably more geographic diversity among the COE ranked faculty. I don't have statistics to demonstrate the point, but I feel strongly that, if someone were to compare the geographic diversity of the COE faculty in 1991-1992 with that of 2003-2004, she/he would find the faculty considerably more geographically diverse, by any of several possible measures. I also feel that the programs of the COE were strengthened considerably by this additional geographical diversity.

The two other concerns were the gender ratio and the low number of ranked faculty members classified as "minority." I think we made considerable progress in both these areas, even if we didn't get to where we should have been, as will be illustrated below.

Gender. I start with the observation that about 75-80% of the COE student body, and of the professional education students that we were serving, was female and that the professional staffing of schools, around the country, was at about the same level. And, yes, I also kept in mind that the K-12 population of schools was closer to a 50-50 gender ratio.

However, in 1991-1992, the ranked faculty of the COE consisted of 58 (47%) women and 66 (53%) men. By 2003-2004, the ranked faculty of the COE consisted of 73 (66%) women and 38 (34%) men. Over that 13-year period, the number of women increased by 26% and the number of men decreased by 42%.

While we always strove to recommend for hiring (and were always supported) the best-qualified candidate for an opening, my view of the statistics in the previous paragraph is that during this time we were doing a reasonably good job in terms of applying the principles of affirmative action with respect to female applicants for our open positions. Having said that, I realize that the reaction of readers of this material will range from "not nearly enough" to "this shows a bias against male applicants." Draw your own conclusions, but rest assured that we always selected and recommended for hiring the "best qualified" person, irrespective of gender, from among those in our applicant pools.

Racial/Ethnic. My reading of the research literature persuades me that the best educational outcomes for K-12 students come when the racial/ethnic makeup of the faculty of a school (assuming well-qualified teachers) approximates the racial/ethnic make-up of the student body. Accordingly, I felt (and continue to feel) that COE's student body would be benefitted by exposure to a greater number of faculty members with differing cultural backgrounds.

In 1991-1992, we had 13 (10%) of our ranked faculty in the COE classified by the University as “minority.” That’s the lowest number for the 13-year period. This gradually increased to as many as 24 (21%) by 2002-2003, although we ended the 13-year period with 22 (20%). That’s a 69% increase over the 13-year period. Again, as with women faculty members, the reaction of readers will range from “not nearly enough” to “this shows a bias against non-minority applicants.” My view is that, again, we were doing a reasonably good job in terms of applying the principles of affirmative action with respect to minority applicants for our open positions. In general, we did a better job with minority faculty hires than most, if not all, of the other academic colleges at EMU.

Academic Rank. Most of our hires among the ranked faculty were at the assistant professor level. This often meant that when a full professor retired, she/he was “replaced” by an assistant professor. Many academic deans—myself included—feel that it is “best” when a department or college has approximately equal numbers of persons at each of the assistant, associate, and full professor levels.

When I became dean of the EMU COE in 1991, I found that 43 (35%) of our ranked faculty were at the full professor level, 45 (36%) were at the associate professor level, 33 (27%) were at the assistant professor level, and three (2%) were at the instructor level. Over time, with numerous promotions and with new hires generally coming in at the assistant professor level, we ended the 13-year period with 41 (37%) full professors, 23 (21%) associate professors, 45 (41%) assistant professors, and two (2%) at the instructor level. Notice the decrease among associate professors and the increase among assistant professors.

I can’t, by any means, say that this was a “better” distribution among the academic ranks at the end of the 13-year period than it was at the beginning of the time period, but the data reflect that during the latter part of the 13-year period, we had numerous retirements (and a few resignations) among the full professors and the senior (in service) associate professors—positions that were filled, in almost all instances, with persons at the assistant professor level. The influx of “new blood” was, in my opinion, a very good thing, with many talented people joining our ranks.

Tenure. In 1991-1992, 77% of the ranked faculty members were tenured. This rose, gradually, to a high of 88% in 1996-1997, as assistant professors of earlier times were promoted to associate professor. The percentage then generally declined for the remainder of the 13-year period to a low (for the 13-year period) of 63% in 2003-2004. This is largely, if not completely, attributable to separations (primarily retirements) of faculty members at the upper academic ranks and the hiring of assistant professors to replace them.

Salaries. At EMU, salary increases for ranked faculty were and are determined through negotiations between the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors and

the EMU central administration, and I had nothing to do with raises. From time to time, I did have some influence on the starting salary for a new hire. High faculty salaries, especially in Education, has never been one of EMU's strong points.

Nevertheless, average salaries in the COE did increase a bit, in current dollars, during the 1991-2004 period, despite the fact that there were numerous retirements among full professors and senior (in service) associate professors—all at relatively high salaries—with numerous replacements at the assistant professor level, at typically relatively low salaries. In 1991-1992, the average salary for ranked faculty in the COE was \$44,837 (\$81,819 in 2018 dollars). In 2003-2004, the average salary for ranked faculty in the COE was \$59,492 (\$80,952 in 2018 dollars). On the surface, this may appear to be “no progress,” but the substantial change in the “mix” of academic ranks must be taken into account in considering this matter.

Work-Load and “Productivity” Measures. In 1991-1992, we offered 2,151 sections of courses. This was the largest number of sections offered per year, during the 13-year period, until 2003-2004, when we offered 2,243 sections. The smallest number of sections offered per year was 1,862, which occurred in 1997-1998. This represents a four per cent increase over the 13-year period.

One of the University's major measures of “productivity” of faculty at the time—which, of course, took only “teaching” into account--was the ratio of “Fiscal-Year Equivalent Students” to “Full-Time Equivalent Faculty” (FYES/FTEF). For 1991-1992, this ratio was 15.72, which then declined each year (as enrollment fell) to 13.68, the lowest point in the 13-year period, in 1995-1996. As enrollments increased over the remainder of the 13-year period, the highest FYES/FTEF ratio was obtained in 2003-2004 with 17.51. This represents an 11% increase in the University's major measure of faculty “productivity” over the 13-year period.

Of course, to no avail whatsoever, we—I in particular--complained continuously (to each other and to the Provost) about the FYES/FTEF statistic, which was obviously considered in resource allocations. First, the faculty master contract with the University required faculty members to engage not only in teaching, but in scholarly and service activities. Yet the central administration measured only “teaching” (and, in particular, the number of student semester credit hours produced through teaching) in determining faculty “productivity.”

Second, an appreciable part of our programming in the COE was in supervised field experiences, especially student teaching, where the ratio of students to faculty had to be low, if for no reason other than for accreditation purposes. To be sure, certain courses, such as “individual study,” were eliminated from the calculation of the FYES/FTEF ratios, but it was never possible for me to obtain a complete list of what was and what wasn't included in the calculation of the FYES/FTEF ratios for the COE.

Third, another appreciable part of our programming was devoted to graduate courses, including, at the time, the institution's only doctoral program. Graduate courses almost always are—and should be—smaller in enrollments than many undergraduate courses. The supervision

of theses and, especially, of doctoral dissertations is very “labor intensive,” for which we in the COE, in my opinion, received insufficient recognition by central administration in terms of resource allocation.

Yet another measure of central administration’s “productivity” of the faculty was how much it cost (in faculty salaries) to produce a student credit hour. This figure for 1991-1992 was \$124, the lowest for the 13-year period. That’s \$226 in 2018 dollars. This figure rose steadily to a high of \$163 in 2002-2003 and then declined a bit to \$160 in 2003-2004. That’s \$222 in 2018 dollars. This represents a 29% increase in current dollars, but a two per cent decrease in constant dollars, over the 13-year period.

Length of Service. Records are not readily available to recognize a large number of COE faculty members who served for extended periods of time. However, the program for the 1994 COE Celebration of Excellence identified some 48 faculty members who, at that time, had served for “20 + years.” Another seven were named as having served 15-19 years. Many of these people continued to serve for years afterward. Longevity in service continued for many faculty members throughout the 1991-2004 period.

Staff

Demographics. The 1991 to 2004 demographic make-up of our support staff, primarily consisting of CS’s (clerical/secretarial) and PT’s (professional/technical) positions, is not available from any authoritative source. From memory, this consisted of both men and women, of both majority and minority racial/ethnic groups, and of a range of ages. My sense is that this was generally representative of the labor pool in the geographic area.

Quantitative. In 1991-92, we had 16 CS’s in the COE, the lowest number for the period. This rose to 20 in 1994-1995 and stayed at about that level through the remainder of the 13-year period, ending with 20 in 2003-2004. This represents an increase of 25% during the period of time.

In 1991-1992, we had nine PT’s in the COE, which fell to five in 1992-1993, the lowest number for the 13-year period. However, this rose to 18 by 2003-2004, the highest number for the time period, a 100% increase over the 13-year period.

We also had one to three FM’s (HPERD locker-room attendants) during each year of the 13-year period of time.

Length of Service. The 1994 program for the COE Celebration of Excellence identified two members of the COE staff who, at that time, had served for “20+ years.” Another three were

recognized for 11-19 years of service to the COE. Many of these went on for additional years of service. Notable among these were Nancy Dahl, Irene Anderson, and Claudia Galli.

Faculty Qualitative Accomplishments.

Representative accomplishments, except for grants awarded (which will be dealt with in a separate chapter), of the distinguished faculty of the COE, during 1991-1992 through 2003-2004, are presented in Appendix B. These include offices held in state, national and international professional organizations; professional recognitions received; major publications and presentations; and other substantial professional activities.

Compiling the extensive material in Appendix B was an emotional experience for me in several major respects. First, it brought back many pleasant memories of accomplishments, recognitions, and valuable activities. It was an opportunity, once again, to bask in the reflected glory of a hard-working, talented, dedicated group of people who were not only highly effective in their teaching roles, but who provided extraordinary scholarship and service of great benefit at the institutional, local, state, national, and international levels.

Second, compiling Appendix B also brought enormous feelings of regret. I now realize that I didn't get to know many of these highly productive people very well. I didn't have—or take—the time, in many instances, to discuss the research lines, the service activities, and the leadership roles that this wonderful group of people were engaged with. When faculty (and staff) successes were coming about on a daily or weekly basis, it was easy to see the “trees” and miss the “forest.” In compiling a 13-year summary, such as is found in Appendix B, the “forest” becomes tall and thick, made up of many, many healthy “trees.” Thanks go to all of the many dozens of people who, collectively, did much good for many individuals and organizations.

It would be extremely risky, and highly arbitrary, to single out a few faculty members who, in my opinion, provided extraordinary service to the College of Education, to EMU, and to the profession during the 1991-2004 period. I'm going to do it anyway! Four “stars”—the tallest “trees” in the “forest”—put, and kept, the EMU COE “on the map” for their teaching, scholarly activities, and service during that time. They were, in alphabetical order:

Charles M. “Chuck” Achilles. I had known Chuck since we were both young professors at Southern institutions. As a result, I was thrilled when we were able to persuade him to join our faculty in Leadership and Counseling. (A few bottles of very fine wine undoubtedly helped with that persuasion!) Chuck had not the slightest hesitation about “taking on” the “conventional wisdom” about some educational practice when he found data and evidence that showed that something else was better. While at EMU he continued and expanded a line of research and publication that demonstrated the positive effects of small class size and for which he received and deserved national and international acclaim. Perhaps just as important, he conducted this research and publication with students, former students, and colleagues from a wide variety of K-12 schools and universities, teaching research methodology, how to get published, and other

important topics along the way. A prominent educational administration organization named Chuck a “living legend,” which is certainly the way that I viewed him and his great work.

Leah Adams. I never think of Leah without recalling Kipling’s words “If you can . . . walk with kings, nor lose the common touch.” I am persuaded that Leah set out to mobilize the political and educational forces of the world to take much better care of our youngest and most vulnerable citizens—and she accomplished much in that regard. Her work involved meeting with political and educational leaders literally around the world to advocate for young children, just as she received joy from interacting with young children in poverty-stricken areas of Africa and Asia and in inner-cities everywhere. Leah taught, she spoke, she organized and led, she conducted research, she wrote and published—all in great quantity, even after she “retired,” and all with great quality and effectiveness. What more could be asked from a university professor?

Valerie Polakow. No one—anywhere—understood the horrible effects of poverty on mothers and children better than Valerie. Her books on the subject were received with high praise and recognition from many. Her chapters, articles, papers, and presentations, in addition to her classroom teaching, opened the eyes of many (although not nearly enough) to the root cause of many social problems, both in this country and elsewhere. Valerie’s thorough study of social systems in other countries, particularly Denmark, where the adverse effects of poverty on mothers and children were and are considerably less than they are here, was a highly admirable attempt to show us in this country that “we can—and must--do much better with an enormous social problem that is getting worse, instead of better.” Valerie was the perfect example of a faculty member who identified a major social issue affecting education and many other aspects of life and spent a career studying this issue, in the process greatly informing her teaching, her scholarship, and her service. The world, especially this country, would be a far better place if we would just heed what Valerie has taught us.

Dale Rice. Late in his career, Dale Rice “caught the bug” of academic service-learning and of the notion that EMU—especially COE—students and faculty members could bring their talents to the betterment of under-served populations in our community. He found a way to support these ideas through highly successful grantsmanship with various federal, state, local, and private sources. The academic service-learning concept spread rapidly among the EMU faculty, with the result that students from a wide range of disciplines were “out in the community”—helping in various ways while learning valuable information at the same time. AmeriCorps students were selected, trained, and put to work providing much needed social services in the community. Dale was so successful with these efforts on the EMU campus that he quickly became involved with (a) training teachers to implement academic service-learning projects at the K-12 level and (b) training faculty members at universities elsewhere in Michigan and in other states as to how to implement academic service-learning in their respective settings. Dale was frequently called on to write about—and, especially, to speak about—how he and his helpers had

accomplished so much in a relatively short period of time. Dale's fine work directly or indirectly had a beneficial effect on thousands of (mostly young) persons, many of whom were traditionally under-served. He made a great difference in the life of EMU and its COE.

Some Staff Recognitions.

Please recall that this is a "personal" history of the COE, 1991-2004. During that time, I had a lot more contact with some staff members than with others. Each department/unit within the college had staff members who were long-serving and/or who provided exemplary service. Their work was reported favorably to me, even as I had only infrequent contact with many of these great staff members, on whom the well-being of the COE depended so much.

Unfortunately, I have no data source to call on such as to comment on the fine work of many of these superb staff members except my own memory of the time and my personal experience. I apologize to those staff members who are not included in the comments below. I can only say to them that I hope that the COE administrators of the time and/or the faculty members and other staff members with whom you worked so effectively can and will find (or have found) a way to recognize in some permanent way your many contributions to the COE during the 1991-1992 through 2003-2004 period.

Secretaries. Ms. Merri McClure served as the secretary to the dean almost the entire time I was in office. To her and to others who served in this position a relatively short period of time at both the beginning and end of my time in office, I am deeply indebted. Countless small items—scheduling, travel arrangements, handling mail, copying, looking after the copy machine, typing, filing, finding items in files, handling visitors to the office, answering the telephone, and on and on—were handled perfectly. The amount of time Merri saved me from routine chores, such that I could attend to more substantive matters, is inestimable and was of great value to the COE. Further, Merri "knew everybody" on campus and could handle many matters involving something outside of the COE highly effectively in an informal/unofficial way. Thank you, Merri, very, very much.

Ms. Carole Zakrzewski was working half-time in the dean's "front office" when I arrived, she continued in that capacity through my time in office, and she was there in that capacity when I left. Carole's longevity in service to the University is to be highly commended and appreciated, as is her work in the dean's office during the time I was there. Her main official responsibilities were to handle the incoming telephone calls and visitors to the office, but that doesn't begin to describe the work she did. She assisted Merri McClure in whatever needed to be done and capably "filled in" when Merri or other dean's office secretaries were absent. Carole's handling of incoming telephone calls and visitors to the office was such that many things that people "needed to know" or tell/ask me could be handled by her, again saving me much time for more substantive matters. Thanks to you, too, Carole, very, very much.

Computer-related. Shay Isa came on board early in my administration. We had two computer labs in Boone Hall, both filled with antiquated, free-standing equipment. Shay “cannibalized” the non-working computers such as to keep the remaining computers functioning. More importantly, Shay did (and organized a number of others to do) a great deal of “extra-legal” work (that I wasn’t supposed to know about) to connect COE computers to each other and to the rest of the world by stringing telephone lines through Boone and other building ceilings and through heating tunnels. It was largely through Shay’s efforts that, early in the fall of 1993, from my office, I was, for the first time, able to send a message over the Internet to a colleague at another university and get a reply. Many, many thanks, Shay.

Cliff Elston replaced Shay Isa and was with the COE for a much longer time. Cliff’s specialty was in “connectivity,” but there was little related to computers and related hardware that Cliff couldn’t handle and handle well. As the number of computers in the COE grew rapidly, Cliff was responsible for setting them up, performing maintenance, and doing a lot of one-on-one instruction to faculty and staff members who were not previous computer users. Cliff’s technical advice as we were planning the Porter Building, such as to make the building very “computer friendly,” was invaluable. Cliff was very helpful to me, as he was to many other COE faculty and staff members, with information and advice about acquisition of electronic equipment and its maintenance thereafter. Much appreciation goes to Cliff for getting and keeping us (faculty, staff, students, administrators) connected, via the Internet, with the rest of the world!

The COE was the first collegiate unit at EMU to have a web site and, very soon afterwards, Val Hughes came “on board” to be the webmaster. Val edited copy and devised very effective layout and links, such that we soon had a large and complete web site. Both prospective and current students made much use of this website as an authoritative and current source of information for self-advicing. Val was also highly instrumental in constructing our “paper-less” NCATE and state reviews and in helping to construct effective PowerPoint presentations. Eventually, it was not necessary to have a full-time webmaster, and Val went on a part-time basis, with much of her work to be done “from home.” It was sometimes interesting to realize that Val was performing very quick “turnaround” on web site content change through such as a “dial-up” connection from a national park in a remote state, or from some small-town library “out west.” Much credit and appreciation goes to Val for producing and maintaining for EMU COE a website as good as (or, often, better than) that of any other institution!

Kirk Nagel only was assigned to the COE for relatively short periods of time, in each instance during periods of intense preparation for (and during and after) an NCATE/state accreditation/approval process. Nevertheless, our successes with these efforts wouldn’t—couldn’t—have happened without the tremendous time, effort, and talent that he gave to the activity. Kirk was, at the time, a brilliant, eccentric, hippy-type who was a great “jack-of-all-trades.” He assembled crews of (often non-conventional) workers to do keyboarding, copying, scanning, data

entry, and everything else necessary to assemble and present the documentation necessary for accreditation/approval processes. When NCATE issued a call for the first institution to do a “paperless” review and I (perhaps foolishly) agreed for EMU to be this pilot institution, Kirk very largely made this happen in terms of all the logistics involved. After the visiting team completed its work, much to my surprise, the NCATE office then asked for a paper copy of all our material. I refused to print all this out and submit it. NCATE authorities then admitted that their staff didn’t know how to open computer files such as to review our material. NCATE then paid for Kirk to come to Washington, D.C. to train the headquarters staff in how to use our—and others that quickly followed--“paperless” accreditation process. Thanks so much, Kirk, for what you did for our NCATE/state reviews in the 1990’s but for NCATE as a whole!