

COMMITTEE ON BUDGET AND INTERDEPARTMENTAL RELATIONS
ANNUAL REPORT 2005-06
November 20, 2006

The Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations (“The Budget Committee”) is a standing committee of the Academic Senate. The Committee makes recommendations to the campus on the appointments and advancements of ladder-rank faculty; it also reviews academic personnel actions for those faculty members with titles in the Agronomist, Adjunct Professor, Lecturer, and Professional Research series as well as other series. In addition, the Committee reviews requests for new or revised FTE; comments on reviews of departments, deans, and other administrators; and participates in task forces and analysis and review of campus and system-wide policies and practices as requested.

Committee Membership

Appointment of Budget Committee members is initiated by the Committee on Committees and endorsed by the Divisional Council. Because of the heavy workload entailed in service on the Committee, it has become increasingly difficult to achieve discipline, gender, and ethnic balance. There has been limited participation by ethnic minorities, and appointment of women has shown a disappointing decline over the last several years. The Budget Committee had three women members in 2003-04, two in 2004-05, and only one in 2005-06. The 2004-05 report of this Committee pointed to the disproportionate workload borne by women and ethnic minorities as reasons for their reluctance to serve. We wish to emphasize that the rewards for service on the Budget Committee are manifold. The preeminence of the Berkeley campus results in large part from shared governance: via delegation by the Academic Senate the Budget Committee represents the campus faculty in reviewing faculty appointments and advancements. In addition to playing a key role in determining the future direction of this great university, service on the Budget Committee has other rewards, in particular, the day-to-day interaction with colleagues who share the goal of maintaining Berkeley as one of the leading universities in the world. We urge those of you who are invited to serve on the Committee to accept the challenge. You will not be disappointed.

The Role of the Budget Committee and the Concept of Shared Governance

Unlike comparable committees at sister campuses, the Budget Committee at Berkeley plays a more thorough role in faculty appointments and reviews, and in making recommendations for allocation of new FTE. The statistics appended to this report show that of the 1,038 cases reviewed by the Committee in 2005-06, the Administration accepted more than 99% of its recommendations. In all but eight cases, four concerning differences in rank and four differences in salary, the Administration found itself in agreement with the Committee. It is nonetheless noteworthy that the number of cases where the campus chose not to accept the Committee’s recommendations rose from five in 2004-05 to eight in 2005-06. There was a disturbing trend in several cases where the Administration acted on appointments without prior consultation with the Budget Committee. These actions are thankfully small in number, but they run counter to the concept of shared governance. We firmly believe that it is crucial that the extent of shared governance unique to the Berkeley campus be maintained.

Faculty Retention

Retaining the best and brightest faculty at Berkeley continues to be a challenge, and non-competitive salaries are at the core of most faculty retention cases. The UC salary scale is a poor instrument, as few faculty are paid on the scale. The UC scale lags behind the salaries paid at peer institutions by about 20% across the board, but in some disciplines, such as Economics, Business Administration, and Law, the gap is wider. It is clearly not in the institution's interest to use an outmoded salary scale, and it is essential that the campus move to a system of remuneration that matches market value. To retain our best faculty the campus should, within reason, be prepared to match outside offers from peer institutions and make adjustments in either rank/step or salary or both.

The Budget Committee contributed to the work of two task forces initiated by the office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs & Faculty Welfare (VPAA&FW) that focused on issues relating to faculty salaries and retention issues. The Faculty Compensation Task Force, established in 2004, issued its final report in 2006, and culminated its review with a recommendation that faculty salaries be adjusted. The Task Force recommended a \$6,000 promotion increment, which is now awarded to all faculty at the time of their promotions to tenure, to Associate Professors under certain parameters, and to all Associate Professors and full Professors up to and including Step V upon appointment. The second task force, Faculty Retention Task Force, developed a set of guidelines for addressing outside offers and made recommendations to extend the Targeted Decoupling Initiative. These guidelines are attached to this report. In addition to reemphasizing the principle that Berkeley should match reasonable competing offers from peer institutions, the guidelines set out criteria that should be considered when retention cases are forwarded to the Budget Committee.

The Budget Committee believes that the campus should continue to act preemptively to dissuade faculty from considering outside offers. One of the most valuable tools at the disposal of Deans and Chairs over the last three years has been the Targeted Decoupling Initiative (TDI). This limited program, which was due to expire at the end of academic year 2005-06, allowed Deans to identify faculty who were retention risks. After Budget Committee review and Administrative approval, the salaries of these at-risk faculty were supplemented. It is widely believed that the TDI program was a valuable tool in the retention arsenal. The Budget Committee strongly supported the extension of the TDI program and was pleased to learn that the program will continue.

Despite our enthusiasm for initiatives to increase faculty salaries and act preemptively on retention, these efforts can only be regarded as stop-gap measures. We believe that there is a pressing need to produce a salary scale for UC Berkeley faculty members that reflects their actual value in the academic market place. The data that the Administration gathers, as well as other information that is available to the Budget Committee, show that Berkeley faculty salaries do not match those at peer institutions. Until these salary discrepancies are rectified, the campus will constantly face rear-guard retention battles. The worst-case scenario is that if salary discrepancies persist, faculty morale will suffer and retention cases will increasingly occupy the time of the Budget Committee.

Case Preparation

As the appended statistical data reflect, the Budget Committee devotes a large part of its efforts to the analysis of personnel cases. Of the 1,038 cases reviewed in 2005-06, we estimate that 30% required external letters of recommendation. Although the office of the VPAA&FW has issued guidelines on the use of external letters, many units do not adhere to this advice. Cases are often accompanied by either an excess of letters from outside referees, or insufficient letters from respondents at peer institutions. For example, in a recent case for promotion to tenure, 23 letters were submitted, certainly overkill. On the other hand a small number of letters from respondents who are close colleagues or collaborators or who are relatively junior in rank do not support a strong case for advancement. We urge units to consult the guidelines on outside letters from the VPAA&FW's office as they prepare cases for promotion.

Teaching: Quality and Quantity

Despite the widely held view that teaching counts less than research for faculty advancement at Berkeley, the Budget Committee places heavy emphasis on the quality of teaching by Berkeley faculty. The Budget Committee often does not recommend advancement if the quality or amount of teaching for the particular discipline does not meet campus standards. The Budget Committee relies on various measures of classroom performance, among them peer-review and student evaluations. We are increasingly disturbed by the negative reactions, often harshly so, that students display toward PowerPoint and similar visual presentation formats. We urge units to work closely with their faculty to assemble a comprehensive analysis of their teaching. The scant information on faculty teaching provided by some units does not serve candidates well.

The amount of classroom teaching by individual faculty varies widely across the campus and these discrepancies are mostly discipline-based. In general, faculty in the experimental sciences do less classroom teaching than those in the humanities and social sciences. This difference can be explained in part by the nature of the disciplines: experimentalists teach and mentor in the laboratory where their efforts are often not recorded or evaluated as formal course work. We are nonetheless disturbed by the apparent inconsistencies in teaching loads at Berkeley and encourage the campus to analyze teaching efforts so that teaching loads are equitably distributed across campus.

There can be no mistaking the importance to the Budget Committee of gathering sound information on teaching. One of the key roles of the Committee is to provide advice to the Administration on FTE allocations. During 2005-06 the Committee was asked to recommend the allocation of 65 FTE from a manifold number of requests submitted by departments and the Deans of the various Colleges and Schools. Although teaching workload is not the only criterion used by the Budget Committee in recommending allocation of FTE, as resources become increasingly limited, judicious FTE allocation become increasingly critical and must be based in large part on programmatic needs.

Criteria for Advancement to Professor, Step VI and to Professor, Above Scale.

In making its recommendations for advancements, the Budget Committee follows the criteria outlined in the Academic Personnel Manual, a system-wide document which

includes the criteria for advancement to Professor, Step VI and to Professor, Above Scale. These criteria have served the Berkeley campus well, but there have been attempts during the past several years to weaken the language in the APM, especially as it affects advancement to Step VI. Neither we nor the system-wide University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) supported the weakening of the language in the APM. Indeed, we support the proposal put forward by UCAP to strengthen the criteria for advancement to Step VI by emphasizing "...sustained excellence in scholarship or creative achievement, University teaching, and service. In addition great academic distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, will be required in at least one of these three categories." The proposed revisions to the APM were not supported by the Academic Council, consequently the criteria for advancement to Professor, Step VI and to Professor, Above Scale have been redistributed for reconsideration by Divisional Councils and Academic Senate committees. We continue to support the application of stringent criteria for advancement to the upper levels of the professoriate.

Criteria for Adjunct Professor Appointments

The APM also spells out criteria for the appointment of Adjunct Professor series faculty, and it makes clear that appointees holding these titles engage in teaching, research, and service. There can be reasonable variations in the ratio of teaching and research, with some appointees emphasizing research and others teaching. As a general rule, Adjunct Professor appointees are expected to teach at least one course per year. Over the last several years the Budget Committee has noted a distinct loosening of these criteria by several academic units. We wish to emphasize that the Adjunct Professor series title is not intended as an honorary title, or awarded to individuals based on past accomplishments. Nor is the title intended for short, ad hoc appointments. We wish to emphasize that candidates in the Adjunct Professor series will be evaluated using the criteria applied to ladder-rank faculty at Berkeley. A copy of the memorandum that clarifies our interpretation of these criteria is appended to this report.

Plagiarism and Self Plagiarism

Most of us in the academic community are familiar with plagiarism, but only recently has the problem of self-plagiarism come to the attention of the Budget Committee. Whereas plagiarism is clearly unethical, self-plagiarism, the re-use of one's own work, may also be unethical. We attach a copy of a memorandum that we sent to the VPAA&FW that provides references to recent articles discussing self-plagiarism in the academic community and helps authors avoid the pitfalls of reuse. We emphasize that authors must clearly indicate when their own work is being re-used by employing citations, footnotes, and the like. Failure to take these steps may be considered an ethical violation barely distinguishable from plagiarism. We urge department chairs and senior colleagues to mentor graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, and junior faculty on the correct use of their own research material.

Budget Committee Support

The Budget Committee cannot perform its work without the help of a hard working and dedicated staff guided by Office Manager Jean Fitz. In addition to Ms. Fitz, Leori Gill, Jan Green, and Aimee Larsen perform their duties as support staff exceptionally well.

Whereas faculty members are transient, the staff are the glue, and they provide the institutional memory that allows the Budget Committee to function efficiently.

Respectfully submitted,

The 2005-2006 Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations

Russell Jones, Chair 2005-06 (Plant and Microbial Biology)

Roger Falcone (Physics)

Timothy Hampton (French, Comparative Literature)

James Hunt (Civil and Environmental Engineering)

Patrick Kirch (Anthropology)

Stephen Palmer (Psychology, Cognitive Science)

Carl Shapiro (Business, Economics)

Nilabh Shastri (MCB)

Linda Williams (Film Studies and Rhetoric)

BUDGET COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT:

2005-06 STATISTICS

TABLES IA & IB: SUMMARY OF LADDER-RANK CASES

IA: Non-Tenured Cases

Case Type	No. of Cases in 2005- 06
Appointments	68
Regularizations	1
Merit Increases / Reappointments	65
Salary Increases	5
Mid-Career Appraisals	21
Promotions	39
Final Appraisals / Terminal Appraisals	10
Change Department; Percent; Status	5
Endowed Chairs	2
TOTAL	216

BUDGET COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT:

2005-06 STATISTICS

IB: Tenured Cases

Case Type	No. of Cases in 2005-06
Appointments	44
Merit Increases	359
Salary Increases	41
Promotions	42
Change Department; Percent; Status	29
Endowed Chair	44
Post-Retirement Appointments / Reappointments	32
TOTAL	591

TOTAL LADDER RANK CASES IN 2005-06:	807
--	------------

BUDGET COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT:

2005-06 STATISTICS

TABLE II: SUMMARY OF NONLADDER-RANK CASES

Case Type	No. of Cases in 2005-06
Appointments	79
Merit Increases / Reappointments	107
Salary Increases	3
Excellence Reviews/Continuing Appointments	24
TOTAL	231

TABLE III: MISCELLANEOUS

Case Type	No. of Cases in 2005-06
Urgent Cases	200
Reconsiderations	151
Administrative Overrules	8

TOTAL CASES IN 2005-06:	1,038
--------------------------------	--------------