

COMMITTEE ON BUDGET AND INTERDEPARTMENTAL RELATIONS  
ANNUAL REPORT 2015-16  
December 2016

The Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations—popularly known as the Budget Committee, or simply the “BC”—is a committee of the Berkeley Division of the University of California Academic Senate. It is made up of nine senior-level faculty members, representing different academic disciplines and scholarly cultures.

The BC functions as a high-level academic-personnel committee for the Berkeley campus. It considers a wide range of issues relating to Berkeley faculty, taking into account recommendations on these issues from Chairs and Deans, and making recommendations of its own to the Berkeley Administration. There are three main clusters of issues that fall within the normal purview of the committee: (1) issues concerning the appointment, promotion, and advancement of individual members of the Berkeley faculty; (2) issues concerning the allocation of FTE positions to Berkeley departments and other academic units; (3) issues concerning general policies and practices that affect Berkeley faculty and the allocation of FTE positions. In addition, there are sometimes extraordinary academic-personnel-related questions that the BC is called on to address.

The following report describes the activities of the BC during the period from July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2016.

**1. Personnel Reviews**

*1.1 Overview*

Here is a summary of the cases processed in 2015-16:

Total Cases Received in 2014-15 and Carried Forward to 2015-16	62
Total Ladder Rank Cases Transferred in 2015-16	761
Total Non-Ladder Rank Cases Transferred in 2015-16	138
Total Cases Transferred in 2015-16	<b>899</b>
Total Cases Received in 2015-16 and Carried Forward to 2016-17	73

The total number of cases transferred to the Academic Personnel Office (APO) in 2015-16 was somewhat higher than in 2014-15 and 2013-14 (when the BC processed 808 and 843 cases, respectively). Of the 899 cases transferred, 839 were AP Bears cases, and 100 were cases marked urgent. During the course of the academic year, the BC responded to 83 requests for reconsideration of our recommendations, and it itself formally requested additional information in a total of 34 cases (the BC also frequently submits informal requests for additional

information directly to APO, but these are not counted). A total of 96 Campus Ad Hoc Review Committees (CAHRCs) were appointed to consider final appraisals (4), new tenure appointments (32), promotions to tenure (26), and promotions to full professor (34). These breakdowns are roughly consistent with the numbers from the previous academic year, with the exception of the number of AP Bears cases transferred to APO by the BC. Roughly 200 more cases of this type were transferred in 2015-16 than in 2014-15, a change that reflects, among other things, the expanded functionality of AP Bears (which now includes materials for appointment and retention cases, as well as ordinary promotions and merit reviews).

As indicated in the above table, the number of cases carried forward to 2016-17 was modestly higher than the number carried forward into 2015-16 (though it was lower than the number carried forward into the years before that). Taken together, the figures collected in the table suggest that there was an increase in the total number of new cases sent to the BC for review during the course of 2015-16.

As is customary, BC recommendations in 2015-16 were accepted by the Berkeley Administration in nearly all cases. There were numerous cases in which the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF) requested clarification or additional information from us about a recommendation we had made. In some of these cases, the VPF visited the committee to discuss an aspect of our recommendation in more detail, a process that typically led to agreement between the committee and the Administration. There were only three cases during the year in which the final recommendation of the BC was not accepted by the Administration, a number that is consistent with the figures from prior years.

### *1.2 Timeliness policies*

The BC continues to honor its commitment to transfer all on-time cases to APO expeditiously, so that decisions in these cases can be communicated to candidates by June 30<sup>th</sup>. In 2015-16, we received and transferred 125 cases of this type, which is roughly in line with the number of on-time cases received and transferred in the preceding year, though significantly lower than the number of on-time cases received and transferred in 2012-13 and 2013-14 (when the totals for cases of this type were 190 and 144, respectively).

At this point, delays in notifying faculty about the outcome of reviews are due exclusively to failures on the part of faculty, departments, and decanal units to meet the posted deadlines for submission of case materials. We note that many cases with July 1, 2015, effective dates reached the committee only after that date (indeed, we received cases of this kind throughout the fall semester of 2015, and even in the spring of 2016).

### *1.3 Process Innovations*

With the advent of AP Bears six years ago, the BC has been gradually transitioning away from reliance on hard copies of case materials, and developing procedures that allow committee members to collaborate electronically in their work on academic-personnel cases. During 2015-16, the BC was able to implement several measures that brought this process largely to completion, with results that have transformed our work.

One important innovation was the incorporation into AP Bears of a case-tracking system to replace the shadow system that BC staff had been relying on in earlier years. Committee members now indicate electronically when their work on a given case is completed, which prompts AP Bears to open the case automatically to the next reader in the queue.

A second innovation, made possible by the first, was to eliminate our reliance on hard copies of materials prepared by BC members in connection with academic-personnel cases. Under the new procedures, which were implemented in the fall of 2015, readers use the collaborative Box application to prepare and review the “minutes” that the committee produces in the vast majority of academic-personnel cases. The third important innovation was the development of functionality in AP Bears to generate agendas for BC meetings.

The consensus in the committee is that the results of these innovations are—on balance, if not in every single respect—overwhelmingly positive. The main difference that the new procedures have made is that BC members no longer need to come into the BC Offices in California Hall to draft and edit case minutes. This has greatly increased the efficiency with which the committee is able to work on academic-personnel cases. The automation of case tracking and agendas through AP Bears has also streamlined case preparation, freeing up BC staff to devote more of their efforts to providing substantive support to the committee’s work, where they have greater value to add. Finally, the use of the Box application and laptop computers in BC meetings has helped the committee to deliberate more effectively about individual cases.

## **2. Targeted Decoupling Initiative**

The UC Office of the President (UCOP) allocated 3% of the total faculty salary pool for salary increases effective July 1, 2015. Half of this total was applied in across-the-board salary increases for individual faculty members, but campuses had discretion about how the other half would be distributed. This amounted to a total of about three million dollars, to be allocated retroactively to July 1, 2015, and campuses were given until the end of the calendar year to decide how the pool would be distributed.

The Berkeley campus decided to use these funds for a one-year Targeted Decoupling Initiative (TDI), with the primary objective of addressing inequities that had been identified in the campus’s 2015 Faculty Salary Equity Study. The BC was extensively involved in formulating guidelines for this exceptional TDI program and in reviewing the decanal proposals for TDI awards. The proposals were submitted in early October 2015, and the committee had about two months to review them and to formulate final recommendations, working in collaboration with the VPF and the Associate Vice Provost for the Faculty (AVPF).

The 2015 TDI program had a worthy objective, and it appears to have made a significant contribution to ameliorating the salary inequities that were uncovered in the 2015 Faculty Salary Equity Study. (For details, see the 2016 Update to the Faculty Salary Equity Study, which is available on the website of the VPF.) There is a new TDI program for 2016, involving a total salary pool nearly as large as that available in 2015. The guidelines for this new program were developed in the spring of 2016 by the BC, the VPF, and the AVPF, taking into account experiences with the 2015 TDI program; we hope that this new program will make further

progress toward correcting salary inequities of various kinds that continue to affect members of the Berkeley faculty.

While applauding the objectives of the 2015 TDI program, however, we feel compelled to note that it was implemented in a way that placed significant extra burdens on the BC members and staff. On top of our regular workload, we had to review a large number of recommendations for TDI awards, in a process that was decoupled from regular merit and promotion reviews. Many hours were spent by BC members and staff on this process, and the committee scheduled two extraordinary three-hour meetings to review preliminary and final decisions. It is the strong consensus of BC members and staff that it would be preferable for UCOP to make multi-year commitments to the campuses concerning the pools available for salary increases in those years, so that a robust TDI program could be designed and implemented in a more thoughtful and deliberative process, one that is better coordinated with the ordinary schedule of faculty reviews.

### **3. FTE Allocations and Process**

#### *3.1 Overview*

In 2015-16, the Berkeley Administration initially authorized a total of 45.00 new positions for target year (TY) 2017-18. This is the same number of new positions that had been authorized for the preceding target year, and a significant reduction from the number of positions authorized for TY 2014-15 and TY 2015-16.

It is natural to speculate that the reduced number of new FTE authorizations in the past two years is a reflection of the budgetary pressures that the campus has been dealing with during the same period. As far as the BC can tell, however, this is not the case. The Administration has upheld its commitment to maintain the size of the ladder-rank faculty on campus, and the number of new positions that was authorized for TY 2017-18 is based in large part on estimates of faculty separations that will be taking place in the immediate future (which in turn are arrived at through extensive consultation with the BC).

#### *3.2 Process Innovations*

In the spring of 2015, a joint BC/Administration committee developed a new call letter to solicit FTE requests from departments and deans for TY 2017-18, as well as a new template for writing up such requests for review by the BC and the Administration. The materials identified five campus values that are especially important in the FTE allocation process and encouraged units to address these values in justifying their FTE requests. The BC found that these new FTE call materials improved the quality of submissions in the TY 2017-18 FTE cycle.

The BC also continued its efforts to improve its internal procedures for assessing FTE requests. In particular, we developed a new template for the “narratives” that committee members use to analyze FTE requests. The intent was to focus the process more tightly on assessment of the requesting unit and of their specific request for an FTE position, emphasizing as criteria the campus values articulated in the FTE call letter. The sense of the committee was that these new templates proved effective as guidelines in the preparation of FTE recommendations.

### *3.3 FTE Recommendations*

In its deliberations about FTE allocations for TY 2017-18, the BC proceeded in two stages. In the first stage, FTE requests from departments within a decanal unit (or within a cluster of similar decanal units, in cases where the units are comparatively small) were compared against each other and ranked in regard to strength. This resulted in preliminary recommendations for some of the 45 positions that were initially authorized for TY 2017-18. In the second stage, the FTE requests in each decanal unit or cluster were assessed in comparison to the requests from other decanal units or clusters, resulting in recommendations for the remainder of the 45 FTE positions initially authorized by the Administration (as well as some adjustments in the preliminary recommendations that resulted from the analysis of the first stage).

This process enables the BC to strike a reasonable balance between the need to maintain Berkeley's comprehensive academic strength across a wide range of very different disciplines, and the importance of responding to new academic challenges and opportunities as they arise. The two-stage procedure is consistent with the general approach taken by the committee to FTE allocation in recent years; the main difference in 2015-16 was that a larger reserve of positions from the initial pool of 45 was set aside for the second stage in the process, which helped to ensure that all FTE allocations were well justified by reference to the academic values to which such decisions are properly responsive.

For TY 2017-18, the total number of new FTE that were finally authorized was somewhat higher than the 45 positions that the Administration initially authorized. Consistent with practice in recent years, the additional positions included FTE that were made available by the Administration to support strategic initiatives and to hire the academic partners of faculty whom the campus was seeking to recruit or to retain.

As in past years, the BC entertained requests for off-cycle FTE authorizations from units that discerned unexpected opportunities to add faculty in areas of need. The number of off-cycle FTE requests was significantly higher in 2015-16 than in recent years; this may reflect increased anxiety on the part of units about the future prospects for faculty recruitment in an environment of budgetary constraint. (We note, however, that the number of off-cycle FTE requests in 2015-16, though higher than in the preceding two years, was roughly the same as in 2012-13, a year in which there was a lower level of general concern about the campus budget situation.) The committee, though concerned about the apparent increase in reliance on off-cycle requests, was nevertheless able to approve most of those that reached us, judging them to be effectively justified in terms of central campus values and goals.

Off-cycle FTE authorizations, which were approved in the spring semester as the BC was finalizing its FTE recommendations for TY 2017-18, were counted against the FTE searches for that year that the committee was prepared to authorize, so they did not increase the total number of new positions that was authorized on an ongoing basis.

#### **4. Academic Personnel Policies**

The BC is customarily called on to provide advice about matters of policy pertaining to academic personnel on the Berkeley campus, and 2015-16 was no exception. We prepared written memoranda for the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate about a series of policy issues that arose throughout the academic year. The most important of these issues was perhaps the report of the University of California Retirement Options Task Force, which provided the basis for the new tier of retirement benefits that go into effect for faculty hired after July 1, 2016. We offered extensive comments on these proposals, which may be expected to have a serious effect on faculty welfare, recruitment, and retention for years to come. Other matters on which we provided advice to the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate included various proposals for modifications to the Academic Personnel Manual; recommendations pertaining to the administration and analysis of student course evaluations; revised UC guidelines for granting faculty search waivers; and various proposals concerning modifications in academic-degree programs on the Berkeley campus.

We also worked closely with the VPF and APO on a range of additional issues pertaining to academic personnel on the Berkeley campus. These included guidelines for joint appointments to the faculty at Berkeley and the University of California, San Francisco; expectations regarding outside letters in cases involving the appointment and promotion of faculty in the Adjunct series; guidelines concerning the preparation of departmental ad hoc committee reports; proposed modifications to the Haas School Faculty Excellence Program; and modifications to campus policies concerning advancement beyond Professor, Step IX, and concerning advancement at the Above Scale level. (The latter modifications are now reflected in the online Berkeley Manual for Academic Personnel [BMAP].)

In addition, the BC continued to negotiate with the VPF about proposed written guidelines relating to the crediting of not-yet-published books and articles; we are hopeful that new guidelines regarding these matters can be finalized and incorporated into BMAP in the immediate future.

#### **5. Academic Realignment**

During 2015-16, the BC was extensively involved in discussions about possibilities for academic realignment on the Berkeley campus. The BC Chair served on a joint Senate–Administration Working Group on Academic Realignment, consulting frequently with the committee members about various proposals that were under consideration by the Working Group. In addition, an extraordinary three-hour meeting was scheduled in the fall term for detailed discussion of issues pertaining to academic realignment; the results of this discussion were shared with the members of the Working Group, and they provided important input into the Working Group’s ongoing deliberations. The BC was thus an important collaborator in a process that was widely perceived to have bypassed the input of Senate faculty, and that ultimately failed, for this among other reasons, to achieve concrete results.

#### **6. BC Membership**

Following two years of constant upheaval and churn, the committee was fortunate in 2015-16 that all nine members who began the year were able to continue their work through the end of the academic year. The stability we experienced no doubt contributed to our ability to maintain very

high productivity while also dealing with numerous additional tasks and challenges (most notably the 2015 TDI program).

The committee has long been concerned to increase the diversity of its membership. A particular obstacle to this goal, however, was the traditional timing of the process of identifying potential new members and extending invitations to them. In recent years, it was not until January or February that the next Chair of the BC was determined by the Senate Committee on Committees (COMS), which meant that invitations could not be extended to new prospective committee members until later in the spring semester. For many distinguished senior-level faculty members (and especially for women and members of underrepresented groups at this level, who face severe demands on their time and efforts), this was far too late in the academic year to enable them to take on a three-year commitment as onerous as joining the BC.

In 2015-16, the Chair of the BC worked very closely with the Chair of COMS to push the whole process forward into the earlier part of the academic year. The results speak for themselves, as COMS was able to obtain firm commitments from three new members by the beginning of the spring semester, all of whom are women; the 2016-17 committee will be the first in history in with a female majority. We very much hope that COMS will continue to follow this accelerated schedule for selecting new BC members in future years.

## **7. BC Offices**

The shift this year to electronic processing of most academic-personnel cases greatly reduced the need for shelving and furniture in the BC conference room to store hard copies of case materials. This presented the committee with the opportunity to reconfigure the main space that members use for meetings and preparatory work. At the same time, the Chair of the committee fortuitously learned that the University Librarian would be replacing a handsome wooden conference table that had been in the Librarian's office for many years.

Taking advantage of this opportunity, arrangements were made to remove and relocate some of the existing furniture, and to replace the old conference table with the wooden one that had been in use at the library (a table apparently designed by Julia Morgan, and used by Bernard Moses when serving as a member of the Philippine Commission). The changes were undertaken in the middle of the spring semester, and the committee has been very pleased with them. They lend our conference room a more spacious feel, and provide a much more attractive collaborative space for our meetings.

## **8. BC Staff**

The BC is heavily dependent on the many contributions of its supremely dedicated, effective, and good-humored staff. BC staff see to it that committee members stay on top of their workload, provide invaluable advice and analysis about crucial matters of academic-personnel policy and precedent, and meticulously review and correct all documents that leave the BC offices. They function as the committee's institutional memory, ensuring continuity in the committee's activities from year to year. Without them it would be impossible for us to cope with the massive volume of cases that we are called on to review.

The BC staff faced some unusual challenges in 2015-16. One of the three staff members, who had been hired and trained only in the preceding academic year, was on maternity leave for the first half of the spring semester of 2016, and she resigned to take a new position soon after

returning to work. As a result, the BC was seriously understaffed throughout the spring semester—the busiest part of the academic year for the committee—and much time had to be spent identifying and training a temporary replacement and conducting a search for a permanent incumbent in the vacant position.

It is a tribute to the professionalism of the BC staff that we were able to maintain a very high level of productivity and efficiency during 2015-16, and to plan and implement several significant process innovations, despite these severe challenges. We are deeply grateful to our staff for their commitment to our common mission and for the justified pride they take in the important work that they do for us.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Jay Wallace, Chair, 2015-16  
Patricia Berger  
Daniel Farber  
Martin Jay  
John Kuriyan  
Michael Lucey  
Roya Maboudian  
Stuart Russell  
Chris Shannon