The Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations, more commonly known as the Budget Committee (BC), has three primary functions: (1) it makes recommendations on academic personnel matters (e.g., on hiring, promotions, and merit advancements); (2) it recommends FTE allocations for departments and other academic units; and (3) it reviews and recommends policies relevant to academic personnel matters and FTE allocations.

**Personnel Reviews**

During the 2011-12 academic year, the BC reviewed and transferred 977 cases to the Academic Personnel Office (APO). Of these cases, 808 concerned members of the Academic Senate; the remainder concerned faculty in the non-Senate ranks. The caseload total was larger than a year ago, when electronic-case processing (APBears) was introduced, but very similar to the caseload in 2009-10, when the BC processed a total of 975 cases.

**Personnel Caseload Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases remaining from 2010-11</th>
<th>Sent to APO in 2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases effective 7/1/11 (or earlier)</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases received in 2011-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases effective 7/1/11 (or earlier)</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases effective 7/1/12</td>
<td>676*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases forwarded to APO in 2011-12</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*Includes 153 cases received in 2011-12 and not sent to APO by 6/30/12)

The BC processed 104 Urgent cases and 127 requests for reconsideration of earlier decisions. A total of 96 Campus Ad Hoc Review Committees (CAHRCs) were appointed to consider new Tenured Appointments (21), Promotions to Tenure (37), and Promotions to full Professor (38). The campus Administration followed the BC’s recommendations in all but three instances.

**FTE Allocations**

In 2011-12 the campus Administration renewed its commitment to increased faculty hiring even in the face of a continuing budget crisis. Hiring for a total of 113.00 FTE positions was approved: 99.00 of these FTE comprised new authorizations, and another 14.00 FTE involved the extension or reactivation of previously authorized positions. Our review of departmental requests for FTE continued to reveal acute hiring needs across campus. In making our recommendations, we continued to give priority to those high-performing units in which recent separations and retirements had produced the largest percentage gaps between the unit’s current and target faculty sizes.
Policy and Process

Over the previous few years, our review of personnel cases revealed a pattern of under-compensation for some high-performing faculty. Unlike some of their colleagues, who have substantial decoupled salary increments (primarily as result of recent hiring or retention actions), these faculty had little to no decoupled increments. In response to this situation, the Administration, in consultation with the BC, agreed to a new three-year Targeted Decoupling Initiative (TDI) that is serving to bring the salaries of such deserving faculty closer to those of other high-performing colleagues. During AY 2011-12, the BC reviewed the TDI plans set forth by the various Deans and, in some instances, recommended and obtained modifications of them. The first tranche of faculty, with merit actions having a July 1, 2012 effective date, have received TDI-based salary increases. The remaining two tranches will receive such increases as part of their scheduled merit reviews this current academic year (2012-13) and next (2013-14). It should be noted that reviewing the TDI plans added considerably to the BC’s workload in fall 2011.

Because the 3% October 1, 2011 salary increase was reserved for meritorious faculty, there were approximately 30 cases that the BC was asked to review to determine their eligibility for that increase.

The BC also encountered a number of merit cases for faculty at Professor, Step V, who were not yet ready to advance past the Step-VI threshold and yet had compiled significant records of achievement during the period under review. To provide more “headroom” for rewarding the achievements of these faculty, we requested that the Vice Provost for the Faculty reinstate Professor, Step V.9, and we are pleased to report that the VP did indeed restore that step in fall 2011.

Working with the Administration, we put in place a checklist system for the appointment and renewal of endowed chairs starting this past academic year. It has been successful in terms of reducing administrative burden on reviewers at all levels of review.

The BC faced a major challenge during 2010-11 from the rollout of APBears, the campus’s new electronic case-routing system. In the second year of working with APBears, we are happy to report that, while some bugs remained, the performance of the system was vastly improved and did not cause the sorts of delay encountered in the first year. That noted, much of fall 2011 was taken up with clearing the backlog generated by those first-year “teething problems.”

As in past years, the failure of some Department Chairs and Deans to forward cases in a timely manner meant that many personnel actions, primarily merits, were resolved later than the faculty would like. Certainly, not all the cases with 7/1/11 effective dates that arrived at the BC after 7/1/11 are attributable to APBears—some are the fault of Chairs and Deans. The 174 known cases with 7/1/12 effective dates that arrived after 7/1/12 are almost entirely the fault of Chairs and Deans. Of the 153 cases with 7/1/12 effective dates received by the BC prior to 7/1/12, but not dealt with until after 7/1/12, all arrived late. It is worth stressing that 100% of the on-time cases received by the BC were dealt with by the BC on time.

Following up on earlier studies that examined the differential rates at which faculty in different disciplines appear to progress up the ladder, we initiated a study of how rates of normal and accelerated merit advances varied across the largest decanal units. Although the data readily available to us was too limited to reach definitive conclusions, they did suggest some systematic differences across those units. At our urging, the Administration is pursuing a more detailed study using a larger data set.

As in past years, the BC was asked to comment on numerous policy proposals, including some important proposed changes to the APM and to how the faculty salary scales should be set.
Because the resulting memoranda were previously delivered to the Academic Senate, we do not repeat their conclusions here. We do, however, note that our careful and thoughtful analysis of these proposals proved highly influential in determining both the Senate and the campus Administration’s response to these proposals.

**BC Staff**

The operation of the BC depends crucially on its experienced and dedicated staff. These three employees continually face the burdens of a large workload, the pressures of numerous urgent cases, and the expectation that their work will be practically perfect. As in years past, the staff performed magnificently and nearly flawlessly. We note two achievements spearheaded by the staff supervisor: first, a collaboration with the Academic Personnel Office in developing an online “Call” of campus personnel policies and procedures; and second, a continuing collaboration with the campus Budget Office to streamline procedures for the Committee’s review of FTE allocations. We end our report by expressing our deep sense of gratitude to the staff for their expertise and support. Although we understand the tightness of budgets, we strongly urge the Senate to consider ways of increasing the salaries of the BC staff, all of whom are underpaid relative to others on campus doing comparable jobs (for instance, at APO).
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