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 and practices relevant to academic-personnel matters and FTE allocations.

**Personnel Reviews**

During the 2012-13 academic year, the BC reviewed and transferred 993 cases to the Academic Personnel Office (APO). Of these cases, 852 concerned members of the Academic Senate; the remainder concerned faculty in the non-Senate ranks. The caseload was slightly larger than the previous year, when the BC processed a total of 977 cases.

**Caseload Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases remaining from 2011-12</th>
<th>Sent to APO in 2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases effective 7/1/11 (or earlier)</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases received in 2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases effective 7/1/12 (or earlier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases effective 7/1/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total cases forwarded to APO in 2012-13 993

(NOTE: An additional 99 cases received in 2012-13 were carried forward to 2013-14)

The BC forwarded 158 urgent cases and 102 requests for reconsideration of earlier decisions. We considered a total of 565 APBears cases. We returned 40 cases for further information. The case carryover figure declined from 153 cases in 2011-12 to 99 cases in 2012-13. A total of 95 Campus Ad Hoc Review Committees (CAHRCs) were appointed to consider new tenured appointments (31), promotions to tenure (38), and promotions to full Professor (26). While the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF) debated with us often regarding step increases in merit cases, the campus Administration followed the BC’s recommendations on promotion in all but one instance.
**FTE Allocations and Process**

In 2012-13 the campus Administration authorized a total of 70.00 new and continuing FTE positions. Our review of departmental requests for FTE continued to reveal acute hiring needs across campus. In making our recommendations, we gave priority to those high-performing units in which recent separations and retirements had produced large percentage gaps between the unit’s current and target faculty sizes. We also considered the arguments offered by Deans and Chairs about the expansion of particular fields and growing workloads.

The BC Chair worked with the VPF, the Campus Budget Office, and the BC staff to make our FTE assessment more transparent and meaningful. Workload data and projected gaps to FTE target were distributed with the initial campus FTE call so that Chairs and Deans could use these data in preparing their requests. Because all levels were working with the same numerical data, BC members were encouraged to offer the Administration a more qualitative reflection on departmental strengths and challenges. BC members consulted the most recent Academic Program Review or strategic plan for the unit as part of their assessment of departmental need. Our FTE assessments identified some intellectual and curricular synergies and redundancies across departments, divisions, colleges, and schools; we offered an informal account of these connections as part of the FTE process. This year we received an unusually high number of requests for so-called “two-fer” appointments attached to a single search in the current cycle; many of these were received while we were determining new search authorizations for the next cycle. We communicated to the campus Administration our wish for a clearer system that would allow the campus to respond to unexpected opportunities while also ensuring fair treatment across units in the allocation of new FTEs.

**Process Overview**

The APBears electronic case-routing system is now in its third year, and the BC used it to access the majority of case materials associated with our academic-personnel reviews; we also helped to devise, test, and implement new case-tracking and reporting capabilities. In the summer of 2012, we completed a year-long process of digitizing our decades-old archive of hard-copy case materials. Everything is now filed electronically.

We continued the implementation of the three-year Targeted Decoupling Initiative (TDI), a program that allocates a pool of funds to Deans so that they can recommend increases in decoupling for high-performing faculty. This program attempts to minimize the salary gap between high-performing faculty who have received retention salary increases and loyal, high-performing faculty who have not.

We also provided extensive feedback on the special salary guidelines associated with the Law School’s Competitive Compensation Initiative and the Haas School of Business’s Faculty Excellence Program, and we began to apply these guidelines uniformly to relevant academic-personnel reviews.

We continued the implementation of the campus “headroom” increment program. This program allows a salary increase in decoupling for assistant professors at high steps who are not yet
undergoing Final Appraisal. It also allows colleagues promoted within the Professor series to receive an increase in decoupling in lieu of increases in step that would place them close to a threshold at their next review.

**Timeliness Policies**

We responded to campus concerns about delays in case turnaround by making our process as transparent as possible. We made data available on case status, including the number of cases submitted on time. Last year 127 cases were received on time; this year the BC received and forwarded 190 on-time cases. In addition, the number of cases submitted after the effective date declined this year (from 174 to 135). We worked with the VPF to develop new policies regarding the timely submission of academic-personnel case materials, including the creation of a uniform deadline for faculty to submit case materials, and the implementation of an APBears reporting system that shows case status at each level of review.

In order to minimize BC caseload and prioritize the review of ladder-rank faculty, we implemented a pilot program that delegates to the decanal level all normal merit reviews for Adjunct Professors. This year the number of non-ladder merit cases we reviewed dropped from 93 to 49.

**Academic-Personnel Policies**

After a lengthy process of writing, reflection, and campus comment, the BC crafted and campus adopted a new policy for the “Evaluation of Creative Accomplishment,” which will be used in academic-personnel assessments. The guidelines expand upon existing APM language to ensure that the venues, commissions, awards, and reception of “creative activity” are evaluated rigorously, with an awareness of the professional norms of specific arts disciplines.

We worked with the VPF to revise and clarify the policy on Career Equity Reviews, factoring in the effects of the new “headroom” increment policy.

Responding to concerns raised by Associate Vice Provost Angelica Stacy and others about the uneven advancement of scholars in book-based disciplines, we worked with the VPF to craft a survey for Deans, Chairs, and faculty in book-based fields to provide feedback on the importance of the monograph in relationship to other forms of publication.

As in past years, the BC was asked to comment on numerous policy proposals, including some important proposed changes to the APM. Because the resulting memoranda were previously delivered to the Academic Senate, we do not repeat their conclusions here. We do note that our analyses of these proposals helped to influence both the Senate’s and the campus Administration’s response to several important issues.

**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. We take this opportunity to recall that the BC used to have a staff of four, which was reduced to three during the staff reduction program of 2010. The BC manager effectively revised processes and created new systems to respond to the challenges presented by the APBears online personnel review process, and the staff adapted to even heavier workloads. In addition, all concerned continued their excellent and detailed work on the changing FTE review process. We end our report by expressing our deep sense of gratitude to the staff for their expertise and support. We are particularly grateful to Andrea Green Rush for instituting an equity review for all Senate staff this year. We note that BC staff salaries are still far below those of their Academic Personnel Office colleagues, and we urge the Senate to consider ways to address this situation.
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