The Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations, 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. This report offers an overview of our activities along each of these dimensions.

**Personnel Reviews**

During academic year 2013-14, we reviewed and transferred 843 cases to the Academic Personnel Office (APO). Of these cases, 758 concerned personnel actions for members of the Academic Senate; the remainder concerned personnel actions for faculty in non-Senate series.

The table below offers a synopsis of the cases processed in and carried forward from academic year 2013-14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Cases Received in 2012-13 Carried Forward to 2013-14</th>
<th>99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Ladder Rank Cases Transferred in 2013-14</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Ladder Rank Cases Transferred in 2013-14</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cases Transferred in 2013-14</strong></td>
<td><strong>843</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases Received in 2013-14 Carried Forward to 2014-15</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We forwarded 138 urgent cases and 117 requests for reconsideration of earlier decisions, considered a total of 517 APBears cases, and returned cases for further information 120 times. While the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF) debated with us often regarding step increases in several merit cases, the campus Administration followed our recommendations on promotion in nearly every instance.

On first glance, the caseload figures for academic year 2013-14 (see above) appear lower than the previous year, when the BC reported processing a total of 993 cases. Due to a difference in counting methodology introduced this year, however, the year-over-year comparison is misleading: past practices have likely biased previous years’ numbers upwards relative to those reported above. Specifically, in prior years it was standard case-tracking practice to “count” a case every time it appeared in the BC office, regardless of whether its appearance was new or represented a request for reconsideration, or, in comparison, was a response to a request for additional information. While it makes sense to count reconsideration requests separately in the caseload numbers (since such cases have already been deliberated once by the BC at the time of the reconsideration), most requests for additional information occur with little or no BC
deliberation. Consequently, this year we did not count cases when they were returned to the BC with additional information—a change in practice that (by our estimation) biased the total numbers downward by 120. In addition, we began to track a small number of other cases that were not previously factored in, which has biased the numbers slightly upwards. Our best conjecture about the net effect, however, is that the 2013-14 case-tracking methodology introduced a downward shift in our net accounting from prior years shift (by about 115 cases). Factoring in this measurement reform, the 2013-14 workload statistics appear comparable to 2012-13 numbers. The year-end case carryover numbers lend support to this inference: the numbers of carryover cases from 2012-13 and 2013-14 remained virtually identical (99 and 97, respectively).

**FTE Allocations and Process**

In 2013-14 the campus Administration authorized a total of 70.00 new and continuing FTE positions for target year 2015-16 (TY 2015-16). (This is the same number as allocated for TY 2014-15, and it tracks historical practice of recent years.) Our review of departmental requests for FTE continued to reveal acute hiring needs across campus. As in previous years, 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 regarding the expansion of emergent fields and growing workloads. Additionally, we paid renewed attention to FTE requests in which departments had jointly identified areas of need and made FTE requests for joint appointments.

The BC Chair continued to work with the VPF, the Campus Budget Office, and the BC staff to make our FTE assessment more transparent and meaningful. For example, the August 2013 call letter from the VPF to Deans and Chairs received considerable input from us in conveying the core criteria used for FTE allocations in a clear fashion. Workload and various other data were distributed with the initial campus FTE call so that Chairs and Deans could use these data in preparing their requests. Because reviewers at 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 continued to consult the relevant units’ most recent academic program reviews or strategic plans as part of their assessment of departmental need. In 2013-14, we once again received an unusually high number of requests for so-called “two-fer” appointments (i.e., sets of two search requests 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). Although we are generally receptive to such requests (at least for units that usually receive new searches each year), it remains a priority for the campus to develop protocols for addressing unexpected opportunities as they arise, while simultaneously ensuring fair treatment across units in the allocation of new FTEs.

During this FTE allocation season, we were somewhat more aggressive in setting aside several of the 70.00 allocated searches as a type of reserve fund for later tiers of the allocation process. This reserve fund not only helped to adjudicate the “hard cases,” in which multiple units had articulated persuasive cases, but it also provided an opportunity to identify new and promising areas of academic growth, where Berkeley could do well to focus prospectively. This set-aside approach appeared to work well, and we found ourselves in the enviable position of having saved
a handful of allocations for promising areas of likely future growth. That said, we could have benefitted from greater input from the Academic Senate as well as the Administration regarding their views of where such “hot fields” reside. (The Deans’ reports were of some help here, but not for allocation decisions between decanal units.)

Because the ongoing academic year has attracted renewed energy in the direction of academic planning (a trend we wholeheartedly endorse), this year may present an opportune moment to institutionalize such feedback to the BC. Former Chair Talley is currently working with Academic Senate leadership to identify promising routes for more informative and constructive feedback on academic planning issues.

Process Overview

The APBears electronic case-routing system was in its fourth year in 2013-14, and we used it to access a solid majority of the case materials associated with our academic-personnel reviews. Everything is now filed and stored electronically, although the digitized archive of paper personnel files pre-dating APBears is stored in a different location from current or archival APBears documents.

One significant change of personnel-assessment protocol in 2013-14 was the introduction of a secure website (Google Box) that facilitated the circulation of materials for some cases requiring BC deliberation (e.g., Five-Year Reviews, non-standard step increases, and Mid-Career Appraisals), but where the first, second, and third readers on the BC were in substantial agreement about disposition. For the first time, we slightly altered our protocols so that such cases could be posted to the Box site, read by the Committee members prior to the meeting, and deliberated without an oral reading of the BC minute prepared for the case. Typically, such cases constituted between three and six of those deliberated at each meeting. Dispensing with the oral delivery of the Box cases significantly compressed the deliberation time for each, and we therefore deemed this experiment to be a success. The new Chair has continued this practice in the ongoing academic year. That said, the Box protocol requires additional work by Committee members in advance of the meeting, and there was general consensus that asking all BC members to read more than six or so cases in advance of a meeting could prove counterproductive. It is therefore unlikely to be scalable significantly beyond current practices.

An additional modification in process this year concerned the preparation of data for review in anticipation of the FTE process. In prior years, BC staff distilled critical information from the “High Form” and enrollment data into a specialized set of spreadsheets (which were called the “Form and Footnote” files). While marginally helpful, such files were extremely time-consuming for staff to transcribe, and the core information could be readily gleaned from other documents. Eliminating this step saved considerable staff resources without doing any discernible harm to the information inputs. We recommend that this more streamlined process continue in the future.

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. In 2012-13 190 cases were received on time; in 2013-14 we received and forwarded 144 on-time cases. We continued to work with the Administration to develop protocols that encouraged the timely submission of academic-personnel case materials. The APBears system, which gives immediate information about where each case is in the review process, has proven to be extremely helpful to all.

**Academic-Personnel Policies**

As in past years, we were 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 only summarize a few highlights here. We note that our analyses of these proposals helped to influence the response of both the Academic Senate and the campus Administration to several important issues.

First, we took the lead in articulating the campus’s response to the proposed amendment to system-wide Bylaw 55, where it has been proposed that units be permitted to extend personnel-related voting privileges to faculty in the Adjunct series. We voiced strong opposition to this proposal insofar as it might affect the Berkeley campus, even as we expressed support for the idea that each campus in the University of California system should enjoy some self-governance authority. Until such self-governance reforms occur, however, we felt the proposed Bylaw 55 amendment was inappropriate and under-defended, in both its original form and as amended. The Divisional Council adopted our view of the proposal at both of the junctures at which we were asked to review it.

In addition, we proposed guidelines for determining conditions under which a completed book manuscript can be credited under campus policy. While acknowledging that each discipline may have its own norms and practices for crediting books, we also grew concerned about horizontal equity problems for candidates who had “completed” a book-length manuscript that still lacked many of the markers by which we would ordinarily credit such an accomplishment (such as a book contract, book galleys, and outside reviews). We exchanged multiple iterations of this document with the VPF, and as of the completion of the year it was still in the working-document stage. We recommend that the BC and the VPF take steps to finalize this document during the coming year.

We also largely completed 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. Should another TDI be in the offing at some point, it is important to consider the possibility that some allocated TDI funds may go unawarded (due to pre-merit separations, unanticipated decelerations, and the like). This issue became particularly salient in 2013-14 as the TDI was ending, and we worked with the Administration and Deans to re-allocate TDI funds that had been provisionally allocated but later came free.
**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 campuswide 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. Last year saw a significant turnover in BC staff, as two of the three staff members retired in June 2014. We express our deep sense of gratitude to the staff (both outgoing and incumbent) for their expertise and support, and we wish every success to the new staff members.
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