The Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations, more widely known as the Budget Committee (BC), has three primary functions: (1) it recommends actions on hiring, promotion, and merit advancement for individual faculty members; (2) it recommends FTE allocations for departments and other academic units; and (3) it reviews and considers policies concerning academic personnel and personnel reviews.

**Personnel Reviews**

During the 2009-10 academic year, the BC reviewed and transferred 973 cases to the Academic Personnel Office (APO). Of these, 802 concerned members of the Academic Senate; the reminder concerned faculty in the non-Senate ranks. The caseload total was smaller than a year ago (973 vs. 1047 in 2008-09), most of the reduction occurring in the non-Senate ranks (171 vs. 242 in 2008-09). Within the Senate ranks, the biggest reduction occurred in the number of appointment cases (32 vs. 98 in 2008-09).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Caseload Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cases remaining from 08-09</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases effective 7/1/09 (or earlier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases received in 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases effective 7/1/09 (or earlier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases effective 7/1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cases forwarded to APO in 09-10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*Includes 123 cases received in 09-10 and not sent to APO by 6/30/10)

The BC processed 145 Urgent cases and 138 requests for Reconsideration of earlier decisions. A total of 92 Campus Ad Hoc Review Committees were appointed to consider Final Appraisals (2), New Tenured Appointments (5), Promotions to Tenure (39), Promotions to full Professor (45), and the Termination of an Assistant Professor (1). On 2 occasions the campus Administration did not adopt the BC’s recommendations: one case concerning a larger-than-normal merit increase; and one concerning advancement to Above Scale.

**FTE Allocations**

In the two previous years (2007-08 and 2008-09), the process of FTE allocations was overtaken by the rapidly-worsening budgetary situation. The BC conducted its
normal review of campus hiring priorities, but in both years campus was able to authorize only a fraction of the number of faculty searches anticipated at the beginning of the FTE review process.

In 2009-10, the campus Administration was able to begin the process of rebuilding the faculty by committing resources to a significant level of FTE authorizations. Hiring for a total of 66.70 FTE positions was approved: 42.70 of these comprised new authorizations, and another 22 FTE involved the extension or reactivation of previously-authorized positions. In addition, 8.00 FTE positions were pre-approved for next year’s authorization cycle (2010-11). Given the sharply-reduced number of new appointments during the past two years, acute hiring needs were found across campus Divisions, Colleges, and Schools. In making its recommendations, the BC especially sought to address needs in those units where the pattern of recent separations and retirements produced the largest percentage gaps between the numbers of current incumbents and established faculty target sizes.

**Policy and Process**

Under the initiative of VP Zedeck and in consultation with the BC, the campus Administration introduced several adjustments to personnel practices. A Step IX increment was introduced for faculty whose accomplishments warrant advancement above Step IX (but not yet to Above Scale); normal merit reviews for Unit 18 Lecturers following successful Excellence Reviews were delegated to the decanal level; and a new abbreviated form of review was adopted for the first merit review following appointment for faculty in the assistant professor rank.

The latter two changes were designed to reduce some of the administrative burdens and delays associated with the personnel review process – a general goal that occupied much of the BC’s attention in 2009-10. While the quality, integrity and outcome of personnel reviews are critically important to members of the faculty, the length of time required for the preparation of cases and the completion of the campus review process are familiar sources of frustration.

The BC focused its efforts two areas. First, drawing on information provided in the Berkeley Reporting Portal (BRP), the Committee sought a better understanding of where the most serious delays occur throughout the several stages of the entire review process. Second, and more important, the BC took steps to improve the dispatch of its own operations. These initiatives were shared in separate discussions with Senate Chair Kutz and Vice Chair Doyle, and with VP Zedeck and EVCP Breslauer, all of whom embraced and strongly encouraged the BC’s efforts.

Due to the disruptions caused by faculty and staff furloughs, 2009-10 was a difficult year to secure greater punctuality in the review process. For example, APO continued to identify a category of “On-Time Cases” for those personnel cases sent to campus reviewers on or before the announced APO deadlines for case submissions. Whereas in 2008-09 the BC received 204 on-time cases, in 2009-10 this number fell to 76. At the same time, the BC succeeded in significantly improving the speed of its own operations. One imperfect measure of this improvement is the number of personnel cases the BC was unable to process in advance of their July 1, 2010 effective dates. This year there were 123 such cases, less than half the comparable totals experienced in recent years. The welcome reduction testifies to the greater timeliness of the BC’s operations,
though the measure also is reflective of elements beyond the Committee’s control: the overall volume of cases in a given year, as well as the number of cases which reach the BC only shortly before their July 1 effective dates.

BC Staff
The operation of the BC depends critically upon its experienced and dedicated staff, who perform under the general burden of a large workload and the pressures of numerous urgent retention or hiring cases. Members of the committee rely extensively on the staff for support and guidance. For the first time in two years, the Committee staff did not suffer disruptions from separations or unplanned leaves. The improved speed of the Committee’s operations owes much to the generous efforts of the BC staff. Among other changes, the staff supervisor designed a new tracking system for monitoring the flow of cases within the Committee; and the staff supervisor helped design and the staff helped implement a new streamlined procedure for handling the Committee’s review of FTE allocations.
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