The Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations, more commonly 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 recommends policies on the academic personnel process.

**Personnel Reviews**

During the 2010-11 academic year, the BC reviewed and transferred 698 cases to the Academic Personnel Office (APO). Of these cases, 545 concerned members of the Academic Senate; the remainder concerned faculty in the non-Senate ranks. The caseload total was smaller than a year ago (698 vs. 975 in 2009-10), with much of the reduction occurring in merit cases for Senate faculty. Ladder-rank appointment cases increased, however, from 32 cases in 2009-10 to 56 this past year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Caseload Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases remaining from 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases effective 7/1/10 (or earlier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases received in 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases effective 7/1/10 (or earlier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases effective 7/1/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases forwarded to APO in 10-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*Includes 182 cases received in 10-11 and not sent to APO by 6/30/11)

The BC processed 98 Urgent cases and 107 requests for Reconsideration of earlier decisions. A total of 112 Campus Ad Hoc Review Committees were appointed to consider new Tenured Appointments (33), Promotions to Tenure (48), and Promotions to full Professor (31). The campus Administration adopted the BC’s recommendations in all but two instances, and in both of these instances the difference was slight, having to do with adjustments to the merit portion of each case.

**FTE Allocations**

In 2010-11, the campus Administration renewed its commitment to increased faculty hiring even in the face of a continuing budget crisis. Hiring for a total of 79.00 FTE positions was approved: 72.50 of these FTE comprised new authorizations, and another 5.50 FTE involved the extension or reactivation of previously authorized positions. In addition, 2.00 FTE positions were pre-
approved for next year’s authorization cycle. Our review of departmental requests for FTE continued to reveal acute hiring needs across campus, and, in making our recommendations, we continued to prioritize the needs of 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

Throughout the year, our review of personnel cases revealed a pattern of under-compensation for advanced faculty who a) had received tenure before the campus began to provide salary adjustments at the time of promotion to tenure, and b) had never entertained outside offers that might have led to a retention increase in their salaries. We recommended that the Administration institute a new Targeted Decoupling Initiative (TDI) that would aid these faculty especially. The Administration supported our recommendation and this year introduced a three-year TDI that should significantly improve the compensation of high-achieving faculty whose salaries lag the salaries of comparable faculty at peer institutions.

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.

We continued to work closely with the Administration on designing a new checklist system for the first merit cases of new Assistant Professors. Department chairs were authorized to begin using this checklist system in fall 2010, and we believe that it has effectively streamlined the processing of first merit cases and thus reduced the workload of reviewers at every level.

The greatest challenges facing the BC during 2010-11 came from the roll-out of APBears, the campus’s new electronic case-routing system, which was restricted this past year to ladder-rank merit cases. Adapting our practices to APBears required innovative thinking from the Committee’s staff and faculty, as well as generous practical and moral support from the Acting Vice Provost for the Faculty and the Director of Academic Personnel -- support for which we were extremely grateful.

A less manageable consequence of the new system was a slowdown in case processing at all levels. The number of on-time cases received by the BC continued to decline, from 204 such cases in 2008-09 and 76 in 2009-10 to 66 in 2010-11. APBears contributed to this decline, as indicated by a comparison of the ladder-rank merit cases that the BC received in mid-March 2010 to those received in mid-March 2011. By 3/17/10, the BC had received 60 merit cases, yet by 3/17/11, we had received only 2. The Committee provided regular reports to the Acting Vice Provost and the Academic Personnel Office regarding the comparative decline in merit cases the BC was receiving, and we urged the Acting Vice Provost to poll deans and chairs in order to determine how and where the implementation of APBears had impeded case-processing.

For the BC, the delay in merit cases meant that we had relatively few cases to review during the normally heavy-workload months of January through March, but an unusually large number of cases to review in the final months of the academic year. As a result, the number of personnel cases that the BC was unable to process before their July 1 effective dates increased from the previous year. There were 182 such cases in the committee after July 1, 2011, as compared to
134 after July 1, 2010; the 2011 remainder did nevertheless compare favorably with the 236 cases remaining in the BC after July 1, 2009. The academic year also saw an increase in the number of cases that the BC received after the effective date of the case: in 2010, the BC received 189 cases after July 1 that were effective July 1, but in 2011 we received 236 cases after July 1 that were effective July 1 (99 of these late cases were APBears cases).

Finally, the BC has long noted that faculty in book-based disciplines appear to progress more slowly through the ranks than faculty in non-book-based disciplines. This past year, we recommended that the Administration closely compare rates of progress among the faculty over an extended period. The resulting study of faculty advancement at UCB from 1985 to 2010 was eye-opening. While it showed that faculty across all disciplines advanced in roughly equal rates to Associate Professor, to Professor, Step VI, and to Professor, Above Scale, the study also revealed an alarming disparity in the progress of faculty from Associate Professor to Professor. Six years after promotion to Associate Professor, more than 80% of the faculty in Physical Sciences, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematical Sciences (PTEM) had been promoted to Professor, while only 20% of the faculty in Humanities had received the same promotion—a gap of 60 percentage points. Even 14 years after tenure, Humanities faculty continued to lag PTEM faculty in promotions to Professor by 30 percentage points. The BC and the Administration have discussed various ways of addressing this disparity; we hope that DIVCO and the Senate generally will join in the search for a fair and responsible solution.

**BC Staff**

The operation of the BC crucially depends on its experienced and dedicated staff, who perform under the general burden of a large workload and the pressures of numerous urgent retention and hiring cases. During the academic year, this burden was increased in three ways: first, by the Operational Excellence initiative entitled Organizational Simplification, which resulted in a 0.5 FTE reduction in BC staff support; second, by the introduction of APBears, which required the staff to reconceive our traditional methods of case-processing; and third, by an extended medical leave for our staff supervisor. The staff performed with heroic effectiveness through all these travails: two of them received SPOT awards for performance above and beyond normal expectations. Of particular note were 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.
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