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 academic year 2014-15, the BC reviewed and transferred 808 cases to the Academic Personnel Office (APO). Of these, 700 concerned ladder-rank faculty (LRF) and 108 concerned non-ladder-rank titles.

The table below offers a synopsis of the cases processed in, and carried forward from, academic year 2014-15:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Cases Received in 2013-14 Carried Forward to 2014-15</th>
<th>97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Ladder Rank Cases Transferred in 2014-15</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Ladder Rank Cases Transferred in 2014-15</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases Transferred in 2014-15</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases Received in 2014-15 and Carried Forward to 2015-16</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total cases transferred to APO included 123 urgent cases, 98 requests for reconsideration of earlier decisions, and 602 cases in AP Bears. We also returned cases for further information 86 times. The case carry over figures declined from nearly 100 in 2013-14 to 62 in 2014-15. While the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF) debated with us often regarding step increases in merit cases, the campus Administration followed our recommendations in nearly every instance.

The caseload figures for academic year 2014-15 (see above) are slightly lower than the previous year, when the BC reported processing a total of 843 cases.

**FTE Allocation and Process**

In 2014-15, the campus Administration authorized a total of 45.00 new positions for target year 2016-17 (TY 2016-17). This represents a significant reduction with respect to the 70.00 FTE allocated for TY 2015-16 and TY 2014-15, and reflects current budgetary constraints. Our review of department requests for FTE continued to reveal pressing hiring needs across campus. In making our recommendations, we gave considerable weight to the arguments offered by
Deans and Chairs about growing workloads and the development and expansion of emergent fields. We also gave priority to FTE request in which departments had jointly identified areas of need and made FTE requests for joint appointments. In a departure from previous practice, we de-emphasized the role that targets played in our decisions, and gave greater weight to qualitative criteria.

The BC Chair continued to work with the VPF, the Campus Budget Office, and the BC staff to make our FTE assessment more transparent. Workload and various other data were distributed with the initial campus FTE call letter so that Chairs and Deans could use these data in preparing their requests, and so that all levels were working with the same numerical data. We also continued to consult the most recent Academic Program Reviews and/or strategic plan for units as part of the assessment of departmental needs. In order to emphasize qualitative criteria in our review, we developed a set of questions regarding workload data, departmental or unit background and challenges, efforts to increase diversity, and the academic strength of proposals; these guided our assessment and ranking of FTE requests. As in past years, we received a number of offcycle FTE requests, the majority of which reached us during the period when we were finalizing recommendations for search authorizations for TY 2016-17. While recognizing that such offcycle appointments may be useful when unexpected opportunities arise, we were somewhat less receptive to them than in previous years, given the significantly reduced number of available FTE. As part of a Senate/Administration working group, we worked with the VPF and the Vice Provost for Strategic Academic and Facilities Planning (VPSAFP) to incorporate language describing the offcycle search-waiver process into the TY 2017-18 call letter, so that all units may be made aware of this opportunity, and to ensure fair treatment across campus.

We continued the practice of setting aside several of the 45.00 FTE allocated searches as a reserve fund for later stages of the allocation process. This gave us some flexibility in our discussions with the VPF and the Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost, and allowed us to accommodate the most pressing needs on campus and to give the fullest possible consideration to difficult cases of competing priorities.

_Process Overview_

Now in its fifth year, the AP Bears electronic routing system allowed us to access the vast majority of case materials for academic personnel reviews. We continued the use of a secure website (Box) that allowed BC members to access materials for our deliberations in advance of our meetings, and thereby deliberate without oral delivery of the BC minute. We employed Box principally for two types of cases: 1) cases in which there was substantial agreement among first, second, and third readers and 2) particularly difficult cases when the entire committee was invited to read case materials. We extended the use of Box to the FTE process as well; rather than filling binders with FTE recommendations in hard copy, the Chair posted the committee’s recommendations to Box in advance of meetings, so that committee members could access them remotely. This reduced the amount of time needed for deliberations in the meetings themselves, and allowed us more efficiently to combine the work of the FTE season with the ongoing review of academic personnel cases.
Timeliness policies

As in the previous year, we transferred all on-time cases to APO in time for decisions to be communicated to units by June 30th: we received and transferred 118 on-time cases. This is a significantly lower number than in the previous two years: in 2012-13, the BC received and forwarded 190 on-time cases; in 2013-14, 144 such cases were received and forwarded. This downward trend, and the fact that 2015 cases are still arriving in the BC as of January 2016, may suggest that units themselves are increasingly the source of delay in timely submission of cases.

Academic Personnel Policies

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 limit ourselves to summarizing several highlights here. We note that our analyses of these proposals helped to influence both the Senate’s and the campus Administration’s response to several important issues.

We offered extensive comments on the 2014 Total Remuneration Study of general campus LRF at the University of California (UC). The study compared the total remuneration of UC LRF in 2013 with the parallel situation in 2009, and explored the effects of the new tier benefits (which went into effect for faculty hired effective July 2013). We expressed concerns about the significant deterioration of benefits and its potential effects on Berkeley’s ability to retain, renew, and rebuild our faculty, and called for a campus-by-campus breakdown of data.

The BC worked with the VPF and the Haas School of Business to clarify criteria for inclusion, expulsion, and readmission in the Faculty Excellence Program (FEP), and to simplify and coordinate the salary algorithms employed by Haas, APO, and the BC in their salary calculations. The FEP memorandum of understanding was revised accordingly.

We also provided feedback to the Center for Teaching and Learning on a sample Chair’s letter, available on its website, and collaborated with the Academic Senate’s Committee on Teaching on proposed revisions to policies and practices for the evaluation of teaching.

The BC drafted proposed guidelines for campus policy and practice concerning the assessment and crediting of unpublished papers in faculty reviews. As of the end of the year, this was still a working document; we urge the BC and the VPF to take steps to finalize this document during 2015-16.

BC Membership

Due to unexpected health issues, this was an anomalous year for the make-up of the BC: five former members of the BC generously filled in for unforeseen vacancies, and five new regular members joined the committee during the year. Despite the resultant rotation, and thanks to the dedication of all concerned, the committee was largely able to keep pace with its workload.
**BC Staff**

The operation of the BC relies crucially upon its highly effective staff. In fall 2014, the staff experienced an upheaval even greater than that of the BC membership, with two of its three staff members taking retirement as of June 30, 2014, one unexpectedly so. The BC manager trained and supervised two temporary staff members during July and August, and oversaw the hiring and subsequent training of two new staff members, who came on board in September 2014. In addition, the BC manager continued to revise processes in response to the changing FTE process and to the often cumbersome updates and unpredictable changes to the AP Bears online personnel system; she also began to lay the ground for the implementation of a fully digitized, paperless procedure in 2015-16. The highly skilled staff continues to face the pressures of requests for urgent turnarounds and the burden of ever heavier workloads with grace and an unparalleled attention to detail. We take this opportunity to express our gratitude for their hard work and dedication.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Spackman, Chair, 2014-15  
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W. Zacheus Cande (September 2015)  
Meg Conkey (February-March 2015)  
Daniel Farber  
Robert Fischer (July-August 2014)  
Inez Fung  
Martin Jay (Fall 2014)  
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Michael Katz  
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Carl Shapiro (April – May 2015)  
R. Jay Wallace