



BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION

REVISED July 22, 2009

July 10, 2009

Enrique Lavernia
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
Chair of the Budget Advisory Committee

RE: Report of the Budget Advisory Committee – Subcommittee on Administration

Dear Enrique,

We submit the Report of the Budget Advisory Committee – Subcommittee on Administration. We hope this report proves useful as the University continues to address severe budgetary challenges.

The subcommittee worked diligently to meet its charge by convening on a weekly basis and scheduling additional meetings as needed. Within the time-frame provided we were unable to fully examine all possible administrative areas or processes. Instead, we sought to identify administrative areas that we believe should be considered for further examination for cost savings. We also considered the question, “Using the current and projected state-supported budget of UC Davis, what were the administrative structures on campus when we had a similar level of state support?” In the attached report you will find the areas or actions that gained the greatest support for a more comprehensive examination. We fully recognize that additional administrative areas will become obvious for further consideration when the subcommittee reports are reviewed together.

We want to recognize the excellent contributions by all members of the subcommittee. Each member fully participated and contributed to this report, and every member was committed to helping the University by identifying areas for administrative savings. In addition, the staff support provided by Chris Carter and Marion Randall was exemplary in all respects and we are extremely thankful for their support.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Powell III, Co-Chair
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Professor and Chair, Department of
Chemical Engineering and Materials Science

Fred E. Wood, Co-Chair
Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs

**Report of the Budget Advisory Committee
Subcommittee on Administration**

Submitted to Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Enrique Lavernia

REVISED July 22, 2009

July 10, 2009

Report of the Budget Advisory Committee Subcommittee on Administration

Introduction

The subcommittee was given its charge (see Appendix 1) and members were appointed (see Appendix 2) in January 2009. As the charge states:

“This sub-committee will focus on central administration units and the deans’ offices. It will consider a broad range of ideas to change, improve, and streamline current processes and identify opportunities to reduce, consolidate or eliminate services. This committee should also identify essential services that should be protected.”

The subcommittee quickly determined that the broad scope of this charge was too great to fully examine all possible areas within the time-frame provided. With concurrence of the Budget Advisory Committee and the Provost, the subcommittee’s charge shifted to identifying areas or processes that might yield considerable savings through a more comprehensive examination.

The subcommittee examined a number of reports, proposals and other documents (Appendix 3). Lead among them was the Administrative Growth Report, prepared by the Administrative Growth Task Force of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate, and related documents. The subcommittee noted several follow-up actions identified in response to the Administrative Growth Report that have not yet been addressed, and the subcommittee chairs sent a letter to the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor inquiring about the status of these actions. The subcommittee did not receive a reply in time for it to be included in this report.

The subcommittee also examined documents related to the “Phase III” process in the early 1990s and examined organizational charts and budgetary summaries for numerous administrative units. The subcommittee’s work was also informed by suggestions made on the “Budget Planning Smartsite” that were related to administration and numerous informal conversations with fellow faculty and staff. The discussions were also guided by the budgetary principles that were approved by the Budget Advisory Committee (see Appendix 4).

After considerable discussion and analysis, the subcommittee identified the following areas as having the greatest potential for administrative savings. The focus of the first set of areas is administrative units and the second involves other areas, processes and procedures which should be examined for cost savings.

Administrative Units Identified for a Comprehensive Examination

- A. Office of Graduate Studies
- B. Office of Research
- C. Information and Educational Technology
- D. University Outreach and International Programs

Administrative Areas, Processes and Procedures Identified for a Comprehensive Examination

- E. Reduction of Ladder-Rank Faculty Administrators
- F. Compliance and Risk Aversion
- G. Campus Indirect Cost Revenues
- H. Re-delegation of a Subset of Academic Personnel actions
- I. Administrative Expenses in Academic Units
- J. Systemic Review of Administrative Units and Structures

During the discussion of these administrative areas, we built on the questions of inquiry provided by the Budget Advisory Committee and addressed the following for each area.

Standard Questions of Inquiry

- Describe the idea/activity/process/unit/etc.
- What is the relative potential for budget savings? What are the relative revenue increases that might be realized? What are the associated timelines and perceived barriers to realize these savings?
- What are the potential adverse impacts of suggested change?
- What metrics and data sources might be used in a comprehensive evaluation?
- Who might be consulted for additional information?

The subcommittee also considered a number of other administrative aspects of the campus in its deliberations that did not, in the subcommittee members' judgment, present the campus with the same potential for savings or demanded more time than the subcommittee could devote within the timeframe provided. These areas included University Relations, campus purchasing limits, accounting services, deans' discretionary resources, and administrative structures at other campuses.

Administrative Units Identified for a Comprehensive Examination

A. Office of Graduate Studies

1. Description

- Decentralize and/or realign all or some of the functions of the Office of Graduate Studies.
- Combine remaining centralized functions with another administrative office (e.g., Academic Personnel, Undergraduate Admissions, or the Office of Research).
- Subcommittee members expressed concerns about a long history at the Office of Graduate Studies of poor communication, management issues, and staff turnover hampering effective, efficient service.

2. What is the relative potential for budget savings? What are the relative revenue increases that might be realized? What are the associated timelines and perceived barriers to realize these savings?

- Depending on the extent of decentralization or realignment, there could be savings in staffing costs. Current annual staffing costs (salary, wages, and benefits) exceed \$2.5 million. Beyond the potential salary savings, there exists the opportunity for significant process improvements that would reduce workload and frustration in the academic units.
- Work on this issue could begin immediately.
- Barriers include time and effort to fully explore the concepts and to determine which functions should remain centralized and what campus unit should be responsible for them. As with all suggested changes, the involved parties will likely have a vested interest in retaining the status quo.

3. What are the potential adverse impacts of suggested change?

- Decentralizing work has a direct impact on the units receiving the work. Staff members presently doing this work are directly impacted, however, some of this may be offset by reduced redundancy when responsibility is placed at another level.

4. What metrics and data sources might be used in a comprehensive evaluation?

- Customer satisfaction survey that includes faculty and graduate students.
- Budgetary analysis of alternative administrative models.
- Graduate acceptance rates as related to the effectiveness of the new on-line application process and the impact of the new processes on campus units and applicants.
- Changes in recruitment and retention rates.

5. Who might be consulted for additional information?

- The Chair of the Academic Senate, the Graduate Council, School and College Deans, department and graduate group chairs, senior graduate student departmental administrators, and the Dean of Graduate Studies.

B. Office of Research (OR)

1. Description

- Initiate an Administrative Unit Review (AUR) of the full organization as soon as possible. The perceived inefficiency and ineffectiveness of this unit is a long-standing issue and substantial change is required to address this perception. The Office of Research is undergoing administrative restructuring, and an AUR may help evaluate and guide the restructuring.
- Subcommittee members have concerns about the effectiveness and efficiency of the Office of Research which are similar to those expressed within the campus community for a number of years. The major concerns are:
 - Low-level service being provided to faculty and departmental staff,
 - Lack of engagement and communication with faculty,
 - Charge of the unit – many perceive that OR functions more as gatekeeper than as a facilitator, and
 - Lack of clarity related to the guiding principles OR uses to make organized research unit funding decisions.
- The subcommittee's discussion of the Office of Research focused substantially on the related issue of contract and grant overhead rates (see Section G on Campus Indirect Cost Revenues), which many believe do not fully cover overhead expenses. There was general agreement that more complete coverage of overhead costs is desirable, and that grants and contracts should cover the cost of research. However, the subcommittee also recognized there are multiple perspectives on this issue. For example, here are two perspectives:
 - Overhead on contracts and grants does not fully cover all of the attendant costs of doing research, thereby requiring a campus investment/subsidy directed at those parts of the campus with large numbers of research awards.
 - The research mission at UC Davis makes a major contribution to the economic health of the state in many ways and raises the visibility of the University for many constituents.

The subcommittee believes the Office of Research should play a lead role in addressing this issue.

2. What is the relative potential for budget savings? What are the relative revenue increases that might be realized? What are the associated timelines and perceived barriers to realize these savings?

- Improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the Office of Research will not create immediate budget savings.
- If research grants collectively covered a greater share of their indirect costs, then some of the campus resources supporting administrative overhead could be redirected to other priorities.
- Indirect costs on state grants should be fully returned to the campus and not held at the Office of the President. In 2006-07, state grants at UC Davis, which had an average overhead rate of about 7%, generated \$4.8 million in indirects, none of which came to campus as indirect cost return funding.

3. What are the potential adverse impacts of suggested change?
 - A reduction in contracts with low or no funding to the campus for indirect costs would negatively impact faculty whose disciplines are funded by organizations that limit indirect cost recovery. Such a reduction would also reduce the research profile of the campus in these areas.
 - While it is unlikely that the indirect costs related to state contracts will cover the true cost of this research, UC would suffer an adverse impact by refusing these contracts.
4. What metrics and data sources might be used in a comprehensive evaluation?
 - Customer satisfaction surveys and process cycle times.
5. Who might be consulted for additional information?
 - Academic Senate Committee on Research, school and college deans, assistant deans, department chairs, senior departmental staff, and the Vice Chancellor for Research

C. Information Educational Technology (IET)

1. Description
 - Promptly proceed with the planned Administrative Unit Review of IET, with the explicit charge to produce increased efficiency and budgetary savings. The subcommittee membership concluded that the mission and role of IET are unclear and that service delivery and technology (systems) coordination are not optimal.
 - The subcommittee suggests the following: 1) there is need to examine how IET is organized to support instruction and the academic mission to create a greater partnership between IET and faculty, 2) while the nature of technology tends toward growth and innovation, the campus should consider a strategy that takes a more conservative approach by investing in systems that are based on standards that promote greater interoperability, efficient support and long life, and 3) there is a need to clarify the role of IET as it relates to the implementation and maintenance of all functional applications (both administrative and instructional).
 - Suggested areas for further investigation: Consistent with the IT Roadmap, place the application development resources closer to the functional domains; place part of IET under academic leadership and consider placing the Academic Technology Support function closer to academic units (e.g. the Teaching Resources Center) and focus IET's efforts on technology infrastructure.
2. What is the relative potential for budget savings? What are the relative revenue increases that might be realized? What are the associated timelines and perceived barriers to realize these savings?
 - Pairing the IET resources (such as instructional support and application development) with the resources of the functional users (domains) may result in the ability to deliver services with a reduced staffing model.
 - If some of the IET organization's resources are reallocated, there may be an opportunity for budgetary saving in reducing the administrative overhead costs of the unit.

3. What are the potential adverse impacts of suggested change?
 - While reallocating IET resources to other parts of the campus may improve effectiveness, it may not result in budgetary savings or increased efficiencies.
 - Realignment of some the functional areas of IET to other parts of the campus structure may be perceived as shifting work to already overburdened units.
 - Unless thoughtfully organized, a less centralized structure could result in less integrated software and increased costs in the longer term. In addition, maintenance of a secure electronic environment may be a greater challenge in a less centralized model.
4. What metrics and data sources might be used in a comprehensive evaluation?
 - Data collected through an AUR of the IET organization.
 - Data gathered through a comprehensive campus needs assessment.
 - While the IT Roadmap initiative is still developing, it should include a review process to examine the underlying principles and progress toward the stated goals.
5. Who might be consulted for additional information?
 - Academic Senate Committee on Information Technology, Committee on Planning and Budget, Campus Council for Information Technology, Technology Infrastructure Forum, Roadmap Conveners Group, Teaching Resource Center, senior technical staff in departments, and the Vice Provost of IET. Additionally we recommend broader consultation with the users of IET services including students, staff and faculty.

D. University Outreach and International Programs (UOIP)

1. Description
 - Return to the campus structure in place prior to the formation of this unit by (1) distributing responsibility for programs currently administered through UOIP to other administrative units and (2) phasing out the immediate vice-provost's office for UOIP.
 - Programs currently under UOIP that would be transferred include the Education Abroad Center (EAC), Fulbright Scholar Programs, Humphrey Fellow Program, International Alumni Relations and Services for International Students and Scholars.
2. What is the relative potential for budget savings? What are the relative revenue increases that might be realized? What are the associated timelines and perceived barriers to realize these savings?
 - A substantial portion of the UOIP central office budget could be saved. The current personnel costs for the vice provost's office are over \$1 million annually.
 - A new examination of reporting units may result in additional budgetary savings.
 - Barriers include the likelihood that the involved parties will have a vested interest in retaining the status quo.

3. What are the potential adverse impacts of suggested change?
 - Some visibility in the international arena may be lost. These could be offset by increased activity at the college, school and departmental levels.
 - Additional workload for some administrative units associated with overseeing the programs currently reporting through UOIP.
4. What metrics and data sources might be used in a comprehensive evaluation?
 - A more detailed analysis of the savings that would accrue from this change.
 - Discussions with administrators who would oversee the units currently in UOIP.
5. Who might be consulted for additional information?
 - Academic Senate Committee on Planning and Budget, Committee on International Study and Exchanges, administrators who would oversee the units currently in UOIP as well as units absorbing the other functions (e.g., University Relations, Graduate Studies, Student Affairs and Undergraduate Studies.)

Administrative Areas, Processes and Procedures Identified for a Comprehensive Examination

E. Reduction of Ladder-Rank Faculty Administrators

1. Description
 - Significantly reduce the number and/or FTE of administrative positions held by faculty at the levels of associate vice chancellor, associate vice provost, associate dean and director.
2. What is the relative potential for budget savings? What are the relative revenue increases that might be realized? What are the associated timelines and perceived barriers to realize these savings?
 - If all appointments of faculty members in the job titles listed above were reduced by half, the subcommittee estimates that the campus could save over \$3 million in course buy-outs and stipends.
 - More courses would be taught by ladder rank faculty.
3. What are the potential adverse impacts of suggested change?
 - Some functions currently being accomplished by these positions would be phased out or would be absorbed by staff.
 - There may be a need for additional staff to accomplish the functions.
4. What metrics and data sources might be used in a comprehensive evaluation?
 - Use all data sources to find the total amount of money committed to these positions.

5. Who might be consulted for additional information?
 - Academic Senate Committee on Planning and Budget, faculty executive committees, department chairs, and units that currently have these positions including deans, vice provosts and vice chancellors.

F. Compliance and Risk Aversion

1. Description
 - While it is difficult to identify specific examples, the culture at UC Davis is overly focused on compliance and risk-aversion. Members of the subcommittee see this issue as being pervasive across the campus.
 - Maintaining high levels of compliance creates considerable work for faculty and staff at significant cost, while it is not clear that extra work in this area yields corresponding benefits.
 - Campus leadership should promote a cultural shift away from simply minimizing risk and instead to promoting acceptable risk, particularly where this leads to less complexity and reduced workload.
 - Procedures should be revised with budgetary savings in mind to promote greater flexibility and efficiency.
2. What is the relative potential for budget savings? What are the relative revenue increases that might be realized? What are the associated timelines and perceived barriers to realize these savings?
 - By avoiding extreme risk-aversion, the campus will see a reduction in both the complexity and volume of work for employees.
 - The risk-averse campus culture is a major barrier and will need to be addressed at all levels.
 - There will be greater personal accountability for decisions, which may be resisted.
3. What are the potential adverse impacts of suggested change?
 - A reduced workforce coupled with less focus on compliance will likely lead to a greater number of mistakes.
4. What metrics and data sources might be used in a comprehensive evaluation?
 - Metrics will be difficult to identify since the impact of a shift in operations will result in diffused saving.
5. Who might be consulted for additional information?
 - Colleagues on other UC campuses that don't have the same risk-averse culture.

G. Campus Indirect Cost Revenues

1. Description

- The campus would be well-served by understanding the size of the gap between the research grant indirects that it collects and the true administrative overhead costs associated with these research grants.
- Research grants awarded to researchers on campus have a range of indirect cost rates, depending on their source.
- Although the campus supports grant applications with low associated indirect cost rates, the campus does not accurately determine the campus support of the true overhead for research grants. The current fiscal environment makes this information particularly valuable.
- Subcommittee members did not all share the same perspective on providing campus funds to support research that does not fully cover administrative overhead. See Section B on the Office of Research for additional explanation.

2. What is the relative potential for budget savings? What are the relative revenue increases that might be realized? What are the associated timelines and perceived barriers to realize these savings?

- There are no immediate savings from this recommendation. However, greater analysis would help campus decision-makers make more informed budget decisions.

3. What are the potential adverse impacts of suggested change?

- Researchers whose fields tend to generate research grants with relatively lower overhead rates will be sensitive to this line of inquiry. Also, a reduction in lower-overhead grants and contracts would have a major implication for the mission-oriented research that has a major positive impact on the University's stake-holders in California and the public opinion of UC.

4. What metrics and data sources might be used in a comprehensive evaluation?

- Campus decision-makers would be better informed about the campus investment in funding the true indirect costs associated with receipt of contracts and grants.

5. Who might be consulted for additional information?

- Academic Senate Committee on Research, Committee on Planning and Budget, and discussions with the staff in Accounting and Financial Services, who are the campus's best resource on assessing campus administrative costs.

H. Re-delegation of a Subset of Academic Personnel Actions

1. Description

- The phrase “streamline the personnel process” is well-worn rejoinder that accompanies any discussions of merit and promotions at UC Davis.
- The subcommittee proposes that, under very specific circumstances, the following personnel actions be re-delegated to the departmental level: Associate Professor I to II, II to III and III to IV; Professor I to II, II to III, III to IV, IV to V, VI to VII, VII to VIII and VIII to IX. Only those actions that represent normal progress would be re-delegated. There would be no re-delegated accelerations.
- This proposal builds upon progress made about a decade ago when a large number of merit actions were re-delegated to Deans who are advised by Faculty Personnel Committees.

2. What is the relative potential for budget savings? What are the relative revenue increases that might be realized? What are the associated timelines and perceived barriers to realize these savings?

- Past estimates have identified the cost of each personnel action as the equivalent of \$20,000 due to the faculty and staff time involved in the assembling the merit package, the review of the package by the Department, the formulation of the letter by the Department Chair, the review at the College/School level (both in the Deans’ offices and by the Faculty Personnel Committees) and by the Committee on Academic Personnel and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel.
- While there is no direct budget savings from this proposal, there should be a reduction in departmental staff time and a substantial reduction of workload at other levels of review.

3. What are the potential adverse impacts of suggested change?

- There is concern that the criteria for faculty merit review would not be appropriately applied. However, this concern is largely unwarranted if, for example, the following strict criteria are applied:
 - A department would need to “apply” to have actions re-delegated to that level. The department would need to demonstrate the final decision was consistent with the departmental recommendation in 95% of the actions over the last five years.
 - If a departmental vote is closer than 80% / 20% (either for or against), then the package must be reviewed by the current procedure.
 - The actual percentages would be agreed upon by the Academic Senate and the administration.

4. What metrics and data sources might be used in a comprehensive evaluation?

- Reduction in personnel involved in the faculty personnel process.
- Less time spent on faculty personnel processes in departments and programs.

5. Who might be consulted for additional information?

- Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel – Oversight, Committee on Planning and Budget, Faculty Executive Committees, Vice Provost – Academic Personnel and ADMAN.

I. Administrative Expenses in Academic Units

1. Description

- There are many administrative responsibilities carried out in academic units across campus, and these units vary in their approaches to addressing these responsibilities.
- The subcommittee's brief investigation showed that 1) units vary in their distribution of responsibilities between deans' offices and departments, and 2) units vary in the portion of their expenditures that reside in the dean's office (see Appendix 5).
- Although the subcommittee did not conclude which academic unit structure might be the most cost-effective, the variation suggests that additional investigation into the approaches to administrative duties might reveal some "best practices" that could yield savings.

2. What is the relative potential for budget savings? What are the relative revenue increases that might be realized? What are the associated timelines and perceived barriers to realize these savings?

- The potential for budget savings is unknown.
- Given the magnitude of the budget reductions facing the campus, some re-structuring of administrative duties within academic units is inevitable. The subcommittee recommends that the campus learn from the varying practices in the campus academic units.
- The campus is clearly moving towards a period of reduced faculty hiring which, in turn, reduces the need for oversight of this process. The deans' offices play a major role in this oversight, so some restructuring could occur. Likewise, a more centralized human resources model would further reduce the need for "HR" at the level of the deans' offices.
- Additional savings in the deans' offices would follow from the suggestions in Sections E and H.

3. What are the potential adverse impacts of suggested change?

- While units can learn from one another, the campus should be careful to avoid a one-size-fits-all administrative model.
- The campus should guard against simply shifting responsibilities from one part of the university to another (e.g. from a Dean's Office to a department).

4. What metrics and data sources might be used in a comprehensive evaluation?

- Reduced FTE carrying out administrative responsibilities.

5. Who might be consulted for additional information?

- Academic Senate Committee on Planning and Budget, department chairs, campus units which approach administrative duties differently and colleagues on other UC campuses.

J. Systemic Review of Administrative Units and Structures

1. Description

- The subcommittee recommends a systemic review of administrative functions on campus with a focus on increasing efficiency and eliminating duplication and redundancy.
- The administrative duties on campus are spread across both administrative and academic units.
- As administrative responsibilities have evolved, the subcommittee has identified instances where there is unnecessary duplication and redundancy. Examples discussed by the subcommittee included human resources functions, information technology functions, payroll, purchasing, etc.
- While the campus dialog on administrative restructuring has tended to focus on centralization, the subcommittee believes that, depending on the situation, the review should consider the benefits of both centralization and decentralization.

2. What is the relative potential for budget savings? What are the relative revenue increases that might be realized? What are the associated timelines and perceived barriers to realize these savings?

- Difficult to project until specific alternative administrative models are identified.

3. What are the potential adverse impacts of suggested change?

- See Section F on Compliance and Risk Aversion; reducing duplication or redundancy may increase the risk for error in some cases.
- What appears to be an increase in efficiency in one area can really be, at least in part, a shift in responsibilities/workload elsewhere. Any effort to increase efficiency or reduce workload should not simply be a shift in workload.

4. What metrics and data sources might be used in a comprehensive evaluation?

- Reduced FTE carrying out administrative responsibilities.

5. Who might be consulted for additional information?

- Academic Senate Committee on Planning and Budget, ADMAN, colleagues at other UC campuses who are facing similar financial pressures, colleagues at UCOP who have re-structured their administrative units, (although the parallels are limited because UCOP does not have research structures) and counterparts at other AAU institutions.

Appendix 1

Description of the Subcommittee on Administration

From UC Davis Budget Planning Process: Description of Budget Committee Membership – January 2009

Sub-committee 2: Administration

This sub-committee will focus on central administration units and the deans' offices. It will consider a broad range of ideas to change, improve, and streamline current processes and identify opportunities to reduce, consolidate or eliminate services. The committee should also identify essential services that should be protected.

The sub-committee will be co-chaired by the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and the Chair of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate. Members will include representatives from the Academic Senate, the Academic Federation, and staff. Staff support will be provided by ORMP Director Chris Carter and a representative from a central administrative unit.

Examples that the committee might consider include:

- Use of administrative clusters or centralized administrative services – what factors or criteria favor this approach; what incentives/disincentives might be used to advance this concept?
- Use of common applications to streamline administrative processes (e.g., calendaring software).
- Identification of services that are most essential and those that are least essential.

Appendix 2
Membership of the Subcommittee on Administration

<i>Name</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Organization</i>
Bob Powell, Co-Chair	Department Chair and Professor, Chair of Davis Division of Academic Senate	Chemical Engineering and Materials Science, College of Engineering
Fred Wood, Co-Chair	Vice Chancellor	Student Affairs
Lesley Byrnes	MSO	Social Sciences
Marie Carter-Dubois	Assistant Dean	School of Education
Michael Condrin	Assistant Dean	School of Medicine
Michael Delwiche	Department Chair and Professor	Biological and Agricultural Engineering, College of Engineering
Barbara Goldman	Associate Director, Teacher Education	School of Education
Tracy Ligtenberg	MSO	School of Veterinary Medicine
Babs Sandeen	Vice Chancellor	University Relations
Pete Siegel	Vice Provost	Information and Educational Technology
David Simpson	Professor	English Department
Bob Smiley	Professor	GSM
Michael Turelli	Professor	Department of Evolution and Ecology, College of Biological Sciences
<i>Staff:</i>		
Chris Carter	Director	Office of Resource Management and Planning
Marion Randall	Executive Director	Human Resources

Appendix 3:

List of Reports Examined by the Subcommittee on Administration

Administrative Growth Report and Response

Administrative Growth Report at UC Davis

Administrative Growth Task Force of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate

June 6, 2008

Letter to Chair Linda Bisson, Davis Division of the Academic Senate

From Interim provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Barbara A. Horwitz

RE: Administrative Growth at UC Davis

July 21, 2008

Administrative Growth: Alternate Perspectives and Observations

From the Office of Resource Management and Planning and Human Resources, Spring 2008

Budget Planning SmartSite Feedback

SmartSite Budget Planning Forum:

Short List from Senior Advisors Committee – Summer/Fall 2008

Budget Planning SmartSite

Feedback from Staff Assembly – December 2008

Campus Budget Letters

2008-09 Budget Planning Letter, 2-26-08

2008-09 Campus Budget Planning Letter Attachment 2-29-08

2008-09 Budget Update, 10-24-08

2008-09 Budget Update and Mid-year Reductions 2-10-09

Campus Budget Status Updates

Budget Planning Overview for Long Rants Planning Committees, 2-21-09

Phase III Information

Phase III Steering Committee Report, 4-15-93

Phase III Decisions, 6-1-93

Phase III Steering Committee Report and Decisions, 6-2-95

ORMP Phase III Overview, February 2008

Appendix 4:

UC Davis Budget Planning Principles

Adopted by Budget Advisory Committee March 17, 2009

1. Reduce budgets strategically in a manner that puts our mission first – i.e., reductions that allow the campus to continue to work toward:
 - Promote the success of the highest academic priorities that emerge from the campus' current academic planning process.
 - Support faculty in efforts to strengthen their research and outreach programs and provide outstanding training opportunities and competitive financial support for graduate students.
 - Maintain the excellence of our undergraduate programs while supporting access—including affordability and timely progress to degree—for our students.
2. Balance budget reductions in a way that recognizes the fundamental contributions of both faculty and staff to the mission.

Seek real reductions in effort and expense—avoid cost and effort transfers between campus units or among faculty, staff, and students unless there is a real net gain in efficiency or effectiveness.
3. Communicate openly, honestly, and frequently about the budget process and budget reduction plans or proposals at all levels of the campus. Consult broadly about reductions to determine the best routes we can take.
4. Seek new resources.
5. Streamline administrative and academic processes and procedures to help reduce expenditures and mitigate staff workload.
6. Maintain an appropriate balance between operational efficiency and risk exposure associated with compliance and controls.

Appendix 5

2007-08 Expenditures at Selected Colleges

BAC Subcommittee on Administration
 Budget Information -- Summary
 6/25/2009

Total Expenditures, 2007-08

- By: 1) GF / All Funds
 2) Dean's Office / Other
 3) Incl. Academic Salary + Benefits / Excl. Academic Salary + Benefits

		CAES		CBS		COE	
		\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
Including Academic Salary + Benefits	<i>All Funds Expenditures</i>						
	Total	\$ 397,544,287	100%	\$ 181,959,302	100%	\$ 191,907,041	100%
	Dean's Office	\$ 15,225,397	4%	\$ 4,421,078	2%	\$ 7,893,146	4%
	Non-Dean's Office	\$ 382,318,890	96%	\$ 177,538,224	98%	\$ 184,013,895	96%
	<i>19900 (GF) Expenditures</i>						
	Total	\$ 80,124,315	100%	\$ 36,224,864	100%	\$ 43,067,423	100%
Dean's Office	\$ 7,968,934	10%	\$ 2,763,343	8%	\$ 4,777,493	11%	
Non-Dean's Office	\$ 72,155,381	90%	\$ 33,461,521	92%	\$ 38,289,931	89%	
Excluding Academic Salary + Benefits	<i>All Funds Expenditures</i>						
	Total	\$ 345,916,298	100%	\$ 158,391,302	100%	\$ 166,320,107	100%
	Dean's Office	\$ 13,989,564	4%	\$ 4,368,797	3%	\$ 7,696,276	5%
	Non-Dean's Office	\$ 331,936,734	96%	\$ 154,022,505	97%	\$ 158,623,800	95%
	<i>19900 (GF) Expenditures</i>						
	Total	\$ 36,571,025	100%	\$ 18,393,059	100%	\$ 19,010,915	100%
Dean's Office	\$ 6,828,792	19%	\$ 2,736,801	15%	\$ 4,512,020	24%	
Non-Dean's Office	\$ 29,742,233	81%	\$ 15,653,258	85%	\$ 14,498,595	76%	