Notes to Resource Allocation Committee (RAC) Table

[These notes were written in 1993 when the first RAC formula was implemented. Minor edits are included to identify changes that were made to the drivers through the years.]

All allocations, except possibly funds for the support of interdepartmental majors, are considered to be to the department and under the control of the department chairperson, regardless of whose activities might be considered to have "generated" any particular part of the allocation.

Where it occurs, lack of correspondence between efforts of individual faculty members and their I&r/AES/CE appointments complicates the application of the formula.

A.1, A.2., A.3., B.1. C.1., C.2. D.1. and D.2. These cells are intended to provide for essential administrative costs only. The Department of Vegetable Crops was an important source of information on the costs of these core functions.

A.1 and D.1. The formula intentionally does not take into account the greater cost per faculty FTE for the operation of a small department, in order to provide small departments with an incentive to share administrative services with another department.

A.1 Funding for .30 staff FTE for every 1.0 faculty FTE. Value for the .30 staff FTE is based on the average salary rate of "state general funds budgeted staff" in the CA&ES. Cell A.1. also allocates $3,000 per faculty FTE for administrative supplies and $4,000 per faculty FTE to address staff workload issues. In 2015-16, the driver for this cell increases by $100 to a total of $24,500 /I&R and AES faculty FTE for Cell A.1.

A.2 Annual dollar amounts were estimated from conservative values of:
   $540/yr for telephone line (instrument with basic service, access to long distance carrier, very limited long distance tolls)
   $700/yr for basic computer with inkjet printer, including capital cost ($500/yr, 5 yr life), printer ink, paper, disks ($200)
   $360/yr for photocopying and miscellaneous supplies

Adjunct, professional series, and emeritus appointees in the context of A.1. and A.2. Appointees in these categories are able to, and often must, serve as PIs on extramural research grants. The conclusion of the RAC is that a department should receive support for the teaching activities (columns B and C) of such appointees in the same fashion that the teaching activities of ladder and CE faculty are rewarded. However, CA&ES should not be responsible for providing support to adjunct, emeritus and professional series appointees under columns A and F, except as such faculty will have access to column F facilities as a benefit of their appointment. The rationale for this recommendation is that such appointees normally are expected to "pay their own way" and that a department must recognize this necessity when, for example, a decision is made to retain an adjunct faculty member.
If A.1. and A.2. cannot be maintained without cutting formula expenditures for teaching and research activities (e.g., A.5. and column B), alternative approaches are to be considered, such as the clustering of administrative services for specific departments and programs.

A.3. and E.3.
Different departments carry out their functions in different ways; provision of part of the administrative support of each department purposefully marked as "discretionary" recognizes differences and encourages innovation at the department level that may lead to more efficient use of funds. For the present, consider A.3. to be covered by A.1.

A.5. To maintain a minimal research program, funding is to be provided for each research faculty member. Funds go to the department, not to the individual faculty member, giving the department chairman discretion in expenditure. Because the actual dollar amounts are minimal, compared to the costs of doing research, no distinction has been made according to discipline. Differences in costs between disciplines will be taken into account at least partially by column F items and by the availability of extramural funds. As in past years, FTE for Lecturers with Security of Employment and Academic Administrator appointments do not enter the box A.5. calculation, which is intended for the support of research only. In 2011-12, the driver for this cell decreased to $0 / I&R and AES faculty FTE. When faculty commit their effort to extramural projects, faculty are encouraged to direct charge this effort to the grant budget to the extent possible (rather than cost sharing the effort). Release of the 19900 salary savings is one mechanism to generate research support funds.

The rationale for a fixed amount of research support per AES and per I&r FTE in the formula term of A.5.a. is:

(i) there should be funding for core research assuring support for, as an example, trying preliminary experiments and other exploratory work independent of what granting agencies may dictate.

(ii) research is essential for both I&r and AES portions of an appointment and basing "core" research funding on AES alone would tend to exacerbate inequities already imposed by I&r/AES splits that do not always correspond to faculty efforts.

(iii) the great majority of faculty members are primarily self-motivated and will not be dissuaded from seeking research support by the minimal support CA&ES is likely to be able to provide at any time in the near future.

(iv) the proposed formula will dictate only the aggregate amount of research support going to a department; the chairperson of the department has the option of not providing research support or providing only minimal support to a faculty member that s/he considers to have a limited capability for using funds productively.

A.6. The small amount specified here is intended to encourage faculty members to participate in public service activities such as participating in meetings with benefits
to California clientele, participating in industry- or government-sponsored conferences where advice of benefit to California may be provided by the faculty member, etc. In 2011-12, the driver for this cell decreased to $0 / I&R and AES faculty FTE. **When faculty commit their effort to extramural projects, faculty are encouraged to direct charge this effort to the grant budget to the extent possible (rather than cost sharing the effort). Release of the 19900 salary savings is one mechanism to generate outreach support funds.**

**B.1-B.4**

Use total enrollments based on pay department of the CA&ES instructor. Also, no adjustment is made for large versus small classes. Graduate and undergraduate are subject to the same funding formulas, as recommended by the ad hoc committee on teaching.

**B.1.** Photocopying ($1.50/SCH), clerical work for adds, drops, course reports, class schedules, placing book orders ($2.50/SCH) based on Animal Science and Environmental Science & Policy department data. The driver for this cell had been $4/SCH for the period 1993-2004. The driver increased to $4.80/SCH in 2004-05. The driver increased again to $4.85/SCH in 2007-08.

**B.2.** and **B.3.**

Amount, which is in excess of the B.1. amount, is intended both as an incentive and to address faculty office supplies costs, possible purchase of software, etc., associated with instruction; also included is inducement for presentation of a freshman seminar. The $2/SCH for GE courses with a writing requirement is intended to assist with the cost of readers for such courses.

**B.4.a.** Funds for special supplies, services of a person who prepares solutions, services of a software expert, etc., varying from $0/SCH for a lecture course to $100/SCH for an expensive laboratory or field course. An interdepartmental technical committee is to advise the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Academic Programs on the funding for specific laboratory and field courses. Funding for courses should be reviewed from time to time, e.g. a 5-year interval. A major review of course funding was conducted in 2006-07, based on principles recommended by a faculty and staff committee to the dean. Decisions were implemented in the 2007-08 RAC formula allocations. Funding is still limited to no more than $100/SCH. Also, funding is not allocated for undergraduate courses with enrollment <12 or graduate courses with enrollment <5. Finally, to be eligible for B.4.a funding, the department must first have established the maximum Course Material Fee for eligible expenses for the course.

**C.1-C.3**

Use number of undergraduate students in department associated majors. For interdepartmental undergraduate majors, funds may be under control of a major advisor or Divisional Associate Dean rather than a department. The amount for each graduate student is for graduate students housed in the department, regardless of whether the graduate degree is to be granted by the department or a graduate group.
C.1. Based on experience in Animal Science, the Exploratory Major and Environmental Science and Policy, the administrative costs of supporting an undergraduate student enrolled in the major is about $75/student; peer advising and other costs account for the remaining $25/student; a graduate student housed in the department engenders significantly greater administrative work (e.g., personnel/payroll) than an undergraduate major; hence the proposed $200/graduate student.

C.2. Funding for undergraduate advising, possibly to be distributed at the discretion of the department chair (or Dean) to accounts of the Master Advisor, the Advisors, and/or an advising center. In 2012-13, the driver for this cell increases by $12 to $42 per undergraduate major headcount. In 2012-13, the driver for this cell increases by $12 to $42 per undergraduate major headcount. In 2015-16, the driver for this cell increases by $50 to $100 per undergraduate major headcount.

C.3. Support for graduate group administration is based on a formula developed by Graduate Studies. While Graduate Studies does not provide support for administration of department based graduate programs, the CA&ES provides partial support for administration of such programs.

D.1. Previous to 2003-04, Cell D.1 allocated support for CE administration at the same rate as Cell A.1 allocated support for I&R and AES administration. Due to the serious CE budget reduction in 2003-04, Cell D.1 allocated only $4,000 per CE Specialist FTE to address CE administration and staff workload issues in 2004-05. The driver for this cell slowly recovered to $7,200/FTE in 2005-06; $9,700/FTE in 2006-07; $10,360 in 2007-08; $12,900 in 2008-09; $6,900 in 2009-10; $10,400 in 2010-11; $12,500 in 2012-13; and $12,660 in 2013-14. In 2014-15, ANR changed its budget model for CE support funding. Effective 7/1/2014, ANR decentralized responsibility to CA&ES for funding CE employee benefits expense for staff and students (ANR still centrally funds employee benefits expense for CE Specialists). And, ANR now allocates to the CA&ES dean the equivalent of $43,000 per CE Specialist FTE for support. These funds have to cover CE administrative effort at the department, cluster, and dean’s office level, CE contribution to Special Facility funding, direct program support to CE Specialists, and benefits expense for staff and students paid on CE funds. The net effect of these changes was a $653,902 reduction in funds allocated from ANR to CA&ES. For 2014-15, additional one-time transition funds were provided - - $300,000 from ANR and $112,138 from CA&ES Dean. These total transition funds amounted to $8,301 per CE FTE. For 2015-16, the driver for this cell increases to $20,913; however, staff and student benefits also have to be funded from this allocation.

D.2. CE personnel must be free to initiate and return many long distance telephone calls per year in order to carry out their assigned tasks. Previous to 2003-04, Cell D.2 provided the $1,600 per CE FTE, as is included in A.2. for I&R and AES, and an additional allotment for telephone expenses in the amount of $1,500/CE FTE. In 2003-04 this was reduced to $0 due to the serious CE budget reduction. In 2004-05, the driver for this cell was restored to $3,100/CE Specialist FTE.
D.5. Research support is provided here, on a basis similar to A.5. The amount of is based on available budget. In 2003-04, this was reduced to $0 due to the serious CE budget reduction. The driver for this cell slowly recovered to $1,000/CE Specialist in 2004-05 and $1,500/CE Specialist FTE in 2005-06, then decreased to $1,000/CE Specialist FTE in 2006-07 and to $500/ CE Specialist FTE in 2009-10. In 2011-12, the driver for this cell decreases by $500 to $0 / CE specialist FTE. **When CE specialists commit their effort to extramural projects, CE specialists are encouraged to direct charge this effort to the grant budget to the extent possible (rather than cost sharing the effort).** Release of the 69085 salary savings is one mechanism to generate research support funds.

D.6. Intended to provide minimal coverage of CE travel expenses plus reimbursement for activities such as those described above for A.6. $5,000/FTE was recommended initially. Incentive factors should also be identified for allocation in this cell. To date, attempts have been unsuccessful to identify incentive factors that can be easily quantified and reported from data bases. Until such factors can be determined and implemented, the funding available will be allocated on an FTE basis and based on available budget. In 2003-04, this was reduced to $1,000 per CE FTE due to the serious CE budget reduction. In 2004-05, the driver for this cell was $4,400/CE Specialist FTE. In 2005-06, the driver for this cell was increased to $7,000/CE Specialist FTE. In 2006-07, the driver for this cell decreased to $5,000/CE Specialist FTE. For 2015-16, the driver for this cell decreases $0 / CE Specialist FTE so that cell D1 could be increased with the eventual goal of reaching parity cell A1.

E.1-3. This funding is intended to help address the additional staff effort required to administer extramural funding, and to provide incentive to faculty members and departments in obtaining extramural support. Based on budget availability, the goal is to allocate up to 5.0% of direct cost extramural expenditures. For 2005-08 the driver was 4.3316%. It changed to 4.4904% in 2008-09; 3.8682% in 2009-10; 3.4314% in 2011-12; 3.4889% in 2012-13; and to 3.6844% in 2014-15.

F.1-3. These terms are intended to recognize the additional costs of maintaining safety standards and supervising the use of space in "wet" laboratory and shop space (defined as being monitored by EH&S or having EH&S imposed safety standards, e.g. eye protection) as well as other non-office space.

F.4-6. Special facilities, including collections, equipment, special resources such as field facilities, etc., are expected to have a life of at least 5 years and may have functions in research, teaching, outreach or some combination of these. Planning, construction and start-up costs of special facilities are to be from discretionary funds and are not to be a part of the department's budget as allocated by this table. A distinction is made between costs associated with maintenance of a facility and the costs associated with use of the facility in support of teaching, research and outreach. "Maintenance" costs are considered to be those required to keep the facility in good repair and safe even in the absence of actual activity at the facility. Costs of maintenance are to be distinct from costs appearing in columns A-E.
Funding should be planned for 5-year intervals for stability and in order to minimize the efforts made in justifying special facilities. Use of special facilities should be a part of the annual presentation of the department. Justifications and expenditures should take into account the fact that expenditures proposed in columns A-E in general are bare-bones, and column F items should be treated with similar rigor. Small collections and similarly inexpensive enterprises should be supported by departmental discretionary funds rather than as a special facility.

A schedule should be established for evaluation of all CA&ES special facilities on a periodic basis. Such evaluation presumably will involve a site visit and negotiations in most instances. Departments should be encouraged to phase out unnecessary facilities by allowing them to retain, for two or three years, a portion of the funding that otherwise would support the facility.

Points to be considered in justifying expenditures on special facilities, equipment and initiatives are:
- What is the impact on CA&ES capabilities of the facility in teaching, research, and public service and in obtaining extramural grants?
- Has the facility been used productively, and is there a reasonable expectation that it will be so used?
- Is the facility used by CA&ES employees and/or students other than those of the department that is managing the facility? Is the facility or initiative critical or important to the activities of two or more departments?
- Is the special facility (such as a collection) irreplaceable?
- Is the facility unique, on the Campus, in California, in the US, internationally? If the facility is used in significant part to benefit non-Californians, i.e., should support be derived in part or wholly from non-CA&ES, non-State funds?
- Is the funding of the facility duplicated by any items covered by columns A-E? Funding for a special facility or initiative is to be net of any funding of A-E.
- Can any or all of the functions of the facility be replaced by cooperative research with California growers, corporations, schools, community groups, etc.?
- Does or can the special facility generate income, e.g. through recharges?

A major review of facilities funding was conducted in 2006-07, based on principles recommended by a faculty and staff committee to the dean. Decisions were implemented in the 2007-08 RAC formula allocations. Special facilities budgets were decreased in 2008-09 (8% decrease for animal, field, and shop facilities; 5.1% decrease for all other facilities). All special facilities budgets were decreased by an additional 6% in 2011-12.

[End of Table 1 notes]
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