

Administrative Growth – Senate Report presented 6/6/08
Alternative perspectives and observations from ORMP and HR

ADMINISTRATIVE GROWTH SECTION (pages 4-5)

1. Section about administrative growth focuses on MSP data:
 - An alternate view of administration is all staff titles (MSP, PSS, SMG) with growth of 29%; exact same rate as academic titles.
 - MSP did increase as a proportion of the total, but by <1%
 - MSP 6.7% of total in 1998-99; increased to 7.6% of total in 2007-08 (PSS titles decreased)
 - Reduction in SMG titles not noted in the report.
 - Average MSP salary per FTE increased by 21%; all other categories (Academic, PSS and SMG) had average salaries increases of 54-56%.
 - Report challenges argument that much of MSP growth was reclassification of PSS positions because there is not a corresponding decrease in PSS. Report concludes that MSP positions that were reclassified were justified with managerial/supervision component leading to increases in PSS categories.
 - Offsetting reduction in PSS titles would be hard to detect because of large variances in absolute numbers (MSP grew by 378 FTE; PSS grew by 2,997 FTE on base of 11,215)
 - Percent change for PSS/MSP combined = academic growth so this is potential evidence of offset.
 - Managerial responsibility/supervision is NOT a pre-requisite for many of the MSP titles that were reclassified. MSP includes Managers and Senior Professionals. The Senior Professional positions are not typically a manager or supervisor.
 - Professional Staff examples include: IT Project Managers (they are managing projects vs. people), Specialists, Development Officers, Principal Development Engineers, Physicians and Sr. Veterinarians.
2. Budget/Expenditure data not used and tends to support a different conclusion:
 - Table 5 from original materials provided by ORMP
 - Instructional expenses increased by 68%
 - Academic support (includes dean's offices) increased by 54%
 - Institutional support increased by 35%
 - Additional context (information from financial schedules not specifically shared with Senate) See attached.
 - UCD last 10 years (1996-97 vs. 2006-07)
 - Instruction increased from 46.2% of total expenses to 50.7%
 - Institutional support increased from 9.3% to 10%
 - Systemwide
 - Institutional support ranges from low of 8% (UCSB, UCI) to 10% (UCD, LA, SD, B) to a high of 12+% (R, SC)

3. Academic Growth

- Growth in all academic titles equivalent to growth in all administrative titles. (also noted above)
- The top 3 categories of academic titles account for 83% of the total academic group as follows:
 - Ladder-faculty growth matches the overall growth (29%; from 981 to 1,266)
 - Academic Student titles – TA, GSR, Reader, Tutor, Interns, Residents – increased at a higher rate (38%; from 1,263 to 1,447)
 - Academic research titles increased by 15% (from 1,522 to 2,099).
- Student affairs growth in academic titles related to student assistant titles. Examples include learning skills center and Women’s Resource and Research Center.
 - Student assistant positions grew from 27 to 68 (239%)

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS SECTION

Campus Budget Process. Operating budget process last reviewed in late 90’s. The process was updated in 2000. The decision at that time was to preserve a largely incremental approach. ORMP agrees that a review would be timely and this has been the basis of recent conversations with dept chairs as we look ahead.

Current policy: <http://www.ormp.ucdavis.edu/documents/budget/budgetplanning/obpbook.pdf>

Closely related to the financial and budget review is the update of the academic plan and consideration of a new long-term enrollment plan. Work on each started this year and will be important inputs to a review of the campus finances.

Review of Human Resources. There are some misnomers in this area (e.g. “Worth, meaning salary, is still largely dictated, not by the innate challenges of the position or the skills required, but by the number of people that report to the individual or the high ranking administrator to whom the position reports). Number of individuals reporting to a position is a consideration in classification but is certainly not the single driver. Our salaries are based on market comparisons and our goal is to be pay within +/- 10% of the market. In many areas, we achieve this goal. One also has to consider total compensation. A recent Mercer study showed that our benefit and retirement programs were considerably better than the market.

The **Career Compass** initiative will help address some of the perceptions in this area. The initiative includes the standardization of position descriptions, an enhanced performance management system and identification of career paths that will link skills/training and development with advancement opportunities on the campus. This program will create greater transparency in our classification and compensation program.

UC Davis Financial Perspectives
Expenditure Trends 1996-97 through 2006-07

Question: How does the campus compare with other with other campuses in spending by major category, and has campus spending by category changed over the last 10 years?

Background and Data Sources

The most readily available data on campus spending as compared with the other UC campuses is the contained in the annual UC financial schedules. Schedule D organizes data by major expenditure category (such as research and instruction) and funds source (such as general funds and private gifts). The following analysis focuses on only general funds and student fees, which are the fund sources that are most often under subject to regental and legislative interest and action.

Campus Findings

Chart 1 shows the campus general fund and fee expenditures by major expenditure category excluding the Medical Center for 1996-97 and 2006-07.

**Chart 1--Expenditures for General Fund and Fee Expenditures 1996-07 and 2006-07
(percent of total expenditures)**

| | 1996-97 | 2006-07 | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| | <u>UCD</u> | <u>UCD</u> | <u>Change</u> |
| Instruction | 46.2% | 50.7% | 4.5% |
| Research | 11.8% | 10.6% | -1.2% |
| Public service | 0.4% | 0.7% | 0.3% |
| Academic support | 12.4% | 8.8% | -3.6% |
| Student services | 5.5% | 7.2% | 1.7% |
| Institutional support | 9.3% | 10.0% | 0.7% |
| Operation & maintenance of plant | 10.0% | 12.0% | 2.0% |
| Student financial aid | 4.3% | 0.0% | -4.4% |
| Auxiliary enterprises | <u>0.0%</u> | <u>0.0%</u> | <u>0.0%</u> |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% |

Key campus findings:

- Increased share of general fund and fee funded support for Instruction from 46.2% to 50.7%, and decreased its share of Academic Support funding from 12.4% to 8.8%.
- Increased share of general fund and fee funded support for Student Services from 5.5% to 7.2%.
- Increased share of general fund and fee funded support for Operation of Maintenance of Plant from 10% to 12.0%.
- Increased share of general fund and fee funded support for Institutional Support from 9.3% to 10.0%.
- Decreased share of general fund and fee funded support for Research from 11.8% to 10.6%.

Comparisons with other UC Campuses

For 2006-07, Chart 2 compares the general fund and fee expenditures by major expenditure category for all of the 8 general campuses (excludes UC Merced and Medical Center expenditures):

Chart 2: 2006-07 Campus Expenditures by Major Category
(percent of total general funds and fees)

| | <u>UCB</u> | <u>UCD</u> | <u>UCI</u> | <u>UCLA</u> | <u>UCR</u> | <u>UCSD</u> | <u>UCSB</u> | <u>UCSC</u> |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Instruction | 60.9% | 50.7% | 54.0% | 56.9% | 44.3% | 56.6% | 51.2% | 43.4% |
| Research | <u>7.9%</u> | <u>10.6%</u> | <u>3.4%</u> | <u>3.4%</u> | <u>8.8%</u> | <u>6.7%</u> | <u>3.4%</u> | <u>3.5%</u> |
| <i>subtotal Inst. & Research</i> | 68.8% | 61.3% | 57.4% | 60.3% | 53.1% | 63.3% | 54.6% | 46.9% |
| Public service | 1.6% | 0.7% | 0.6% | 0.6% | 0.6% | 0.8% | 0.8% | 2.7% |
| Academic support | 9.8% | 8.8% | 14.6% | 14.6% | 11.4% | 8.1% | 8.2% | 10.3% |
| Student services | 2.4% | 7.2% | 6.2% | 5.3% | 9.5% | 6.9% | 11.9% | 15.5% |
| Institutional support | 10.6% | 10.0% | 8.2% | 10.0% | 12.3% | 10.2% | 8.0% | 12.7% |
| Operation & maint. plant | 9.1% | 12.0% | 8.3% | 8.8% | 8.5% | 11.5% | 8.7% | 8.7% |
| Student financial aid | -2.5% | 0.0% | 4.7% | 0.3% | 4.6% | -0.8% | 7.7% | 2.5% |
| Auxiliary enterprises | <u>0.2%</u> | <u>0.0%</u> | <u>0.0%</u> | <u>0.0%</u> | <u>0.0%</u> | <u>0.0%</u> | <u>0.2%</u> | <u>0.6%</u> |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Key campus findings:

- At 50.7% of total general funds and fees, the campus has the 6th highest percentage allocated to Instruction.
- At 10.6% of total general funds and fees, the campus has the highest percentage allocated to Research.
- At 12% of total general funds and fees, the campus has the highest percentage allocated to Operation and Maintenance of Plant.
- At 10.0% of total general funds and fees, the campus has the 5th highest percentage allocated to Institutional Support.
- At 10.0% of total general funds and fees, the campus has the 4th highest percentage allocated to Student Services.