

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

12-6-1999

FACULTY SENATE - December 6, 1999 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "FACULTY SENATE - December 6, 1999 Minutes Summary" (1999). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 428.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/428

This Text is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes by an authorized administrator of University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. For more information, please contact Scholarly.Communication@unh.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
FACULTY SENATE
DECEMBER 6, 1999 MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll - The following Faculty Senate members were absent: de la Torre, Macieski, and VonDamm. Absent as work to rule were Barretto, Carr, Christie, Echt, Garland, Kaye, Planalp, Reardon, Roh, Stine and Turner. Excused were Lamb and Williams.

II. Communications with the President - The president said that the Board of Trustees has approved domestic partner benefits. Regarding land acquisition and disposal, the president said that she does not believe there is a problem with the policy but rather with its implementation. The policy requires that a number of issues be considered including current uses, the environment, appraised value and donor wishes. Properties can be sold under certain conditions, and the municipalities concerned must be informed. The university is working on improving documentation of its external properties, which include approximately 3400 acres in fifty parcels; and some were originally donated with conditions which curtail any disposal. The Board of Trustees has given approval to start the steps required by the policy before any possible disposal of twelve parcels of land totaling about 286 acres.

Continuing ownership of those twelve parcels costs the university money. The dean of COLSA was asked to document the academic uses of these lands. However, there is no list of that use; and it has been hard to discover who all the users are. The president said that we need to put in place a structure which can answer these questions and that perhaps we should expand the charge of the Woodlands Commission to include lands which are not wooded. We now have a university committee to assess whether land gifts will be more costly than they are worth, and another possibility is to expand the charge of this committee to include keeping track of the academic use of land. A professor said that there has been no assurance that the proceeds of property sale would go to the university, and the president replied that this issue is no longer a worry and that the money from any such sale would belong to the university.

A faculty member said that, during the recent contract mediation, the mediator offered to bring a possible solution forward but the Board of Trustees refused to hear the proposal. The president replied that the trustees had asked if there was a chance that the faculty would accept the proposal, and the mediator responded that he was not optimistic. A professor said that, regarding retroactive pay, the system negotiators had said that a three percent pay increase was the limit because that was all that had been budgeted. If those monies were budgeted, why withhold them from the faculty, except to be punitive? The president responded that those issues have to be bargained and that she hopes the sides will come together soon.

III. Minutes - The minutes of the last Faculty Senate meeting were approved unanimously.

IV. Disposal of Property - The Campus Planning Committee, through its chair, presented a motion on property disposal as follows:

Many UNH properties, both in the vicinity of the UNH campus and across the state, are classrooms of the university. They are used as teaching tools and as sites for both graduate and undergraduate research (and sometimes in collaborative usage with UNH Cooperative Extension). This often involved long-term research which cannot be readily carried out on other lands not controlled by the university. As such, these properties should not be considered for disposal or change of status in any way without faculty assessment of the affected properties. The senate acknowledges that a policy to assess the impact of a sale of property exists; however, the implementation of that policy is deficient. The senate calls for a revision of the policy's implementation structure, ensuring consultation with affected departments and faculty and continuing to require an academic

impact statement prior to any action being taken to dispose or change the status of any university property.

The committee chair said that there is a current policy on land disposal but that there have been problems with the implementation of the policy. Also, closer collaboration among the Resources Committee, the Woodlands Commission, and the Land Acquisitions Policy Committee is needed. A professor said that the chairs and the faculty of the Natural Resources Department and the Animal Science Department were not aware of the plans to sell the lands and that these are lands which are used for teaching and research especially by those departments and also by the Plant Biology Department and the Thompson School. Faculty want to be consulted early in the process. The Campus Planning Committee has discussed the possibility of having a member of their committee also be a member of the committee which will be modified to deal with better implementation of the land disposal policy. The chair of the Campus Planning Committee said that the president has confirmed that no land sales are imminent.

Suggestions were made to change the last sentence of the motion to say “The senate calls for a clear, written statement of the policy’s implementation structure, ensuring consultation with affected departments and faculty and continuing to require an academic impact statement prior to any action being taken to dispose or change the status of any university property.” This change was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Jim Farrell moved and Bob Connors seconded alternate wording for the motion as follows:

The university shall conduct an academic impact study prior to the disposal or sale of any university property. An academic impact report shall be submitted to the Faculty Senate Campus Planning Committee, with copies to the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee. Such study shall evaluate the importance of the property for current or future teaching or research. Academic departments and individual faculty, whose work would be affected by the sale or disposal of university property, shall be given the opportunity to respond to the academic impact report. The Faculty Senate shall offer a recommendation to the president on the sale or disposal of the property within 30 days of receiving the academic impact study (or, if the university is not in session, at the first full meeting of the senate subsequent to the issuance of the report).

A professor said that she would like an opportunity to read the current policy. A faculty member added that we should emphasize that the Faculty Senate’s roll is critical regardless of what is in the policy. Also there should be a provision in the policy to deal with conflicting desires for land use among faculty. **Tim Ashwell moved and John Pokoski seconded that the motion should be tabled until the January 24 meeting of the Faculty Senate. The motion to table passed with 24 ayes, 2 nays and 2 abstentions.** A senator asked the Campus Planning Committee chair to stay in touch with the provost on this issue, and she agreed to do that and also to see if there is a policy on change of land use in addition to the policy on land sales. She repeated that she has been assured that there will be no land sales in the near future. A professor expressed concern about damage done to university fields when a jeep was driven over them for a survey. A faculty member suggested that any motion should explicitly include leasing and not just sale of lands.

V. Responsibility-Center Management - The chair of the Finance and Administration Committee said that his committee wrote part one of the first motion on the RCM handout and that the Agenda Committee wrote parts two and three of that motion. Then both committees agreed on the entire motion one. In addition, his committee provided a second motion to be voted on if the first motion does not pass. The Finance and Administration Committee, through its chair, moved motion one, including parts two and three as friendly amendments which have been accepted. A professor said that motion one has been worded so that the provost would see to it that the deans communicate with the faculty on how the deans will implement RCM and also so that there will be

continued consultation with and participation of faculty at the department level under RCM. Concern was expressed that all revenues generated by faculty will flow through the dean's office and that we should ensure that faculty and departments which take extra steps of grant seeking and entrepreneurial efforts will receive some or all of the resulting funds.

The Academic Affairs Committee chair presented a different RCM motion which included requests for reassurance on the basic principles of maintaining academic quality, preserving the faculty's role, and showing administrative support. This motion concluded by urging that academic reviews be conducted each year by the provost and representatives of the senate for the first three years and every three years thereafter. These reviews should consider both quantitative benchmarks and qualitative considerations which were named in the motion, and the review results should be reported to the senate. A professor said that the motion should address checks and balances and recourses. After much debate and considering the president's intention to make her decision on RCM in December, a proposal was made to take the Academic Affairs Committee motion, up until the sentence before the word "therefore" near the bottom of page two, and attach those paragraphs to the beginning of the Finance and Administration Committee's motion as adjusted by a number of wording changes which had been proposed from the floor.

The combined motion read as follows:

In its consideration of the proposed budgeting system change to the more decentralized budgeting system, known as RCM, the University of New Hampshire Faculty Senate requests reassurance on the following basic principles.

Principle 1: Academic quality must be maintained.

We seek reassurance that, if the new budgeting system harms academic quality, this will be discovered and changes will be made to ameliorate immediate problems and prevent them from recurring. We recognize that oversight mechanisms are in place: the University Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee and the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost will act to support the academic integrity and quality. But we need to know on an ongoing basis that the oversight is effective.

Principle 2: The Faculty's role must be preserved.

Decentralized budgeting is intended to be a "daylight process," with all concerned having full access to "user friendly" and meaningful budget information. Deans have been given the power to determine how they will implement the new budget system within their colleges. Because it is ultimately the faculty who are responsible for academic policy, we ask that deans include faculty in these planning and priority-setting activities. Furthermore, if the pressure is going to be on faculty to act in ways that increase college revenues, faculty should also benefit directly from those increases in their own teaching, programs, departments, and scholarship; unless they have agreed to forego those benefits so that common goals, on which they have agreed, can be achieved.

Principle 3: Administrative commitment.

Most faculty do not want to become accountants nor should they have to; they have neither the time nor the interest. But the new system requires timely and accurate information about and awareness of budgets on a regular basis. We seek assurance that the support structures will be in place and that, if the current Business Service Centers are not able to provide the information and record keeping needed for this system to work as intended, the VPFA office will fill in while upgrading the BSCs as

required. Ideally, the system should be transparent, at work without our awareness.

Consequently, in response to the administration's request for consultation with the Faculty Senate on the proposed Responsibility-Center Management plan, the Faculty Senate strongly advises that RCM should not be implemented unless and until:

(1) the President reaches agreement with the Chancellor and the Trustees, as required, to permit units to carry forward funds, maintain Educational and General fund balances, and transfer funds between salary and non-salary categories.

(2) The Provost requests and receives from the Deans their plans for implementing Responsibility-Center Management in their units, and these plans are communicated to the faculty for comment and college-wide approval.

(3) The Provost ensures that in the future the following concerns continue to be addressed:

(a) the compatibility of RCM with the overall mission of the university,

(b) the involvement of the departments in RCM decisions and implementation,

(c) the comprehensive evaluation of administrators including their handling of RCM issues in their units.

A motion to table the motion failed, with four ayes. The original motion first moved by the chair of the Finance and Administration Committee failed, with seven favorable votes. **The combined motion passed** with fourteen ayes, three nays and eight abstentions.

VI. Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned.