

University of New Hampshire

## University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

---

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

---

11-22-1999

### FACULTY SENATE - November 22, 1999 Minutes Summary

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_agendas\\_minutes](https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "FACULTY SENATE - November 22, 1999 Minutes Summary" (1999). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 429.

[https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty\\_senate\\_agendas\\_minutes/429](https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/429)

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](mailto:Scholarly.Communication@unh.edu).

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
FACULTY SENATE  
NOVEMBER 22, 1999 MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll - The following Faculty Senate members were absent: de la Torre, Finn, Hiller, Macieski, McConnell, and VonDamm. Absent as work to rule were Barretto, Carr, Christie, Echt, Garland, Planalp, Reardon, Roh, Stine and Turner. Excused were Draper, Givan, Lukens, Naumes and Reid.

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

III. Responsibility-Centered Management - The Faculty Senate chair has emailed to the senators the main points of last Monday's discussion on RCM. Today the president said that our current budget model has certain faults. The budget is incremental, built on last year's budget plus or minus a small amount. Decisions are made by a relatively small group of senior administrators, some of whom are at the system level. We cannot use carry forwards as a standard budget tool. The current budget model is relatively hard to understand; and the model encourages short-range planning, because monies unspent by the end of the year are usually lost by the unit. As we consider the RCM model, we need to give careful thought to our institutional and academic values, mission and vision. Also there are issues that must be addressed with the system administration. We must get assurance in writing from the system office on such issues as carry forwards. In addition, we still need to work on a system of measurements and criteria, so that we will be able to evaluate RCM and make mid-course corrections. This year both the old and the new budget models are running concurrently, and the president is to make a decision in December on whether or not to use the RCM model for future budgets. The president concluded by saying that it is important for us to understand that RCM would not give us more resources but rather would help us manage our resources more efficiently.

The provost said that the university community has been engaged in widely participatory and non-ideological discussion on the RCM budget model and that many changes in the model have been made as a result of these discussions. We are attempting to create safeguards, in order to avoid disadvantages of decentralization. To this end we must agree on the goals of the university. Ideally we would work on the academic mission statement first, but we will have to do that in the next year. Each college's actions must further the agreed-upon mission plan. For example, the College of Liberal Arts could not decide to eliminate the General Education Program. The University Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee will provide faculty oversight for curricular changes.

The provost added that we need to identify the criteria for success or failure of RCM and that input from the faculty on these criteria is requested. Examples of such criteria might include seeing more long-range planning and more flexibility in the use of salary monies. If we decide to move forward on RCM, we would refocus RCM in three years and re-evaluate it in five years, taking a comprehensive look at the program and its criteria. In addition at the current time, we must pay more attention to how RCM will be implemented at the unit level, and the VPFA and the provost are sending a letter to the deans asking them to clarify this step. We also need to create a better system of evaluation and accountability on the basis of how each person's decisions enhance the mission of the university.

The president was asked whether she will obtain a response in writing from the system office before she makes her decision in December, and she said that she would have the response by then. A deal breaker would be constraints on carry forwards at the unit level, since we must let the units develop reserves. Also, we want to be able to control faculty positions and their funding. The president thinks that we will soon have a response in writing from the system but that the exact

changes in the wording of the system policy manual will take longer to implement. The president agreed that it might be suitable for the Faculty Senate to say that it does not consider the RCM proposal appropriate for this university without assurances on certain items. A professor said that, just as we need assurances in writing from the chancellor, faculty also feel the need for statements in writing from the deans about faculty participation. The president replied that we are asking the system office to change procedures that are now in writing but that the plans from the deans would not constitute a change in written policy.

The provost said that a broadly participatory group with three representatives from the Faculty Senate as well as additional representatives from the faculty will work on a strategic action plan next semester. Implementing RCM at the college level will be a work in progress, because the colleges are so variable, as are the departments within each college. Since some departments are much bigger than others, there is no one way that will work for all. However, the provost added that we can soon have a general answer from the deans. The president said that we will need to work with all levels including the department chairs, so that they will feel comfortable working with the new budget model. A professor said that, although the RCM model comes from the business world, the university is not a business and we must not forget that. Concern was expressed that the new budget model will take a lot of faculty time and new infrastructure. The president pointed out that the budget decisions are being made now and that the question is who should be making those decisions and how we can have the most budget flexibility. RCM would call for a different level of skill in decision making, especially on the part of the department chairs.

A faculty member asked for assurance that the decentralized model would continue in good budget times as well as bad ones; and he asked that research be supported. Another professor said that, over the last few years, his department has made some special initiatives and that enrollment is now at a high. He asked how this fact will affect the department under RCM. He also expressed concern that under RCM people will be judged by the bottom line and not by academic quality. The VPFA agreed that a unit which starts RCM at the height of an enrollment cycle could have a problem. She added that we will start each unit off with a share of the campus reserves as a buffer. The president said that we must be sure that the model provides for enrollment fluctuations and that the fund balances would help with this. She stated that we cannot expect that all programs will be revenue positive, and she added that a dean could apply to the university central fund for money to start a program which would benefit the state and forward the mission and goals of the university but which might not be revenue positive. She said that new programs must have a safety net so that they do not damage other programs. The provost added that he and the University Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee will work to see that academic quality is maintained. Faculty at other institutions have said that such a committee is essential to the success of RCM. The provost confirmed that we must keep constant check on the quality of the curriculum and of the students.

A professor suggested that, under RCM, we may need more staff in the colleges and less in the central administrative offices. However, the VPFA replied that we have already created business service centers which are central to each unit. Now that those centers have completed their start-up work, they will be available to serve as regional support structures for RCM in each unit; and therefore we will not need any additional staff in the units. The provost added that some programs may experience change and that we must make our curricula more efficient, since many programs have grown by addition rather than according to a plan. For example, we should consider how many laboratory hours are needed for a course and whether a similar course is taught in another department. The provost said that we need to create a balance between fiscal and curricular needs; and we think that, when people in charge of programs are given the opportunity to make decisions about the program, the program will benefit.

A professor said that many faculty have concerns about how RCM will impact academics. For example, many department chairs have all they can handle now, and under RCM there will be

much more work for the chairs. The VPFA said that her office will provide the business service centers and the chairs with additional training and support, so that the same number of people can accomplish the tasks needed under RCM. Fears were expressed that this learning of new processes and bureaucratic work will take away faculty time for research. A professor pointed out how bad our current contract situation is for faculty morale. One faculty member said that anything is better than our current budget process. The president commented that, in the year following the institution of RCM, every bad thing which occurs will be blamed on RCM. Concern was expressed that most other institutions with RCM are much larger than UNH or much better endowed. A faculty member said that we should ask if RCM will be good for the state as a whole.

A professor said that he wants to attend a conference in August and order the tickets months in advance in order to get a good price. With our lack of carry forward capability, he can only do this if he can get special permission from the dean. The professor added that he is in favor of RCM but wants to know what the administration will do if that budget plan is implemented and appears to be causing big problems in six months. The VPFA replied that we will keep the steering committee active in the first two years or so, in order to deal with any problems and make any necessary changes. Under RCM, carry forward capability would be at the unit level; and so the college could sweep up money that departments might want to carry forward to the next year. The provost said that we can mandate a process by which the deans would interact with their department chairs. The president added that her expectation is that departments could not accumulate monies without an agreement with the dean on the purpose for which the funds would be held. The provost said that a dean that misused this capability would be accountable to the faculty and to the provost. This issue is being discussed in the search process for two new deans at the present time. The president agreed that there will be a new relationship between the chairs and deans.

IV. Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned.