

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

11-8-1999

FACULTY SENATE - November 8, 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 - November 8, 1999 Minutes Summary" (1999). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 430.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/430

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
NOVEMBER 8, 1999 MINUTES SUMMARY

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

II. Minutes - The minutes of October 18 and October 25 were both approved unanimously.

III. Responsibility-Centered Management - Suggestions on RCM from the senate's Finance and Administration Committee were distributed on email to the senators and in hard copy at this meeting. Today the vice president for finance and administration will speak with the senate on RCM; and on Nov. 15 she and the provost will discuss the matter further, at a joint meeting of the senate's Academic Affairs, Finance and Administration, and Agenda Committees. Finally the president, VPFA and provost will discuss RCM with the senate at its November 22 meeting; and the president will make a decision on the RCM proposal in December, even though a few details will not yet be firm.

The VPFA sent to the senators in advance of today's meeting a packet including her recent Campus Journal article on RCM, materials from the RCM website, a summary showing what the E&G budgets of the academic units would have been in FY98 under the current RCM model, and a graph on the proposed distribution of the state appropriation. The VPFA is interested in dealing with the USNH policy changes which are part of the RCM proposal. Two essential parts of that proposal are that units would be able to carry funds over from one year to the next and also that units would be able to transfer salary dollars to and from other categories, without asking for permission.

On the page showing what the E&G budgets would have been in FY 98, undergraduate tuition was calculated from the undergraduate tuition average share of credit hours for the two previous calendar years. Graduate tuition is not averaged and is on a per-student basis. Summer session tuition would be distributed as it currently is, and fees would continue to be collected by the units. The PAU allocation from the state appropriation would include areas such as the agricultural experiment stations and UNH-Manchester, which receive specific appropriations from the state. The library would get 1% of indirect cost recovery, 16% of state appropriations, and 1% of undergraduate net tuition. Also from the state appropriation, the university fund would receive 27%, as would the PAUs; and the academic units would receive 28% and the research units 2%.

The university fund is a centrally maintained fund that will be used to satisfy certain needs of the units and also to fulfill the "hold-harmless" pledge for the first year. The university fund would be subject to review at intervals. Credit-hour calculations would have weighting factors, with CEPS having a 1.5 weighting, LA a 0.8 weighting, and the other units none. This weighting factor mechanism has been introduced because there are very different cost structures between fields. The VPFA said that we need more data on this matter and will begin this year to participate in the Delaware Study. She added that, at the end of the third year of RCM and based on more objective data, we would be prepared to change those credit hour weightings. Weightings were given to CEPS and LA only, because those colleges were clearly the outliers in terms of cost. A professor protested that, when you look at what dollars were spent in the past for each college, you see only what funds were available for spending and not what should have been spent. The deans would decide how resources would be passed on to each department in the college.

A faculty member asked if there is any specific plan in RCM to deal with recisions. The VPFA said that we plan to decentralize 45% of the current campus reserves and give that to the colleges. The remainder, somewhat over 1.5 million dollars, would be kept in institutional reserves. If there were a recision which occurred early in the year and was not large, the recision might be shared by the units on a pro-rata basis according to how each unit receives state funds. Another faculty member asked if

differential tuition proposals have been considered. The VPFA answered that CEPS and WSBE now have differential tuition in small amounts. Dealing with larger plans for differential tuition cannot be done now, since there are so many other changes being considered at this time. If differential tuition were considered in the future, the university should at the same time reduce its reliance on course fees.

Regarding expenditures under the RCM plan, undergraduate financial aid would be averaged; but graduate student financial aid would follow each student and not be averaged. The "other financial aid" category would include prizes and the agricultural experiment stations. The amount charged each unit for facilities would be based on the square footage controlled by the unit. Each unit would be charged an academic affairs assessment based on the total revenue and total payroll. The same would be true of a general overhead assessment. A professor asked how we could check administrative growth such as funds for golden parachutes. The VPFA answered that the central budget committee would be able to review such items at any time for the central budget units. Also, tax rates used to develop these assessments would not be subject to annual change. If one of these central units wanted to get more funds, it would have to go to the central budget committee. In addition, the service unit advisory board would look at the matter from time to time. The central budget committee would be composed of four vice presidents, four deans, two RCM unit directors who are not deans, and five faculty including the chairs of the Faculty Senate and the senate's Finance and Administration Committee.

A professor said that, if a department is in an old and inefficient building, the expenses would be greater through no fault of the department. A committee is now working to develop a service agreement to set down in writing what the service levels are to be for the square footage rate. It would be too complicated to charge higher fees for the more modern buildings, and some buildings are not separately metered. The square footage fee also would pay for the cost of renovation and repair, which would be decided on by the Space Allocation Repair and Renovation Committee (SARRC). The VPFA said that under RCM we will need to review the membership of that committee, so that the faculty member or members would have a vote. The square footage fee would be \$11.11 per square foot except for the farm buildings in COLSA which would be at \$2 per square foot. The square footage fee includes snow removal. Furniture in a new building is always part of the capital budget. A unit could decide to give up space in order to reduce costs, but this would have to be done in such a way that another unit could use the space.

The major revenues for parking and roads come from money collected from parking permits and fines. Square footage fees for classrooms which are under the control of the registrar are charged to the academic affairs unit and paid for by the academic affairs assessment; but each college must pay for classroom space which the college controls. The steering committee is not seeking to impose requirements below the level of the units, except for the indirect costs which go to the principle investigators. The provost wants to see from each dean a concrete plan for how the principles will be applied within each school. The VPFA said that one reason the RCM plan can work is the law of averages within each unit. Also, a proposed new course which would incur expenses but bring in greater revenues would be more likely to be accepted under RCM than now, when the additional revenues do not go back to the unit. A faculty member expressed concern that a new course would often just cause a corresponding reduction of enrollment in other courses in the unit. Another professor asked if there will be checks and balances on possible efforts by one college to create courses and rules that would prevent their students from taking electives from another college. The VPFA said that there must be a curricular mechanism which will decide on such issues and that the senate's Academic Affairs Committee is setting up a University Curriculum and Academic Policies Committee which will be advisory to the provost. A professor said that, if we increase enrollments, we will strain already overworked facilities and faculty. There is no mechanism to increase funding for the writing center if its work increases.

The senate's Finance and Administration Committee observed that inadequate funding at UNH is a problem under both RCM and the current system. It is not useful for the senate to discuss the specific

dollar allocations to units. Comparisons with other institutions regarding RCM are generally flawed, because the other institutions have better funding. Under RCM, the decision and power structure would remain basically unchanged at the university and at the department level. The provost would still retain funds for program adjustments, and he and the curriculum committee would have control over the quality and type of courses offered. There may be enhanced entrepreneurial spirit, more flexibility of funds, and a more transparent budget and accounting system under RCM. There may be less protection for non-profit-making courses, and programs may try to create curriculum changes to prevent students from taking standard courses outside the program. The curriculum committee needs a clearly explained plan of operation. Also, the Finance and Administration Committee said that focus on RCM may divert faculty from dealing with other important administrative and curricular matters.

Faculty expressed concern about how the deans will deal with individual departments, about the additional power the deans would have, and about instructional quality and student quality under RCM. If a committee has a check on the deans' new power, would the committee members be elected or appointed? Many faculty want to see a specific plan from each dean on how RCM will be carried down to the departmental level, so that this will be institutionalized even if there were a change of dean. Other professors are concerned that under RCM the potential competition among colleges and departments will do more harm than good. Will the University Curriculum and Academic Policies Committee approve all curricular changes before they are implemented, or will it only deal with changes which are challenged? Reviewing every change would be too time consuming. Perhaps each curricular change could be circulated to the people who would be affected, and then the committee could review only when requested to do so. The Faculty Senate will prepare for the president a recommendation on RCM by the end of this month.

IV. Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned.