

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

9-13-1999

FACULTY SENATE - September 13, 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 - September 13, 1999 Minutes Summary" (1999). *Faculty Senate Agendas & Minutes*. 518.

https://scholars.unh.edu/faculty_senate_agendas_minutes/518

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
SEPTEMBER 13, 1999 MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll - The following Faculty Senate members were absent: Bornstein, de la Torre, Farrell, Grenier, Lukens, McCann, Pugh, Roh, and VonDamm. Absent as work to rule were Christie, Garland, Reardon and Stine. Excused was Givan.

II. Communications with the President - The president said that the freshman class is larger this year than last. However, this big freshman class replaces last year's large senior class; and so the total enrollment this year is similar to the previous year, with only thirty-four students more this year. This freshman class has more honors students but slightly lower average SAT scores, and there are no marginal admissions. These freshman are fifty-two percent in state and sixty percent women. The university intends to set up a long-term enrollment plan.

The university's revenues have increased 4.3 percent over last year, and seventy-two percent of this increase is intended for salary and fringe benefits. Collective bargaining is at an impasse. The fact finder's report was accepted by the AAUP but not by the trustees. We must now resume the negotiations to see if there is some common ground. Due to the Claremont decision, the Governor has requested a seven to ten percent rescission plan by January 1. Senators are asked to read the entire fact finder's report, which is available on the web at the following address: chaucer.unh.edu/aaup/factfinder.html.

III. Communications from the Chair - The Faculty Senate chair said that Amy Gutman, speaker for the faculty luncheon, has received electronic mail from some faculty asking that she not come to the university due to the salary dispute. The chair said that he will provide the Faculty Senate committee conveners with a list of the committee members by tomorrow, so that committee meetings can be arranged.

IV. Minutes - The minutes of the last meeting were approved unanimously.

V. Responsibility-Centered Management - Ken Appel said that responsibility-centered management will not mean that the faculty will have control over the amount of money that the university or a college will receive. Colleges would be allowed to carry over funds from one year to the next without getting permission from any central authority. The central administration would have the power to transfer funds from one college to another, although the administration could not do anything that goes against the collective bargaining contract. The administration has always had the power to change the distribution of funds.

Many faculty at the University of Illinois, which has a version of RCM, feel that it is not a problem; but other faculty at that university do not like RCM at all. Ken Appel said that under the UNH plan for RCM, unless permitted by the deans and administration, there will not be any need for decisions to go beyond the deans. He added that there will be a faculty committee but that it is not clear what authority the committee will have. In the first year, no budgets will be changed by RCM; but after that time, some colleges would receive increased funding and other colleges'

budgets would decrease.

Another faculty member said that she has visited Central Michigan University, which uses RCM; and this budgeting method gave a lot of new power to the deans. The budget of each college would fluctuate with the number of students and credit hours. If a well-paid senior professor retires and a young faculty member is hired, the savings could stay in the college. A professor suggested that we need to think about ways to balance the deans' power. We need to look into the details of the proposal and see if there are enough protections and controls for the plan to work. A faculty member asked if the deans would be able to set tuition for the students in that college or decide not to support a part of the university which does not directly create income, like the library. The Service Unit Advisory Board will decide on the support for such units.

A senator will soon visit the University of Minnesota to inquire about the type of RCM used there. The Faculty Senate chair said that, after the senate has discussed the UNH plan further, he would like to have the vice president for financial affairs come to the senate to discuss RCM and answer questions about it. The chair asked that the senators read the RCM report, which is accessible through the UNH web site.

Concerns were expressed that RCM would pit colleges against each other. A professor from UNH-Manchester said that UNH-Manchester has a budget with many similarities to RCM. Each program has to justify its existence. However, he felt that the result was more democratic than in the past. Other faculty commented that market value is not the best way to evaluate a university program, adding that there are important cultural considerations. The senate chair asked that senators consult with their departmental colleagues and be prepared to discuss this topic further at the next meeting.

VI. Work to Rule - Faculty want to do something to protest the continuing lack of a contract and the system's rejection of the fact finder's recommendation. Although it is difficult to choose an action which will not have negative consequences, faculty need to choose actions which will be in their best interest. A professor said that, if we were to define work to rule as preventing attendance at Faculty Senate meetings, the faculty would do themselves a disservice. The senate is the faculty's own body and has a track record of preventing changes which faculty did not want. One professor said that it is important for faculty to stand up for what they believe and that, in order to show protest over the lack of a faculty contract, he invites faculty senators to join him in standing when the president speaks with the senate. Another professor said that she voted for work to rule but believes that it should not include the Faculty Senate because the Faculty Senate was founded during work to rule so that faculty would have a place to deal with important issues during such a time. Another senator said that the Faculty Senate is a body that is concerned with faculty affairs and suggested that the senate clarify the situation by passing a motion that the senate should not be affected by work to rule.

A professor said that his department discussed this issue at great length and that his department will be unanimous on a strike vote. However, he said that, if we do not send a representative to the Faculty Senate and Executive Committee meetings, what decisions will be made? Another professor said that faculty senators are in a position to make a difference on issues such as RCM. Last year the senate set up the University Curriculum and Academic Policies Committee which

will be an important check on changes during RCM and is charged to protect the academic integrity of the university. Another professor said that we should distinguish between governance and service and that we can withdraw from service without withdrawing from governance. He added that, for example, if we do not take action, the university's parking committee may be planning to implement some parts of the old parking plan which most faculty do not want.

Discussion ensued on whether or not to decide to inform members of the administration that they will not be invited to any Faculty Senate meetings until the contract is signed. Some faculty felt that administrators should not be allowed to speak to the Faculty Senate until a contract is signed. Others said that we participate in shared governance and are not compromised by speaking to administrators. Some professors felt that we should do something, even though it would cause disadvantages for faculty. Another professor said that we should be able to arrange for administrators to come onto our turf when we want to and should use this opportunity to assertively deal with issues that are important to us.

VII. Motion on Fact Finder's Recommendation - A faculty member suggested that the senate vote to support the fact finder's recommendation and ask the Board of Trustees to accept it. Others responded that the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws state that the senate may discuss collective bargaining issues but must not take official action on them. Motions one and two by Jim Farrell were read to the senators; and in his absence, Funso Afolayan moved and Guy Petty seconded parts A and C of motion one. Another senator called a point of order and said that we cannot address this motion without a two-thirds vote to change the senate constitution, because the motion is directly about collective bargaining issues.

A friendly amendment was made to reword section A to say "The Faculty Senate of the University of New Hampshire deplores the Board of Trustees' failure to accept the recommendations of the independent fact finder and thereby end the contract impasse with the UNH faculty". Section C adds that "The Faculty Senate applauds the AAUP for its willingness to compromise and for its acceptance of the fact finder's report in the interest of ending the contract impasse."

A professor said that we must act in accordance with section nine of the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws, because that clause was inserted in the constitution so that there could never be two voices by the faculty on collective bargaining issues. A motion was made and seconded to carry over the issue to the next Faculty Senate meeting. A senator asked that written copies of the constitution be sent to all faculty senators. The motion to table the main motion until the next senate meeting passed.

VIII. Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned.