UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
FACULTY SENATE
2 NOVEMBER 1998 MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Roll - The following Faculty Senate members were absent: Bornstein, Condon, Morris, Pugh, Williams, Zia. Excused were Afolayan, Garland, Roh, and Walsh.

II. Minutes - Discussion of the minutes was tabled to the next regular meeting.

III. Communication from the Chair - The Faculty Senate chair gave a chronology of events leading up to the writing of the academic impact statement on the deans’ and provost’s budget recommendations. Historically the Agenda Committee has served as a resource during the summer when the Faculty Senate and its other committees do not meet. During the discussions this summer, the Agenda Committee gave a great deal of input and affirmed that any changes to the general education requirements would have to be approved by the Faculty Senate. The chair strove to maximize the faculty input on the budget recommendations, within the bounds of confidentiality stipulated by the administration. Over a third of the Faculty Senators participated in this task.

Confidentiality was maintained so that the discussion could be wide ranging and changes could be made without causing unnecessary harm to programs considered for and then removed from the list of budget cuts. The Faculty Senate meetings are open to all tenure-track faculty, and the minutes are available to everyone on the internet. The chair distributed meeting transcriptions. The Agenda Committee has emphasized that it did not endorse the cuts but wanted to provide a university-wide view of their academic impact.

IV. Budget Shortfall - Some faculty senators said that the senate should have insisted that the senate as a whole have access to the documents on a confidential basis or that they should have been declared open and not confidential, with time to discuss these documents in a Faculty Senate meeting and give input prior to the president’s approval of the budget plan. A faculty member suggested that the chair tell the president that the release of the proposed cuts prior to a senate discussion has created problems. A professor said that the senate and the administration should coordinate when the president intends to make a decision on responsibility-centered management and arrange that the senate committee reviewing this issue will be able to bring a motion to the full senate in time for discussion and input, before the decision is made by the president.

A senator said that the academic impact statement on the budget was very well written, well thought out and forceful. Many senators expressed support for the chair, saying that he had the best of motives and worked hard to increase senators’ involvement in the budgetary process.

Concern was expressed about the university system’s rainy day fund. A suggestion was made to call upon the university system to explain in detail why increasing system reserves are needed in this time of budgetary shortfall. In the past, the senate voted that
funding for the system offices be reduced to zero. However, the money goes to the system before it is received by the university. A suggestion was made that we should ask the university administration to review the mission statement and then articulate why it is better to make cuts in university programs rather than to reduce the budget of the system offices.

A question was asked whether motions can be brought to the floor of the senate without first being reviewed by a senate committee. The chair answered that they can come to the senate without committee preparation but that committee input is usual and preferred.

James Farrell moved and distributed two motions. The first, which was seconded by Barbara Krysiak and is designated motion III-M1, calls upon the state legislature to significantly increase state funding of the university so that no less than twenty percent of its total revenue comes from state funding. Bob Connors moved and Pedro de Alba seconded that the third paragraph from the bottom be deleted. A friendly amendment was made and accepted to change that paragraph to: “Be it hereby resolved, by the Faculty Senate of the University of New Hampshire, that the Legislature and the Governor of the State of New Hampshire should fulfill their obligation to provide adequate funding for the University of New Hampshire”. After extensive discussion, the amendment to change the wording of this paragraph passed.

A friendly amendment was made to change the fifth paragraph from the bottom to: “And whereas a long history of under funding, budget cuts, and high tuition make the university increasingly less attractive to prospective students”. This amendment was accepted. The main motion III-M1 passed with the two amendments.

The last motion by James Farrell, regarding withholding $534,000 from the University System, was seconded by Rosemary Wang and is designated motion III-M2. A friendly amendment was made and accepted to change the first paragraph to: “Whereas the University System has ordered that $4.5 million be cut from the UNH budget”. After some discussion, a motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously, to refer motion III-M2 to the Academic Affairs Committee to report at the next regular Faculty Senate meeting, which will be in three weeks.

V. Adjournment - Today’s meeting was adjourned.