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

II. Communications from the Chair - The Faculty Senate chair said that, because there are no classes on October 11, the Faculty Senate meeting schedule will be modified so that the next two senate meetings will be held on October 18 and 25. Senate committees may meet on October 11. The senate chair passed out a letter from Joan Tambling, explaining why she declined to attend today’s senate meeting, and also information on current proposals for responsibility-centered management. Under RCM revenues, item one would include credit weighting factors of 1.4 for CEPS and 0.7 for Liberal Arts. Under RCM expenses, item one regarding charges per square footage may be deleted. Under other aspects of the RCM model, items two, three and four would require approval by USNH and are needed for the continuation of the RCM plan.

III. Minutes - The minutes of the last meeting were approved unanimously when modified so that the first sentence in the last paragraph reads, “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”.

IV. Responsibility-Centered Management - The senate chair said that the Faculty Senate will continue to discuss RCM through the senate’s last meeting in November. Ken Appel said that clarification on RCM statistics is needed and that the senate should see that the charges of the various committees with RCM oversight are spelled out in detail. The senate should consider carefully how faculty will be involved in governing the university before and after RCM is instituted.

A professor asked what justification there is for weighting only CEPS and Liberal Arts. The formula is still under discussion but was proposed so that the opening budgets would be the same as now. The provost will have a pool of money to balance inequities, but the CEPS dean wanted a method of automatic weighting as part of the RCM plan. There is a difference between the colleges in the standard number of credit hours per course, and the credit hours in CEPS are set in accordance with decisions by the accrediting board. Concern was expressed about the weighting proposal and the fact that it does not include the other colleges as well.

Professor Thomas Ballestero recently visited the University of Minnesota on behalf of the faculty here, to inquire about the version of RCM in use there; and his report is available on the RCM web site. Most universities do not use a square footage fee, because it adds a complication which is not worth the time and cost required to administer it. At the University of Minnesota, interdisciplinary efforts were enhanced rather than prevented by RCM. It is easier to implement RCM when economic times are good. In good times, faculty may not notice the change.

Faculty are concerned about how the deans will handle savings or increased revenues from a department. Will these benefit the department or go directly to the college? Such criteria need to be spelled out. The dean would be able to redistribute, within the college, faculty positions which become vacant. A process for maintaining academic quality and core curricula and for protecting the academic mission needs to be ensured. Units will have more variation in revenues under RCM. The senate will continue the discussion of RCM at its next meeting, and senators are asked to consult with their colleagues.

V. Introduction of Student Leaders - Kate Kokko and Amanda Wilson, Student Body President and
Vice President, introduced themselves and presented some of the issues on which the Student Senate is working. These include voter registration, an on-line book swap, legal advice for students, bus service, general education, parking, housing, and advocating better university funding. Students would like to be part of the decision-making process.

VI. Communications with the President - The president said that the university will ask the trustees for permission to move ahead with plans for an additional residence hall and dining hall, to be funded with bonds which would be paid for out of student fees for room and board. The new residence hall may have an area set aside for honors students. Possible locations for the new halls were discussed. A request was made that consideration be given to a central location for a faculty/staff club. A new capital campaign will start up soon, and construction of a new performing arts facility may be funded by donations.

Our campus has two hundred structures of which eighty are core facilities under state funding. We need to set up a plan with the governor and the state for the orderly renovation of these essential buildings. The Board of Trustees is working to redefine both its own committee structure and the structure of the system administration. The trustees have defined twenty goals for this year. The mission statement for UNH needs to be updated to more clearly differentiate our mission from those of the other institutions in the system. In the past, the university president could not submit a separate budget to the trustees, and they received an aggregate budget prepared by the system. Board of Trustee meetings are public, but some of the trustee committee meetings which deal with personnel or collective bargaining issues are closed.

As soon as a collective bargaining contract is reached, the president would like the collective bargaining process to be reworked, probably with the help of outside consultants as well as the input of all the parties. The president has often shared with the trustees her concern that the present process has the potential to damage the university.

VII. Collective Bargaining - Professor Steve Fan gave an update on the history and current status of the contract negotiations. During bargaining, the system negotiators always say that the budget is already set and that there is no more money than they have offered. However, each time a contract is signed, additional funds are made available for both faculty and staff salaries. The factfinder has made his recommendation, which the union accepted but the system did not. After that, the chief negotiators of each side met; and the system asked the union to accept a salary package lower than the factfinder recommended. However, the union feels that, even with the salary package recommended by the factfinder, faculty salaries would not reach parity with the average salaries at similar nearby universities. A mediator is now being chosen.

When a contract is eventually signed, raises for faculty will be retroactive to the beginning of the contract period; but faculty will not receive interest on the salary money which was held by the system during the retroactive period. Research funding on a per faculty basis at UNH is the highest in New England, and so is the teaching load. For the first year of the contract negotiations, the union did not recommend any action by the faculty to agitate for a contract, but now the union asks that faculty apply work to rule in order to encourage the system to agree to a suitable contract. A professor asked if the AAUP could get articles in the newspapers each week to clarify the continuing status of the collective bargaining at UNH.

VIII. Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned.