

DRAFT
MINUTES

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE
April 4, 1985
Regents' Room, Morrill Hall
3:15 - 4:20

Members present: Mark Brenner, John Adams, Richard Goldstein, Wendell Johnson, F. Gerald Kline, Gerald Klement, David Madison, Irwin Rubenstein, Paul Schulte, David Storvick, Deon Stuthman (Chr.), John Sullivan.

Guests: V. Rama Murthy, W. Phillips Shively.

1. Threat of deep legislative cuts in University's requested appropriation.

University personnel were alarmed by proposals made within legislative committees to provide the University essentially no increase in real dollars in the 1985-87 appropriation. The consequences, Professor Shively and Vice President Murthy warned, would be disastrous: program cuts, steep tuition increases, damage to the entire University. A House appropriations committee was proposing to project the rate of inflation over the biennium as zero. That would mean no pay increases for any state employees, and no SE&E increases; new buildings could not be opened.

SFC discussion focused on tactics the University and its friends could undertake to lobby effectively against the radical proposal which parts of the legislature have initiated, and to open people's eyes to the adverse consequences for the state its implementation would mean. Vice President Murthy referred to efforts already underway, including use of the network of county extension agents. He noted that the budgetary loss which would occur if the proposal were adopted would be equivalent to the entire budgets of CLA and IT.

2. Polling among SFC faculty members' departments on prioritization among several important budgetary areas. (The chairman had distributed a short survey to SFC's faculty members several days before the meeting with the request that each one put it to colleagues.) The members reported on the responses.

Goldstein: Got some very negative reactions to being asked to weigh faculty salary increases against graduate tuition fellowships.

Kline: Colleagues favored combining the two (salaries, fellowships) into a single item because they are symbiotically related.

Rubenstein: Colleagues would like increase in faculty salaries; the only other high priority item for which they would sacrifice would be graduate student tuition fellowships.

Sullivan: (He chose to add to the survey the specific items of funding for research and research equipment.) Eleven of twelve put faculty salary increases first, then research and research equipment funding, then graduate tuition fellowships.

Adams: Colleagues wanted the faculty to stay on the schedule for recovering 1973 purchasing power, but made additional remarks on the importance of other support. They noted that capital requests seem rather easy to get approved, but then the operating budgets compete with other University needs, which is not a good situation.

Storvick: Colleagues said strongly the University must stay on the faculty salary improvement schedule or our very best will be hired away.

Stuthman remarked that units which have very few assistantships might favor more strongly funds for tuition fellowships, to make themselves more competitive in attracting students. He then suggested members might wish to carry their polling a bit further.

Sullivan emphasized how much the responses are affected by the way the questions are structured and by the background information provided. When the support infrastructure at this University is spelled out to respondents, he said, it is not obvious that increasing faculty salaries will clearly be the highest choice.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Meredith Poppele,
Secretary