

## UMBC FACULTY SENATE

### MINUTES

APRIL 12, 1988

The meeting began at 3:30 p.m. There were 33 present. Senators Broyles, Hathaway, Schamp, and vonKerczek were absent. (Professor Schamp had been called to jury duty).

The Minutes of December 8, 1987, February 9, 1988 and February 25, 1988 were unanimously approved as circulated. The Minutes of March 8 were amended on page 1 to correct the spelling of the word "Anthropology" and were then unanimously approved.

President Roberts announced the deaths of Emeritus Professor of History Augustus Low, Professor Franklin Mendels (on leave from the History Department), and Alfie Brown, Visiting Assistant Professor of African American Studies and wife of Mr. William Brown, Chairman of the Theater Department. (He will express the condolences of the Senate to the families of these three well known and well respected faculty members.)

#### CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Chancellor Hooker spoke about two recent actions of the Maryland State Legislature: Budget and Higher Education Reorganization. His remarks on each subject are summarized below:

1. Budget. UMBC's FY89 budget, recently approved by the Legislature, shows an operating loss to the campus of \$140,000 from the increase recommended by the Governor, and includes approximately \$550,000 for renovations to the newly acquired Technology Research Center, located at the intersection of Linden and Shelbourne Road. This building, formerly known as the DET Building, will house Engineering programs and faculty offices until the Engineering building is constructed. Unfortunately, the appropriation for the Engineering building, described by Chancellor Hooker as the University's highest priority in the capital budget, was not approved this year. The Chancellor said that funding for the building will be sought again next year. The University budget as a whole represents an approximate 16% increase; UMBC will receive an increase of 13.6%. College Park was given its increment and held harmless for enrollment decline. Chancellor Hooker assessed the budget to be satisfactory overall. It represents a larger increase than the University expected, and should be seen in light of the fact that less financially healthy states are cutting university budgets.



2. Higher Education Reorganization. The Maryland General Assembly approved a higher education reorganization bill in the last hours of its annual session on April 11. Although the bill is not yet available in print and the fine details of the bill are not yet known, Chancellor Hooker was able to speak of three known items of consequence to UMBC. Those three provisions concerned budget, the determination of UMBC's peer institutions (which will affect future funding), and the definition of mission. He elaborated on each item as shown below. Chancellor Hooker said that the bill, in its final version, restored authority to the Chancellor (CEO) of the consolidated system (which was restricted in an earlier version). He said that UMBC will benefit by the selection of President John Toll as Chancellor. He believed that a strong Chancellor will be needed to reduce the positioning for power which is likely to occur among the institutions to be included within the University of Maryland System.

Budget: The Legislature has mandated a "large" budget increase. At this time, the amount of that increase is not yet known, but Chancellor Hooker said it probably will not be nearly as large as the newspapers have reported. Also unknown, is a determination of whether that increase will be in addition to or will include within it the cost of living increase that would have been built into the FY90 budget had reorganization not come to higher education this year. Chancellor Hooker explained that UMBC, in FY90, is slated to receive 100% of SBHE guidelines for FY 89.

Peer Determinations: After FY90, budget increases will be determined by a formula based on peer comparisons. It will be very important, therefore, for the campus to be in as favorable a position as possible when those comparisons are established. It was the Chancellor's understanding that peer descriptions will be provided by each campus and will be established subject to the approval of the newly established Maryland Higher Education Commission. Language in the bill treated UMAB and UMBC as one institution for the purposes of peer determination. This will permit UMBC the advantage of comparison to such well funded universities as UCLA or the University of Illinois Chicago. As a result, Chancellor Hooker felt optimistic that a continuation of budget increases will be assured in the near future. Not specified in the bill, however, were criteria to determine how peers can be selected, or if peer institutions may be identified with an eye to future mission and goals. Chancellor Hooker thought that the new Maryland Higher Education Commission will be inclined to establish favorable peers for each of the 11 institutions in the System because of the Legislature's expressed intention to accelerate the development of excellence of higher education in Maryland. Not completely optimistic in this regard, he also admitted to some



apprehensions. Using one of the new additions to the System as an example, he speculated that if one of the former State colleges should be permitted to select Ph.D. granting institutions as peers, an opportunity could then exist for that institution to argue that it should also offer the Ph.D. degree. For the short term, at least, Chancellor Hooker felt that UMBC will be well positioned in terms of funding as a result of this bill.

Mission: Chancellor Hooker said that mission will be within the purview of the Maryland Higher Education Commission. He reminded the Senate of his oft-repeated statement that now the "real battle" will begin to secure the best mission possible for UMBC.

Since the Maryland Higher Education Commission will approve peer determinations and will establish mission statements for the campuses, the Governor's choice of appointments to the Commission will be of particular concern and importance to UMBC. The Chancellor felt that it will be "exceedingly important" that the members chosen be people who "recognize the need in Baltimore for a major research university and who will regard UMBC as the best candidate to be built into that major research university".

#### Question and Answers:

Professor Rothstein was concerned about proper interpretation of the will of the Legislature as it had regarded mission. He cited text from a draft version of the bill which called upon the System Chancellor to develop an overall plan to: (1) enhance UMCP as the "State's flagship campus with programs and faculty nationally recognized for excellence in research and the advancement of knowledge", and (2) maintain a "coordinated center of higher education, research, graduate and professional study in the Baltimore area." He believed that the intent of this language was to specify that College Park will have one mission and "all the higher educational institutions in Baltimore" will have another. He argued that this language precluded any special role in the Baltimore area for UMBC. Chancellor Hooker stated that he was not sure that this language was left intact in the final version of the bill. Professor LaNoue said that the legislation does, indeed, create a preeminent role for College Park which, he said, had previously existed de facto but would now exist in law as well. He stated that sentiment for a special status for College Park was overwhelming in the legislature. He also stated that language describing the second principal center concept was deleted. Professor LaNoue believed that there is a possibility the Board of Regents may still regard that concept as alive. He stressed that the bill does protect UMBC, as the Chancellor had said, by creating for



it a special classification for peer determination. Professor Rothstein then debated the peer issue. He read from the draft bill that, "based on the joint UMAB-UMBC joint graduate research programs UMAB and UMBC shall be considered a single reserach institution for the purposes of determining peer institutions and funding." The draft bill later allowed that, "funding for UMAB shall be based on peer comparisons separately established for each school". He wondered about the meaning of language which would consider UMBC and UMAB as a single entity in one sentence and then treat UMAB as 5 schools in another. He added his opinion that, historically, all Maryland higher educational institutions have always fallen below what the theoretical formulas have predicted. He claimed that UMBC will need strong leadership and energetic lobbying by local politicians (which he did not believe happened before the bill was passed) if UMBC is to fare well in the eductional wars to come and asked Chancellor Hooker to explain how he plans to uphold UMBC's interests in the future. He asked if the Chancellor is "with us or against us". Chancellor Hooker assured him that he is "with us". At this point, the Chancellor requested that his remarks be off the record. Professor Rothstein protested this request and asked that his objection be recorded.

#### COMMITTEE REPORTS

##### AD HOC COMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Professor Graham had one action and three informational items. He distributed two handouts. One was a copy of the action item--a resolution of appreciation in recognition of the close and effective working relationship the ad hoc committee has enjoyed with the campus senates at UMAB and College Park. The other, illustrative of two of the informational items, was a single two-sided page containing a mark-up copy of the House amendment to establish UMBC and UMAB as a single entity for the purposes of determining peer institutions, and a table of comparative salary data grouped according to institutional classification systems.

Two of the informational items were interrelated. The first, a discussion of the peer determinations evolved into the second, a discussion of the various institutional classification systems and how such classification could influence faculty salaries.

Professor Graham remarked that the ad hoc committee and representatives of the UMAB and College Park campus senates had lobbied together to gain peer-based funding, campus autonomy, and a satisfactory resolution to the question of higher education in Baltimore. The UMAB-UMBC peer-group amendment was