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A FACULTY SENATE resolution proposing principles and recommendations for the current budget revision process.

WHEREAS, An enrollment shortfall has resulted in a reduction in projected revenues which threatens the financial viability of the university; and,

WHEREAS, The integrity of the academic offerings of the university is based upon building and maintaining viable programs, and attracting and keeping qualified faculty; and,

WHEREAS, Transparency in budgeting, policy making, and program development, as well as shared governance, are concomitant to the success of the university; and,

WHEREAS, The budget revision process must address the demands of our many academic programs in a timely and fair manner; and,

Therefore to insure an orderly and strategic response to the need, as President Bennett outlined September 24, for USM “to make budget adjustments in order to live within our means when we have a decline in enrollment,” we recommend the following:

1. that faculty input on planned cuts be achieved immediately through a spending reduction planning process that is in line with the President’s desire to make this a ‘transparent’ process;

2. that any program elimination should be carefully vetted by faculty and designed to build effective utilization of scarce resources and maintain the integrity of the university;

3. that vacant lines and attrition be used whenever possible but even only after considering the viability of the targeted programs;

4. that a plan be created for colleges to evaluate existing programs that respects the many ways that program success can be measured which would include, for example, current
and future potential, efficiency, outside support/funding, as well as number of students, and contributions to the general education curriculum;

5. that to the extent possible, the cuts be outside of academics, acknowledging the Administration’s plans to impose a 4.5% cut in all budget units (e.g., administration, athletic, and other non-academic area spending);

6. that to the extent possible, programs that maintained or grew enrollment carry less, or none of the burden of the reduced enrollment;

7. that for the 2015-2016 academic year, the Deans and the Administration create two plans: one for no growth in enrollment; and another for possible loss of 350 or so in enrollment. Have both in place by mid Spring;

8. that the Administration mount an expanded recruitment effort to help boost enrollment;

9. and finally that faculty be encouraged to do what they can to support student success and participate to the extent possible in recruitment activities to help boost enrollment.