

January 2005

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE

I. Introduction

In making these recommendations we have kept in mind the definition of the Faculty's authority as specified in the *Faculty Handbook* (see Appendix F). In general, the Faculty's decisions should be definitive in matters related to the curriculum and requirements for degrees, and these matters should be carefully considered and expeditiously decided. At the same time, the Faculty has a compelling interest in other aspects of the University's operation, in that all affect the realization of the University's Mission. The Faculty has a right to be informed in a timely manner of such matters, and to express its recommendations to the President.

All members of the Bucknell community share an interest in making the University stronger. While conflict is often a necessary part of decision-making, it is important that it occur in the context of an overarching sense of collaboration in this common cause.

A. History and Context

Responding to the perception in some faculty, administrative, and trustees quarters that the governance system of the University was in need of serious scrutiny, both the Board and the Faculty initiated reviews during 2003-2004. In February 2004, the Faculty Council indicated its intent to propose an ad hoc committee to study the governance system (Appendix A). Later in the spring, the Middle States visiting team issued its report, which included pointed criticisms and suggestions regarding governance (Appendix B). This committee was authorized by faculty vote in April 2004, (Appendix C), and elected in September. Having been authorized without a detailed charge, the Committee reported its proposed charge to the Faculty in November 2004 (Appendix D).

B. The Committee's work

The Committee proceeded by soliciting comments from members of the university community, by submitting an on-line survey to all recipients of the Faculty list-serve, and by conducting confidential interviews with several present and former senior administrators and faculty officers (some in person, some by telephone, and some by email). We also reviewed relevant documents, including the Middle States Self-Study and the Evaluation Report.

C. Generalizations from interviews, survey, and other sources

Faculty Communications

Several faculty members communicated directly with the committee. Although small in number, these volunteered communications were fruitful sources of ideas. Among suggestions that emerged were

- the importance of changing the meeting time in order to meet the needs of members with family responsibilities;
- some frustration with meetings consumed by matters not explicitly on the agenda while issues on the agenda get short shrift;
- some frustration with the cavalier rejection or amendment of committee reports;
- a perception that participation in governance is not really valued by the administration;
- a perception that the Committee on Instruction is seriously overburdened by its large number of subcommittees;
- a strong commitment to teaching and scholarship as first priorities and a corresponding reluctance to devote more time to governance.

Governance Survey

The survey of faculty yielded 121 responses, which is a good response rate for such surveys. We do not assume that the results are fully representative of faculty views, however, the distribution of the sample, by division, rank, gender, and tenure status approximate the distribution of the faculty. A detailed summary of the responses may be found in Appendix E. Most of the results tend to confirm what we heard from other sources and one set of responses was so strong as to inspire a great deal of confidence in the generalizability of the results. These were regarding whether the President should have the authority to reject salary recommendations or tenure decisions: there were overwhelming majorities in the negative on both issues.

Interviews

Several administrative respondents were more receptive to proposals to enhance the authority of the president in tenure, retention, and salary decisions (as suggested by the Middle States Evaluation Report), and some cited problems with the governance system such as a lack of focus on specifically faculty (i.e. curricular) issues or committee reports being overturned by motions from the floor. While there was indication that the governance system needs some tweaking to address such issues (see our recommendations in parts II, III and IV of this document), the committee got no sense from these interviewees that the system is in serious crisis.

Conclusion

We find considerable agreement on several relatively modest steps that could be taken to improve our present governance system; these are contained in the following section on “Immediate Recommendations.” Then we have several more recommendations that, while still modest, would require amendments to the Faculty Handbook. Finally, we conclude with more radical proposed reforms, which we commend to the Faculty’s careful deliberation. This committee was charged with producing ideas for further study,

and we have done that. The Faculty Council will determine, based on the Faculty's votes on this report, what further action is required.

II. Immediate Recommendations

The changes suggested in this section could be made, either on the initiative of the Chair, or by Faculty vote, without amending the Handbook.

1. Change the time of the regular faculty meeting from the first Monday of each month from 5:00 to 6:30, to Tuesday or Thursday, twice a month, from 12:00 to 1:00.

Since about 1970, the size of the Faculty has nearly doubled, but attendance at Faculty meetings has changed little. About fifteen years ago, the quorum was raised to 75 from 50. Typical attendance is between 75 and 100 (except for September, when new faculty members are introduced), and perhaps one regular meeting per year fails to make a quorum. Thus, between 1/4 and 1/3 of the Faculty normally act on its behalf. Even though a significant number of faculty are on leave or off campus at any given time, this attendance is still so small as to undermine the credibility of the Faculty as a voice to be taken seriously: those who attend are for practical purposes self-appointed representatives, while the rest of the Faculty delegate their votes to the attendees. We believe that attendance at faculty meetings could be significantly improved by changing the meeting time. The most likely time would be Tuesday or Thursday from 12:00 to 1:00, when no classes are scheduled. Two such meetings in a month should be able to handle all faculty business.

2. Place reports and motions from standing committees first on faculty meeting agendas, followed by remarks and reports by the president and members of his/her staff, then by other old and new business.

This will help to assure that the Faculty gives first priority to its central business.

3. The deadline for inclusion in the agenda should be advanced to two weeks.

This will provide faculty members more opportunity to read and consider reports and motions prior to the meeting.

4. The use of substitute motions applied to motions from standing or ad hoc committees should be restricted or regulated.

The intent is to allow full consideration of committee proposals. A substitute motion can have the effect of cutting off debate on a committee proposal. We would still permit amendments and motions to refer a report to a committee.

5. The Chair should enforce the principle of Robert's Rules that "a member who has spoken twice on a particular question on the same day has exhausted his right to debate that question for that day."*

This would prevent debate from being monopolized by a small number of members.

* *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised* (1970), Section 4, p. 35.

6. The President should sit at the head table with the Faculty Chair and Secretary at faculty meetings.

While the Middle States Evaluation Report recommends that the President chair faculty meetings, the Committee believes such a step would entail more costs than benefits. An informal survey of comparable colleges and universities finds no consistent pattern on this issue. Our present arrangement allows the President to participate fully in faculty debate and discussion without compromising the impartiality that s/he would have to maintain were s/he the presiding officer. At the same time, the Faculty gains a great deal by having its own elected Chair, who has formal standing as a spokesperson for the Faculty with both the Administration and the Board. On the other hand, we believe it appropriate to recognize that the President does have a special status; this could be accomplished by placing the President at the head table.

7. Make no change in the President's authority regarding salary and tenure/retention decisions.

The Middle States Evaluation Report recommends that the President be able to change salary and tenure recommendations. However, the strongest result of our survey is the overwhelming rejection of such a change (note that the wording of the questions was based directly on the aggressive wording of the Middle States report; there may be intermediate ways of conceiving the president's authority). We believe that the present systems for merit review, retention and tenure have considerable legitimacy in the eyes of faculty members, a legitimacy that could only be undermined by explicitly authorizing the President to change such recommendations. The President's authority under the Charter remains extensive. Any decisions made by administrative officers (as in merit review) or by the University Review Committee (as in retention and tenure decisions) constitute recommendations to the President and to the Board. The charge of the University Review Committee explicitly authorizes the President to communicate to the Board any disagreement with URC recommendations.

8. The role of the Chair of the Faculty having significantly expanded in the last decade, we recommend that the Faculty Chair receive released time.

The responsibilities of the chair are much more extensive and significant than they used to be. We think they are certainly comparable to chairing a small department.

9. The Secretary of the Faculty should be added as an ex officio attendee at Trustee meetings.

The Secretary, like the Chair, is elected by the whole Faculty, and is privy to all faculty business. Therefore, it seems appropriate that s/he attend Trustee meetings. This would also aid the Faculty Chair in providing a surrogate when committee meetings of the Board conflict.

III. Recommendations Requiring Handbook Amendments

Proposals contained in this section would require amendments to *Faculty Handbook* (II, University Governance). The amendment procedures in Handbook section II.G specify

that proposed amendments be referred to the University Council for its comments, that amendments may not be voted on at the meeting in which they were introduced, and that when voted upon at a subsequent meeting, a majority of those present and voting is sufficient for approval.

Since the proposals in this section are so disparate, we recommend separate votes on each, with the understanding that each vote constitutes advice to the Faculty Council as it determines how to proceed with each proposal.

1. The quorum for faculty meetings should be raised to 100, from the present 75.

This will enhance the credibility of faculty decisions by having a larger proportion of faculty members present and voting.

2. While the Committee on Instruction in particular is seriously overburdened, several key areas are presently overseen by appointed committees. The general interest may be better served by creating standing committees with elected faculty membership alongside appropriate administrative and student members:

- **2a. The Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid should be made a standing Faculty committee, in view of the centrality of its purview to Faculty concerns.**
- **2b. Similarly, a new Faculty Committee on Information Services and Resources should be constituted; the present advisory committees on academic computing and on the library should either report to the new committee, or be absorbed by it.**
- **2c. The Committee on Athletics should be made a standing University committee, with elected faculty and student membership, and with authority to oversee matters of athletic and recreational policy.**

Both the Admissions/Financial aid Committee and the Information Services and Resources Committee would be taking over jurisdiction from appointed committees that nominally report to the Committee on Instruction. The appointed Athletics Committee also reports to the COI. All deal with matters of sufficient importance to warrant elected membership and status as standing committees. While the first two should be Faculty committees because of their centrality to faculty concerns, the third should be a University committee because the faculty interest is more evenly balanced by other interests.

3. The University Council should be replaced by a standing Strategic Planning Council, whose charge should be to coordinate ongoing strategic planning, and to propose changes as necessary. This council might have to meet when the University is not in session, so provision should be made for stipends for faculty and student members and for substitutes in the event that members cannot attend a meeting. Membership should include the President (as Chair), the Provost (as Vice Chair), the Vice Presidents, the Deans of the Colleges, a faculty majority, and representation for students, professional and nonprofessional staff. The faculty membership might be made to include the Faculty Chair and Secretary.

While the University Council has proven to be an ill-defined and rarely convened body, there is a pressing need for a broadly representative body to exercise permanent oversight of strategic planning. As President Mitchell has recently said, we need to start thinking of strategic planning as a permanent, ongoing process. While the Committee on Planning and Budget was conceived to have planning as part of its purview, in practice it is so absorbed by the minutiae of annual budgeting that it has rarely had time to think in depth about the big picture and the long term. We submit that a faculty majority is justified because of the centrality of the Faculty to the mission of the University. Unlike the present University Council, the faculty membership of the Strategic Planning Council would be separately elected.

4. The Faculty Council should have a more specific charge that includes advising the Chair of the Faculty and the President, and to continually monitor the functioning of the governance system.

At present, the Faculty Council is mentioned in the Handbook only as an appendage of the University Council. But whereas the latter has been of little importance, the former has evolved into an important body. It should be listed as a standing committee of the Faculty with a clearly specified charge. While the Faculty Council would cease to be an appendage of the University Council, it would retain the responsibility of administering faculty elections. Because the University will increasingly face the need to make decisions expeditiously under changing conditions, our system for making those decisions will need to be continually monitored. We think the Faculty Council is well equipped to do that.

5. The privileges accorded to the present professional librarians should not be extended to additional professional staff (whether librarians or not) in the future. As was the case when the decision was made to cease appointing coaches with faculty status, those librarians who now have faculty privileges should retain them.

The issue of faculty privileges for professional librarians should be addressed in light of the history of the provision and the current organization of ISR. The present provision dates from the era of Vietnam War protests and was an attempt by the Faculty to protect the academic freedom of librarians who might be called upon to reveal confidential information about the borrowing habits of library patrons. Ironically, we find ourselves in a similar national political environment today, but in a radically changed informational environment. Those who have access to confidential information about staff members and students, and who might be asked for such information by government agents, are a far broader group than the professional librarians. At the same time, the integrated organization of Information Services and Resources has blurred the distinction between librarians and other information professionals.

The University has a compelling interest in protecting the academic freedom of non-faculty members (as well as faculty members, of course), while assuring that the University remains in compliance with the law. We recommend that the President take urgent action (to the extent that it has not already been taken), to assure that these interests are protected.

The Faculty has benefited greatly by the participation of our librarian colleagues. Yet there is now no compelling basis for distinguishing librarians from other professional staff. We cannot accord voting privileges and the protection of CAFT to all administrative and professional staff; to do so would fatally dilute the character and mission of the Faculty. We regretfully conclude that the original purpose for which librarians were given faculty privileges will now be better served by administrative measures protecting all professional and administrative staff.

IV. Recommendation to the Faculty Council: a basic structural change

The Committee believes there is a good chance that the reforms recommended above will be successful in increasing the number of faculty members attending meetings. Other suggested reforms should increase the efficiency of faculty decision-making. However, given the present size of the Faculty, and its prospective growth as we move to a five course load, it may be that the Faculty has simply gotten too large to function well in its present organization. We will be in a better position to make this judgment after the previously proposed reforms have been tried, but **we propose that the Faculty Council begin now to consider alternative approaches such as the following:**

1. The Faculty could have different ways of dealing with the transmission of information (by committees or the President's Staff), and basic policy decisions such as curricular changes or Handbook amendments. We could have Plenary Faculty Meetings once each semester to deal with basic policy issues, while more routine business could be dealt with monthly or biweekly by a Council of Delegates, meeting publicly, and with published minutes. Such a council could function smoothly with about 50 elected members, enough to represent diverse viewpoints and interests. The Council would refer policy issues to the Plenary Faculty Meeting. Other members of the Faculty could refer issues to the Council or to the Plenary Faculty. The Faculty Council or chairs of standing committees could act as a clearinghouse to determine the better venue for any given issue. The Chair of the Faculty would also chair the Council of Delegates.

2. The Faculty could delegate its policy-making authority to a Faculty Senate, which would be elected to deal with all matters presently dealt with by the Faculty. As with the Council of Delegates, about 50 elected members would suffice to represent diverse viewpoints and interests. The Faculty Chair would preside, committees would report to the Senate, and its decisions would have the status of Faculty decisions now. Meetings would be public, and minutes would be published. Some non-trivial number of faculty members could convene a meeting of the full Faculty for a specific purpose within the authority of the Faculty. Any motion passed by such a special meeting of the Faculty would supersede a Senate motion only in the areas of primary Faculty responsibility (i.e., areas covered by the Faculty Committees).

Each of these proposals would involve the delegation of faculty authority to a body of elected representatives. Each would be justified only if it were concluded that the Faculty could not continue to fulfill its duties adequately in the present manner. The Council of Delegates is obviously the more moderate change, the Senate the more radical, but both would entail an historic shift for this Faculty. A constant feature of both proposed reforms and of the present governance system is the right of the President to reject recommendations. We are no doubt fortunate that presidents have rarely found it necessary to exercise this right, but the President's authority under the Charter is clear.

The committee believes we should first undertake the more limited changes proposed above, while the Faculty Council initiates a process of systematic consideration of more sweeping changes such as these, under a procedure to be determined by the Council.

APPENDIX A

Michael Payne's notice to the Faculty, 12 February 2004:

The Faculty Council met recently to consider how to proceed with a review of the Faculty governance system. The time seems right to conduct such a review for several reasons: (1) It is an expected element in the Middle States process. (2) It would be an important, good-faith follow up to the Trustees' review of governance that was sent to all of us recently as part of the Ciffolillo report. (3) Although that report identified no serious problems with Faculty governance, some have been alleged that should be discussed. (4) This would seem to be a natural part of the transition process in preparation for the arrival of a new president.

We propose that a special ad hoc committee be formed to carry out this review. The committee (we suggest) would consist of six elected faculty members, three of whom would be nominated by the current members of our five standing Faculty committees (Personnel, Development, Staff Planning, URC, and CAFT) and three nominated at large. One of the at-large positions would be for a non-tenured faculty member. A slate of nominees for the at-large positions will be prepared by the Faculty Council with additional nominations from the floor.

We propose that the committee begin its work in April and deliver its report by the time of the December 2004 faculty meeting. The topics the committee might wish to consider include but are not limited to the following: attendance at University Faculty meetings, efficiency of the governance system, the realization of the concept and goal of shared governance, the role of the Faculty Council, willingness of faculty to stand for election to committees, the role of the President in Faculty governance, voting privileges for non-faculty members.

This topic will be included on the agenda of the March Faculty meeting as a formal report from the Faculty Council.

APPENDIX B

Middle States Evaluation Report, Spring 2004, pp. 7-9:

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

Standard 5: Administration

Bucknell's success is a tribute to the men and women who labor on behalf of the University, not to its governance structure. Although ostensibly shared, governance is mainly "shared" by trustees and faculty at the expense of the President. As recognized in the Self-Study, this structure needs to change.

We feel strongly that the President and chief academic officer need to reclaim their authority. Without a realignment of authority, Bucknell will not be able to maximize its obvious potential and move forward. Opportunities have been lost in the past; if future opportunities are not to be lost, both the Board of Trustees and the faculty must do their part to insure a successful, long-standing presidency. By doing so, they will help insure the University's success and make it more likely that the turnover in senior administrative personnel, which is unusually high, can be significantly lessened.

To its credit the Board of Trustees has begun the process. The Board has been tremendously generous to the University with both its resources and time. However, it has also engaged over the years in micromanagement, ranging from involvement in matters normally within the purview of the President to interference in athletics. By making the President a voting member of the Board, the Board has begun to reverse a process by which it has not been well-served. More needs to be done than simply making the President a voting member of the Board.

Suggestions:

- The President should have the right to participate actively in all Board committees, except the Audit Committee;
- Agendas for full Board meetings should be set by the President and Chair of the Board and committee agendas should be set by the President (or his delegate) and the Board committee chair;
- The Board should re-examine its By-Laws to reflect the conclusions of its self-assessment;
- Trustee Access Days should be terminated; and
- The practice of "back-channeling" should be ended and all communications with Board members should be through the President, or, in the alternative, the President should be kept fully informed of any communications between members of the Bucknell community and individual Board members.

The issue of faculty governance is more problematic. Unlike the Board of Trustees, the faculty does not understand that its role in governance needs to change. While we recognize that every institution is different and that the processes in place at Bucknell, from the faculty point of view, work well, it is clear to us that the President and chief academic officer do not lead academically, since they lack the normal authority that people in their positions have. Although the faculty is incredibly committed to Bucknell

and the process that has existed for more than two decades, we suggest that the self-assessment that the faculty has agreed to undergo result in some basic changes.

- The President should chair faculty meetings, rather than be treated as a guest at those meetings;
- The President should be given the ability to review, and, if necessary, to change salary recommendations; and
- The Faculty Manual should be amended to give the President the right to reject a tenure recommendation, as is standard at institutions across the land.

Recommendation:

With a governance structure that is weak, the Board should continue to address this issue, the faculty should begin to do so, and the authority of the President should be reclaimed, and evidence of progress should be submitted by the end of the 2004-05 academic year.

APPENDIX C

From the Minutes of the April 2004 Faculty Meeting:

Professor Payne introduced the topic of a review of faculty governance, which would be a good-faith followup to the Trustee self review and was also recommended by Middle States. The Faculty Council offered a proposal to constitute an ad-hoc committee (set out in an earlier communication): *six elected faculty members, three of whom would be nominated by the current members of our five standing Faculty committees (Personnel, Development, Staff Planning, URC, and CAFT) and three nominated at large. One of the at-large positions would be for a non-tenured faculty member.* This was seconded. Discussion clarified that the nominees need not be currently on the committees. Several people suggested that the committee include divisional representation, resulting in an amendment by Prof. Mitch Chernin to increase the at large membership to four, one per division. This amendment was voted on and passed. The timetable includes constituting the committee in September 2004 with completion of the review by February 2005. This part of the proposal was then voted on and passed. The second part of the proposal involved the committee's charge: *The topics the committee might wish to consider include but are not limited to the following: attendance at University Faculty meetings, efficiency of the governance system, the realization of the concept and goal of shared governance, the role of the Faculty Council, willingness of faculty to stand for election to committees, the role of the President in Faculty governance, voting privileges for non-faculty members.* Prof. Ben Marsh made a motion to ask the committee to bring its own more focused charge to Faculty at its earliest convenience. This motion failed and the main motion passed.

APPENDIX D

Charge: The following was presented to the Faculty at its meeting November 1, 2004:

The Committee, elected in September 2004, pursuant to a motion passed by the Faculty in April 2004, is to report to the Faculty by 1 February 2005. The Committee will:

Examine appropriate sections of the Middle States Self-Study, the Visiting Team Report and the Bucknell response to that report, so as to enumerate what issues of faculty governance were reported in those documents;

Solicit and analyze further suggestions from members of the Faculty, and from the President and his senior administrative staff;

Evaluate the current governance system in light of these suggestions;

Formulate proposals to the Faculty for immediate action that would not require amendments to the Faculty Handbook;

Identify larger issues or proposals that require further study, which might involve amendments to the Faculty Handbook.

The Committee will report to the faculty in February 2005, consider their response, and assist with the preparation of the Middle States Monitoring Report due April 1, 2005.

The Faculty Council will determine further action on the Committee's recommendations.

APPENDIX E

Faculty Survey

1. General Response Patterns (Frequencies)

Total responses: 121

By division:

Humanities	34	28%
Nat'l Sciences/ Math	31	26%
Social Sciences	35	29%
Engineering	16	13%
Ex Officio	3	3%
NA	2	2%

By rank:

Assistant	45
Associate	44
Professor	25

By Gender

Female	50
Male	64

By Gender and Rank:

	Female	Male
Assistant	21	24
Associate	22	22
Professor	7	18

By tenure status:

Tenured	67
Untenured	43
Visiting	2

Attend Faculty meetings;

All/almost all	44%
Most	14%
About half/some	25%
Rarely/never	13%

Among those who gave reasons for not attending at least most of the faculty meetings (67-70 individuals depending on the question or 56-58% of the sample), a range of reasons were given. There was a bimodal distribution on the importance of 5pm as a conflict with family/childcare responsibilities: 30 cited it as an "extremely important" reason for not attending while 25 cited it as "not at all important." In contrast, only 17 of 70 individuals said 5pm conflicts with teaching responsibilities were "extremely" or "somewhat" important, 14 of 69 said Monday conflicts with family/childcare were "extremely" or "somewhat" important, and only 10 of 67 respondents said Monday conflicts with teaching responsibilities were "extremely" or "somewhat" important.

In terms of the meetings themselves, only 14 of 67 cited the meetings being "uninteresting" as an "extremely" or "somewhat" important reason for lack of attendance

and only 17 of 67 said having their opinions sufficiently represented by those who attend was an “extremely” or “somewhat” important reason. However, 32 of 68 said it was “extremely” or “somewhat” important that the meetings were a “waste of my time.” There is somewhat divided opinion on the meetings being an inefficient way to conduct business (27 felt this was an extremely or somewhat important reason vs. 23 who felt it was somewhat unimportant or not at all important). Few faculty felt that meetings were unimportant in the governance process (only 13 of 68 responses cited this as extremely or somewhat important) and most faculty did not think there was too little reward for attending (only 18 of 68 said this was an extremely or somewhat important reason).

The reasons given the most as “important” reasons for lack of attendance are that faculty meetings are a waste of time, that they are inefficient ways to conduct business, and that they conflict at 5pm with family/childcare responsibilities. But faculty opinion on the last two was somewhat polarized or bimodal.

Of the 121 respondents to the survey overall, only 21% said they understood the role of the Faculty Council “very well” and 50% said “somewhat.” And while only 18% feel the FC advises the President and members of the administration “very well” (50% said “somewhat” and 11% said “not very well”), 48% believe the FC fulfills its function as a nominating committee “very well” (less than 7% felt the FC did this “not very well”). When it comes to the role of the Faculty Chair, 40% said they understood the role very well and only 8% said “not very well.” Similarly, 39% said the Chair serves “very well” as a liaison to the Board, 50% said somewhat, and only 6% said “not very well.” The view was more positive on the Chair serving as a liaison to campus administration with 50% saying the chair does that “very well”, 37% “somewhat” and 6% “not very well.”

Most respondents said they were very willing (33%) or somewhat willing (45%) to run for committees when asked. Less than 20% were in any way unwilling. Among the 46 individuals who gave reasons for not always being willing to stand for election, 39 said it was extremely or somewhat important that committees took too much time from teaching and research, 24 said it was extremely or somewhat important to them that committee work is not sufficiently rewarded in merit reviews, 29 that committee work gets undone in faculty meetings, and 34 that they were already serving on committees or as a program/department chair. In contrast, few faculty citing reasons for not serving said it was because committee work wasn’t valued by colleagues (only 16 of 45 said this was an important reason) or by the administration (only 16 of 45 said this was important).

In the overall sample (n=121), most respondents think university governance is sufficiently important to participate (106 strongly agreed or agreed), even though the vast majority do not believe faculty are sufficiently rewarded for participation (only 27 strongly agreed or agreed while 58 disagreed or strongly disagreed). Most respondents did not think that our governance system impedes “good governance” (only 35 of 116 agreed or strongly agreed) and even fewer believe it hinders the formation of a “stable senior administration” (only 11 of 115 agreed or strongly agreed with this).

In terms of changing the role of the president, the majority of the sample did not think he should chair faculty meetings (6 of the 117 responding agreed or strongly agreed vs. 99 who disagreed or strongly disagreed). Only 11 of 116 who responded agreed that the President should be able to review and change salary recommendations from the deans (compared with 105 who disagreed or strongly disagreed). And while 12 of 118 respondents said the President should be able to reject tenure decisions from the URC, 96 disagreed or strongly disagreed with this.

Finally, on the question of faculty privileges for librarians and ISR professionals, of the 114 respondents to this particular question, 57 believe they should be granted only to librarians, 24 believe we should grant them to both, 25 believe we should grant them to neither group, and 8 said “it depends”.

2. Issues by Gender

Among survey questions where issues seemed to be divided or distinct by gender, attendance at faculty meetings shows some differences by gender: 64% of men reported attending most, almost all, or all of the time as compared with 56% of women. This is not due to conflicts in family/childcare however since fewer women than men cited this as an important reason for not attending (51% of women vs. 54% of men). In fact, more women than men (42% of women vs. 30% of men) said conflicts with family/childcare were “not at all important” when asked to cite reasons for not attending faculty meetings.

Although men and women reported approximately equal levels of interest in faculty meetings (only 22% of either group said this was an important reason for not attending), women, however, felt much more strongly that faculty meetings were a waste of time (56% of women vs. 41% of men said that was an important or extremely important reason for not attending), that meetings were an inefficient way to conduct business (44% of women vs. 35% of men said this was an important or extremely important reason for not attending), and felt that their opinions were sufficiently represented by those who attended (35% of women vs. 16% of men cited this as an important or extremely important reason for not attending). Men were somewhat more likely to cite faculty meetings’ lack of importance as a reason for not attending (22% of men vs. 16% of women cited this as important or extremely important), but women felt the lack of reward for more strongly (28% of women vs. 19% of men said it as important or extremely important as a reason for not attending).

Finally, men are more likely to be “very willing” to stand for election to committees (40% of men vs. 28% of women) but women are more junior in the sample overall and women are more likely to be already serving on committees or as chairs.

3. Key Issues by Rank

When looking at responses by rank, some important differences appear here. First, full professors report much greater likelihood of attending faculty meetings: 56% of full

professors attend “all” or “almost all of the time” as compared with 48% of associates and 38% of assistants. We see the same linear relationship between rank and willingness to stand for election to committees: only 24% of assistant professors are “very willing” to stand for election as compared with 37% of associates and 48% of full professors.

Junior faculty are, not surprisingly, least likely to report that they understand the role of the Faculty Council or Faculty chair. Only 7% of assistants vs. 20% of associates and 48% of full professors report understanding the role of the Faculty Council “very well.” As to the role of the Chair, 24% of assistant professors vs. 47% of associates and 60% of full professors said they understand that role “very well.”

Full professors are much more likely to see faculty governance as “sufficiently important to justify” participation (84% of full professors strongly agree vs. 51% of associates and 53% of assistants). Similarly, full professors are much more likely to agree or strongly agree that faculty are sufficiently rewarded for participation in university governance (40% of full professors vs. 19% of associates vs. 20% of assistants). In contrast, newer faculty (assistant professors) are more likely to see the structure of our governance system as impeding good governance (38% of assistant professors strongly agree vs. 31% of associates and 31% of full professors).

In terms of suggested changes to the role of the President, there is a curvilinear relationship by rank: 80% of assistant professors disagree or strongly disagree with the idea that the President should chair faculty meetings, as compared with 95% of associates who disagreed or strongly disagreed and 80% of full professors. A similar pattern appears in regard to the question of the President’s role in tenure decisions: 60% of assistants strongly disagree with this idea vs. 79% of associates and 68% of full professors. When it comes to the President changing salary recommendations, there is a linear relationship by rank once more: only 48% of assistants strongly disagree with this vs. 64% of associates vs. 72% of full professors who strongly disagree.

4. Issues by Tenured/Untenured Status

The final perspective tries to distinguish views between those who are tenured and not, subsuming the differences by rank into what may be the focal status distinction. When we examine attendance at faculty meetings, we see that only 37% of untenured faculty report attending “all” or “almost all of the time,” as compared with 56% of tenured faculty but some of this difference can be explained by conflicts with family/childcare responsibilities (57% of untenured said this was an extremely or somewhat important reason for not attending vs. 49% of tenured faculty).

Untenured faculty are less likely to cite the lack of reward as a reason for not attending faculty meetings (7% of untenured said it was an extremely important reason vs. 16% of tenured faculty), likewise, untenured faculty were less likely to say committee work was not sufficiently rewarded (26% said this was an extremely important reason not to stand for election compared with 33% of tenured faculty). Untenured faculty, however, were

much more concerned about committee work taking time from teaching and research (50% of untenured said this was an extremely important reason for not standing for election compared with 30% of tenured faculty) but tenured faculty were less likely to stand for election because of the way they perceive committee work being “undone” in faculty meetings (42% of tenured faculty said this was extremely important vs. 11% of untenured faculty). In addition, tenured faculty were much more likely to cite lack of respect for committee work by colleagues as a reason for not standing for election than untenured colleagues (50% of tenured faculty said this was extremely or somewhat important vs. 17% of untenured faculty) and tenured faculty were more likely to say that committee work wasn’t valued by the administration (48% of tenured faculty said this was an extremely or somewhat important reason not to run for committees vs. 21% of untenured faculty).

Finally, tenured faculty were much more likely to cite current and on-going commitments as a reason for not standing for election (currently serving on committees or as a department or program chair): 59% of tenured faculty said this was an extremely important reason vs. 37% of untenured faculty.

APPENDIX F

Faculty authority (*Faculty Handbook*, I, pp 6-7):

The Faculty shall consist of the President, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Deans of the Colleges, and those who are ranked as professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, and academic lecturers.

Subject to the regulations which the Board of Trustees may provide, and in a manner consistent with general University policies, the Faculty

- considers and makes recommendations to the President regarding any and all phases of education at Bucknell, as defined by the general purpose and mission of the University.
- determines the curricular and other requirements for recommendations for degrees in course.
- encourages and supports the development of courses, programs, and other academic activities that will enable the University to maintain and enhance its role as an institution of higher education.
- determines the qualifications for the admission of students.
- sets procedures for its own governance, including the selection of officers of the Faculty and the establishment of committees of the Faculty.
- determines the qualifications for membership in the Faculty; makes recommendations regarding recruitment and retention of members of the Faculty of the highest professional competence; and evaluates colleagues for purposes of recommendations regarding retention, tenure, and promotion.
- formulates policy on the general salary structure for academic personnel.
- participates in resource allocation and in the University budget process.
- has the power of enforcing the rules and regulations adopted by the trustees for the government and instruction of the students.
- advises the President in the appointment of the Vice Presidents and the Deans of the Colleges. The officers of the Faculty, in consultation with the University Council and the President, will appoint committees for this purpose.
- advises the Board of Trustees in the appointment of the President. The Chairperson of the Faculty and one other faculty member selected by the Faculty Council shall be members of the Presidential Search Committee.