

## **Minutes of the Faculty Meeting December 4, 2000**

The meeting was called to order at 5PM by Prof. Michael Payne. He welcomed the undersigned as the new Secretary of the Faculty and noted there would be an additional committee report from the Trustee Finance Committee (Prof. Michael Moohr, attached) and a revised motion about the merit system from Prof. Ben Marsh.

### Announcements by President

President Rogers reported that the recent Board of Trustees meeting went well. Trustees were positively disposed to reevaluating faculty salaries as we fall behind our salary goals and also looking at courseload reduction, as well as the merit system. They are generally interested in job satisfaction for the faculty. Regarding new building projects, funding for the renovation of Coleman Hall was increased from \$5 million to 7.4 million, including contingency, via a bond issue to finance some utilities construction (allowing that money to move to the renovation).

Some major gifts were announced: Larry Breakiron gave \$5 million for an addition to the Engineering College building, although the timetable for construction is uncertain due to the many ongoing building projects on campus. New artificial turf in the football stadium is a gift of Norm and Mary Lou Garrity, who also endowed the football coach position. The Campaign will reach \$185 to \$190 million, and we will continue staffing for fundraising activities post-campaign.

At the Patriot League meeting on December 12, President Rogers plans, with support from the Board, to vote for the least permissive financial incentive policy. He anticipates however that the League as a whole will move in a more permissive direction. He also announced that the meeting of the Greek Life Task Force went well, noting that the members are open to discussing all relevant issues and that Chair Norm Garrity was supportive of having high expectations of fraternities.

Board of Trustees Chairman Schubauer will step down in June. Trustee Lee Hamilton was elected to Vice-chair which may make him a leading candidate for Chair. Finally, the President reported that he has visited 11 cities so far on the Orange and Blue tour. This has been a success in fundraising and raising excitement of constituencies, but he looks forward to reducing his travel schedule in the future.

### Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty

Prof. Payne expressed cautious optimism about the Board meeting. He noted positive contributions by faculty, especially in promoting the teacher scholar model and the possibility of a courseload reduction. President Rogers was supportive of faculty issues in several venues. Regarding the Greek Life Task Force, Prof. Payne's previous skepticism turned to optimism, especially after presentations by Deans Ferraro and Baker. Trustees told him they want to be informed about the faculty as a profession, as individuals, and as a governing body.

Prof. Payne went on to note that as a new Chair, he may make some mistakes. The informal impression of the Board meeting he shared with the faculty may not have corresponded to proceedings from just official meetings. He apologized for his "incautious language", but he stands by his optimism about courseload and strategic plan issues.

Prof. Payne also announced that the Faculty Council will meet shortly to discuss President Rogers's inaugural speech with a view to distributing some issues it raises to appropriate faculty committees.

Finally, Prof. Payne announced that CAFT has two vacancies in midyear. The Chair of the Faculty and CAFT Chair normally form a committee for nominations in the spring. Prof. Payne proposed that he and CAFT Chair Prof. Marty Ligare form such a nominating committee now to fill these vacancies; the motion passed.

### Committee Reports

Committee on Instruction Chair Prof. Nancy White continued with her presentation of the report on the Board of Review on Academic Responsibility (distributed with November, 2000 agenda). Prof. Erik Lofgren asked what penalties could be envisioned between an F in the course and dismissal. Interim VPAA Genie Gerdes elaborated that we need such a penalty particularly when a student already failing in a course commits an infraction (where dismissal would be inappropriately harsh). Sometimes a student has been required to write a term paper on academic integrity as an addition to having already failed the course on merit. Profs. Aarne Vesilind and Marj Kastner asked about student records, and General Counsel Richard Zansitis commented that although records of infractions are now kept indefinitely, there is some thought to putting a time limit on keeping records of at least more minor transgressions. Prof. White added that how a student handles a Review procedure might have an impact on the disposition of a student's records.

Prof. White went on to briefly summarize and ask for questions about the other COI subcommittee reports included in the December, 2000 agenda. Regarding the report on Inter-College Curricular Issues, Prof. Michael Prince asked what "consultation" meant in a curricular proposal, and Prof. Chuck Knisely replied that consultation mean wide communication but not veto power. Prof. Paul Sussman asked for more information about the soc/hum courses allowed by the College of Engineering. Interim Engineering Dean Jim Orbison replied that the courses need to be classified as social sciences or humanities, but not skills courses. A list of such courses will be distributed to department heads this spring.

Prof. White announced that Prof. Jean Peterson will be COI chair starting this spring.

Prof. Michael Frey presented the report from the Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel on the merit system (attached to December 2000 agenda). He highlighted three findings: a) it is not appropriate to review the merit system now, as the faculty asked for review after two complete cycles (and will be done by a joint group from FAP, Faculty Council, and Faculty Development Committee) b) FAP informally reviewed progress to date and concluded that in many ways the system is meeting the goals set for it c) of main concern should be the center of the distribution of faculty increases. This not decided by merit system but by the total increase allowed in the annual budget. He also commented that even though the system seems to be meeting its own goals, faculty still express concern that the system pits us against one another. This is a valid feeling when the salary pool is tight. In general, the system is producing salary distributions that are similar to those produced by the previous merit system (Categories I, II, III).

Prof. Matt Silberman asked if FAP looked at the criteria being used in evaluating teaching, service, and scholarship. Prof. Frey replied that those concerns went beyond the current limited review. A formal review needs input by deans, chairs, and other constituencies. Prof. Ligare said the shape and spread of the salary distribution matter to our sense of community. Prof. Frey agreed, but reiterated that the distribution is similar to previous systems, although there is now more spread because of there being more salary categories. Approximately 80% of faculty have received scores between 5 and 8.5 on a 0 -10 scale. That proportion is similar to old Categories II. The spread was reduced last year by \$500 structural adjustment. He also reminded us that there are mechanisms to reduce extreme differences in salaries. This system is more complicated but part of that is because we see the mechanism at work.

Prof. Ben Marsh asked: if the systems are similar, why not revert to the previous one? Prof. Frey replied that there are important differences, and also that the Trustees had wanted a system that rewards "stars" more so than the system we eventually settled on. In response to a question by Prof. Prince about reviewing the system early, Prof. Frey said that the review cycle needs to be set by the faculty.

At this point, Prof. Marsh introduced his motion, revised since the agenda was printed: "The merit review system will revert to the previous three-category arrangement as of the 2001-2002 academic year unless a revised merit system is adopted by the faculty before January 2002." The motion was seconded. In his rationale, Prof. Marsh complimented the hard work put in by those who devised the current system, but suggested that faculty morale and productivity are being damaged. He claimed that the current system weights scholarship more heavily than time resources permit, and service less heavily than the hours many faculty devote to this activity. He suggested that the current system creates incentives for faculty to teach so as to elicit the highest teaching recommendations and to publish as many "units" as possible. Prof. Marsh also offered his view that the current system was vague in setting out criteria for each category and overly precise in the number of quality categories. He urged the faculty to evaluate the merit system independently of possible Trustee opinion and to send this issue to the Personnel Committee with an eye to consider changes and clarifications.

In response to a question by Prof. Kastner, Prof. Marsh said that his opinion that the current system is fatally flawed is based on anecdotal evidence, but not input from the whole faculty. Prof. Frey thought that the possibility of changing the system too many times in a short period of time was problematical. Prof. Jerry Mead, supporting the motion, thought the old system was fairer in recognizing that most faculty were appropriately judged to be in the middle merit category most years, while recognizing that in some review periods their contributions might be excellent. Prof. Ned Ladd was concerned that much time would be consumed by reviewing the system now, especially as Trustees were interested in the issue, although Prof. Payne remarked that he didn't think they were wedded to any one system.

Prof. John Miller, opposing the motion, thought that many people would have negative opinions on any merit system, and that it is inaccurate to say the faculty were pressured to vote for the system. We have no data on satisfaction with the current system. Prof. Marsh replied that the current vote represents some data. Prof. Silberman added that the 84% of faculty who were dissatisfied with the old system were dissatisfied for a number of reasons, and that the old system represented a compromise position. VP Gerdes was surprised to hear the opinion that the current system rewards only one model of faculty merit. She in fact had heard that as a complaint about old system, in which Category III people had to excel in all categories simultaneously. Now people can be excellent in one category but in all not of them, and still be recognized. She also noted that the Faculty can review the weights for teaching, scholarship, and service, and change them if they wish. She views current system as an attempt for faculty to take control of own system. She echoed previous remarks that the Trustees had wanted a system that produced even more quality categories and thus salary differences, and we compromised.

We will never have a system that pleases everyone. President Rogers remarked that if the merit system is on the Board of Trustees's "radar screen," it is because he put it there. He urged the Faculty to reconsider reverting to the old system as a default during review of the new system, as that will make working with trustees more difficult.

When the question was called, it failed by a voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 6:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea Halpern

Secretary of the Faculty

Enclosed: Finance Committee Report, Committee on Planning and Budget Report

Report of the Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees

In the main, it was a remarkably quiet meeting, with only one major proposal before the committee. The more famous and celebratory meeting (with fireworks and grand theatre) occurs every January, when two major proposals are put before the committee, both with respect to the University's operating budget for fiscal 2001-2002, i.e, the revenue and expenditure anchors of the budget: 1. The proposed increase in the comprehensive fee 2. The proposed increase in total compensation. These two issues always seem to bring out the greatest theatricality in the Trustees.

The primary function of the November meeting was to review the results of last year's operating budget. Little attention was given to the fact that Bucknell ended the fiscal year once again with a surplus (an excess of revenues over expenditures) of approximately \$1.4 million, which should be a matter of some celebration. Rather, nearly all of the attention was focused on the fact that we were over-budget on travel expenses. Note these expenditures are: 1. Not much more than chump change, that is, a relatively small proportion of the total dollar value of the operating budget and, 2. are largely non-discretionary in nature.

This generated an overly-long and not very well enlightened discussion of the topic, including a question of whether we were too liberal in our use of first-class travel (I didn't know Greyhound buses offered first-class sections).

The next item was a campus proposal to issue \$2.4 million in new debt to finance the extension of underground utilities to the new science and athletic buildings, freeing up that same amount to allocate to the renovation of Coleman Hall. After some discussion about perceived cost overruns on the Coleman project, the approval of the proposal was postponed, but was subsequently approved by the full Board on Saturday.

Then, perhaps inappropriately, attention was devoted to what was believed to be an excessively large number of false fire alarms in the dormitories. It was agreed that the campus would study the matter further and report its findings back to the Board at some later date.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Moohr

Faculty Representative to the Trustee Finance Committee

December 4, 2000