



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

Minutes of the Faculty Meeting

December 3, 2001

The meeting was called to order at 5PM by Prof. Michael Payne. He suggested reordering the published agenda to deal first with the Personnel Committee report on the merit system and then the Planning and Budget Committee report on salaries and fees, because of various January deadlines on these matters. Prof. George Exner, chair of the Committee on Instruction, announced a forum on Assessment on December 5 at 5PM in the LC Forum. He invited comments on the COI report on this issue.

Personnel Committee Report: Kim Daubman

Prof. Daubman reminded us that the charge to her committee was to operationalize the 3-pt. scale for teaching, scholarship, and service that was passed by the faculty at its last meeting (the Peeler amendment). She noted that in the course of their discussions, the Committee found some bothersome issues with operationalizing the 3 pts, for instance that it seemed difficult to figure out what a 2 and 1 were if 2 indicated high caliber and 1 indicated significant deficiencies in teaching, scholarship, or service. They therefore also offered for discussion a 4-pt scale system; these are compared on the attached report. To bring the various systems forward for discussion, she moved that the Peeler amendment be rescinded, which was seconded.

A discussion of the parliamentary procedure ensued about whether rescindment would affect just the Peeler amendment (the 3-pt scale) or the entire merit motion, which also included several recommendations from the Personnel Committee's report. With the help of current parliamentarian Prof. John Peeler (wearing his official parliamentarian's hat) and past parliamentarian Prof. Dee Casteel, it was decided that the motion to rescind had to apply to the entire merit motion.

Debate on the motion to rescind included concerns that the current approach would not allow the body to vote on all three options (3-, 4-, and 5-pt. scales) and whether the motion is contrary to the faculty will as expressed at the November 13, 2001 meeting. Prof. Payne clarified that any person can bring a motion to rescind, not just a committee. Remarks also addressed the substance of the Peeler vs. Personnel Committee's recommendations. Prof. Peeler (hatless, and thus speaking as himself) spoke against the motion, arguing that faculty with serious deficiencies ought to be dealt with not by receiving 1's but by administrative means. He thought 3 pts. could be assigned reliably to performance, resulting in fewer arguments than in systems using more points. And he did not necessarily think that a normal distribution of 1s, 2s, and 3s would emerge, although he thought the 2's would be the largest category.

Provost Steve Bowen reminded the company of the need to address the motion to rescind, which he favored. At the last meeting, we voted in favor of an undefined system. The Personnel Committee has worked hard on this issue and we should discuss it fully.

Prof. Payne clarified that should the motion to rescind not pass, the motion on the floor would be the original Personnel Committee 5-pt. proposal, not the 4 pt. scale.

At this point, Prof. Jean Shackelford proposed via a substitute motion that we vote on the 3-pt. operationalization from the Personnel Committee. After seconding, several faculty spoke in favor of the motion, arguing that it would return our discussion to the substance of the Peeler amendment's 3-pt. scale. Prof. Christopher Para noted that if the substitute motion fails, we may still elect to discuss the 4-pt. system. Prof. Glyne Griffith speaking against the motion was concerned that the 3-pt. system still implied that faculty would be compared to one another, not an absolute standard. The vote to substitute was voted on and passed, opening debate on the substance of the operationalization of the 3-pt. system.

Prof. Matt Silberman asked how the categories were created. Prof. Daubman said the Personnel Committee started with Prof. Peeler's language, such as "majority", "high caliber", etc. The Committee operationalized "large majority" as about 2/3 and high caliber as "excellence". About 20% of the faculty received 4's [the highest rating] in teaching over the last few years. Prof. Jean Peterson was troubled by the presence of expected percentages for each rating category, which might lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy. What if some years are unusual with more very high or very low people? Prof. Daubman said the Committee thought the bottom category should be reserved for significant deficiencies. But she and Prof. Peeler agreed that the bottom category would be used and probably more frequently than is the case now. After several more expressions of dissatisfaction with including the expected percentages in the operationalization, Prof. Allen Schweinsberg moved to drop those percentages and keep the labels. This motion was seconded and passed.

Debate then continued on the other aspects of the Personnel Committee's language. Prof. Paula Buck wondered if the Committee considered using "consistent" as the middle category. Prof. Peeler didn't think that high caliber necessarily meant excellence. Prof. Sandra Morris pointed out that the descriptors were not parallel across teaching, scholarship, and service; to which Prof. Daubman replied that they thought scholarship and service were easier to quantify than teaching. Prof. Doug Allen added that there may be a higher expected level in teaching than scholarship, as reflected in the ratings in final merit rating. Prof. Marie Simpson asked about the discount for each merit point. Prof. Daubman noted that no matter how many scale points in each category, people end up with a final merit rating on a 10 pt. scale so the same discounting can be applied.

Prof. Mike Frey asked how the new system would be phased in; Prof. Daubman replied that we are just starting a new 3-year round of merit reviews and people will keep their old score until reviewed under the new system.

After a reminder from the Chair about time growing short, several more faculty spoke for and against the motion. It was also made clear that an "aye" vote would be a vote on the actual language presented; that it would not be going back to the Personnel Committee for consideration. The question was called, and a motion to cut off debate passed by the required 2/3 majority. The motion on the floor (the Personnel Committee's operationalization of the 3-pt. scale, minus any expected percentages) was then voted on and passed.

President Rogers then made a statement thanking the Personnel Committee and its chair for their hard work. He noted that this policy would be considered by the administration and the trustees. Thus he asked that merit reviews not take place this year

until after the January Board of Trustees meeting. Prof. Payne added his thanks to the Committee.

Planning and Budget Committee Report: Bill King

Prof. King reported that at this time every year, CPB makes recommendations on faculty and staff compensation and the comprehensive fee for next year. Discussions have been ongoing between the campus and the trustees about an appropriate list of comparison schools for these indices, but the current list seems to be acceptable. The goal is to be above the median in faculty salaries for that list. As the attached report shows, Bucknell has been falling behind, especially among full professors. CPB is recommending a one-year adjustment of a 7.3% increase in faculty salaries or about \$1.5 million. This is \$376,000 above what was already projected for next year. Prof. King added that this money would be available to the Council of Deans to address any market or equity issues that they see.

As for staff salaries, a 4.8% increase is recommended for now, but CPB would eventually like to track peer institutions on staff salaries. They still need more information in order to make definitive recommendations for the future. A comprehensive fee recommendation is still being formulated in light of recent financial planning changes.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea Halpern
Secretary of the Faculty

Personnel Committee Report

TEACHING

	FAPC proposal (with changes from 1998 system highlighted)		4-Point Scale option		Peeler-1 Operationalized
5	Documented level Evidence of extraordinary achievement in classroom effectiveness <u>that may include substantial</u> pedagogical enhancement or curricular development during review period. Rare.	4	Evidence of extraordinary achievement in classroom effectiveness that may include substantial pedagogical or curricular development.	3	Evidence of extraordinary achievement in classroom effectiveness that may include substantial pedagogical or curricular development. Uncommon (approx. 20%)
4	Evidence of unusual excellence in classroom effectiveness <u>that may include</u> pedagogical enhancement or curricular development. Unusual.	3	Evidence of expected excellence in classroom effectiveness that may include pedagogical or curricular development.	2	Evidence of expected excellence in classroom effectiveness that may include pedagogical or curricular development. Common (approx. 65%)
3	Evidence of normal levels of consistent classroom effectiveness <u>that may include</u> pedagogical enhancement and or curricular development. Common.				
2	One or more areas of teaching performance warrant faculty member's effort to improve performance in classroom effectiveness, pedagogical enhancement, or curricular development indicate a need for improvement. Unusual.	2	Effective teaching, but one or more areas indicate a need for improvement.	1	Significant deficiencies in teaching effectiveness. Uncommon (approx. 15%)
1	One or more areas of teaching performance demonstrate indicate serious deficiencies in classroom effectiveness, pedagogical enhancement, or curricular development; or longstanding deficiencies in teaching with little or no attempt at improvement. Rare.	1	Serious deficiencies in teaching effectiveness.		

	1998 Merit System SCHOLARSHIP		FAPC proposal		4-Point Scale option		Peeler-1 Operationalized
4	Evidence of extraordinary achievement in scholarship: publication of book, major artistic show or performance, significant articles, or other exceptional scholarly accomplishment during the period of review. Rare.	5	Outstanding scholarship as evidenced by significant contribution(s) that may include books, successful grant proposals, peer-reviewed articles, performances, exhibitions of artistic works, or other exceptional scholarly accomplishments.	4	Outstanding scholarship as evidenced by significant contribution(s) that may include books, successful grant proposals, peer-reviewed articles, performances, exhibitions of artistic works, or other exceptional scholarly accomplishments.	3	Outstanding scholarship as evidenced by significant contribution(s) that may include books, successful grant proposals, peer-reviewed articles, performances, exhibitions of artistic works, or other exceptional scholarly accomplishments. Uncommon (approx. 20%)
3	Evidence of unusual excellence in scholarship, as evidenced by peer-reviewed publication of significant articles, performances, or exhibitions of artistic works, and evidence of engagement in the external professional community (e.g., presentation of results in professional meetings, invited talks, reviews . Unusual.	4	Active scholarship as evidenced by presentations, publications, shows, or similar productivity, which occurs in a peer-reviewed or comparable process.	3	Active scholarship as evidenced by presentations, publications, shows, or similar productivity, which occurs in a peer-reviewed or comparable process.	2	Active scholarship as evidenced by presentations, publications, shows, or similar productivity, which occurs in a peer-reviewed or comparable process. Common (approx. 65%)
2	Evidence of normal level of scholarly activity and engagement in a peer-reviewed process; publications; documentation of work in progress, presentations of research at professional meetings, submission of work for peer review and publication. Common.	3	Scholarly program as evidenced by some achievement within a peer-reviewed or comparable process.				
1	Evidence of the presence of a scholarly program, without significant engagement in a peer-reviewed process during review period; few or no submissions or presentations; little progress since previous review. Unusual.	2	Scholarly program as evidenced by works in progress; no engagement in a peer-reviewed or comparable process. Little progress since previous review.	2	Scholarly program as evidenced by works in progress.	1	Scholarly program as evidenced by works in progress or personal statement. Uncommon (15%)
0	Little or no evidence of a scholarly program in progress (as evidenced by personal statement of research program and works in progress); no engagement in a peer-review process. Rare.	1	Scholarly program evidenced only by a personal statement.	1	Scholarly program evidenced only by a personal statement.		

SERVICE

	FAPC proposal (with changes from 1998 system highlighted)		4-Point Scale option		Peeler-1 Operationalized
5	Extraordinary record of service and leadership within University and/or departmental governance processes during review period activities. Rare.	4	Extraordinary record of service and leadership within University and/or departmental activities.	3	Extraordinary record of service and leadership within University and/or departmental activities. Uncommon (approx. 20%)
4	Participation in more than one major service activity or leadership in at least one University or departmental governance process activity. Uncommon.	3	Significant engagement in University and/or departmental service.	2	Significant engagement in University and/or departmental service. Common (approx. 65%)
3	Normal Engagement in University and departmental governance process service beyond that required of all members of a department, <u>including at least one major service activity.</u> Common.				
2	Infrequent Little engagement University and departmental governance processes; participation in departmental activities in service beyond that expected of all members of department members. Unusual.	2	Little or no engagement in service beyond that expected of department members.	1	Little or no engagement in service beyond that expected of department members (e.g., attending department meetings and participating in departmental committees). Uncommon (approx. 15%)
1	Little or no engagement in University and/or departmental governance process service. Does not fulfill some expectations of departmental members (e.g., attending department meetings participating in DRC and search committees, participating in departmental functions and participating in departmental committees). Rare.	1	Little engagement in University and/or departmental service. Does not fulfill some expectations of departmental members (e.g., attending department meetings and participating in departmental committees).		

Committee on Planning and Budget Report

Faculty Compensation

The Committee examined data on percent salary increases at many other institutions, most similar to Bucknell in some sense. The data indicate that we have fallen behind considerably in achieving goals set by the recent Five-Year Strategic Plan. Yet for the past several years, we have been unable to come to a consensus with the Board of Trustees on either an acceptable list of peer institutions or a methodology for keeping pace with salaries at these institutions. Recently, however, we have made progress in developing a peer list that may be acceptable to the Board. This list is shown in the attached table with recent salaries (fall 2000) indicated by rank. Also attached is a graph that shows the growing salary gap between BU and this peer group that started in FY95-96.

Our goal is to stay above the median of this list of 12 institutions. To move toward this goal, a 7.3% increase in the faculty salary pool is recommended for FY02-03. This represents an increase of approximately \$1,500,000 above the current salary pool. We plan to review the situation yearly to maintain parity with the peer group.

Staff Compensation

Eventually, we would like to track staff salaries in a similar way to faculty salaries. That is, gather data from the list of reference institutions for staff positions, both those of national and local focus and then recommend increases for staff salaries to keep pace with an above median ranking. In addition, although we have initiated our discussions on the living wage issue, they are not complete. During the spring semester, we hope to reach a point in our deliberations where we can make definitive recommendations for all staff salaries. In the meantime, we recommend an increase of 4.8% for staff salaries. This is 1.8% above an inflation rate of 3.0% based on Congressional Budget Office data.

Comprehensive Fee

Normally, we provide a recommendation for an increase in the comprehensive fee at this time. However, as a result of the recent board meeting, we are in the process of reformulating our current financial planning model. We need to bring expenses in line and to decide how best to project increases in revenue. The Committee will continue its discussions on this issue and keep you informed.

Average Faculty Salaries by Rank, Fall 2000. All Full-Time Faculty

Professor		
School	2000 Average Salary	Rank
Trinity	\$96,051	1
Colgate	\$95,443	2
Villanova	\$94,204	3
Urichmond	\$93,410	4
Middlebury	\$91,845	5
Lehigh	\$91,200	6
F&M	\$85,129	7
BUCKNELL	\$84,521	8
Lafayette	\$84,500	9
Holy Cross	\$84,151	10
Union	\$83,709	11
Oberlin	\$82,280	12

Associate Professor		
School	2000 Average Salary	Rank
Colgate	\$70,428	1
Trinity	\$67,495	2
Lafayette	\$66,200	3
Lehigh	\$65,600	4
Urichmond	\$64,900	5
Villanova	\$64,762	6
Union	\$64,066	7
BUCKNELL	\$63,875	8
Middlebury	\$63,862	9
Oberlin	\$63,654	10
Holy Cross	\$62,592	11
F&M	\$59,795	12

Assistant Professor		
School	2000 Average Salary	Rank
Lehigh	\$56,300	1
Villanova	\$53,735	2
Urichmond	\$53,088	3
Colgate	\$52,839	4
Oberlin	\$51,727	5
BUCKNELL	\$51,667	6
Middlebury	\$50,867	7
Lafayette	\$50,200	8
Union	\$49,613	9
Trinity	\$48,792	10
F&M	\$48,658	11
Holy Cross	\$48,438	12

Faculty Salary Increases

