



## UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

The November meeting of the University Faculty will be held on Monday, November 5, 2001, beginning at 5:00 PM in the Langone Center Forum. Professor Michael Payne will preside. If there are any amendments to the October, 2001 minutes, please send them to Andrea Halpern, Secretary of the Faculty, in advance of the meeting.

### AGENDA

1. **Amendments to October 2001 minutes**
2. **Announcements and remarks by the President and members of his staff**
3. **Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty**  
Report on the planning process
4. **Old Business**
  - a. Report from Committee on Instruction: George Exner

This report was in progress when the October meeting was adjourned. The last sentence (italicized) has been added to Point 3 of that report .

In the rare instances when the Board of Review on Academic Responsibility cannot be convened and a case must be heard between semesters (for example for a graduating senior or a student going abroad for the following semester), the Chair of the Board of Review or another experienced faculty member of the Board of Review to be designated by the Chair should hear the case rather than an Associate Dean. *For the sake of consistency, such a faculty member should consult records of the Registrar for information about penalties, given in the past for similar offenses, at hearings of a full Board of Review.*

- b. Report from the Faculty Representative to the Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees: Michael Moohr
  - c. Report from the Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee: Kim Daubman
    - i) Continuation of discussion of proposals to revise the merit system.
    - ii) Current report

**Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel**  
**October 26, 2001**

The Committee continued to consider the merit review system, specifically the issue of how we might implement a policy of differential weightings of teaching, scholarship, and service for department and program chairs, and perhaps others with special roles. Our continued consideration of this issue was prompted by the large number of respondents to the Merit System Review Survey who indicated agreement with the statement that "differential weightings should be used in evaluation of faculty with special roles." Provost Steve Bowen brought this issue to the meetings of department and program chairs in both colleges where he found little support for the issue. Both philosophical objections and practical difficulties were cited. Therefore, after consultation with department and program chairs, we will drop recommendation 4 (which would have charged the Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel with developing a proposal for differential weightings) from the motion we introduced at the last faculty meeting of October 1.

Marcia Hoffman and Cindy Bilger of the Office of Personnel gave a presentation to the Committee about the changes in the benefits package for next year. All faculty have since received the packet explaining the changes and so it will not be described here. Ms. Hoffman and Ms. Bilger reported that the levels of satisfaction with the various plans offered (i.e., BCBS Traditional, BCBS CustomBlue, and GHP) appear to be roughly equivalent.

Finally, the Committee also considered the non-smoking policy adopted by the Administrative Council with unanimous support from the Committee on Complementary Activities. The policy states that all University buildings and stadiums will be entirely smoke-free by July 1, 2002. This Committee was asked to consider how this policy might be enforced. We agreed that there should be enforcement if there is a policy, and considered various enforcement options. We referred the issue of designing an implementation and enforcement policy back to the Administrative Council

iii) Proposed amendment to the merit system proposals by John Peeler

- That on each of the categories of teaching, scholarship, and service, there shall be three possible ratings (1, 2, 3, where 3 is highest).

- That a rating of "2" will acknowledge the high calibre of work that is expected of Bucknell faculty members in each area, such that normally, the large majority of faculty members will receive "2" ratings in any given category. "3" will denote extraordinary achievement, while "1" will indicate significant shortcomings in any given category.

- The Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee is charged to develop operational definitions of these three-point scales.

**Rationale:** My intent is to capture an important asset of the present system (the clear differentiation of the three areas of work, such that outstanding work in one area can be recognized). At the same time I will argue that we do not have valid and reliable means of assessing performance of faculty on a 5-point scale. Our former system had the virtue of not trying to do so. This proposal recaptures that feature while keeping the differentiation of teaching, scholarship, and service.

## 5. New Business

### Report from the Committee on Planning and Budget: Bill King

The Committee on Planning and Budget is providing this report on the University Operating Budget results for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2001 (FY2000-01).

**FY2000-01 Budget Results**

As shown below, Bucknell ended FY2000-01 with an unrestricted surplus of \$1,041,000. **Tuition & Fees** varied due to a slightly larger than anticipated Class of 2004 and greater than anticipated retention from the Fall 2000 to the Spring 2001 semesters. The variances in the **Sponsored Research & Programs** area, where both revenues and related expenses varied significantly, are due to the timing of research activities. The large negative variance in **Auxiliary Enterprise Revenues** (Dining Services, Residence Halls, Bookstore, Summer Conferences) is an indication of increasing competition from external sources. The large variance in **Compensation** (salaries, wages, and benefits) was primarily the result of the stellar performance of investments associated with the support staff defined benefits plan. Since the support staff moved to a defined contribution plan beginning July 1, 2001, this one-time windfall will not be repeated. The variance in **Other Expenses** (which includes the day-to-day operating budgets for most departments and programs) is attributable to smaller unrestricted and restricted variances that occur across the University.

	<b>2000-01</b>	<b>2000-01</b>	<b>2000-01</b>
	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Variance</b>
	<b>(\$000)</b>	<b>(\$000)</b>	<b>(\$000)</b>
<b>REVENUES:</b>			
TUITION & FEES	\$ 81,462	\$ 82,161	\$ 699
SPONSORED RESEARCH & PROGRAMS	1,325	2,505	1,180
GIFTS AND GRANTS	9,489	10,021	532
SPENDABLE ENDOWMENT INCOME	14,817	15,004	187
OTHER REVENUES	5,730	6,179	449
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES	<u>22,038</u>	<u>20,734</u>	<u>(1,304)</u>
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>\$ 134,861</b>	<b>\$ 136,604</b>	<b>\$ 1,743</b>
<b>EXPENDITURES AND ALLOCATIONS</b>			
COMPENSATION	\$ 61,121	\$ 59,161	\$ (1,960)
TOTAL FINANCIAL AID	25,639	25,663	24
SPONSORED RESEARCH & PROGRAMS	1,169	2,070	901
INFORM. TECH. & INFORM. RESRS.	4,645	4,327	(318)
UTILITIES AND FUELS	3,682	3,513	(169)
OTHER OPERATING EXPENSES	24,052	25,948	1,896
RETIREE HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSE	2,940	2,910	(30)
BUDGETED ALLOCATIONS	10,775	11,071	296
BUDGETED CONTINGENCY	<u>838</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>(838)</u>
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES AND ALLOCATIONS</b>	<b>\$ 134,861</b>	<b>\$ 134,663</b>	<b>\$ (198)</b>
<b>EXCESS REVENUES(DEFICIT)</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,941</b>	<b>\$ 1,941</b>
<b>Excess Restricted Revenues</b>		<b>\$ 900</b>	
<b>Excess Unrestricted Revenues</b>		<b>\$ 1,041</b>	

**Comparison of FY2000-01 to FY1999-00**

FY2000-01 is the last year in which significant excess unrestricted revenues are expected. The single largest component of the excess unrestricted revenue was in the **Compensation** area, specifically the support staff pension plan. With the movement of the support staff from a defined benefit plan to a defined contribution plan beginning July 1, 2001, it is certain this windfall will not occur again. The second largest variance was in the area of **Auxiliary Enterprise Revenues**. While these budgets have been adjusted accordingly for FY2001-02 and beyond, it is still certain that competition from external sources will continue to exert significant pressures.

	<b>2000-01</b>	<b>1999-00</b>
	<b>(\$000)</b>	<b>(\$000)</b>
Total Revenues	\$136,604	\$130,098
Total Expenses	\$134,663	\$128,677
Total Excess Revenue	\$1,941	\$1,421
Excess Restricted Revenue	\$900	\$794
Excess Unrestricted Revenue	\$1,041	\$627

**Disposition of Excess Revenues**

Excess **Restricted** revenues must remain in the program for which the funds were received, and must be expended within the guidelines set forth by the donor/grantor during future fiscal years. Historically, any excess **Unrestricted** revenue is moved to the University's quasi-endowment. However, with the approval of the Board of Trustees, unrestricted revenues can be allocated for specific purposes.