



The April meeting of the University Faculty will be held on Monday, April 7, 2003, beginning at 5:00 PM in the Langone Center Forum. Professor Michael Payne will preside. If there are any amendments to the March, 2003 minutes, please send them to Andrea Halpern, Secretary of the Faculty, in advance of the meeting.

## **AGENDA**

### **1. Amendments to March 2003 minutes**

### **2. Announcements and remarks by the President and members of his staff**

#### Question

I've heard a rumor that the University will be spending a sizeable chunk of money on a new presidential dining room in the LC. Is this true? If it is true, how much will it cost? If it is true, please justify the expenditure in light of the financial belt tightening departments and individuals are being asked to accept. If the money came from a donor, will you discuss the steps that were taken to convince the donor that you and the University would really rather see such funds go toward academic programs?

### **3. Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty**

#### **a. Nominations for University and Faculty Committees**

See attached page for ballot prepared by the Faculty Council. Nominations will be solicited from the floor. Slots that do not have the required minimum number of nominees are noted. Please clear all nominations with the potential nominee.

#### **b. Faculty Council list of 2010 Issues**

See attached page

### **4. Old Business**

Report from the Committee on Academic and Faculty Personnel : Allen Schweinsberg  
Vote on updated *Faculty Handbook*

### **5. New Business**

Report from the Committee on Instruction: George Exner  
Response to the Academic Affairs Task Force report

## **Standing Committees: Open Slots for Nominations For 2003-2004**

### **Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel**

1 untenured: Cathy O'Connor, Philippe Dubois

1 one-year tenured: *need two more*

### **Committee on Faculty Development**

1 natural sciences : Kathleen Page, Jim Swan

1 social science: Charles Moran, Karen Morin

1 at large, one year: Tom Kinnaman, Tristan Riley

1 humanities, one year: Barry Hannigan, Sherri Geller

### **Committee on Staff Planning**

1 natural sciences : Mary Beth Gray, Charlie Clapp

1 social sciences: Tony Massoud, JT Ptacek

1 engineering, one year: Tom DeStephano *need one more*

### **Committee on Instruction**

1 natural sciences : Marj Kastner, Tom Cassidy

1 social sciences: Kevin Myers, Matt Silberman

### **Committee on Planning and Budget**

1 Engineering: Dave Cartwright, *need one more*

### **University Review Committee**

1 at large: *need two more*

### **Committee on Complementary Activities**

4 at large: Chris Boyatzis, Eric Santanen, Susan Tabrizi, Mitch Chernin, Tim Sweeney, Gary Grant

### **Faculty Hearing Committee**

1 natural sciences: Dee Casteel, Duane Griffin

1 social sciences, 1 year: Owen Floody, Nancy White

1 at large, spring semester: Peter Stryker, Mary Howe

### **Faculty Council**

1 social studies: Paul Susman, Steve Stamos

1 untenured: Katharina Vollmayr-Lee, Daniel Cavanagh

2 at-large: Mark Spiro, John Kirkland, Paula Buck

### **Faculty Representatives to the Board of Trustees Committees (at large)**

### **Committee on Complementary Activities**

1 at large: Mike Prince, *need one more*

### **Committee on Educational Policy**

1 at large: Mary Beth Gray, Glyne Griffith

### **Committee on University Relations**

2 at large: Erik Lofgren, *need two more*

### **Faculty Council List of 2010 Issues**

At the April 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the University Faculty we will attempt to determine if a preliminary consensus exists among the Faculty on the following issues. We will proceed with a serial discussion and vote on those items. Section B, which does not require vote, includes items that need further work as the planning process continues. References in parentheses are to the task force reports, the COI report (on the current Agenda), as well as a report from COIE, and A&Scur. This FC list and the COI report are in many ways complementary.

#### **A: Proposed FC preliminary consensus items**

1. One of the highest priorities of 2010 should be the enhancement of the intellectual life of the campus in order better to foster the life of the mind at Bucknell and in order to fulfill our central academic mission. (COI, 1)
2. The continuation of Bucknell's Carnegie designation as a liberal arts institution is essential to maintaining the identity of the University and to fostering our commitment to academic and intellectual excellence. (AATF, 2; A&Scur, 2)
3. A carefully worked out timetable and procedure needs to be devised for bringing about a transition to the five-course teaching load that was approved by the Faculty in December 2002. (COI, 4)
4. Bucknell's teacher/scholar model is fundamental to the identity of the University and should be continued and fully supported. (AATF, Appendix A)
5. The Faculty continues to be concerned about the negative effects of Bucknell's student culture on our students, which significantly affects many students' decisions to transfer or not to apply to Bucknell in the first place. Alternatives to the Greek system need to be developed for the benefit of both non-affiliated students and for those who choose fraternities and sororities. (COI, 3).
6. The plan for diversity should be developed in order better to explain the need for a pluralistic campus in order to achieve the goals of liberal education. (SLC, Issue 3)
7. There needs to be a full and open discussion of the proportion of expense per student for academic, athletic, and student life activities in order to give the Faculty a better sense of whether our stated institutional values are being matched by our financial expenditures. These details should be made available to the Faculty by the beginning of the fall semester 2003. (COI, 1-3)
8. Constructing a new Art Building with classrooms deserves high priority with a net increase in the number of classrooms. (A&Scur, 5)

#### **B: Items recommended for further work**

1. Recent discussions of such innovations in the curriculum and in teaching as the providing of increased opportunities for international education, civic engagement, artistic activity, and the establishment of a center for teaching and learning should continue; but these need to be more clearly focused, and the costs of the center need to be determined by the time of final action on the 2010 plan. (A&Scur, 3-4; COIE report.)
2. Appendix C of the Student Life and Culture Report needs to be completed in order to provide a fully articulated plan for athletics at Bucknell.

#### **C: Responses from committees**

- 1.COI: Committee on Instruction
- 2.COIE: Committee on International Education
- 3.A&Scur: Curriculum Committee, College of Arts and Sciences

### **Committee on Instruction Responses to the AATF report**

**Summary:**

**I. Broad Issues**

- 1) We give below our Strategic Objectives and some action steps: the most important objectives are a clear statement that academic education is the centerpiece of Bucknell's mission and a version of the Teacher-Scholar Ideal that provides for a workload sustainable over the course of a career.
- 2) We find the Student Life Plan has implicit a mission for Bucknell finding essentially equal a very broad array of potentially educational experiences. We disagree with that view, and call for a vision of student life with support of the academic mission its primary goal.
- 3) We call for full and frank discussions on the (distinct) problems of sustainable faculty workload and the balance of that workload (these problems stated, but not resolved, on page 6 of Appendix A, the Teacher-Scholar Ideal).

**II. Matters that CoI was specifically charged to consider**

- 4) CoI endorses the statement on our identity as an institution of liberal learning.
- 5) CoI endorses the proposal for a Teaching and Learning Center, both in its proposed mission to support faculty and in the proposal to enhance student support, but is divided on whether these missions should be under one roof.

**III. Responses to specific portions of the text**

- 6) We find the paragraph on "undersubscribed departments" [page 11] quite problematic and call for an unambiguous statement on what is intended, which we believe should be faculty decisions, within the overall educational budget, of how to support departments with small numbers of majors and/or students.

---

**1) Strategic Objectives**

It is worth noting that CoI had little time for these discussions, as we were working primarily on our responses to the various white papers, especially the Academic Affairs Task Force report. Nonetheless, the objectives below are those viewed by the committee as the most important. (Many of these are included, and developed in fuller detail, in the various responses below.)

I. Affirm the central position of intellectual life, primarily expressed in the context of academic education, at Bucknell.

Action Steps:

1. Rewrite the mission statement to make academic education (as opposed to "any" educative experience) explicitly central.
2. Adjust the percentage allocation of financial resources to the academic mission so as to match our peers.
3. Track the admissions process on an ongoing basis to find out, on the basis of data, who speaks for students (Coaches? Professors?), what the percent success rates are for various groups, and what students think is being marketed by BU. Adjust on the basis of the results to match this "centrality" strategic objective.
4. Found a Teaching and Learning Center.
5. Support, enhance, and extend the Residential College structures.

II. Affirm a version of the Teacher-Scholar Ideal allowing for various reasonable choices as to the balance between teaching and research and with commitment to a total workload sustainable over a career.

Action Steps:

1. Address in frank and public conversations, explicitly, the questions of balance between teaching and research.
2. Address in frank and public conversations, explicitly and as a question distinct from that in 1, the matter of a workload sustainable over the course of a career.
3. Ensure that the solutions proposed to each of the above include commitment to appropriate institutional response as well as encouragement for individual responses.

III. Adopt a vision for Student Affairs which makes its primary mission the support of academic education.

IV. Enhance Bucknell's national reputation.

Action Step:

1. Note that those with higher reputations are in most cases selling academics, and not sports or the "college experience" (for example). Market, and admit, accordingly.

V. Affirm Bucknell's identity as an institution of liberal learning.

VI. Enhance diversity (as elsewhere addressed).

VII. Ensure Bucknell's financial base (as elsewhere addressed).

## **2) Response to the Student Life portion of the AATF report, and to the Student Life and Culture Plan white paper**

The Committee on Instruction had a mixed reaction to the Student Life portion of the AATF report and to the Student Life and Culture Plan white paper. It is unfortunate that the AATF report said so little about the matter of student life, and therefore the documents before us are essentially those written by the Student Life Task Force (however informed by conversations with and information from other bodies). There are certainly things in the SLTF report we support. In particular, the discussion of diversity, and the goals for it, seem to us right on the mark. CoI supports as well the desire to address long term needs in Psychological Services, and the need to provide alternative experiences for students not in the fraternity/sorority system, including, for example, desirable social space not owned or controlled by these organizations. We support as well the proposal for inclusion of an academic component to first year student orientation.

CoI also strongly supports improvements and extensions of the Residential College offerings. We hope that ways can be found to increase faculty interest in the colleges, perhaps by frank discussions of the workload such involvement entails. We support the Residential College in particular because they provide a concrete example of a setting in which, under faculty leadership, Student Life provides support for the academic mission of the institution.

We had, however, several concerns about the overall thrust of the document. First, it is an extremely ambitious one; were all these things to be taken on, the need for resources would be great. We fear that this may be in conflict with the strategic goal to increase the percentage of financial resources to the teaching mission of the institution. The Academic Affairs document seems, in resource terms, much more modest than the quite expansive Student Life and Culture Plan.

**Our main difficulty, though, is with the vision of the institutional mission evident throughout the Student Life and Culture Plan white paper.** The tension is exactly this: is Bucknell University primarily about "a full spectrum of growth-promoting opportunities" for students [page 1, draft 1/30/03, STLP] or is it primarily about "academic

education and the life of the mind" [page 2, draft 2/4/03, AATF]? While the STLP sometimes asserts the primacy of the academic mission, it much more often undercuts that assertion (see the third full paragraph of the introduction in this regard). We note that matters of support of the academic enterprise do not occur in the goals until page 5, and appear in that context as some entries in a list of ways to "Create in every student a strong sense of connection and commitment to Bucknell, thereby increasing retention, learning, and alumni loyalty." Many of the goals, initiatives, and more detailed desires point to a vision of Bucknell in which academics is just one of a great many of educative experiences all of which Bucknell should seek (and devote resources) to provide. Calls for "the 'student orientation' of faculty" [page 5, and similar discussions elsewhere] invite the faculty into co- and extra-curricular activities as opposed to wishing to help decrease ways in which these detract from the academic mission. The paper sometimes suggests the injection of non-academic matters into courses: core ethical values [page 8] or a "social issues" program [page 3]. In general, the paper does not seem to support a vision of Student Affairs and student culture having as their main mission support of the academic enterprise.

It is possible that the language of the paper is unintentionally strong. It is natural that people in Student Affairs should prize highly what they spend time doing; it is certainly true that there are many educative things in life of which academic education is only one; surely many sorts of non-academic, but still educational, things happen at Bucknell. But this white paper is a strongly articulated vision of a Bucknell with which CoI is frankly at odds; further, we lack a similarly strongly articulated vision of a Bucknell in which academics is central. In particular, we have no statement about what Student Affairs and student life would be in such an institution, and several members of CoI were uncomfortable with the thought that we might, by default, meet somewhere in the middle of these two visions. (We remark that the proposed University Mission statement does not reassure us on this point.) We wish to make a careful distinction: while we realize that students will make choices about what to do with their time here, and support the opportunity for such choices are part of the developmental process, Bucknell as an institution should have a clear statement of what it believes is central for the student experience here. **The Committee on Instruction therefore wishes to endorse, strongly, the vision of Bucknell as a place in which academic education is central. This includes, in part, a vision of Student Affairs primarily dedicated to support of the academic mission, as opposed to a primary focus on providing other, even other educational, offerings.**

### **3) Response to the concluding paragraphs of the Teacher-Scholar Ideal (page 6 of Appendix A to the AATF report), especially the final paragraph.**

The Committee on Instruction had several concerns with these closing paragraphs, and particularly the final one. The problems of faculty workload and the balance of teaching and scholarship are raised, but there is neither a solution given nor a proposal for how we might move to a decision. **CoI therefore calls for frank conversations, and actions taken, on the (distinct) problems of a sustainable faculty workload and the appropriate balance of teaching and scholarship, with each considered in terms of both individual faculty response and institutional response.**

We support the notion that "no one approach to balancing these competing responsibilities is appropriate to all faculty," [page 6, Appendix A, AATF white paper] and very much encourage faculty to seek their own solutions. Individuals are often the best judges of how to use their particular strengths to make the largest contributions to the institutions. Faculty should indeed be encouraged to be flexible in their responses to demands on their time.

However, there must be as well an institutional response: the solution to these difficulties cannot be laid primarily upon the shoulders of individuals. CoI believes that the institution must clearly indicate that it accepts and rewards (in ways of which merit is but one example) reasonable individual choices as to how to strike a balance. Perhaps this will include more explicit celebration of research, which some on the committee feel must now be hidden lest one be viewed as devoting inadequate attention to teaching. The right of individual departments to judge the relative weight (teaching or research) of activities such as student research should be supported. The encouragement of "creative solutions to the time-pressure problem" [page 6] is not a substitute for the need for Bucknell, as an institution, to provide clear guidance to its young faculty, and to faculty whose balance in these areas may well change over the course of a career.

As well, the Committee wants to highlight the distinction between the problems of an appropriate balance of workload and a sustainable workload. An institution in which faculty are working in excess of what is sustainable over a career is not (in the long run) a healthy one, and things are only marginally improved if the excessive load is

at least in balance. The text in the final paragraph on page 6 clearly recognizes the problem of overwork, as well as issues of a balance of work, but the former is actually addressed even less than the latter. Bucknell, like most institutions, has not done well at budgeting the resource of faculty time in the way that it routinely budgets financial resources. For the institution to remain silent on this issue is tempting, because it gives the illusion that we may spend faculty time as if it were limitless. And again, to change the balance of a workload under which faculty are over-extended is not redress.

CoI strongly endorses the move to a 5 course teaching load as having the potential to be part of a solution to both the sustainable workload and balance problems. However, it is important that this step not be oversold. The time savings cannot simultaneously reduce faculty stress, allow for more mentoring of students and independent study work, increase time invested in the residential colleges, allow for more "student-faculty interaction, both course related and general" [page 5, Student Life and Culture Plan], and so on and so on. We believe that it is important that this move not lead to increased expectations in teaching and scholarship. We further believe that it is important that our discussions, both for internal use and for communication to others, must be unambiguous on this point, on what the move to a 5 course load is in fact intended to accomplish, and on what potential uses of the reduction in course load we will not pursue.

#### **4) Endorsement:**

The Committee on Instruction endorses the statement in Planning Initiative I on liberal learning and the desire to maintain a 55-45 liberal arts to professional degree ratio. This is a statement with which we agree about "who we are," emphasizing the liberal learning underlying both our professional and liberal arts degree programs. The maintenance of our current Carnegie Classification in the liberal arts is appropriate strategically as well.

#### **5) Comments on the proposed Teaching and Learning Center**

The Committee on Instruction endorses the proposed Teaching and Learning Center in its mission to support faculty in matters of teaching. Implementation of the TLC must consider how to find an appropriate balance between providing assistance in those techniques and methods that are widely applicable across disciplines and those tools and approaches that are much more specific to a single discipline or a small group of disciplines. The devotion of resources to the TLC should not reduce the opportunity of faculty to attend off-campus (perhaps area-related) workshops and programs with pedagogical emphases. Indeed, it is to be hoped that the TLC will have a budget for such support, and will aid faculty in obtaining external support, for such opportunities.

Also to be considered are the relationship of FACT to the proposed center (perhaps it might continue as an advisory board to the TLC). The TLC may act as an umbrella organization over or perhaps incorporate various groups on campus engaged in pedagogical support (such as the Race/Gender Resource Center or the Center for Service Learning). In either form, it is to be hoped that the TLC can coordinate activities in useful ways (one example of which is scheduling).

The Committee on Instruction emphasizes the importance of an improvement in academic support services for students (including, for example, the necessity of a home for science and mathematics tutoring other than the Writing Center). We hope that this goal will not be forgotten in enthusiasm over the faculty support mission for the proposed TLC. An issue that must be addressed in planning is to strike a balance between the mission of providing better student academic support and the resources, especially new or expanded resources, to be devoted to this effort: we have some concern that it would be easy to call upon a TLC to take on more than can be done with the staff available (as may well have happened with the present Writing Center). But we support an improvement in the support services for students.

CoI is divided over the merits of the proposal in which the TLC incorporates both faculty and student support missions. (We note that at several other institutions the functions are not combined.) On the one hand, the benefits of someone who is doing writing tutoring (for example) being the one to lead faculty workshops on writing are clear. Further, it has been suggested that the jobs of those in a TLC with both missions will be more varied, and hence more satisfying, than those called upon to do, for example, only writing tutoring for students. On the other hand, there have been concerns that at present some aspects of the Writing Center mission to provide writing

tutoring, and especially remedial writing instruction, have gotten lost in staff enthusiasm for workshops for faculty. Staff of a combined TLC, with more to do than could actually be done, might choose or omit from among the tasks actually taken on differently than the community as a whole would wish.

**6) Response to the remarks in the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan on "undersubscribed departments" (first full paragraph, page 11, draft of 02/04/03):**

The Committee on Instruction finds the language of the first full paragraph on page 11 of the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan (concerning "undersubscribed departments") to be quite troublesome. It has been suggested that this language is "code" to signal a resistance to cost/benefit analyses of departments with small numbers of majors and/or relatively low student enrollment: the text is to build a wall against requests (from whatever source) for such analyses. But at least some faculty (including several on CoI) have read this text quite differently as, in fact, exactly opening a door to allow such analyses. Since the language may well outlast the memories of those who know the code, or be read by those who do not, we believe the paragraph should be made clear in its intent.

There are various sorts of faculty concern about this issue. Faculty in departments that might be affected are concerned, as are other faculty from other departments who nonetheless feel that the presence of such departments may be educationally necessary (and these latter faculty may not have received informal reassurances given to particular departments). Further, there are different levels of things to be anxious about. At one extreme is the concern that departments might, through attrition, cease to exist over time, or shrink to a level not allowing a strong major. But more broadly there is concern that a larger range of departments may be pressured or feel pressured to make choices to increase enrollments, perhaps at the expense of major courses. (Some feel that this has already happened in some departments.) Some in CoI expressed concern that the need to draw in larger number of students puts upward pressure on grades in courses so designed. Finally, there is some concern that this paragraph, which was to be deleted, has been retained in the document, and worry that the editing process has not been as responsive as would be useful.

We well understand that there are limits on the numbers of courses and departments that can serve very few students. But CoI believes that these decisions are best made in the context of choices within an overall educational budget, as opposed to in some broader context. Further, faculty feel much more comfortable when those choices are to be made primarily by groups of faculty; there is concern that the text seems to raise the possibility of such decisions being made, for example, at an administrative level.

The Committee on Instruction therefore urges the appropriate bodies to draft an unambiguous paragraph to be included in the strategic plan, and to be brought forward for faculty discussion.