



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

Minutes of the Faculty Meeting

March 3, 2003

Prof. Michael Payne called the meeting to order at 5 PM.

Announcements by the President

VP Bob Kallin introduced Rick Rosenberg, Director of Corporate and Foundation Relations, who received a warm welcome. VP Charlie Pollock, in answer to a submitted question about a review of procedures for adjudication of sexual assault, said that a comprehensive review of all adjudication procedures is being planned.

President Rogers spent his remaining time addressing the Vision 2010 planning process. He first thanked the Faculty Council for suggesting taking more time to complete the process. He reviewed some reasons he initiated Vision 2010 shortly after he arrived: The previous planning document *Foundations for the Future* was 10 years old and also faculty were unclear about how valued their role was in fashioning the future of the University. In his view, Bucknell should in the future have a greatly enhanced presence and a balanced life for students. We should be “one Bucknell”, without large divides between different segments of the University, and we need the funds to fulfill our dreams. He offered a short set of strategic objectives for wide consideration. The details do not have to be in place yet although we will need planning initiatives and metrics.

1. To enhance the intellectual climate of the campus in order to promote the life of the mind. (This involves the proposal for a 5-course load, although we may want to consider other teaching schedules such as a 4-day teaching week, or teaching one course at a time in concentrated blocks.)
2. To educate students to live and lead in the 21st century.
3. To enhance Bucknell’s national reputation.
4. To provide a student life program that promotes development of the whole person.
5. To enhance diversity, with a goal of 25% minority students (including international students)
6. To enhance our financial base, especially the instructional budget. We will have a new capital campaign beginning in 2006 and the plan will define priorities for this campaign.

President Rogers concluded by emphasizing that this is not his plan or the Trustees’ plan but our plan. The governance system will be able to have input on the objectives. He noted that students on the Steering Committee have said that they love Bucknell but think we could set higher intellectual expectations.

Announcements by the Chair of Faculty

Prof. Payne gave a report from the Faculty Council. This included the calendar for planning process (published in the Agenda) which the faculty might wish to approve, as Faculty Council reports do not become policy absent faculty action. Prof. Payne elaborated on the timing of the planning process, noting that the President at the outset had to both staff his administration and repair damage from the "Tenets" document. The turmoil of 9/11 and financial problems also had to be dealt with. Now we can identify key strategic issues, such as the need to enhance the intellectual climate, the 5-course load, our liberal arts identity, and placing financial priority on instruction. Next month's meeting will mostly be devoted to these issues so that we can send ideas to the Trustees before their April meeting; final action on the plan by faculty will not take place until next fall. He expects that we will have a good working relationship with the Trustees in this process. VP Pollock asked how "consensus" on key issues will be identified. Prof. Payne said that faculty should discuss what their consensus is and pass that to the Trustees. This discussion need not be limited to the academic program.

Prof. Ben Marsh moved that *The faculty endorses the role of the Faculty Council in determining the timing and nature of faculty actions relating to the Vision 2010 planning process*, which was seconded. His main rationale was that all items should come to the faculty floor through the Faculty Council for clarity of process. During questioning, he clarified that his purpose was to avoid multiple motions coming from different governance groups, which might profitably be combined. The Faculty Council may in fact bring initiatives from the University Council (of which it is a subset) to the floor. The motion passed, after which Prof. Marsh noted that the affirmative vote in effect constituted approval of the planning calendar.

Remaining discussion on this matter concerned the process and timing for discussion of key issues. Prof. Payne reminded the group that all divisional "white papers" are now in general circulation except for the one from University Relations. The faculty can discuss goals emerging from any of the plans but might want to discuss the Academic plan more deeply in April or October. The April faculty meeting should be reserved for items we want to mark as high priority for discussion with the Board at their April meeting. Some work on the plans, such as editing or research, may take place during the summer; President Rogers said he will try to provide a stipend for some faculty members who take on this task. Provost Steve Bowen added that we need to consult the Introduction-Goals-Guidelines document from last fall to help bring ideas together.

New Business

Prof. Allen Schweinsberg, Chair of the Personnel Committee, next introduced the update to the *Faculty Handbook*, which he hopes will be voted on next month (as an update is a "giant amendment" to the *Handbook*). He began by noting that the current edition dates from 1992 and much information is inaccurate. He reminded the faculty that they can view the changed text on E-Reserve. The Committee wants feedback from faculty on any aspect, especially about omissions. Prof. Paul Susman stated that while some changes simply reflect wording or policy previously approved, some are new amendments and should receive full deliberation. Prof. Schweinsberg's opinion was that no more than 4 or 5 changes are truly amendments, and that few changes are controversial. All such changes are marked clearly in the posted document, along with explanations, and faculty can report to the Committee which they feel are substantive. The update also now has documents and policies as an integral part. In discussion about committee charges, he said that no committees have requested their charges be changed.

Prof. Schweinsberg's second item was a recommendation about the new performance review system. Right now, about 2/3 of the faculty have merit ratings from the previous system and about 1/3 have reviews in progress. Ratings from these reviews will be on different scales.

How should merit dollars be distributed in this case? One possibility was to convert the old scale to the new scale, which would be complicated but could be done fairly. However, the Committee is recommending that the merit pay pool be divided into two pots, consisting of 2/3 and 1/3 of the available funds, respectively. These would be distributed separately. In response to questions, he said that at the moment we do not know if the two groups of faculty have the same rank or merit distribution, but this could be looked at. The sample should be large enough to smooth out differences. Prof. Susman asked if everyone will achieve a raise at least comparable to the Consumer Price Index, but Prof. Schweinsberg said probably not, as we have only a total of a 2.5% increase over last year, and we need some money set aside for promotion increments and equity. Provost Bowen added that by current calculations, the 3-year forward weighted average, ending in June, gives us a CPI figure of 2.1%.

Prof. Susman then moved reintroduction of the “Kresl amendment” [first introduced and passed on April 13, 1998 in the context of a discussion of the previous merit system: *The combined Across-the-Board plus Merit components shall provide at least a cost of living increase for every member of the faculty*]. After the motion was seconded, Prof. Schweinsberg responded that the Kresl amendment does not cover a situation in which funds are not available to meet CPI. President Rogers added that changing the system even before one cycle was complete was undesirable. Prof. Susman countered that the Trustees would be understanding if they realized that the faculty was experiencing a real pay cut. If we can’t achieve pay raises equal to CPI for everyone, then we should get as close as possible. Dean Genie Gerdes noted that the merit portion is a fixed dollar amount, so the effect of the amendment would be to shift money from lower to higher paid faculty members. The eponymous Prof. Peter Kresl said that if an amount equal to half of the CPI was given out as ATB, and the other half as merit dollars, everyone would get a raise at least equivalent to the CPI; we have typically assumed that only some people who were not really trying would earn below this level. Prof. Marsh worried that it was an inopportune time to push this issue because the CPI is so low that the monetary amounts in question are also very low. The question was called and the motion failed.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea Halpern
Secretary of the Faculty