



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

Minutes of the Faculty Meeting

November 4, 2002

The meeting was called to order at 5PM by Prof. Michael Payne. He corrected an earlier misstatement that all reports presented to the faculty become policy without any vote to the contrary. In fact, this procedure only pertains to standing Faculty Committees. Thus the lack of action on the report on Merit Aid at the October 28, 2002 meeting cannot be interpreted as having created faculty policy on the matter.

Announcements by the President

President Rogers reported on several budget items. We are in a deficit position, even before requests for new positions are considered. He will give a full report at the December meeting. He then addressed the request for information from the last regular faculty meeting on costs associated with implementing a \$9/hour minimum wage. He first pointed out that with benefits figured in, a nominal \$7/hr wage came to effectively \$11.42/hr. Bringing all employees to \$9/hr would cost \$212,766 in Year 1. Adjusting for wage compression for 450 employees would add \$773,492, for a total of \$986,258. His preference was to look at compensation in the context of the ongoing classification/compensation review. He pointed out that inflation was very low right now so that waiting until that review was complete in January 2004 to adjust salaries would not have a very large impact on the eventual size of the adjustment. VP Jo-Anne Lema added that her preference was to consider this whole issue in the context of the Vision 2010 process.

Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty.

Prof. Payne requested that anyone making Powerpoint presentations bring two hard copies of the presentation for the Chair and Secretary [note from the Secretary: page-saving "six-per-page" printouts are fine].

Old Business

The faculty voted to discuss the new Tucker/Susman motion on the living wage (see November, 2002 Agenda). Professor Paul Susman clarified that the \$9/hr figure assumes benefits will also be paid. Prof. Marj Kastner moved to amend the motion to remove the word "immediate" [implementation], to recognize our current budget problems. After this was seconded, some discussion concerned two possible interpretations of the word "immediate" (immediate implementation of the initiative, or not making employees wait four years to reach \$9/hr, as per the Committee on Planning and Budget recommendation). Prof. Susman pointed out that any such motion can only recommend to the President, but at least there would be a reporting requirement. The motion to amend was defeated. After a reminder from Prof. Ben Marsh (Chair of CPB) that the President's opening remarks

indicated progression in the right direction, the Tucker/Susman motion was voted on and passed.

Prof. George Exner next reported for the Committee on Instruction. COI was asked to write a charge for the Committee on Assessment, which was approved in principle by the faculty last spring. The text was presented in the October 2002 Agenda. The purpose of the committee is to consider assessment that is not departmentally based, e.g., to review the effectiveness of calculus courses for Engineering students. The committee would have Faculty from four divisions, and representatives from other offices involved in academic policy. As there were no objections, the report was accepted as policy.

Prof. Marsh next formally presented the CPB motion to expand the membership of the committee; text may be found in the October, 2002 agenda. Because this is an alteration to the Faculty Handbook, this presentation constitutes the required first reading, to be voted on next month.

Prof. Marsh remained on the floor, as himself rather than as chair of CPB, to present his motion to a) endorse the Merit Aid report from the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (discussed at the October 28, 2002 special meeting, see Agenda of that meeting for text of the report), b) after a change to spread athletic merit aid more widely than the report proposed (see November, 2002 Agenda for text of the motion). Prof. Payne said that we would discuss and vote on part b) before the endorsement of the report. After a second to his motion, Prof. Marsh reviewed his rationale for the suggested change. If the intent of merit aid is to distribute a small number of talented students widely into community, this should also be true of athletics and not concentrate the merit aid awards in basketball. If this decision is driven by the Patriot League, we should ask how many of our values we should give up to be in that league. We need to assess the role of athletics in the university; the large dollar amounts spent on the new athletic facility and in travel for the football team, and the new athletics website BucknellBison.com (rather than .edu) may point to a focus on athletics not as an extension of academics, but as publicity. If we want to increase the academic quality of basketball players, this should be done via the Admissions process. The merit aid system as proposed will be hard to dismantle in the future.

In the following discussion, some faculty members worried that giving merit aid awards in sports other than basketball would spread the perceived semiprofessionalization of basketball to other sports, and put pressure on other Patriot League teams to award merit aid more widely. Other faculty members thought that Bucknell integrates athletics into its mission in a balanced fashion. Some skepticism was expressed that allowing merit aid for basketball now was just the opening for offering more merit aid for athletics in the future, and concern about the influence of the Patriot League in university decisions was once again mentioned.

Prof. Kastner thought that the goal of merit aid in raising academic standards could be more effectively met during the Admissions process, and moved that: *Any student receiving merit aid will be required to be in the top 3/4 of the entry pool of students*, which was seconded. She thought this was not an onerous standard to meet, and would be an alternative to micromanaging the distribution of merit aid awards. Prof. Payne observed that both CAFA and the Trustee subcommittee working on this issue are sensitive to possible ramifications of offering merit aid. The vote to amend Prof. Marsh's motion failed.

Returning to Prof. Marsh's motion, several people asked about the rationale of concentrating merit aid funds in basketball. Prof. Arthur Shapiro, Chair of CAFA, responded by first saying that we already give preferential need-based aid to desired players. However, medium-need people can currently get more money from other colleges than from Bucknell.

Therefore, we are attracting players from a high-need pool, which is less qualified than one that includes those with medium need. Basketball is a good destination for these funds because it is a high profile sport that nevertheless involves relatively few students (12 each on the men's and women's teams). VP Charlie Pollock added that right now, Bucknell's basketball players are disadvantaged relative to other Patriot League teams by not getting merit aid.

Prof. Carl Milofsky, a member of the Committee on Athletics, was concerned because his committee has never discussed this issue. And indeed, no faculty committee has oversight for Athletics. We arguably already have the best integrated student/athlete model in the NCAA, but the emphasis on basketball may create a class structure among sports. Prof. Payne also wondered who will or should oversee this program.

At this point, a vote was taken on part b) of Prof. Marsh's motion, which failed on a close vote. To enable the vote on part a) the group voted to extend the meeting time by 5 min. The vote to endorse the CAFA report passed, also on a close vote. The meeting adjourned at just past 6:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea Halpern
Secretary of the Faculty