



## UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

The April meeting of the University Faculty will be held on Tuesday, April 6, 2004, beginning at 5PM in the Langone Center Forum. Professor Michael Payne will preside. If there are any amendments to the December, 2003 minutes, please send them to Andrea Halpern, Secretary of the Faculty, in advance of the meeting.

### AGENDA

#### 1. Amendments to December 2003 minutes

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

##### Questions

a. (Ben Marsh). Our October minutes say "The final order of business was to vote on the entire [Faculty] Handbook update. ... The motion passed without dissent, accompanied by a joyful round of applause. President Rogers asked, in view of its importance, that the faculty action on the updated Handbook be presented to him in writing, to which he will respond in kind." What is the present status of those revisions?

b. (Anonymous). What criteria are used to determine campus openings and closings during hazardous snow and ice conditions? How long ago were the criteria established, and has thought been given to the possibility that the criteria might now need to be reevaluated?

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

Report on review of faculty governance (see separate mailing)

Nominations to committees (see attached for candidates from Faculty Council)

#### 4. Old Business

Handbook motion on procedures for selecting faculty representatives to trustee meetings: Janice Mann (first introduced in December, 2003. See that Agenda for text)

#### 5. New Business

a. Report from the Committee on Academic and Faculty Personnel: Allen Schweinsberg

### On addressing the CPI issue

Last November the faculty requested that "In a timely fashion Personnel should bring to the faculty for its decision a set of options for how to address [the] CPI issue."

For many years merit increases have been awarded in fixed dollar amounts. Consequently, faculty receiving the same merit scores receive identical merit increases, with the result that higher salaried faculty receive lower percentage increases. In the current year 38 faculty received raises lower than CPI, because the 2.5% increase in the salary pool for tenured faculty barely exceeded the CPI of 2.13%.

In response to the faculty directive the Personnel Committee offers two alternatives to the current system.

(Option A) Continue to distribute merit increases to tenured faculty in fixed dollar amounts, provided the percent increase in the salary pool is at least 50% greater than CPI. [For example, if CPI were 2% then the salary pool would need to have increased by at least 3%.] In years when the percent increase in the salary pool fails to exceed CPI by 50%, award merit increases as percentages of salaries.

(Option B) Each year, distribute half of the money available for merit increases to tenured faculty in fixed dollar amounts. Distribute the remaining half as percentages of salaries.

Option (A) adheres to the current system (equal merit pay for equal merit) in years when the increase in the salary pool is adequate to provide raises that exceed CPI. In lean years, merit pay would be distributed by percent of salary in order to limit the number of faculty with raises less than CPI.

This option provides relatively more dollars to lower salaried faculty. It restrains the salary gap between younger and older faculty and between faculty in non-market fields and those in market fields. However, as we have seen, after a period of years the resulting salary compression can result in salaries at senior ranks below those at comparable institutions. Over the course of one's career any individual would presumably receive slightly higher pay during early years at the expense of pay later in the career.

By distributing half of the merit dollars in fixed dollar amounts, Option (B) still honors, in part, the principle of equal pay for equal merit. But it also uses percentages to lower the risk of high salaried faculty falling below CPI. Option (B) also addresses the problem of salary compression at higher ranks. It has the simplicity of remaining the same each year, although in years in which CPI and salary increases are very close more faculty will receive raises below CPI than would occur with option (A).

Most members of the Personnel Committee prefer Option (A), although we believe both options provide considerable protection from the CPI problem that arose last spring.

b. Report from the Committee on Planning and Budget: Ben Marsh

The Committee on Planning and Budget has begun an intensive review of the university's general policy on benefits. It is clear to us and to the Trustees, that the present rate of cost increase -- over 12% -- is not endlessly sustainable. We hope to be well informed about the problem and our options before substantial changes become necessary. The "Campus Benefits Advisory Group", which has representation from the administrative and academic personnel committees, is doing most of the leg-work on this topic.

c. Report from the University Review Committee: Gary Steiner

**Reviews of DRC Statements on Procedure and Criteria for  
Retention and Tenure**

The URC, in consultation with CAFT and the Office of Academic Affairs, has found that changes are warranted in the guidelines governing periodic review of department/program statements of procedures governing the review of candidates for retention and tenure. These changes do not pertain to criteria for retention and tenure, but pertain exclusively to procedures governing the periodic review of each department/program's review guidelines. The impetus for these changes was first provided by CAFT during the 2002-2003 academic year, in the interest of streamlining the process by which each department's/program's guidelines are reviewed. The following changes have been developed in consultation with CAFT.

*University Review Committee's Reviews for Retention and Tenure*

(Accepted by the Faculty 3/3/87)

(Revised 4/98 to incorporate accepted recommendations of the Task Force on Retention, Tenure and Promotion)

Last paragraph on Page 1 now reads:

DRC statements of procedures and criteria must be reviewed every five years by the department/program, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. DRC procedures should be dated to indicate the most recent revision date. The department chairperson or program director will provide each member of a department/program with a copy of the DRC statement currently in use.

Recommended revision (changes are underlined):

DRC statements of procedures and criteria must be reviewed every five years by the department/program, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs in that order. The office of the Provost will notify departments and programs on September 1<sup>st</sup> of a given academic year their documents are scheduled for review. Once reviewed, department/program statements showing planned changes will be forwarded to CAFT no later than September 1<sup>st</sup> of the following academic year. Reviews by CAFT and the Provost, and responses by the department/program, if necessary, normally will be concluded prior to May 1<sup>st</sup> so that updated documents may be distributed on that date to faculty anticipating reviews for reappointment, tenure, or promotion during the subsequent academic year. A cover sheet will provide signatures and dates to document the actions of each of the three parties. Should either CAFT or the Provost ask the department/program for changes, the new text will next be forwarded to CAFT for approval before it is forwarded to the Provost. The above procedures will also apply when review of DRC/PRC statements is initiated by or motivated by purposes other than the five-year review cycle. DRC/PRC statements should display prominently the date on which they received final approval. The department chairperson or program director will provide each member of the department/program faculty with a copy of the current, approved DRC/PRC statement.

- d. Report from Committee on Instruction: Ann Tlusty

### **Policy on Conflicts with Observance of Religious Holidays**

The faculty endorse the principle that an institutional climate of respect for cultural and ideological diversity extends to the variety of religious practices in our community. Religious practice is for many individuals an important element of personal identity, intellectual development, and psychological well-being, and is in many cases inseparable from cultural identity. We consider each individual's decision to either engage in or refrain from religious worship to be worthy of respect and consideration. Our efforts to promote inspection and understanding of individual and cultural differences are hindered when reasonable accommodations are not made for such differences. Further, because Bucknell's policy of non-discrimination published in the University Catalog specifically prohibits discrimination based on religion, action that effectively penalizes or denies opportunities to an individual because of their conscientious adherence to religious practice is contrary to our commitment to non-discrimination. For all of these reasons, faculty are expected to be mindful of potential conflicts with religious observances, and it is incumbent upon each individual faculty member to make reasonable accommodations when students' observance of a religious holiday conflicts with an academic obligation.

At the beginning of each academic year, the University Chaplain will publicize a list of commonly recognized religious holidays that are most likely to present scheduling conflicts. These dates will also be published in the University calendar. This list is intended for informational purposes (given that there may always be individuals on campus who practice religions not represented on the list) and is not intended to be an exhaustive list of days to which this policy applies. In cases of holidays not listed by the Chaplain's office, the guiding principle is that similar situations should be treated similarly, without regard to the commonness of the religion.

Faculty are expected to consider potential conflicts with religious holidays when scheduling exams, project due dates, field trips or other activities, and are asked to avoid scheduling these on religious holidays whenever possible. If it is impractical to avoid scheduling on religious holidays, faculty are expected to allow a reasonable and comparable alternative for students whose religious practice creates a conflict with their academic obligations. For example, the student may be offered an earlier or later exam or due date, or a comparable alternative activity in place of a field trip. Scheduling for other major University events and extracurricular activities should also be done mindfully of religious holidays, and schedule conflicts should be avoided whenever possible so that religiously observant students are able to participate.

It is the responsibility of a student to discuss potential time conflicts with their professors in advance. Faculty can facilitate this by describing in their syllabi how such conflicts are typically to be resolved. The Associate Dean of the student's college can serve as an impartial mediator between faculty and student if there is difficulty in resolving a perceived conflict.

## e. Motion from Marj Kastner

I move that the faculty replace the 1967 policy of final exams, the 1996 motion revising that policy, and current ad hoc accommodations made for Track and Field, with the following motion:

Henceforth, from 7 am the Wednesday following the last day of class to the end of the period of final examinations, no events of any kind be scheduled either officially or unofficially; including: additional class hours, meetings, seminars, social events, athletic games\*, professional interviews, special programs, or any examinations beyond the final exams scheduled through the registrars office. \*Students seeking to participate in final varsity-level competitions scheduled by the appropriate athletic association will be allowed to do so only upon the agreement of the faculty whose exams may conflict with said events: students potentially affected by this policy should learn the individual faculty members policy prior to registration for a course.

**Standing Committees: Open Slots for Nominations  
(for the 2004-05 academic year)**

**Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel**

2 tenured, full term: Joe Murray, Geof Schneider  
1 untenured, full term: Karl Voss, Amy Wolaver

**Committee on Faculty Development**

1 Engineering, full term: Mike Toole, Constance Ziemian

**Committee on Staff Planning**

1 at large, full term: Warren Abrahamson, John Rickard

**Committee on Instruction**

1 humanities, full term:  
1 at large, fall semester: Jim Swan, Jeff Trop

**Committee on Planning and Budget**

1 social science, full term: Jean Shackelford, Keith Willoughby  
1 natural science, full term: Ben Marsh, Brian Williams  
1 engineering, 1 year: Dick McGinnis, Pat Wenner

**University Review Committee**

1 natural science, full term: Paul McGuire  
1 social science, full term: Tom Greaves, Steve Stamos

**Committee on Complementary Activities**

1 at large: Bill Flack

**Faculty Hearing Committee**

1 humanities, full term:  
1 social science, full term: Nancy White  
1 engineering, 1 year: Steve Shooter, Rick Zaccone

**Faculty Council**

1 engineering, full term: Matt Higgins, Peter Stryker  
1 natural science, full term: Charlie Clapp, Pam Gorkin

**Chair of the Faculty**

Marty Ligare

**Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees Committee on Finance**

Doug Allen