UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

The November meeting of the University Faculty will be held on Monday, November 3, 2003, beginning at 5:00 PM in the Langone Center Forum. Professor Michael Payne will preside. If there are any amendments to the October, 2003 minutes, please send them to Andrea Halpern, Secretary of the Faculty, in advance of the meeting.

AGENDA

1. **Amendments to October 2003 minutes**

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

Questions

a. Instead of the extraordinarily small number of faculty, if any, that you described at the September faculty meeting as receiving less than cost-of-living raises this year (less than the 2.1 % increase in the consumer price index used by the administration this year to measure cost of living increases), we now know, from an informal survey, that approximately 40 members of the faculty received less than the 2.1 % increase for this year. Given the assurance that we received repeatedly that it would be only the rare underperforming senior faculty who would fall into this category, how is the university administration assuring that such a gross violation of the promise made to the faculty about the performance review system will not occur again?

b. Given the inaccuracies in the President's response to the question about faculty salaries raised for the September faculty meeting, we ask again whether any administrators at the rank of dean, vice president, and president received less than the 2.1 % increase for this year. We ask not for the average raise received (previously reported as 2.5 %) but for the number of administrators at these ranks who received less than CPI.

c. Third, casual surveys suggest that many staff, and more than the few reported at the September faculty meeting, also received less than the 2.1 % cost of living increase for this year. How many staff persons received less than a 2.1 % increase this year?

d. Could the President or an appropriate member of his staff brief us on the Campus Benefits Advisory Group and indicate the reason for its existence, its charge, and its timetable.

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

a. Review of faculty governance
b. The faculty's role in the Middle States review

4 . **New Business**

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

Faculty raises (see attached)

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

The Committee on Planning and Budget has been preparing for its annual recommendations to the campus, for review and conveyance to the board by the president, on compensation and comprehensive fee increases. CPB reviewed the two-year-old faculty compensation model that compares Bucknell faculty salaries, by academic rank, with those of other universities. (The model was not used last year because of the tight budget.)

The committee also is discussing a proposal to the Trustees to fix an enrollment target of 3350 undergraduates studying in Lewisburg (that is, independent of any study-abroad enrollment). This proposed target, which is above the ten-year-old nominal target of 3250, approximates recent actual enrollments. Current admissions office procedures enable the university to hit the target closely, so enrollments shouldn't drift as much as they have in the past.

c. Motion from Matt Silberman

The Campus Benefits Advisory Group, the body that is currently discussing benefits for 2005 and beyond, should present options concerning benefits to the campus and the Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel in a timely fashion so that any proposed changes in benefits may be considered by the governance system before their implementation. Furthermore, as the appropriate body to formulate policy concerning benefits for Faculty and academic personnel, the Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel should present its recommendations concerning 2005 benefits for Faculty action so that proposed changes in benefits may be considered by the Faculty before their implementation.

d. Motion from John Peeler

Whereas:

- The quality of instruction provided by this Faculty would be enhanced by a modest reduction in the number of courses expected of each faculty member, which would allow higher quality preparation and more time for individual students;
- The ability of the University to attract and retain faculty of the highest caliber is seriously weakened by a course load that is incommensurate with that of our frame-of-reference institutions and of almost all other highly ranked institutions;

This Faculty endorsed a reduced course load in December 2002. The Faculty therefore charges the Committee on Staff Planning to proceed with planning for the urgent implementation of a reduced course load for teaching faculty. The Committee on Staff Planning may delegate portions of this task to other committees such as Planning and Budget or Instruction. Under the guidance of the Committee on Staff Planning, the Committee on Planning and Budget should work to incorporate the costs of the plan into the current budget planning models.

The plan should include the following essential components:

A) the rationale for moving to a five course load;
B) principles to guide the implementation and impact of such a transition;
C) explanation of how existing resources can be used;
D) delineation of how many new faculty positions would be required;
E) projection of the cost of the plan;
F) timetable and procedures for implementation.

The Committee on Staff Planning should report back to the Faculty by October 2004.

Report of the Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel (FAPC) on Faculty Raises for 2003-04

I. In the spring of 2003, 65 tenured faculty members were reviewed under the new Performance Evaluation System. The remaining 109 tenured faculty retained their old merit scores. Following the recommendation of FAPC, the dollars available for faculty raises were split proportionally into two "pots," so that faculty members' raises could be computed on the basis of their respective evaluation systems.

This fall, during the process of determining the number of faculty who received raises less than CPI (2.13%), we discovered that, contrary to expectation, there were significant differences between the group of 65 and the group of 109. The group of 65 contained a disproportionate number of faculty needing promotional/equity adjustments. The result was that the faculty who were reviewed last spring received raises from a pot that was depleted because a relatively large amount was set aside for equity and promotions. There was a second difference that only partially offset the first – the group of 65 had lower salaries on average. Less need for ATB (across-the-board) dollars left them with more for merit.

To remedy this unforeseen occurrence the Administration recommends, and FAPC concurs, that the 2003-04 base salary for the 65 faculty reviewed last spring under the new Performance Evaluation System be increased by $138. This amount will be added to December paychecks.

To prevent this from happening again next spring, equity/promotion and ATB should be set aside <u>before</u> the funds are divided into two pots.

II. After the above described adjustment, the number of faculty who received a salary increment less than CPI (2.13%) for 2003-04 is 38 (12 among the 65, and 26 among the 109). Raises for these faculty were roughly $100 below CPI, some more, some less.

Some comments are in order.

Because we make awards for merit in dollar amounts, high salaried faculty receive a lower percentage raise than low salaried faculty. Those who received less than 2.13% last spring tended to be high salaried. With faculty raises on the order of 6% in 2001 and full professors typically receiving raises over 12% in 2002, those who fell below the CPI in 2003 have still done quite well over a longer period.

There were several reasons the Personnel Committee recommended that no changes be made to the procedure for computing faculty salaries last spring. It was the first year of the new Performance Evaluation System. Also, in March the faculty rejected for the second time an attempt to adopt a provision to guarantee CPI, with one faculty member saying 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” (minutes of the March 3, 2003 faculty meeting).