



## UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

### **Minutes of the Faculty Meeting October 7, 2003**

Prior to calling the meeting to order, Prof. Michael Payne asked for a count of voting members present; approximately 105 members were in attendance. The meeting was called to order at 5:05 PM.

The Secretary announced one amendment to the September minutes, in that the budget deficit at that time was \$2.1 million, not \$2.5 million as originally reported.

#### Announcements by the President

President Rogers began by noting recent changes for the worse in student culture. Alcohol violations, disorderly gatherings, alcohol poisonings and DUI's have been on the increase, and one DUI involved property damage. These are serious issues and he has asked VP Charlie Pollock to make addressing them his top priority.

VP David Surgala then presented some figures relating to the Athletics budget, in answer to a submitted question. He showed data from a 2001 Patriot League study, indicating that Bucknell is 7<sup>th</sup> out of 8 in the League in total athletic expenditures, lowest in athletic expenditures per participant, and 4<sup>th</sup> out of the 6 reporting schools in athletic expenditures as a percentage of total expenditures. He noted limitations of the data, including the fact that the figures are not recent, the study comes from the Patriot League and not Bucknell, and that the figures include only salary, wages, and expenses, and these only for varsity teams (excluding financial aid, facilities and maintenance, and any expenditures on recreational athletics). He intends to prepare annual reports on this issue in conjunction with the Committee on Planning and Budget. VP Pollock added that if financial aid were figured in, our rankings would be higher because we have more student athletes than those schools just above us on the list.

#### Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty

Prof. Payne summarized a recent email to the faculty in which he reported that the Faculty Advisory Committee for the presidential search has met twice; nominations can be sent to that committee via himself or Prof. Mary Beth Gray. The Middle States process is continuing. The Faculty Council has expressed some concern about the availability of documents and is in favor of holding an open forum. The Council will report further on this in the near future. After Fall Break, Prof. Payne will convene an informal faculty discussion of the governance system.

Prof. Ben Marsh expressed dismay about the status of the Middle States process. This review should be done very carefully, but the faculty as a whole has not yet had an opportunity to make sure issues of concern were included in the review. In particular he mentioned the need to address issues of instruction and also shared governance. Prof. Payne assured him that the Faculty Council is aware of these issues. In the original timetable, the Vision 2010 plan would have been completed by now and been meshed with the Middle States process. The head of the

Middle States review team will be here October 28 and we may want to consider holding an extra faculty meeting.

Provost Steve Bowen added his perspective on progress to date. Discussions began in September, 2001 about a plan for the Vision 2010 process, which was to be integrated with the Middle States Self Study. This plan was presented to the faculty in December, 2001. The strategic planning groups were subcommittees of the University Council. Each group addressed specific questions. Open forums were held then and we do have plans to have open forums on the whole Middle States document. His conclusion was that we are not so far behind schedule.

The discussion then turned to the main item of business, adoption of the updated *Faculty Handbook*. Prof. Allen Schweinsberg, representing the Personnel Committee, moved adoption, which was seconded. He reviewed the history of this update, which began with former Associate VP Judy Becker, then was taken up by Personnel. The *Faculty Handbook* consists of a mixture of policy, procedure, and information, which are sometimes hard to distinguish. It is easy to update policies by extracting formal actions of this body from the Minutes. Information is trickier in that it changes without formal action. The more recently updated *Staff Handbook* has served as a guide. No major changes have been introduced and he has heard no mention of any difficult issues from faculty members. Personnel and CAFT have consulted on several issues, resulting in some friendly amendments. Prof. Payne thanked Prof. Schweinsberg and all who were involved in this process for their hard work.

Prof. David Evans, representing CAFT, began by adding his thanks as well. He introduced his motion, which was seconded. He described Motion 1a, which removes Policies and Documents (Section VI) from the *Handbook*. Some policies are outdated or superceded and some were not approved by faculty. No policy is invalidated by not being in the *Handbook*. He noted that the argument for having these documents in the *Handbook* was mostly a matter of convenience. Motion 1a passed without dissent.

Prof. Evans turned to Motion 1b to omit all references to Section VI, Policies and Documents from the Handbook. He said he wanted to remove the final clause of the original motion (“*and replaced with language that directs the reader to the appropriate resource pertaining to the policy and document in question*”). Prof. Schweinsberg added that all such documents will be made available on E-Reserve. This submotion was voted on and passed.

The final part of the motion concerned placement of our policy on sexual harassment. Although the just-approved motions would remove this policy from the *Handbook*, CAFT wants this one policy to remain. Prof. Evans clarified that CAFT is only referring to the policy statement in the document, not procedures for investigating and adjudicating cases of harassment.

A discussion then ensued about the history of this policy. Dean Genie Gerdes noted that the faculty did not vote on the policy, as it pertains to the whole community, but that Personnel reviewed the current version in September, 2000. The 1992 *Faculty Handbook* did have a sexual harassment policy included, so removing it would be inappropriate in an update. Several faculty members wondered at the exact language in the policy and whether the faculty should review the whole document. Prof. Jim Orr however thought it was a simple question: do we want a *policy* on sexual harassment included in the *Handbook*. Motion 2 was then voted on and passed without dissent.

The final order of business was to vote on the entire Handbook update. Prof. Payne reminded the group that this needed a 2/3 majority to pass. 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.

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea Halpern  
Secretary of the Faculty