



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

**Minutes of the Faculty Meeting  
December 6, 2004**

Prof. Martin Ligare called the meeting to order at 5PM.

Announcements by the President

President Mitchell began with the topic of the strategic plan and announced that a series of meetings were to be held before the holidays as an effort to open the dialog and define the timeline. A slide presentation was shown to the full Board of Trustees with the goal to determine the principles guiding the strategic planning process. President Mitchell commended Jerry Rackoff, Director of Planning and Institutional Research, for his very good work on the first part of the analysis.

President Mitchell then discussed the possibility of Bucknell receiving a \$50K grant from Andrew Mellon for the purpose of strategic planning. If granted, the imprimatur of Andrew Mellon would be very beneficial to our institution.

On the topic of governance and review of the Board of Trustees, President Mitchell confirmed that he and Trustee Craig Mills will chair the review while Wayne Bromfield, General Counsel, will serve as a liaison. The governance review by the Board will be foundation-oriented, starting with a reexamination of the Office of the President. President Mitchell commented on the speed of the process.

Then President Mitchell discussed his interest in seeing the reinstatement of granting honorary degrees at Commencement. Given that the Board of Trustees has agreed to consider it and that students are interested and willing to help in reinstating honorary degrees, President Mitchell hopes, with faculty approval, to be able to reinstitute this tradition in an amicable way. Before giving the floor to VP David Surgala, President Mitchell mentioned that he and VP Charles Pollock would be on the road later sharing the drive to a Patriot League meeting.

Then, VP David Surgala proceeded with a report in the form of a slide presentation designed to articulate for the staff and the faculty the findings of a review of dining services following the recommendations from a hired board of consultants. After the presentation (see attached), Prof. Paul Susman took the floor to present the following motion:

*Keeping in mind our institutional commitment embodied in the terms, "compassions, civility, and a sense of justice," and given the imminent request for bids to operate the dining service, I move the following faculty resolution of principles that the university should build into the requirements for the bids for the next dining services contract:*

*1) That all dining service employees be hired by Bucknell with its wages and benefits levels and that the selected dining service have a managerial role;*

- 2) *If #1 is impossible for good reasons to be explained to the university faculty, then all Bucknell sub-contracted dining service workers should be paid according to Bucknell's wage and benefit schedule.*
- 3) *All current Bucknell and sub-contracted Sodhexo workers in good standing at Bucknell be retained;*
- 4) *That all current Bucknell and Sodhexo employees in good standing at Bucknell be guaranteed at least their current wage and benefit levels when the new manager takes over;*
- 5) *That those employees with credit towards Bucknell tuition benefits retain such benefits, accruing additional time towards those benefits according to the same time rules that would apply if they still worked for Bucknell directly, instead of for a sub-contractor;*
- 6) *Other benefits should be retained under the same principle (see #5).*

The motion was seconded and opened for discussion.

The Chair of the Faculty noted that such issues are part of the faculty's responsibilities since the faculty participates in the resources of the University as stated in the Handbook. Following the request by several faculty members to justify the changes recommended in the presentation, Prof. Ligare reminded the group that the motion rather than an explanation of the review was currently under discussion.

Prof. Tom Greaves noted that tuition benefits are an important factor in the decision of our support staff to work at Bucknell. In fact, extending tuition benefits to employees is one of the characteristics of Bucknell, and we need to do more as an institution. Prof. John Peeler underlined that although this conversation as a matter of general concern to faculty was entirely appropriate, the matter was not on the agenda, and he suggested that the faculty might be unprepared to address the issue. Therefore it would be unwise to vote on this motion. Prof. Ligare responded by saying that following the three-day rule observed at the faculty meetings, this discussion was considered as a response to a report and not considered as new order. He also pointed out that this was the only chance for the faculty to comment before the proposal goes out. VP Surgala said that the Request For Proposal was not yet set in stone, and that although it is the Administration's intent to have one dining-services staff, as advised by experts, many details remained to be negotiated between now and April.

Following comments on the financial importance of auxiliary services, and after questions on the affordability of a relatively large increase in that part of the budget, Prof. Ned Ladd suggested that this was a complicated issue, which might be better resolved through the work of a committee. Prof. John Peeler suggested the Committee on Planning and Budget. VP Surgala pointed out that any principles from the faculty would need to be received by January 20<sup>th</sup>. Prof. Geoff Schneider summarized the two key principles as being a. minimum wage and b. a decent level of benefits for Bucknell's employees, reflecting the caring treatment that Bucknell students have come to expect from dining services.

Following the realization that negotiating after the RFP is out might prove difficult and that faculty seems to support the general principal, Prof. Michael Drexler proposed a substitute motion stated as follows: *the faculty moves that any new proposition maintains existing benefit level as is for all dining services employees.* After much discussion, Prof. Ben Marsh noted the faculty concern with the matter but also pointed out that resolution to such issues is difficult to attempt on the floor. He moved that *we commit this issue to Faculty Council for further action on the part of the faculty.* The motion was seconded. To the comment that faculty should at least commit to the issue in principle, Prof Marsh responded that it was important to have a formal expression of the faculty's sentiment before the RFP goes out in several days and that CPB would likely bring back a motion similar to the Prof. Paul Susman's motion. It was

noted that the Faculty Council should try to get a sense from the faculty about its general sentiment on the issue. The question to vote to close the debate was called and was passed, as was the vote on the motion itself.

Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty

Prof. Ligare officially introduced and welcomed the new Secretary of the Faculty. This was followed by a warm round of applause, for which the undersigned, in turn, thanks his colleagues.

Prof. Ligare reported briefly on the Board meeting and noted that faculty representation was well received. Then he announced the need for a replacement on COI.

Prof. Ligare next introduced John Siwicki, whose term as President of Bucknell Student Government is ending. In turn, John Siwicki introduced the new executive board for BSG: President—Joel Buckman; VP Operations—David Seal; VP Finance—Ben Lewis; VP Administration—Megan McGraw. The introductions were followed by a welcoming round of applause.

Nominations from the floor for a one-semester replacement on CAFT for an untenured slot were solicited and then closed.

Prof. Ben Marsh presented the report from Committee on Planning and Budget (below). While some of our peer institutions average about 6% in comprehensive fee increases, the range of 6.3% increase recommended by CPB is one suggested by Trustees. In terms of faculty salaries, the Board of Trustees suggested the possibility of a larger increase than the 4.3% recommended, especially in ranks losing grounds relative to our reference institutions.

The next item was a motion by Committee on Instruction from Prof. Tom Cassidy. This was a response to Prof. John Peeler's previous motion to refer the issue of Final Exam Policy to COI (see minutes of April 2004 Faculty Meeting). Prof. Cassidy reminded the group that except in the case of track and field, students cannot participate in major events during finals week. He noted the urgency of the faculty's decision on this issue, as a group of engineering students is scheduled to register in January for a competition in May. Prof. Cassidy pointed to a few minor changes in the language from the original policy. Such changes include the addition of the words *student*, *Associate Deans*, and *web page* to the 1979 document. The most important changes concern paragraph number 5, which attempts to treat all activities equally including academic events. Prof. Cassidy pointed out that it would still be up to the Deans and the Associate Deans, not to the faculty, to decide on which events would qualify. Prof. Ben Marsh regretted that in addition to this policy, there was not more time to discuss a plan to protect students during the final days of classes. After it was confirmed that the Associate Deans had endorsed the policy, the motion was voted on and passed.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Philippe C. Dubois  
Secretary of the Faculty

Report from Committee on Planning and Budget

1. CPB recommends a comprehensive fee increase of 6.3% for the coming academic year. The recommendation is made in light of the relatively large increases in comprehensive fees reported this year for other private universities, and next year's larger-than-usual compensation requirements for the faculty and staff. The committee expects that the following year's increases will be made within the parameters of a new strategic pricing plan.
2. CPB endorses the university's efforts to move the average salaries for all faculty ranks toward the middle range of our peer group, within the constraints of a balanced budget. Our present methodology suggests that a 5.6% increase can attain this goal. CPB understands that if an increase is received beyond our previous recommendation, the Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee would make equity distributions differentially by rank after committing sufficient funds to 'merit' to make that system meaningful.
3. CPB has not yet reached a conclusion about the comprehensive fee increase. This year's increase should be very similar to recent increases; significant movement in pricing would await completion of the strategic plan. Presently we are looking at a narrow range, between 5.9 and 6.3%.