



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

Minutes of the Open Discussion of the Ad Hoc Committee Report on Faculty Governance February 14, 2005

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

He presented an outline of five categories of topics, each open for a 15 minute discussion in no particular order.

Under the category *Immediate Recommendations*, the first topic discussed was a change in the meeting time for Faculty meetings. Prof. John Peeler suggested an 11:15-12:45 meeting time on Tuesdays or Thursdays. Associate Dean Robert Midkiff remarked that classes are scheduled at that time. After much discussion of the impact of various suggested meeting windows on classroom use and encroachment on scheduled department meeting times, it was clear that a majority of people were in favor of a change in meeting times but that there were no obvious time slot. Prof Massoud noted that an 8 AM meeting time would shift to the morning the issue of parents with school-aged children.

Prof. Andrea Halpern brought up the issue of the two week deadline that was recommended for the Faculty meeting agenda and pointed out that enough time has to be given to committees to accomplish their work. A two week deadline would make committee reports even more outdated. It was suggested that such a recommendation concerning the agenda be weighed against the coherence of committee reports.

Next, Prof Ligare introduced the topic of ROR limitations on speaking and confirmed that no one has ever spoken more than twice. Prof Peeler reported that Faculty meetings are perceived sometimes as being monopolized by one or two people who speak a lot. Prof. Dee Casteel added that Faculty meetings do not exactly follow Robert's Rules of Order as dialogue is often allowed for clarifications. Dean of Arts and Sciences Genie Gerdes referred to a procedure according to which nobody gets to speak a second time until anyone, who wants to speak, gets a chance to do so.

Then, the discussion moved to the topic of limitation of substitute motions. Prof. Peeler identified the envisioned limitations as concerning primarily substitute motions amending proposals by standing committees. He warned that original proposals may then be voted out without being discussed.

On the topic of the reorganization of the agenda, it was suggested that it be done by the Chair of the Faculty and the Faculty Council in order of the most pressing business as opposed to following the current categories. Although prioritizing sometimes occurs, a little more flexibility would be helpful. Prof. Peeler stressed that Faculty governance should not be sacrificed and that the business of standing committees ought to be given priority.

Under the *Handbook Amendments* category, Nancy Dagle, Director of Information and Integration, discussed the status of librarians, pointing out that librarians do not have true faculty status since there are no tenure, rank or research expectations. But they benefit from the protection of CAFT and get to vote at Faculty meetings. She recalled that Librarians were granted faculty status by a vote of the faculty in 1969. According to her, active collaboration between faculty and librarians is essential to ensure continued improvement of students' research skills in today's information environment, and to ensure that the Bucknell community continues to have the access to the information it needs. She concluded by observing that discontinuing faculty

privileges for librarians would send an unfortunate signal that librarians contributions are devalued. Instead, librarians should be more closely integrated into the teaching and learning mission of the university. Prof. John Peeler noted the complexity of the whole ISR area and the difficult distinction of boundaries between library and computer services. Although it is not his intention to devalue the work of his librarian colleagues, Prof. Peeler wondered if faculty status should then be extended to the entire ISR. The question of faculty status was raised for other teaching constituencies on campus such as the Writing Center. Gene Spencer, Associate VP for ISR, distinguished ISR from the library not in terms of their dealings with privacy issues, but in relation to teaching. IRS is not seeking faculty status.

Then Associate VP Spencer moved to the discussion of new standing committees and suggested that ISR become a University Committee. Although Prof. Peeler had no objection to that, Prof. Halpern raised the election problem. With 1.5 people needed to run for every position, she is concerned that the number of positions is growing faster than the number of faculty. Prof. Ben Marsh took the example of COI and noted that there are benefits to existing as a subcommittee since issues can be seen through a very specific lens, such as instruction in this case.

On the question of the University Council and its work on strategic planning, it was noted that faculty members are on ten month contracts and that scholarly work is expected during summer months. Prof. Ligare distinguished a Strategic Planning Council with a specific workload from a body constituted in order to respond to issues during the summer.

Although there was no response to the quorum question, Prof. Ligare pointed out that the usual number of people attending faculty meetings is well over the present quorum of 75.

Under the category of *Basic Structural Changes*, disappointment was expressed at a possible change in structure, in which the current collegiality of the meetings may be lost. Also, the question of the effectiveness of the current process will emerge as the move to a five course load will significantly increase the size of the Faculty. Jerry Rackoff, Director of Planning and Institutional Research, agreed to look into the structure of comparable institutions.

A more general discussion ensued about the lack of a common vision amongst faculty of what shared governance means, as well as a clear understanding of the responsibilities associated with faculty status. A request was made for an outside source to help analyze and address these issues.

Then, Prof. Ligare gratefully acknowledged the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance, before Associate Dean Midkiff proposed to extend teaching times on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 7:45 AM to 4:30 PM in order to create a 1 hour and 15 minute block of time for governance. Other options such as shorter meetings every other Tuesday or Thursday were suggested.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Philippe C. Dubois
Secretary of the Faculty