



## UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

The March meeting of the University Faculty will be held on Monday, March 7, 2005, beginning at 5:00 PM in the Langone Center Forum. Professor Martin Ligare will preside. If there are any amendments to the February, 2005 minutes, please send them to Philippe Dubois, Secretary of the Faculty, in advance of the meeting.

### **AGENDA**

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

#### **2. Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty**

Announcement of the CAFT nominating committee: Jim Baish, Geoff Schneider, and Meenakshi Ponnuswami.

#### **3. New Business**

##### **a. Report from the Faculty Council: Marty Ligare**

Revival of the Committee on Honorary Degrees.

The Faculty Council supports the revival of the Faculty Committee on Honorary Degrees, and Susan Crawford has expressed the Board's support for the new procedures. If the faculty votes to revive the Committee on Honorary Degrees, the Faculty Council will present nominations to fill the Committee at the April Faculty Meeting.

(see attached for background)

##### **b. Motion from Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee: Geoff Schneider**

Motion to amend something previously adopted by the faculty.

The Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee moves that the faculty adopt the changes to the Faculty Handbook proposed in Section 1 of the Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee's report (dated March 1, 2005, attached electronically to your agenda for this meeting). The version of the Faculty Handbook being amended is the one approved by this body on 10/7/2003.

This motion will be discussed and voted on at the April meeting of the University Faculty.

##### **c. Report and recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance: John Peeler (see attached)**

##### **d. Report from the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid: John Hunter**

Merit-Aid Scholarships.

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

Committee on Planning and Budget has been reviewing a preliminary version of some proposals, prepared by the Campus Benefits Advisory Group, for controlling the university's expenses for future retiree health care costs. The primary concern is not the on-going cost of retiree health care, but rather the essentially unlimited potential future liability. The current proposals would introduce limits on expenditures which are not expected to affect anyone for a number of years, but would eventually cap university liability if health care cost inflation continues at a high rate. Another part of the proposal involves a Mellon Foundation sponsored, TIAA-CREF-style, "defined-contribution" model for retiree health care, which would be offered to younger future employees. The CBAG proposals have been shared with the three personnel committees, including our Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee.

**f. Report from the Committee on Instruction: Rich Kozick**

The Committee on Instruction reports that Forgery will be added to the university's policy on Academic Responsibility. This will be done by adding Forgery to the list of examples of Fabrication in the brochure, in the *Student Handbook--Documents*, and on the web site. The URL for the web page on Fabrication is [http://www.bucknell.edu/Academics/Resources/Academic\\_Responsibility/Policies\\_and\\_Procedures/Fabrication.html](http://www.bucknell.edu/Academics/Resources/Academic_Responsibility/Policies_and_Procedures/Fabrication.html) and the following text will be added:

"To forge a signature on an academic document such as a registration card or a drop/add card."

COI proposes the following penalties for the Board of Review to apply if the policy is violated.

- The student is barred from enrolling in the course(s) for the semester in which the forgery was committed.
- If this is impossible due to degree requirements, then the student will register with the last group in his/her class during the next registration period.
- If this is impossible, then the student will write a paper to the satisfaction of an Associate Dean for the student's college, with the topic and due date determined by the Board of Review. The student's diploma will be withheld if the paper is not completed.

**g. Report from the Committee on Athletics: Mitch Chernin**

Complete data from the graduation class of 2004 are used to estimate the statistical effect of participation in varsity athletics on academic performance of undergraduate students in the class of 2004 at Bucknell University. Results suggest athletic participation among male and female athletes does not significantly affect cumulative in-major GPA. These results control for the separate effects on grades arising from a student's gender, ethnic group, U.S. citizenship status, participation in fraternal "Greek" organizations, high school academic index, and choice of major.

(Entire report posted on e-reserves under Athlete Academic Performance)

Attachment to the agenda.

Background:

Bucknell stopped awarding honorary degrees in 1987 after a long and contentious dispute between the Faculty and the Board of Trustees about the qualifications of a nominee for such a degree. Last semester President Mitchell convened a meeting of the University Council to consider the possibility of resuming the granting of Honorary Degrees by Bucknell. The University Council agreed that the time might be right to revive the practice, but only if we could develop a set of procedures that would lead to Faculty, Board, and Administration agreement on worthy degree recipients. This semester the Administration and the Faculty Council have worked out a new set of procedures and timetable that implement the principles articulated in the Faculty Handbook, and that we believe will have all parties working together to identify an appropriate set of candidates.

As we return to the consideration of this issue at Bucknell, it is important to clear up a misconception about the 1987 decision to stop granting honorary degrees. It is widely believed that the faculty voted to stop granting honorary degrees, but this is not the case. At the February 1987 Faculty Meeting the following motion was made:

"The Faculty believes that the Board's response to the CAFT report indicates that areas of disagreement remain on the questions of Academic Freedom and honorary degrees.

The Faculty will not award honorary degrees until the issues of authority, procedures, and criteria for the awarding of such degrees is resolved."

The motion failed. So why did Bucknell stop granting honorary degrees in 1987? President Sojka made the decision that at that moment it was not in the University's best interest to continue granting honorary degrees, and the issue has not been taken up since then.

Although the February 1987 motion failed, the issues it raised concerning the authority, procedures, and criteria were legitimate then and they are worthy of consideration now. The conversations between the Faculty Council, the Administration, and the Board have addressed exactly these issues. The procedures that will be presented at the March Faculty Meeting are based on the assumption that recipients of honorary degrees must have the support of both the Faculty and the Board of Trustees. The Faculty Handbook calls for consultation between the Faculty Committee and the Trustee Sub-committee on Honorary Degrees, and the new procedures institutionalize this consultation by calling for joint meetings of the two committees at the September Board retreat and the November Annual Board meeting. Only candidates who are acceptable to both committees after these joint meetings will be forwarded to the President, who will select recipients from this list of mutually acceptable nominees and present those names to the Board as a whole. This means that that an elected faculty committee, a sub-committee of the Board, and the President will all be invested in the selections before they go to the entire Board for final approval.

Attachment to the agenda.

\*\*\*

Colleagues,

At the March faculty meeting, the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance will present its recommendations for votes. We will ask the Faculty to vote on these recommendations, subject to motions from the floor to delete or amend any recommendation, in order to inform the Faculty Council's deliberations as it works to elaborate concrete proposals. The Immediate Recommendations will be voted on as a block. The Faculty Handbook Amendments will be voted on individually. The Basic Structural Changes will not be voted on at this time.

The Faculty Council may delegate its responsibilities under these motions to another standing or ad hoc committee.

In light of feedback on our January 2005 report, the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance will make the following changes in its recommendations that will be presented at the March faculty meeting:

## II. Immediate Recommendations

1. Meeting time: The meeting time should be changed from Monday, 5-6:30, The Faculty Council should determine the best alternative time.

2. Agenda order: As a standard practice, reports and motions from standing committees should be first on the agenda, but the Chair and Faculty Council may change the order to respond to circumstances that require another order. A brief presidential statement at the beginning of the meeting would not be inconsistent with this motion, as long as any questions for the president or his staff were saved until later.

3. Agenda deadline: The texts of committee reports and motions must be either attached to the published agenda, or made available at the same time as the agenda is published.

4. Substitute motions: Substitute motions on committee reports should be discouraged by the Chair until the report has been fully presented.

5. Limits on speakers: We would emphasize that the cited provision of Robert's Rules would not prevent the presenter of a motion from speaking more than twice.

6. President at head table: No change.

7. President's authority: We will make no motion on this recommendation. Because this issue was specifically mentioned in the Middle States Report, we will not withdraw it, in order to have our position on the issue on the record.

8. Chair's released time: No change.

9. Secretary and Trustees: No change.

## III. Handbook amendments

1. Quorum: No change.

2. Standing committees: Faculty or University committee status should be determined by the Faculty Council or such group as it delegates.

3. Strategic Planning Council: No change.

4. Faculty Council charge: No change.

5. Librarians: We will withdraw this recommendation.

IV. Basic Structural Change: We will make no motion on either model, because the advisability of either is contingent on the future performance of the governance system with the changes here proposed. But we do think it advisable for the Faculty Council (with its new charge) to begin thinking about these long-term options.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: Information is now being gathered concerning governance systems at comparable institutions. The Faculty Council or its delegate should receive this information and determine what lessons it may hold for Bucknell. The Faculty Council or its delegate should conduct a review of the charges of the present standing committees, and determine if changes should be recommended. The Faculty Council or its delegate should systematically assess the impact of the changes implemented as a result of this report, and make further recommendations concerning governance, as it finds necessary.

John Peeler