



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

Minutes of the Faculty Meeting October 4, 2004

Prof. Ligare called the meeting to order at 5 PM. The Secretary announced several amendments to the Minutes from September, 2004. The Faculty Council policy of asking untenured committee members who then get tenure to move into tenured slots on that committee had been omitted. Also, a clarification was added about next year's health plans: Geisinger Health Plan will be less expensive than Highmark Enhanced PPO, but both plans will see sharp rate increases.

Announcements by the President

President Brian Mitchell reviewed the reorganization within the senior staff of the university, previously announced in several emails. Jerry Rackoff takes an additional title as Director of Planning. Senior staff groups are now divided into policy and operations, the latter group discussing day to day operation of the university and budgets.

Public Safety is undergoing a review of operations, policies, procedures, and interactions with students and staff. VP Charlie Pollock elaborated that this is part of a cycle of reviews in administrative offices. Phase 1 was conducted by law enforcement directors from several other institutions. They spent three days on campus, interviewed 60 people inside and outside the department, as well as municipal authorities. Phase 2 in the next six weeks entails broad-based campus discussions on the place of Public Safety at Bucknell. The report of the visiting team and on-campus discussion will result in recommendations on the future of Public Safety.

President Mitchell reported that the Provost search process recently brought John Thornburgh from search firm Witt/Kieffer to campus to meet with various groups. The timeline includes finalizing the profile and ads in mid-October, selecting 10-12 candidates for preliminary interviews in November, and a round of off-campus interviews in December. At least six candidates will proceed to a reference review and at least three will be selected for final on-campus interviews in late January, including a public forum. The President would like final recommendations by February. All present were urged to send in names of good candidates. Finally, he noted the upcoming Parents' Weekend, and hoped that all 4000 guests would receive a warm welcome.

Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty

Prof. Ligare reminded the faculty that if voice votes strike a member as insufficiently informative, he or she can call for a vote by show of hands. He also announced that the Committee on Instruction will think more about the policy on medical excuses for class absences brought forward last month. Finally, he said that he encourages people to ask questions about reports brought by standing committees, but he

does not want the entire faculty to act as a committee of the whole. Motions relevant to reports can be made, but discussion should not turn into broad open forums on the issue.

Prof. Tom Cassidy, chair of Committee on Instruction, gave two brief reports from subcommittees. The University Library Committee devised recommendations on local implementation of the Patriot Act, which ISR has adopted. He noted that an Assessment Plan has been completed by the Assessment Committee and is available to read on-line at the Institutional Research website. Prof. John Hunter, representing the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid reported that comments from faculty on the merit aid plan have been culled from emails and an open forum, and will be forwarded to the President as well as posted on ERES.

Prof. Geoff Schneider, chair of Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel reported that this committee is working with the University Counsel to resolve outstanding issues on the status of the *Faculty Handbook*. All parties are in agreement about accepting sections other than IIIM (referring to what document should guide procedures in termination cases). Thus we have a functioning *Handbook* except for that section; this problem should be resolved soon.

The rest of the meeting was devoted to a report from the Committee on Staff Planning on the five-course load, presented by Prof. Tony Massoud. This is an update, in response to a motion from Prof. John Peeler in the fall of 2003. The process of developing a plan is important; we don't want a plan to come forward for an up or down vote without preparation and feedback. Data collected three years ago on departmental responses to a five-course load were not complete and may be outdated, so departments need to be consulted again. The current document is still a draft. Some background information: in the spring of 1999, Planning and Budget produced a white paper on the importance of moving faculty to five-course load. Results from the first round of data collection indicated that about 20 faculty lines would be necessary to implement the reduction, if we can reclaim as much as 50% of released time currently awarded. The CSP report was presented in December of 2002, and was endorsed by the faculty.

CSP is beginning to work on a plan including a rationale, as well as consideration of resources, new faculty lines, costs, and a timetable. Goals remain as they did in the December, 2002 report: to enhance the quality of undergraduate education, to strengthen the teacher-scholar model and recruitment, and to raise Bucknell's reputation.

Prof. Massoud reviewed the principles presented in the report in the Agenda. He emphasized the need to look at "reclaiming" some released time; one likely candidate is the course release program, and released time for some faculty carrying out administrative duties. Untenured leave and sabbatical programs are not currently under discussion. The number of new faculty lines required depends on various assumptions and the amount of reclaimed time, as well as departmental decisions about how many courses can be removed or taught less frequently. A rough estimate from Planning and Budget on the cost of each new faculty line, including salary, benefits, and recruitment, is about \$100K. This does not include the cost of any additional building. The current CSP timetable calls for a plan by the end of spring 2005. However, Prof. Massoud anticipated that the recommended plan would be part of our next overall strategic plan.

A lengthy question and answer exchange followed, including these points: Oversight of implementation of a 3-2 load will be complex, and Associate Deans will need support in that possibly hazardous function. Several faculty members raised the

issue of “accounting systems” for courseloads across departments and divisions: will this be reassessed in the new system? CSP has not yet discussed this difficult issue. Another set of questions concerned the proposal that temporary faculty teach six courses. On the one hand, we expect all faculty to teach well and presumably everyone will teach better with fewer courses to prepare and teach. On the other hand, we do not have the same expectations of temporary faculty regarding scholarship or service. Might future administrators be tempted to hire more visiting faculty? Dean Genie Gerdes thought not, as we hire temporary faculty just for replacements so their use will not grow beyond growth of faculty. Her concern about equity is more focused on salary inequities between temporary and adjunct faculty. The incentive might be to hire an adjunct in place of a temporary faculty member teaching five courses.

The next exchange concerned timing. First, how might we implement a lowered teaching load gradually but fairly? Prof. Massoud said that one idea was to offer the lowered load first to relatively junior and/or relatively senior cohorts, or to allow departments more ready to implement the plan to do so earlier. We may need to explore space issues in conjunction with this: although we can scrape up 20 or so offices, they are not ideal spaces, and any new buildings would surely be part of a strategic plan.

Second, should we move a five-course plan forward as quickly as possible to the Trustees or wait for the completed strategic plan? Prof. Ben Marsh moved: *The faculty requests that the Faculty Council work with the President and university committees to prepare a plan for the Trustees at the spring meeting to move to a five-course load*, which was seconded. He argued that although details will have to worked out, we need to tell Trustees that this is a priority. Speakers for the motion agreed with Prof. Marsh that the time had come to move this plan forward expeditiously; speakers against the motion thought that the usual governance process was adequate. Dean Gerdes and President Mitchell emphasized the importance of folding a courseload reduction plan in with a strategic plan both for practical reasons (where does a new building fit in?) and to present this as part of an overall educational goal.

The motion was then voted on, and failed. The meeting adjourned at 6:15PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea Halpern
Secretary of the Faculty