



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

Minutes of the Faculty Meeting  
7 March 2006

The meeting was called to order at 12:04PM by Professor Martin Ligare, Chair of the Faculty.

**1. Announcements and remarks by the President**

President Mitchell began by updating the faculty on the strategic planning process. The final draft is out and marks a watershed moment for Bucknell. After acknowledging the University Council's efforts, he noted that the University is moving forward toward the "great fun" of the next stage. Part of that next stage will be continued discussions with both University Council and Faculty Council on where we go next, and how we will get there. President Mitchell next addressed the up-coming comprehensive campaign, a two-stage—silent phase and public phase—process, for which we are now ramping up. Part of this preparatory process includes spending from quasi-endowment to enhance University Relations. President Mitchell then noted that our basketball team has been (and, we hope, will continue to be) successful. As the University did last year, that success will be described in terms that emphasize scholars who also happen to be excellent athletes. Finally, president Mitchell announced, to applause, that Bucknell was the recipient of an \$800,000 Jack Kent Cooke Foundation grant, the largest of its kind in Bucknell's history, in support of diversity initiatives. The grant fits into the goals of *The Plan for Bucknell*, and helps reposition positively the University on a national scale.

**2. Announcements and remarks by the Provost**

Provost DeCredico conveyed a reminder from Maryjane Mitchell: the faculty are invited to a reception this afternoon at the President's house, hosted by Kappa Kappa Gamma sorority.

**3. Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty**

Professor Ligare noted that the agenda had been modified slightly. The Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel will put forward a recommendation for a modification to the *Faculty Handbook*, but the faculty will not vote on the actual amendment; rather the faculty will vote to propose it as an amendment. If that vote passes, then the faculty will vote on the amendment at the April Faculty Meeting.

## 5. Unfinished Business

Professor Marty Ligare explained that Professor Sojka is out of town and, therefore, unable to present the report from the Steering Committee on the NCAA Recertification Process. Because Professor Sojka has already notified the faculty by e-mail (9 February 2006) that the final report is available on e-res (<<http://eres.bucknell.edu/eres/coursepage.aspx?cid=1637&page=docs>> [password: NCAA]), Professor Ligare is treating that e-mail as the report.

## 6. Committee Reports

Professor Ligare yielded the chair briefly to the undersigned (Professor Pam Gorkin took minutes) and presented a report from Faculty Council, in accordance with the approved motion by John Peeler (15 November 2005) stipulating a faculty vote to endorse *The Plan for Bucknell*. Professor Ligare, on behalf of Faculty Council, moved that *the Faculty endorse The Plan for Bucknell, the final draft of which was circulated to the campus by President Mitchell on 24 February 2006*. The motion was seconded and Professor Ligare presented a brief history of the process that gave us *The Plan* in its final form, as well as a summary of its strengths and benefits for Bucknell. Professor Ben Marsh voiced his support for the plan, but indicated that the next issue is going from high-level goals to implementation. In particular, he was concerned about the mid-level structure that will bring this together and asked for assistance from Faculty Council, a role Professor Ligare said Faculty Council will take. The faculty then voted unanimously to endorse the strategic plan.

Professor Ligare next introduced a motion from Faculty Council for *the creation of a University Committee on Athletics. The charge to the Committee will be that described in the amendments section of this Agenda* (see Agenda for full charge). [Because this motion requires an amendment to section II.D of the *Faculty Handbook* to include the charge to the committee, it is only being introduced. It will not be discussed or voted on prior to the April meeting.] The motion was seconded. Professor Ligare indicated that the impetus came from the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Faculty Governance (motion adopted 4 April 2005) to create a standing committee rather than a subcommittee of Committee on Instruction. Faculty Council consulted with an ad-hoc committee responsible for drafting the charge of the proposed standing Committee on Athletics (Mitch Chernin [chair], John Hardt, Joel Wade, George Exner, Jean Peterson, and Kari Conrad). Faculty Council will attempt to populate the committee this spring. Professor Sue Reed asked what a “Senior Woman Administrator of Athletics” was and Vice President for Student Affairs Charlie Pollock indicated that this was the title of a position identified by the NCAA.

At this point, Professor Ligare resumed his duties as Chair.

Next, Professor Kevin Myers delivered a two-part report from Committee on Instruction. He first provided an update on the reporting of grade statistics, noting that the discussion at the December Faculty Meeting suggested that work still remained to be done to provide data in a format most useful to faculty. The Committee is now considering alternatives. Faculty are encouraged to send comments to the Committee prior to April. He then turned to the

Composition Council update (see report in the Agenda). The two major issues are: 1) gathering feedback on writing program, and 2) developing an assessment plan for the writing program and for student writing. A motion to change the writing program will be forthcoming.

Professors Geoff Schneider and Amy McCready presented a two-part report from the Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel. Professor Schneider first discussed faculty salary increases (see report in the Agenda) which follow the Committee on Planning and Budget report (see February minutes). The raises, which are large, both in real terms and as measured against inflation, are calculated to move us closer to the 6<sup>th</sup> rank of our peer institutions. He also noted that next year's raises will be significant as well. Professor Schneider next explained the differentials, noting that the raises are highest for Full Professors because their raises in merit are in fixed-dollar terms which means they have slipped relative to their peers. He reminded the faculty that raises comprise two parts: an across-the-board component equal to ½ the moving CPI, and the remainder from the merit system. The merit system creates some compression at the upper ranks because merit pay is fixed dollars, not a percentage. Finally, he noted that Assistant Professors have the lowest percentage raise because of the big bump they received last year. Professor Ben Marsh pointed out that basing the raises on current merit is not as equitable as would be a system that took a longer historical view. He offered a motion, made as a recommendation to the committee, to address this short-coming: *The faculty requests that the bulk of the raises be allocated in a fashion reflecting longer-term performance than current merit rankings.* The motion was seconded.

Dean Genie Gerdes said that the data necessary to incorporate the long-term view are not easily accessible. She added that anything other than across the board may not be acceptable to the Trustees. Professor Marsh replied that base salary *is* a long-term data set. The Committee might look at long-term overall pattern of raises in peers (5.2%) and allocate this to this year. The remaining funds could be allocated according to the existing formula of ½ of CPI and the rest for merit. Professor Schneider indicated that the Committee was not opposed to the idea, but that it would be difficult to operationalize. Dean Jim Orbison observed that the structure for merit and raises adopted by Faculty and Trustees, to which Professor Marsh asked whether this larger than usual allocation comes under the standard merit system. Since the amount is extraordinary perhaps it could be treated differently from standard raise. Professor Mike Price asked by when these changes would have to be made, to which Professor Schneider responded that the Committee has only ten days. Professor John Rickard asked whether the Committee could reject the proposal. Professor Marsh reiterated his desire not to micromanage the Committee; thus, the motion is only a recommendation and the Committee should do what it thinks is appropriate after they consider a longer-term base. In response to a concern that the Trustees might be concerned if we deviate from their approved methodologies, Professor Marsh also pointed out that the aggregate numbers were part of the Trustee Compensation Committee discussion. The motion was then voted on and passed.

At this point, several other general questions emerged. Professor J. T. Ptacek wished to know why we were aiming for the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile, and how that compares to our aspirations in other areas. President Mitchell responded that, in the case of faculty salaries, it was a moving target: salaries need to be stabilized at some level, but when we get there, we may decide to move up. Professor Ken Field asked whether the salary averages we used reflected the fact that we have a differential pay scale as a result of the market-driven salaries in our pool. Professor Marsh explained that we have tried for a model that satisfies both us and the Trustees. This

particular model is simple, but uses a reference group of handsome institutions, a trade-off we have accepted. Professor Schneider added that the comparisons are pretty close in any case.

Professor Amy McCready next reported on a *Faculty Handbook* change proposed by the Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel to address inequities in the process by which time on a untenured leave is, or is not, counted toward the fourth-year and tenure reviews (see report in the Agenda). In short, the proposal seeks to make available to those who take only one semester off, the same default option to have the leave-year not count toward tenure that those who take the full year as leave already have. The proposal would also clarify the process by which someone who has an untenured faculty leave could opt to have the year count toward tenure. The new policy would involve the department chair and the appropriate academic dean, but not the University Review Committee or Provost, as is required under the current language of the *Faculty Handbook*.

Professor McCready then offered a motion *proposing to vote on this next month*. The motion was seconded, voted on, and passed.

The meeting adjourned at 12:52PM. There will be no meeting on 21 March 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

Erik R. Lofgren  
Secretary of the Faculty