



## UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

### Minutes of the Faculty Meeting October 6, 2005

The meeting was called to order at 12:00PM by Professor Martin Ligare, Chair of the Faculty.

#### Announcements and remarks by the President

First President Mitchell announced that nominations for honorary degrees from Bucknell may be submitted to the Office of the Provost. Honorary degree candidates should exemplify qualities of intellect, character, and creativity most cherished by the University with special consideration to individuals whose distinguished contributions have not yet been formally recognized outside their own fields. President Mitchell noted the importance of students' voice throughout the process. In future years, the protocol will allow for nominations to be received during the spring and summer and for consideration earlier in the academic year. President Mitchell thanked everyone involved including the Board of Trustees and the Bucknell faculty for re-commissioning their respective Honorary Degree Committees.

Next President Mitchell read an e-mail message sent to the University Council in which he offered his apologies for the confusion concerning the mailing of the first draft of *The Plan for Bucknell*. He also outlined the next steps in the plan procedure (see full text attached to these minutes). There were no questions afterwards.

#### Announcements and remarks by the Provost

Provost Mary DeCredico commented on the ambitious Strategic Planning process, its focus on students and on the academic core. She also pointed out that five years is too long to wait for an implemented five-course load, and recommended increased support for the teacher-scholar model. Calling for an assessment of the relevance of the entire academic program, she spoke to a better integration of academic and student affairs. The Provost also emphasized the need to embrace and encourage diversity in all its forms, placing this particular issue at the heart of academic freedom. As she encouraged ongoing dialogs with various groups, she urged every department to think about their needs.

Following a question about an update concerning the five-course load, Provost DeCredico recommended a more aggressive time-line before turning to Professor Tony Massoud, Chair of the Committee on Staff Planning, who confirmed a possible expedited implementation over the next two years, with the goal to have something to vote on by the end of the semester. Provost DeCredico added that the best strategy would not be to rely on adjunct but on tenure-track positions. In regards to equivalence between

departments, the Provost and Dean of Engineering Orbison agreed that it is time to understand and solve this complex issue. On the topic of research and its direction five years from now, the Provost talked of a dedicated research office designed to help with grant writing, and emphasized the need to celebrate achievements including student research. It was pointed out that the research process must remain as important as the outcome, and deserves to be encouraged and rewarded just as well. One last comment concerned the ‘centers for excellence’, now called ‘areas of current and emerging strength’, which were described as areas with distinction that would attract teachers, students and potential donors. A round of applause concluded the Provost remarks.

### Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty

Professor Ligare started by reinstating an old practice, according to which chairs of Faculty and University standing committees will report regularly at the faculty meeting on their committee’s activity.

Then Professor Ligare reminded the audience of the nominations for special elections (see minutes) and mentioned two additional openings: one for the Committee on Complementary Activity and one for Secretary of the Faculty.

Also next month, the Faculty Council will propose a response to the report by Professor John Peeler for the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance with a draft of new charges.

Next Professor Ligare thanked President Mitchell for incorporating the changes suggested by the University Council to the draft of *The Plan for Bucknell*. Following a question from Professor Ben Marsh about most appropriate ways for the faculty to react to the Strategic Plan, Professor Ligare recommended the organization of a forum as a mechanism to respond to the proposed Plan. President Mitchell offered to extend this strategy of formal and informal deliberations to other stakeholders across campus as he noted the centrality of faculty but also students, donors and alumni in the process.

### New Business

Professor Tony Massoud rose to the floor and on behalf of the Committee on Staff Planning reported on an estimated three-year process to complete the five-course load goal. President Mitchell suggested using the first large private gift to begin financing, and recommended securing sufficient funds in order to achieve the targeted objective quickly. To the question concerning ways to account for department growth and enrollment pressures within the context of the moratorium on faculty hiring over the past years, Professor Massoud responded that department needs should be conveyed to the appropriate Dean and to the Provost.

Then Professor Kevin Myers from the Committee on Instruction presented a report not recommending a change in established teaching times supposed to lead to the creation of a new permanent time slot for faculty meetings (see agenda). He also reported on the dissemination of grading statistics. The ensuing conversation discussed links between athletics and academic performance, concluding that the monitoring of academic performance will be part of the charge of the new committee on athletics.

Next Professor Amy McCready from the Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee reported on three items:

1. Concerning the Dean's Travel Budget, the Committee has been assessing and addressing shortfalls and differences between the Colleges of Engineering and Arts and Sciences, and will soon propose revisions to the guidelines for faculty travel to professional meetings.
2. In the course of reviewing the new health insurance figures, FAPC considered other benefits and have recommended to CBAG an increase in life insurance benefits.
3. On the topic of untenured leave, the Committee has begun to address the different consequences for the tenure clock of taking a full-year UTL versus a one-semester UTL (clock may stop for the former but not for the latter). FAPC hopes to propose a revision to the handbook by the end of the semester to remedy this inequity.

The last report came from the Committee on Planning and Budget. While pointing out that some of the endowment problems have been solved, Professor Ben Marsh underlined the need to anticipate some of the consequences of the Strategic Plan, and referred for instance to the impact of the five-course load on the budget.

The meeting adjourned at 12:52PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Philippe C. Dubois  
Secretary of the Faculty

## ATTACHEMENT

To: University Council  
From: Brian C. Mitchell  
Date: October 5, 2005  
Re: Going Forward

I learned this morning from Marty Ligare that the University had not mailed out the University Council comments as an attachment to the first draft of *The Plan for Bucknell*. I am frankly mortified by this discovery since it violates my pledge to the University Council and runs counter to my intentions. As President, I accept full responsibility for this mistake and offer to each of you my personal apology. I will work with increased diligence to make certain that the relationship between communication and execution is more clear.

I am also writing to provide you with an update on where we stand as we go forward, based in part upon a conversation Marty and I had in my office this morning. As I write, we have completed an agreed upon minutes for the University Council and the Board of Trustees. Jerry, Mary, and I will meet in my office late this afternoon to take Marty up on a suggestion he has made. That suggestion is to produce a 1.1 version of the first draft of *The Plan for Bucknell*. Hopefully, it will be ready next week. Once it becomes available, I will forward copies of Version 1.1, the University Council minutes and the Board of Trustees minutes. Mrs. Vargo will contact you on your availability for a meeting sometime in the next 10-14 days. The agenda will be to review Version 1.1 for *The Plan of Bucknell*.

After this meeting, my approach will be to schedule a teleconference call with the Long Range Planning Committee of the Board of Trustees to review Version 1.1 with them. Then we will provide you with a copy of the minutes of this meeting and may schedule a second meeting with you in early November to discuss the Long Range Planning Committee's perceptions of Version 1.1. At the same time in early November, we will produce a second "official" draft version of *The Plan for Bucknell*, which will be distributed broadly across campus. The Plan will be ready to be mailed to the Board and distributed to the University Council by about November 4. At the Board meeting on November 18, the Long Range Planning Committee of the Board will meet with the University Council to seek additional consensus in a broader committee format. At the same time, we will be continuing our meetings with academic and administrative programs and have begun a broader communication strategy to incorporate reactions and suggestions aimed at improving the plan.

I will outline this procedure during tomorrow's faculty meeting, at which time I will also offer my personal apologies to you for the slip-up in mailing. I look forward to seeing you then.