



## UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

The December 2006 meetings of the University Faculty will be held on Tuesday, December 7, 2006 in the Langone Center Forum beginning at 12:00 p.m. and running until 12:52 p.m. or the conclusion of business, whichever comes first. Professor Martin Ligare, Chairperson of the Faculty, will preside. Any corrections to the November 2006 minutes should be sent to Faculty Secretary Jamie Hendry prior to the meeting.

### AGENDA

- 1. Amendments to and approval of November 2006 minutes**
  - Minutes are available on E-Reserves
- 2. Announcements and remarks by the President**
- 3. Announcements and remarks by the Chair of the Faculty**
  - Election for a one-semester replacement for an untenured member of Faculty Council
    - DeeAnn Reeder
  - Faculty Council will make its official response to Professor Ben Marsh's motion, passed in November 2006, regarding the September 28 letter sent to Middle States. The written report is unavailable at the time this Agenda is being published.
- 4. Committee Reports:**
  - a. Committee on Planning and Budget**
    - Report of the Committee on Planning and Budget is available in the Appendix to this Agenda
  - b. Committee on Instruction**
    - Report of the Committee on Instruction regarding Course Load Equity is available in the Appendix to this Agenda
    - Report of the Committee on Instruction regarding Grade Reporting is available on E-Reserves
  - c. Committee on Complementary Activities**
    - Report of the Committee on Complementary Activities is available on E-Reserves
  - d. Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel**
  - e. Committee on Staff Planning**
  - f. Committee on Faculty Development**

- g. **Committee on Honorary Degrees**
  - h. **University Review Committee**
  - i. **Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure**
- 5. **Unfinished business**
  - 6. **New business**
  - 7. **Adjournment**

---

## APPENDIX

### **Report from the Committee on Planning and Budget – December 2006**

Budget for FY 2007/2008 (FY '08): At the November meeting of the Board of Trustees, the board's Compensation Committee asked the administration to investigate going a little beyond CPB's recommended increase of 4.53% if budgetarily appropriate; specifically, the trustees prefer to maintain the recent gains made in our rankings for salaries for assistant professors. Similarly, the trustees endorsed a range of from 6.0% - 7.0% for increases in the comprehensive fee. The ranges are intended to give the administration flexibility in forming a budget FY '08.

CPB continues to work with and advise the Finance Office in the development of a budget not only for FY '08 but also for subsequent years, accounting for additional expenses incurred both by a new fuel contract (due to take effect next year) and the multi-year move to a 5-course teaching load.

Discussions about Faculty compensation model: In response to a question from a faculty member, CPB has had discussions about the model used to determine recommendations for salary increases. (The questions were also forwarded to FAPC for discussion.) Specifically, questions were raised about including both market (e.g., management and engineering) and non-market fields in salary averages in the model. Several issues came out of these discussions:

1. As part of the strategic financial plan, "Excellence and Access," Bucknell employed a complicated compensation model in the late 1990s that attempted to compare non-market fields at Bucknell with those of our peers, and market fields with separate peer groups. The Board did not clearly understand this model and had little confidence in its predictive ability. Consequently, they consistently authorized lower salary increases than the model projected we would need to maintain our salary ranking.
2. A request was made to determine the rankings excluding the salaries of market fields at Bucknell. CPB is reluctant to do this considering that about half of the schools on our peer list also have faculty in market fields. Re-calculating averages at our peer schools without market fields would be extremely time-consuming and unreliable, considering

the lack of available data.

3. Regardless of the *magnitude* of salaries, the model currently used successfully tracks *increases* with our competitors. The evidence indicates that entering salaries are sufficient to avoid losing prospective faculty members. Consequently, CPB considers the model currently used to be sufficient to enable Bucknell to attract and retain qualified faculty, regardless of the field.

### **Report from the Committee on Instruction regarding Course Load Equity – December 2006**

At the April 2006 faculty meeting, the following motion by Prof. Brian Williams was referred to the Committee on Instruction (CoI):

The faculty recommends that a task force be established to study the question of course load policy. This task force would be organized and chaired by Provost DeCredico and include representatives of all divisions and the administration in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Engineering. The task force would report back to the faculty any findings or recommendations within one year.

It was specified that CoI should produce a report this year, with an interim report due in the fall semester .

CoI has investigated this issue. Some key points of this investigation are listed below:

- The method used by the Committee on Staff Planning (CSP) to calculate teaching loads does not make major changes in the way these loads are calculated for the Chemistry and Biology departments; members of these departments raised the original concerns about the CSP method. Teaching credit for laboratory sections (1/2 credit) is unchanged. For Chemistry and Biology, there is a slight increase in the load generated by independent study students; previously, supervising three such students counted for 1/2 of a teaching credit, while CSP's method gives 1/2 credit for supervising four students. CSP's method, however, extends this teaching credit to all departments, which CoI sees as more fair. CoI heard no objections to Engineering's move from the twelfths system to the system used by Arts and Sciences.
- The Dean's Office in the College of Arts and Sciences has been approving course loads in Biology and Chemistry that amount to five or five and one-half courses per year under the old system of counting teaching credit. This is a result of an agreement of long standing; we were unable to determine who made the agreement or when it was made. Under CSP's method, the allocation of teaching credit for these loads will not change except for the counting of independent study students discussed above. Under the five-course load plan, however, these loads will not be reduced below five courses per year.

- CoI determined that there are a few situations in which a full teaching credit is granted for teaching a half-credit lecture course. Specific examples include mathematics courses required by Engineering degree programs. This exception was made because these courses meet for three hours of lecture a week. We also received comments about Psychology, where majors were required to take two half-credit laboratory courses; teaching credit for these courses was a full course. This is no longer the case. The Psychology Department has replaced their half-credit offerings with a selection of one-credit courses as part of a larger revision to the Psychology curriculum that was already in progress.
- Exceptions to the specified allocation of teaching credit are currently negotiated between department chairs and their respective deans, subject to approval of the provost.

As a result of this investigation, CoI does not believe there are issues to justify a task force or major study of course load equity at this time. CoI plans to discuss further how exceptions to the standard allocation of teaching credit should be handled.