



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

The October 2006 meetings of the University Faculty was called to order by Faculty Chair Marty Ligare at 12:02 p.m., Tuesday, 3 October 2006 in the Langone Center Forum.

MINUTES

1. Approval of September 2006 minutes: Jamie Hendry

Faculty Secretary Jamie Hendry announced two minor corrections to the September 2006 minutes provided by Tom Solomon. The corrected minutes are available on E-Reserves.

2. Announcements and remarks by the University President: Brian Mitchell

Carnegie Classification: There is a new system for the Carnegie classification of colleges and universities. Bucknell has always been in the category “Baccalaureate Colleges / Liberal Arts.” The new system adds five new classifications and redefines the previous classifications slightly. The redefinition of “Baccalaureate Colleges / Liberal Arts” imposes a limit of 50 masters degrees per year. In the last academic year, Bucknell exceeded this threshold slightly, putting us in a different category with many schools that are unlike us. Other colleges, including Middlebury and Bryn Mawr, suffered similarly. Because we felt that the resulting discrepancies likely implied a big change for us, potentially even changing how we would market Bucknell and how we would see ourselves as an institution, the University initiated a formal appeal in June 2006. A lengthy conversation ensued. On August 8, we were granted our appeal, thereby retaining our category and status.

U.S. News Ranking: Bucknell stands at #29 in the U.S. News rankings, a decline of two spots from our previous ranking of #27. Our score did not change, however. (Other school’s scores rose above ours.) Alumni participation, financial resources (expenditures per capita), and faculty resources hurt us. (For example, we were #84 in faculty resources.) The five-course load should help with this. President Mitchell noted that he is not particularly concerned with the U.S. News rankings; if we do the things we are talking about in the Strategic Plan, the rankings will take care of themselves.

Middle States: An interim Middle States letter went out, with the assistance of numerous folks here. It will be attached to the November agenda and available on E-

Reserves so that faculty can read it.

Constitution Day: Leslie Patrick and Mary DeCredico did an excellent job of organizing and facilitating the Constitution Day program this year, and President Mitchell extended congratulations and thanks to both of them.

Undergraduate Scholarships: Bucknell is seeking very high quality undergraduate students of the caliber to qualify for Rhodes, Marshall, and Fulbright scholarships. Candidates for these scholarships are being screened at present. Dave Schoepf, the Graduate School Advising Coordinator, is spearheading this effort.

Bucknell in the National Political Spotlight: One of the hot nationally watched Congressional debates – Sherwood v. Carney – will be held here at Bucknell on Wednesday night, October 4. The candidates are willing to take questions from the audience, including from Bucknell undergrads. Pennsylvania is likely to be a bellweather state in the 2008 elections, so this is an important step for us to take to position ourselves as an attractive location where other political presentations can be held.

Question & Answer:

Carl Milofsky asked about the relationship between the University's 501(c)3 status and the appearance of politicians on campus. President Mitchell noted that political rallies could not be held on campus. General Counsel Wayne Bromfield commented that the appearance of politicians as an educational venture is acceptable, but not as a campaign stop.

Kevin Myers asked whether President Mitchell's thinking about the need for the Strategic Plan to address the status of graduate programs had changed as a result of the Carnegie classification appeal. President Mitchell said that he didn't feel that the graduate programs needed to be re-thought but said that because the question of their status is fundamental to the University's future, they would undoubtedly be revisited periodically.

Mike Prince asked what President Mitchell would like to see happen regarding the faculty governance system this year. President Mitchell said that he thought the discussion about governance facilitated by Richard Chait was an excellent start and noted that Mr. Chait has been retained by the Board of Trustees to consult on governance issues going forward. President Mitchell would like to see governance questions addressed before heading into the comprehensive campaign.

3. Announcements and remarks by the Chair of the Faculty: Marty Ligare

Introductions: Faculty Chair Marty Ligare introduced new Director of Public Safety Jason Friedberg, who was unable to attend the September meeting.

Constitution Day: Professor Ligare extended sincere thanks to Leslie Patrick, who put together an excellent Constitution Day program with very little notice. Professor Ligare asked the faculty to consider potential speakers for next year's program and to forward them to Provost Mary DeCredico, who will be spearheading this effort.

Spring Meeting Schedule: In the Spring, one religious holiday is going to require a change in the faculty meeting schedule, and the President's travel schedule may also

require one or more changes. Professor Ligare will announce the entire Spring semester faculty meeting schedule as soon as he meets with Presidential Assistant Marilyn Vargo.

4. Reports of Standing Committees

a. Committee on Planning and Budget: Tom Solomon

- The written report is included in the appendix to this agenda and also available on E-Reserves

CPB Chair Tom Solomon remarked that the CPB compares Bucknell faculty salaries by rank with those of ten peer institutions. Last year, at the Assistant Professor Level, we were ninth out of 11; at the Associate Professor level, we were tenth out of 11; and at the Full Professor level, we were eighth out of 11. The Trustees determined that we should be in the middle of the rankings instead of near the bottom; according to CPB calculations, that would have required an increase of about 10% in a single year, which was not feasible. Instead, CPB recommended an 8.12% increase for last year and estimated that an additional 6.57% would be needed for this year.

Now CPB has discovered that the 8% increase did a lot more than had been predicted: we are now projected to rank fifth out of 11 at both the Assistant and Associate Professor levels and seventh out of 11 at the Full Professor level.

Given the significant increases predicted for energy costs as well as the hiring of additional faculty as part of the five-course load plan, CPB is recommending that we not proceed with the previously recommended 6.57% salary increase; instead, CPB is recommending a 4.53% increase, which is a few tenths of a percent greater than what is estimated to be needed to keep us ranked sixth out of 11.

Question & Answer: Someone pointed out that, because merit increments are given on a dollar basis rather than on a percentage basis, anchoring our salaries to those of our peer groups would essentially necessitate continuous adjustments each year. CPB Chair Tom Solomon conferred with Personnel Committee Geoff Schneider in this regard, and Geoff said that the Personnel Committee will comment on this in its November 2006 report to the faculty.

b. University Review Committee: Steve Stamos

Because of more numerous reviews than usual (“a bulge in the candidate pool”) in Fall 2005, the URC requested that the Faculty approve some temporary modifications to its procedures. The Faculty approved of these temporary modifications but requested that the URC report on the effectiveness of those modified procedures after the reviews were complete. URC Chair Steve Stamos reported that the process worked very well in Fall 2005 and that the URC doesn’t think that the decision making, conversations, or full examination of cases was compromised. The URC will be using the same process and procedures this year (Fall 2006), which means that, again, the committee will slightly change the way that it structures itself to handle this “bulge.” Although the Committee would prefer to

return to the previous process, that's unrealistic at this point. Nevertheless, cases requiring the full attention of the committee do get that full attention. Professor Stamos suggested that the URC make another report in April and noted that the URC might even want to revisit the regular timetable for reviews at that point, as a more permanent change to expand the timetable may be required now that even more faculty are being hired (as part of the five-course load plan).

Question & Answer: Gary Steiner asked how many candidates are being reviewed this term, and Professor Stamos replied that the number has declined from 65 last Fall to 45 this Fall. He noted, though, that it is pragmatically impossible to handle this number of cases using the usual procedures.

Debbie Abowitz asked what specifically the URC might be contemplating regarding extending the calendar. Professor Stamos replied that it was too soon to tell; the URC may consider whether it would be appropriate to have different timetables for different review stages, but that there are other possibilities as well.

Gary Steiner asked whether we needed to vote to approve extending the streamlined procedures for this year. Faculty Chair Marty Ligare made a motion:

The Faculty endorses using exactly the same URC procedures this year that were endorsed this year.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

5. Faculty Council Report: Marty Ligare

Dean of Arts & Sciences Search Committee: Faculty Council appointed Nancy Weida (Management) to the final position on this committee.

Standing Committee on Athletics: The Ad Hoc Committee to Review Faculty Governance, chaired by John Peeler, recommended the creation of a Standing Committee on Athletics; the Faculty supported this recommendation in a vote taken in March 2005. Faculty Council appointed an Ad Hoc Committee – comprised of Mitch Chernin (chair), Joel Wade, George Exner, and Jean Peterson – to develop the charge for the Standing Committee on Athletics; the charge was included as an appendix to the October 2006 agenda.

On behalf of the Faculty Council, Tammy Hiller moved that the charge be incorporated into the Faculty Handbook. Because a proposed change to the Handbook is involved, the motion will not be discussed and voted on until the November 2006 meeting. The floor was open for questions of clarification only, but no questions of that sort were advanced.

6. Unfinished business

None

7. New business

None

8. Announcements and remarks by the President's Staff

None

9. Other Announcements

Laura Denbow announced a new CDC program for externships that involves a two-day shadow experience. In developing the program, the CDC surveyed students to get information about their interests. The program was initiated in July, and the CDC has already secured over 1000 externship opportunities. The CDC is encouraging sophomores to pursue this opportunity, focusing on what they're really interested in rather than what job they want. Ms. Denbow noted that this program also enables the University to develop new and closer relationships with employers. She provided a handout on the program and commented that the CDC is also working with the annual fund to gain additional contacts. When Ms. Denbow remarked that students have to secure their own lodging and transportation for the externship, one faculty member expressed concern that some students might not have the financial resources to handle this. Both Ms. Denbow and President Mitchell said they would look into ways to facilitate the experience for such students.

10. Adjournment

The Faculty Meeting for October 2006 was adjourned at 12:52 p.m.; no second meeting time was necessary this month.

APPENDICES

Report from the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) – October 2006

Faculty compensation: CPB recommends an overall increase of 4.53% in the budget for continuing faculty salaries for academic year 2007/2008 (FY 2008). We will forward this recommendation to President Mitchell and Provost DeCredico.

Rationale: Faculty salaries at Bucknell, although competitive, have ranked low (often in the lowest quartile) of Bucknell's eleven school peer group for many years. Last year, at the urging of President Mitchell and the Trustees' Compensation Committee, CPB made a two-year recommendation to "step the faculty salaries up to the middle of our peers." An increase of 8.12% was approved for FY 2007 (the 2006/2007 academic year), with an expectation that another (smaller) step would be needed for FY 2008 to achieve the stated goal. In addition, the University community and Trustees declared their intent to maintain a compensation program designed to target mid-range rankings.

The salary increase for FY 2007 has had a significant impact on Bucknell's standings. Planning and Budget is pleased to report that for the first time in recent memory, all three faculty categories – professor, associate professor and assistant professor – are forecast to be within the mid-range of the peer group. Assistant and Associate Professors are forecast to rank 5/11 in salaries and full professors 7/11 for the academic year 2006-2007.

Given this positive position, and based on the average increases of our peer schools over the past five years, CPB forecasts (or estimates) that an overall faculty increase of 4.53% for academic year 2007-2008 (fiscal 2008) will maintain Bucknell's targeted mid-range ranking.

Because recommendations are necessarily based on historic averages, forecasts must be adjusted each year as real data become available. Thus, the calculation methodology is not an exact science. CPB expects that there will be years where one or more faculty salary categories will be a bit above or below the mid-range. We expect correcting adjustments in subsequent years.

The Committee on Planning and Budget will next focus on comprehensive fee discussions and then turn its attention to budgeting for the additional faculty lines needed to implement the five course load.

Motion brought by Faculty Council – October 2006

The Faculty Council moves that the *Faculty Handbook* be amended to create a Standing University Committee on Athletics. The charge of the Committee will be as follows:

The responsibilities of the Committee on Athletics are to:

- a. foster an intercollegiate athletics program consistent with the educational mission of the University;
- b. develop policy recommendations for consideration by the faculty and/or administration;
- c. respond as appropriate to requests from the faculty on matters at the intersection of academics and athletics;
- d. annually monitor and evaluate issues pertaining to gender equity and minority opportunities – programs mandated by the NCAA;
- e. conduct and evaluate the annual academic performance survey of student athletes;
- f. periodically review programs specifically established for student athletes;
- g. actively participate in the NCAA recertification process;
- h. communicate the results of its work to appropriate university committees or constituencies;
- i. act as an advisory group to the Director of Athletics who reports directly to the President.

Membership:

- Three members of the faculty elected at-large (3-yr terms)
- Faculty Athletics Representative to the NCAA
- Athletic Director
- Dean of Students (or appointee)
- VP for Enrollment Management (or appointee)
- Associate Dean for Academic Policy
- Associate Dean of Engineering
- Senior Woman Administrator of Athletics *ex officio*
- Senior Associate Director of Athletics *ex officio*
- Two students (one male, one female) elected from the Student Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) for a term to be set by SAAC, but not less than 1 year
- Student elected by the BSG, for a term to be set by the BSG, but not less than one year

The chairperson of the committee shall be elected from its faculty membership.