



## UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

The March meetings of the University Faculty will be held on Tuesday, March 4, 2008 and, if needed, on Tuesday, March 18, 2008 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 February 2008 minutes should be sent to Faculty Secretary Philippe Dubois prior to the meeting.

### AGENDA

- 1. Amendments to and approval of February 2008 minutes**
- 2. Announcements and remarks by the President**
- 3. Announcements and remarks by the Chair of the Faculty**
- 4. Committee Reports:**
  - a. Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee**

FAPC Motion on Revising the Faculty Council Charge.

As a product of the ongoing review of faculty governance at Bucknell, the Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee is proposing the following change in the faculty handbook to the charge for the Faculty Council:

#### FACULTY COUNCIL

Faculty Council fosters the operation of a responsive and inclusive Faculty governance system. Faculty Council supports the committee system by consulting with and coordinating the Faculty and University committees, by facilitating inter-committee communication, and by providing advice and oversight guidance to insure that Faculty governance processes are executed effectively. The Faculty Council insures that committees other than the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (see II.F) are populated, by preparing lists of nominees, soliciting additional nominees from the Faculty, and organizing elections to fill positions vacated by the routine cycle of terms, and by that means or by appointment to fill positions vacated mid-term. The Faculty Council helps to set the long-term agenda of the Faculty by identifying and reporting pending issues of importance to the Faculty with regard to governance and to the academic mission of the

University. Faculty Council facilitates communication between the Faculty and the Administration by meeting regularly with the University Council and by providing advice to the president as requested on matters of substance and process. In consultation with the Faculty and University committees, the Faculty Council advises the administration and makes recommendations on strategic planning through the University Council and otherwise as requested. The Faculty Council responds to issues of Faculty concern that are not under the purview of existing parts of the Faculty governance system, to act upon them or to direct them to an existing or *ad hoc* Faculty body. The Faculty Council receives governance matters when the Faculty is unable to meet, and may speak for the Faculty at such times if it believes this is necessary. When Faculty Council acts for the Faculty because of the nature of the issue or because of its timing, Faculty Council will consult with relevant committees, will report actions to the Faculty, and will seek to integrate issues into normal governance channels, in a timely fashion.

Faculty council comprises seven members:

- Chairperson of the Faculty,
- Secretary of the Faculty,
- Four members of the Faculty elected from each of the standard groups (see II.F.6),
- One untenured member of the Faculty, to be replaced upon receiving tenure.

The Chairperson of the Faculty will serve as the chairperson of the Faculty Council.

**Rationale:**

The Faculty Council is already serving in the capacity outlined above, so to some degree we are suggesting changes to the handbook that more accurately mirror current practices. Nevertheless, this change in the Faculty Handbook is important in that it formalizes the Faculty Council's role in governance as a coordinating and advisory body, and as the first line of governance for issues not already covered under the existing definitions of faculty governance. FAPC believes that this change clarifies and improves faculty governance structures.

**b. Committee on Instruction**

--The written report of the Committee on Instruction appears in the Appendix to this agenda.

**c. Committee on Complementary Activities**

--The written report of the Committee on Complementary Activities appears in the Appendix to this agenda.

**d. Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure**

- e. Committee on Staff Planning**
  - f. Committee on Faculty Development**
  - g. Committee on Honorary Degrees**
  - h. University Review Committee**
  - i. Committee on Planning and Budget**
- 5. Ad hoc Committee Reports:**
- Ad hoc Committee to Review Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures**
    - The written report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures appears in the Appendix to this agenda.
- 5. Unfinished business**
- 6. Announcement and remarks by members of the President's staff**
- 7. Announcement from Bucknell Student Government**
- 8. New business**
- 9. Adjournment**

# APPENDIX

## Report from the Committee on Instruction, March 2008

- (1) CoI unanimously approved the curricular aspect of the proposal for a new “Languages & Cultures Residential College.” CoI directed the proposal to the dean’s & provost’s offices for final approval.
- (2) Now that the Learning Goals have been endorsed, CoI is now revising the other parts of the Strategic Academic Vision document.

## Report from the Committee on Complementary Activities, March 2008

### **A. Our Mission & Composition**

The University committees upon which Faculty members serve are Complementary Activities, Instruction, and Planning and Budget. **Please refer to the Faculty Handbook for our mission.**

**SP’08 Membership & Co-chairs\*:** *Faculty:* Elizabeth Capaldi Evans\*, Mike Coyne, Manuel Delgado, Gary Grant, Luda Lavine, Dave Rovnyak *Students:* Kevin Cooper-Smith, Jordan Franklin, Alison Faux, Paul Majeski, Jim Ritter, Spike Short\* *Admin:* Susan Hopp, Robert Midkiff

### **B. Our recent activities:**

1. Committee on Greek Life procedures, policies, and by-laws
2. Review of Public Safety Emergency Procedures
3. Clarification of Alcohol Policies and Procedures, requested by BSG
4. Review of Report on Transitions to College Life course, Tracey Shaynak
5. Discussion of renaming the Craft Center, Gretchen Hughes
6. Arming Public Safety, Task Force

**i. Background:** In the wake of the tragic incident at Virginia Tech last April, the Board of Trustees directed the University administration to evaluate and upgrade security measures on campus. This evaluation resulted in a number of safety and security changes on campus, including a new card security system for building access and a new emergency notification procedure. Because the question of arming campus Public Safety officers was more complex, the Board deferred action on that issue, creating a campus task force to advise the board on issues relative to arming. (The Task Force is comprised of Dave Myers, Chief of Staff for the President; Wayne Bromfield, University General Counsel; Susan Hopp, Dean of Students; Paul McGuire, Professor of Mathematics and Dave Surgala, Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration.)

The Task Force worked in conjunction with CCA and a special student advisory group during the Fall 2007 semester, and reviewed materials compiled by Public Safety Chief Jason Friedberg and additional information provided by external consultants on campus safety. Three campus forums were held on the issue to solicit campus opinion. The Task Force and the student advisory group prepared reports to the Board that outlined the arguments for and against arming. In addition, lists of factors to be considered were generated by all groups. All documents associated with this process have been available to the campus community on myBucknell, in the section on Spotlights, Bucknell Public Safety Documents. Subsequently, the CCA prepared its own list of concerns about arming, which can be found in the same place.

In January, the Board decided to arm the Bucknell Public Safety officers, but left the details about arming open until its April board meeting.

**ii. Unresolved Issues:** While the decision to arm has been made by the Board, there are still a number of unresolved questions about the process including

- What weapons will be used?
- What ammunition will be used?
- Will all of the officers be armed at all times while they are on duty?
- Will a special strike force be established?
- What additional training will officers receive beyond the requirements of state law for police officer training?
- Will the officers be subject to new or additional background checks and psychological testing?
- What will be the protocols for the use of lethal and non-lethal force?
- Will Public Safety establish a campus advisory group and a situation review process that involves the community?
- How will Public Safety interact with local law enforcement, on campus and/or in the community?
- What can the University in general (and Public Safety, in particular) do to mitigate any impact that arming might have on the campus culture?

**iii. What happens now?** The Board will decide at its April meeting how to proceed with arming Public Safety Officers. Their announced intention is to have the officers armed by the beginning of the 2008-2009 academic year. They have asked the administration to produce a budget for arming the officers and to engage an outside consultant to review the outstanding issues and make appropriate recommendations. The Task Force created by the Board remains active, and will continue to work with CCA and the Bucknell Student Government to identify concerns and solicit recommendations. The email box they established ([armingquestion@bucknell.edu](mailto:armingquestion@bucknell.edu)) remains active. There may be additional campus forums. The task force anticipates preparing a final report to the Board for its April meeting. CCA reminds you of these options for being involved in or learning more about the process.

**iv. What can the faculty do?** The Board has asked for opinions from the campus community on the process of arming. CCA asks that you review the documents on

myBucknell and submit your opinions to the Task Force. The only issue that the Board has decided has been the one to arm Public Safety officers. None of the other issues have been settled yet.

### **C. Upcoming issues for CCA**

1. Setting a review/report cycle for the CCA areas of scope, CCA initiative
2. Campus Master Plan and Greening, report by Dennis Hawley
3. International Student Services, report by Paula Cogan Myers
4. Sexual Assault Task Force results, Robert Midkiff
5. Student Dining and Catering Services Contract Renewal, informed by BSG request

### **Report from the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures, March 2008**

The ad hoc committee was convened last October by Faculty Council, the URC, and CAFT, and charged with undertaking a comprehensive review of tenure and promotion at Bucknell. The charge is appended to this report.

Included in the charge was the mandate to give a progress report at the March 2008 faculty meeting, with the option of bringing forward proposed Handbook amendments that could be voted on in April and in place for the 2008-09 academic year. We are not ready to propose any specific policies at this point.

Upon convening, our first actions were to identify what types of data we plan to collect and to determine the order in which to pursue the data. Priority was given to data that take longer to acquire or which are needed to inform our decisions for further information seeking. Our timeline, at present and going forward, consists of collecting and synthesizing the information through the Spring semester, and forming the specific recommendations and communicating these at some point next Fall.

A brief description of the information we are currently collecting is as follows. First, we are quantifying objective information about Bucknell's tenure history for faculty hired from 1987 to present. We are also seeking, with the aid of Institutional Research, to obtain similar objective data from peer institutions.

Second, we are studying the tenure and promotion practices at peer institutions. We have identified a list of 22 institutions, consisting of the peer and aspirant list created by the Board, as well as those schools ranked from five above to five below Bucknell in US News and World Report ratings. We are characterizing the policies and procedures of these institutions using a combination of Faculty Handbook information and discussions with officials at these institutions.

Third, we have issued a survey of the Faculty, which is intended to give us a sense of faculty perceptions of what our system is and opinions of what it should be. The survey

results will be used to identify targets for follow up data collection, most likely in the form of focus groups and meetings.

All information we gather will be made public in suitable form, with appropriate attention to confidentiality.

**Charge from the Faculty Council, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, and the co-chairs of the University Review Committee**

Tenure and promotion policies and practice play a critical role in shaping the faculty, and thus the future of the university. This committee is charged to undertake a critical examination of Bucknell's system of evaluation for tenure and promotion, and make recommendations to the faculty regarding any changes that will help us to develop the faculty that can best serve our students and university. In considering such changes the committee should undertake a review of Bucknell's record of hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion, and it should also compare Bucknell's tenure and promotion system to those in place at peer institutions. (Any changes that are recommended should be implemented in such a way that they will not affect in any substantive way those untenured faculty who have already begun careers at Bucknell at the time the changes are made.) In addition the committee is asked to examine the following issues:

- the fundamental charge of the URC and its relationship to DRCs;
- the procedures that the URC uses in evaluation of materials;
- the appropriate process by which evolving standards for tenure and promotion should be determined;
- a consideration of which elements of DRC statements can be made more uniform;
- the communication of standards to departments and to individual candidates;
- the workload of the URC;
- the presidential role in tenure and promotion; and
- the annual schedule for reviews.

The committee is asked to present an interim report to the faculty no later than the March meeting of the faculty. In addition to summarizing the preliminary work of the committee, this report could introduce motions to amend the Faculty Handbook so that they could be voted on at the April faculty meeting. The committee should make a final report to the faculty in the Fall semester of 2008 with recommendations for changes that should be brought to the faculty for consideration.