



The February meeting of the University Faculty will be held on Monday, February 3, 2003, beginning at 5:00 PM in the Langone Center Forum. Professor Michael Payne will preside. If there are any amendments to the December, 2002 minutes, please send them to Andrea Halpern, Secretary of the Faculty, in advance of the meeting.

AGENDA

1. Amendments to December 2002 minutes

2. Announcements and remarks by the President and members of his staff

Question

At the December faculty meeting, the President informed the faculty that the analysis of results of the Climate Survey was in progress and that the results would be reported to the faculty during the Spring semester once they were shared with staff members. Staff members say that they received results of the Climate Survey in the Fall. As a follow-up to the question asked at the December faculty meeting:

- a) When can the faculty expect to receive its report on the Climate Survey?
- b) Will the results of the Climate Survey be incorporated into the strategic planning process?
- c) What was the cost of the Climate Survey paid to the outside consultants?

3. Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty

Report on the Vision 2010 planning process.

4. Old Business

- a. Motion from the Committee on Academic and Faculty Personnel and the Committee on Staff Planning: Allen Schweinsberg (CAFP)

We move that the following language be added to the final paragraph in the Faculty Handbook Personnel Policies section, part I.4.a.1.

In order to mitigate staffing problems that may result from aggregation of faculty leaves in one year, a department may request that an individual faculty member's sabbatical leave schedule be advanced as many as three years. All other considerations being equal, preference will be given to more senior faculty, and faculty who have not previously benefited from an advanced leave schedule will be given priority if further schedule changes are necessary. The

request must be approved by the cognate Dean and the Provost/VPAA. It is expected that this remedy will be applied infrequently.

This motion, an amendment to the *Faculty Handbook*, was introduced last month.

b. Motion from Prof. George Exner (offered as a private citizen, not chair of COI)

Motion: That no varsity team activity be allowed for varsity athletes between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. ("class hours") Monday through Friday, except as permitted by paragraphs A and B below. Excluded are all activities involving a member of the coaching staff or athletic department and more than one athlete, and any activity involving a member of the coaching staff and a single athlete if sports instruction is taking place. Also excluded are activities in which three or more athletes engage in training for the sport not in the presence of a member of the coaching staff, except strength and conditioning training as in paragraph A. Forbidden also is any regularly scheduled or recurring activity for the sport during these hours regardless of the number of athletes participating simultaneously, except as modified by paragraph A. Activities as described above are to be excluded, whether they are "required" or "optional" and both in and out of season. Paragraph C lists examples of such activities, but is not intended to cover all things excluded; paragraph D provides penalties and procedures in the event of non-compliance; paragraph E places upon the Committee on Athletics a reporting obligation.

Accompanying text may be found in the December 2002 agenda.

5. New Business

a. Report from Committee on Instruction: George Exner

Report and recommendations on student advising (report is appended).

b. Report from Committee on Planning and Budget: Ben Marsh

Working through the year-end break, the committee wrote these eight strategic recommendations for the president concerning budget cuts to respond to the forthcoming pinch.

1. We should protect Bucknell's strengths and uphold institutional priorities by making strategic budget adjustments rather than broadly cutting across the board.
2. A blanket hiring freeze is not appropriate.
3. A net loss of faculty lines is not justified by a short-time budget shortfall.
4. We should maintain an investment in financial aid that is faithful to our long-held principles.
5. Accepting a student body of 3350 [rather than 3250 or 3300] is a necessary tactical concession to these several years of stress.
6. A group of mid-level staff might be empowered to identify and propose new ideas about controlling expenditures.
7. Long-term cost-savings or revenue enhancements that increase expenses today may be still appropriate, despite the short-term budget situation.
8. The budget information used by the groups working on these matters should be divided by programmatic activity as well as by revenue/expense type.
9. It will be important to promptly publicize whatever decisions are made.

In his reply the president was generally supportive of the recommendations, with minor caveats concerning #3, 6, and 8 to protect the latitude of his staff as they make difficult and complex decisions.

c. Motion from Ben Marsh (This motion is not from CP&B.)

Funding levels for sabbatical replacement and adjunct staffing for next year should be provided at levels at least equivalent the trend of the last several years. Future decisions about allocating sabbatical replacements to departments should be made in conjunction with the Committee on Staff Planning; policy about adjuncts should be monitored regularly by that committee.

Rationale

A significant reduction in next year's leave replacement and adjunct staffing support has been implemented, prior to the acceptance of an overall university budget. Adjuncts and sabbatical replacements are crucial elements of departments' abilities to provide a broad, stable, and predictable curriculum, to contribute to extradepartmental programs, and to schedule appropriate leaves without fear about damage to the students' academic progress or curricular options.

We are giving up real instruction — the numbers of teachers in classrooms — to offset projected budget shortfalls associated with increases in building expenses primarily in athletics and student services. Instruction should be the last place to look for savings, not the first. It is reported that the percentage of Bucknell's funding that goes to instruction is significantly lower than at comparable institutions. This is a moment and a reason to begin rectifying that imbalance. The provision of sabbatical replacements is a quasi-curricular decision, as lack of coverage can hurt a program in a way that impacts students for several years. Such important decisions belong within the governance system.

d. Motion from Aarne Vesilind

I move that the faculty, recognizing the potential harm to both our cheerleaders and to the university from continuing stunting on unprotected floors, requests a reasoned official response to the letter from P. Aarne Vesilind to John Hardt, dated 14 November 2002, with copies to Michael Payne, Chair of the Faculty.

Report and Recommendations on Student Advising COI

During the Spring and Fall semesters of 2002 the Committee on Instruction has considered problems with student advising (particularly that occurring before students are assigned an advisor in the major department) and some potential solutions. Such discussions were motivated by a general perception that there are difficulties with advising, as supported by data gathered in the senior survey, by some results of the review of the Common Learning Agenda, and by reports of the academic deans of their efforts to cope with poorly advised or misadvised students. CoI itself gathered information this past Spring with an electronic survey of students and a parallel electronic survey of faculty members. Students perceive problems in frequent (involuntary) changes of advisor; that faculty advisors often lack information about majors and courses in other departments; that advisors are uninformed about details of the scheduling and registration process; that they are of less than the hoped-for help in career matters; that advising is often limited to some few minutes, once a semester, entirely about course scheduling. Faculty see problems in how advising "counts" in matters of merit pay, promotion, and tenure; whether it is to be viewed as teaching or service; large numbers of advisees (partly the result of inequitable advising loads) that make it difficult to do the task well; lack of preparation and/or engagement in advising by some students; that some (few) faculty don't take advising very seriously; that to take advising seriously is in competition with other duties for which there is already insufficient time.

Some of these difficulties can be solved by better use of existing information and resources. For example, it seems clear that the Faculty Advisor Handbook would, if consulted, provide scheduling and registration

information and answers to other questions. More clear direction by faculty to students to use the Career Development Center might better align faculty/student perceptions about where career information should be sought. Nonetheless, some questions are not so readily dealt with. The following sections provide a list of CoI's recommendations, a grid showing what is being asked of what parties, and some approaches CoI chose not to recommend.

I. Recommendations

1. Departmental Review Documents for tenure/promotion and merit review documents should have advising clearly included under teaching (where it lies by faculty decision).

The purpose here is to be reminded of our current policy according to which advising is a component of teaching. This request is directed to the Academic Deans to remind Department Chairs, the Chairs themselves, and to CAFT to check DRC documents for clarity in their cycle of review of these documents.

2. CoI proposes the creation of an advising prize parallel to the faculty teaching prizes.

The purpose here is to show that advising is valued, and provide a chance to celebrate and recognize good advising. We request the faculty to approve, and the development office to pursue a donor to endow, such a prize.

3. The University should develop on-line FAQ's for advising matters. The Deans and Registrar's office should develop a central site for general questions, including scheduling and registration, and with links to and from reasonable places (e.g., the page for admitted students). Departments should develop ones of their own, based on their own experience and improved by observing those questions asked by outside faculty; departmental FAQ's should be linked to and from the central site. CoI proposes that the Registrar's office maintain the central site, perhaps with funding for a student assistant for such maintenance.

A central, searchable, site for general information, and departmental sites to aid students and faculty from other departments, will render information more readily available.

4. A week or two before advising, the Academic Deans should send to the faculty, by email, the links to various information pages including FAQ's, and with a "read this paragraph" note of vital matters.

The goal here is to provide faculty with ready access to useful information, in a single place, at the right time.

5. Institute University-wide, as opposed to Departmental, reassignment of advisees when required by faculty leaves; allow student requests as to the new department and/or new advisor. (More properly, we in fact remind the community that this should be present practice.) These assignments should be done by the Academic Deans; department chairs should not make "in-department" reassignments for convenience. In addition, first year seminar instructors about to go on leave should assist students in a suitable choice of the next advisor.

The purpose here is to minimize the frequency of advisor changes for students. Chairs are requested to examine their policies, and the Academic Deans are requested to remind Chairs from time to time of the practice.

6. CoI requests that the Faculty approve, the Academic Deans organize, and Department Chairs and Departments support, a "Fair" in the fieldhouse (or similar location) each February for students to speak with departmental representatives about advising/program planning/scheduling questions. First and second year students are to be invited, with second year students (soon to declare a major) the primary audience.

The goal here is better program planning for students not yet with an advisor in the intended major.

7. The University adopt a form (at some point to become electronic) to solicit student comments on advising. The form should be submitted at the time of registration, and should be required in order to register. This form should survey all students, but probably not every semester, with results not linked to a particular advisor, to provide information about the general status of advising.

The goal here is to gather data about advising in large, to monitor the effects of these and future efforts to improve advising, and to suggest further efforts. The Academic Deans are requested to put this in place, in cooperation with the Registrar, and with the assistance of a professional in survey techniques to design a good form.

8. Finally, CoI requests departments and department chairs to consider, as feasible, sabbatical leave schedules when assigning faculty to foundation seminars, and to avoid assigning visiting faculty to teach foundation seminars.

The goal here is to reduce the number of advisor changes, as possible within other constraints.

II. The table below summarizes who is being asked to do what.

| Item | Deans | Deans to Remind Chairs | Chairs | Faculty | Other(s) |
|--|--------------------------------------|------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Advising falls under teaching | | Yes | (DRC documents) | | CAFT (review documents) |
| 2. Advising prize | | | | approval | Development Office |
| 3. On-line FAQ's | (develop central site) | Yes | Develop dept. sites | | Registrar |
| 4. Email advising info. | Send a timely email | | | Read and save | |
| 5. Central advisee reassignment | Do the re-assignment. Allow requests | Yes | Not to assign within dept. | | |
| 6. Advising Fair | organize | Yes | Staff and support | Staff and support | |
| 7. General Advising Survey Form | Develop, with assistance | | | | Registrar; Institutional Research (?) |
| 8. Consider effects of leaves/temporary faculty on foundation seminars | | Yes | Take these matters into account as possible. | Assist in mitigating these effects as possible. | |

III. Rejected notions and comments

CoI spent considerable time discussing the possibility of student evaluation of individual advisors. It was finally decided not to institute this, as we lack data indicating it is necessary (such data may appear as a result of the general survey discussed in 7 above), and because of considerable faculty resistance to "yet more evaluation." It is important to note in this context, however, that both student members of CoI were strongly supportive of such student evaluations of individual advisors, and BSG voted 34-0-0 in favor of such evaluations (upon our request for an opinion).

CoI also rejected a "window" for major declaration (Fall of Sophomore year to Spring, say), as tending to pressure students to declare a major early, in spite of possible beneficial reduction of advisor changes. We rejected as well a summer on-campus advising/orientation session required for new students, because of its complexity and the lack of a demonstrated need for such a program (although we note such sessions are held at many other institutions). A day during the semester set aside for morning advising workshops for faculty and afternoon student appointments (not primarily concerned with the mechanics of scheduling) was set aside for calendar/scheduling reasons.