



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

The April meeting of the University Faculty will be held on Monday, April 4, 2005, beginning at 5:00 PM in the Langone Center Forum. Professor Martin Ligare will preside. If there are any amendments to the March, 2005 minutes, please send them to Philippe Dubois, Secretary of the Faculty, in advance of the meeting.

AGENDA

1. **Announcements and remarks by the President and members of his staff**

2. **Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty**

Nominations for committees (see attached)

3. **Old Business**

Continued discussion of report and recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance: John Peeler (see attached)

4. **New Business**

a. Report from the University Review Committee: Gary Steiner

(see attached)

b. Motion from the Faculty Council: Pam Gorkin

The Faculty Council moves that the meeting time for Faculty meetings be changed to 12:00-12:52 on the first and third Tuesdays of the month on a trial basis for the academic year 2005-2006.

c. Report from the Committee on Planning and Budget: Ben Marsh

Proposed changes in future retiree healthcare coverage.

The Committee on Planning and Budget reviewed the financial and general personnel implications of the ad hoc Campus Benefits Advisory Group's proposal that the university cap its contributions to future retirees' health care coverage at 200% of 07-01-2006 rates. The cap would be indexed to rise with CPI. The cap would not affect retirees who will be within 5 years of retirement eligibility at 07-01-2006.

The committee agrees that the proposal is fiscally appropriate and does not create an unacceptable burden upon future retirees.

The committee further endorses the intent of the university to seek a method to shift to a "defined contribution" retiree health care system that would be made available to future hires.

CPB, as a University Committee, looked at this issue from an aggregate financial and personnel perspective. The committee acknowledges that the Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee has oversight of this same issue from the perspective of faculty benefits, and may bring a separate report. (see attached for background)

d. Report from Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee: Geoff Schneider

Response to the P&B/CBAG report.

e. Motion from Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee: Geoff Schneider

Motion to amend something previously adopted by the faculty.

The Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee moves that the faculty adopt the changes to the Faculty Handbook proposed in Section 1 of the Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee's report (dated March 1, 2005, attached electronically to your agenda for this meeting). The version of the Faculty Handbook being amended is the one approved by this body on 10/7/2003.

f. Motion from Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee: Geoff Schneider

Report and motion regarding honorary degrees. (see attached)

g. Report from the Committee on Athletics (subcommittee of COI): Tom Kinnaman

Complete data from the graduation class of 2004 are used to estimate the statistical effect of participation in varsity athletics on academic performance of undergraduate students in the class of 2004 at Bucknell University. Results suggest athletic participation among male and female athletes does not significantly affect cumulative in-major GPA. These results control for the separate effects on grades arising from a student's gender, ethnic group, U.S. citizenship status, participation in fraternal "Greek" organizations, high school academic index, and choice of major.

(Entire report posted on e-reserves under Athlete Academic Performance)

h. Report from the Committee on Instruction: Rich Kozick

1. The Committee on Assessment has revised their charge, and COI approved the new charge.
2. Report from student government about the new honor code (presented by JT Dean, student member of COI)
3. Preliminary report on disseminating grade statistics to faculty:

COI is asking the Registrar's Office to develop a procedure for disseminating grading statistics to the faculty through BANNER Web. We are reporting this preliminary action to the faculty at this time because the Registrar's Office will work on the task during the summer. No grading statistics will be disseminated unless and until the faculty votes to do so. COI will prepare a detailed proposal to describe the grading statistics that are recommended for dissemination. COI expects to present this proposal to the faculty in the fall.

Attachments to the agenda:

Committee Nominations from Faculty Council

Personnel

- Tenured
 - Mike Payne
 - Dave Schoepf
- Tenured (fall replacement)
 - Jim Swan

Faculty Development

- Humanities
 - Renee Gosson
 - Roz Richards
- At large - **2 positions**
 - Pete Brooksbank
 - David Evans
 - Sally Koutsoliotas
 - Ann Tlusty

Staff Planing

- Engineering
 - David Kelley
- Natural Sciences and Math (fall replacement)
 - George Exner
 - Mark Spiro

URC

- Humanities
 - Jean Peterson
 - Angele Kingue
- Engineering
 - James Maneval

Complementary Activities

- At large
 - Georgia Newlin
 - Elizabeth Capaldi

Instruction

- Engineering
 - Steve Guattery
- Social Sciences

- Debbie Abowitz
 - Jan Knoedler
- Natural Sciences and Math (1 year replacement)
 - Dave Rovnyak
 - Jeff Trop

Planning and Budget

- Humanities
 - Erik Lofgren
- Engineering (Leave replacement in spring)
 - Tom Distefano

Board Reps

- Complementary Activities
 - Ron Ziemian
- University Relations
 - Jeff Csernica
 - Sally Koutsoliotas

Faculty Council

- Engineering (1 year replacement)
 - Tom Rich

Honorary Degrees

(2 one-year, 2 two-year, and 2 three-year positions)

- Humanities
 - Mike Payne
 - Elisabeth Guerrero
- Social Sciences
 - Greg Krohn
 - Mark Bettner
- Engineering
 - Maurice Aburdene
- Natural Sciences and Math
 - Allen Schweinsberg
 - Mark Spiro
- At large - **Two positions**
 - Karen Morin
 - Jim Van Fleet
 - Jamie Hendry

Faculty Hearing Committee

- Engineering
 - To be announced
- At Large
 - Tom Solomon

CAFT

- Engineering (tenured)
 - Maurice Aburdene
 - Richard McGinnis
- Arts and Sciences (tenured)
 - Leslie Patrick
 - Linden Lewis
- At large (tenured)
 - Hilbourne Watson
 - Janice Mann
- At large - Two slots (tenured; one-year leave replacement)
 - Abe Feuerstein
 - Nancy White
 - Eric Mazur
 - George Exner
- At large - Two slots (untenured)
 - Peter Wilshusen
 - Nina Banks
 - Michael Drexler
 - Sherri Geller
 - Roger Rothman
- At large (untenured; Spring '06 replacement)
 - David Kristjanson-Gural

Report and recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance: John Peeler

At the March faculty meeting, the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance presented its recommendations for votes. We will ask the Faculty to vote on these recommendations, subject to motions from the floor to delete or amend any recommendation, in order to inform the Faculty Council's deliberations as it works to elaborate concrete proposals. The Immediate Recommendations were voted on as a block. The Faculty Handbook Amendments will be voted on individually. The Basic Structural Changes will not be voted on at this time.

The Faculty Council may delegate its responsibilities under these motions to another standing or ad hoc committee.

In light of feedback on our January 2005 report, the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance will make the following changes in its recommendations that will be presented at the March faculty meeting:

II. Immediate Recommendations

1. Meeting time: The meeting time should be changed from Monday, 5-6:30, The Faculty Council should determine the best alternative time.

2. Agenda order: As a standard practice, reports and motions from standing committees should be first on the agenda, but the Chair and Faculty Council may change the order to respond to circumstances that require another order. A brief presidential statement at the beginning of the meeting would not be inconsistent with this motion, as long as any questions for the president or his staff were saved until later.

3. Agenda deadline: The texts of committee reports and motions must be either attached to the published agenda, or made available at the same time as the agenda is published.
4. Substitute motions: Substitute motions on committee reports should be discouraged by the Chair until the report has been fully presented.
5. Limits on speakers: We would emphasize that the cited provision of Robert's Rules would not prevent the presenter of a motion from speaking more than twice.
6. President at head table: No change.
7. President's authority: We will make no motion on this recommendation. Because this issue was specifically mentioned in the Middle States Report, we will not withdraw it, in order to have our position on the issue on the record.
8. Chair's released time: No change.
9. Secretary and Trustees: No change.

III. Handbook amendments

1. Quorum: No change.
2. Standing committees: Faculty or University committee status should be determined by the Faculty Council or such group as it delegates.
3. Strategic Planning Council: No change.
4. Faculty Council charge: No change.
5. Librarians: We will withdraw this recommendation.

IV. Basic Structural Change: We will make no motion on either model, because the advisability of either is contingent on the future performance of the governance system with the changes here proposed. But we do think it advisable for the Faculty Council (with its new charge) to begin thinking about these long-term options.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: Information is now being gathered concerning governance systems at comparable institutions. The Faculty Council or its delegate should receive this information and determine what lessons it may hold for Bucknell. The Faculty Council or its delegate should conduct a review of the charges of the present standing committees, and determine if changes should be recommended. The Faculty Council or its delegate should systematically assess the impact of the changes implemented as a result of this report, and make further recommendations concerning governance, as it finds necessary.

John Peeler

URC Report for the April, 2005 Faculty Meeting **Submitted by Gary Steiner, Chair, University Review Committee**

For at least the next several years, there will be a much larger number of URC reviews for retention, promotion, and tenure than in previous years. In fall, 2005, there will be 65 second-, fourth-, and sixth-year reviews; approximately the same number of reviews is expected in fall, 2006 and fall, 2007. In the past three years, the URC has conducted between 43 and 49 reviews each fall; the work load for these recent reviews has been extremely high for committee members, and the number of reviews in the coming years poses logistical problems that require adjustments in the URC's review procedures. In past years, all URC members have participated in all reviews; but the number of upcoming reviews makes this impossible. A particular problem is the fact that it would be impossible for the Deans to read the materials of and take active part in the review of every candidate. The URC identified and considered many options to address the difficulties that will present themselves beginning with next fall's reviews. Implementing a review cycle consisting of only third-year and sixth-year reviews, while common at other institutions, was rejected as we believe that the early and more frequent reviews provide important and valuable feedback to our untenured colleagues. The option of limiting the second-year reviews to those conducted by the DRC, with only negative recommendations coming forward to the URC for review, was considered but ultimately set aside due to concerns arising from variations in DRC review expectations and feedback to candidates. In consultation with the department chairs in the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Engineering, the URC has decided to employ the following review procedures during the 2005-2006 academic year, and will report to the faculty no later than the April 2006 faculty meeting on the efficacy of these procedures.

1. At all three levels of review (second/third-, fourth/fifth-, and sixth-year), each candidate's materials will be reviewed by a subcommittee of three URC members. Each such subcommittee will consist of two faculty members of the URC and one administrator (either a Dean or the Provost).
2. Each subcommittee will have a primary reader who presents the case to the other members of the subcommittee.
3. Each subcommittee will present its findings and recommendations to the entire URC.
4. The full review files for all cases that subcommittee members deem problematic (e.g., cases that might have a negative outcome) will be read and reviewed by all non-recused URC members.
5. The entire URC will read the short files (the materials submitted in 11 packets along with each candidate's entire review file) for every review candidate.
6. The use of course evaluation tabulation sheets, including a summary cover tabulation for all courses in a review period, has been recommended by the URC in recent years and will now be required for all candidates under review.

7. Candidates' personal statements will be subject to a maximum length of 12 pages (12-point font). In addition, DRCs are encouraged to exhibit restraint, without compromising completeness, regarding the length of their reports to the URC.

8. Faculty members of the URC will receive a one-course release in the fall of each year of service on the URC; for faculty members whose teaching requirements do not permit a course release, comparable compensation (to be determined by the Deans and Provost) will be provided.

In addition, the URC encourages DRCs to complete the review process and submit materials for second-year reviews as soon as possible after October 1.

Report from the Committee on Planning and Budget: Ben Marsh

Proposed changes in future retiree healthcare coverage.

Background

1. The Committee on Planning and Budget has been considering the future state of the university's retiree health care expenses.
2. Bucknell retiree healthcare benefits are significantly richer than those at most comparable institutions, according to a recent survey.
3. Since the early 1990's, accounting rules have required the institution to budget for future costs of retiree healthcare. We presently allocate several million dollars a year to those costs.
4. In 20 years, our total future liability is projected to rise to \$125,800,000, but it could be much higher if healthcare inflation is higher than expected. The issue is very much in the awareness of the business community because of the impact it has had on several large domestic industries.
5. The Campus Benefits Advisory Group (CBAG) examined a variety of ways to control that unlimited future liability.
6. A cap in the university's contribution to the health care benefits of future retirees was deemed the most appropriate way to respond. A cap of 200% of the 7-1-2006 value, as indexed to CPI increase, was chosen.
7. The plan will not affect anyone eligible for retirement before 7-1-2011, and probably won't affect anyone at all for some years thereafter.

An extended presentation of these points is available at:

http://www.facstaff.bucknell.edu/marsh/bu_business/retiree_hc.pdf

Motion from Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee: Geoff Schneider

The Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee (FAPC) is proposing the changes to the Faculty Handbook described in Section 1 of our report below. These proposed changes will be voted on at the September 2006 faculty meeting. The FAPC also is charging the Faculty Committee on Honorary Degrees with certain specific tasks, described in section 2 of our report below.

Section 1. The Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee moves that the faculty adopt the following changes to the Faculty Handbook section relating to Honorary Degrees.

New text is underlined, and deleted text is in ~~strickthrough~~.

3. FACULTY COMMITTEE ON HONORARY DEGREES

The Committee operates under the general principle that honorary degrees are awarded in order to recognize individuals whose work exemplifies the qualities of intellect, character, and creativity most cherished by the University. The Committee gives special consideration to those individuals whose distinguished contributions have not yet been widely or formally recognized outside their own fields and to individuals who are part of the Bucknell community.

The Committee will receive nominations for honorary degrees from all members of the Bucknell community: faculty, administration, students, and trustees. These nominations will be evaluated by the Committee in consultation with the Trustee Sub-committee on Honorary Degrees. The list of candidates agreed on by both the Committee and the Trustee Sub-committee will be submitted to the President for review. ~~The President's recommendations from this list will be submitted to~~ the Committee on Educational Policy of the Board of Trustees for its approval and recommendation to the Board. Honorary degrees, although traditionally awarded during Commencement exercises, may be presented at any time during the academic year.

Deleted: Faculty

Deleted: Faculty

Membership:

The Provost, (or Provost's designate)
Six faculty members (one elected from each of the standard groups, see II.F.6, and two elected at-large)
Two members will be elected in April of each year.

Deleted: President

Deleted: President's

The chairperson of the Committee shall be elected from its elected membership.

Section 2. Charge to the Faculty Committee on Honorary Degrees.

The process for granting honorary degrees proposed at the March 2005 faculty meeting is one which has the potential to be cooperative and collaborative between the faculty, the President, and the Trustees. We hope that this process will achieve a relationship of mutual trust between all parties with respect to this issue.

It is also important for the faculty to articulate a set of principles on the issue of honorary degrees. In that spirit, we charge the Faculty Committee on Honorary Degrees as follows:

Given that the procedures stated in the handbook require that the list of candidates forwarded to the president be "agreed on by both" the faculty and trustee committees on honorary degrees, we expect that these committees will meet to discuss the candidates and that the list that they submit will be the result of their joint deliberations. Furthermore, candidates should not be judged ineligible for an honorary degree based on characteristics such as gender, race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation or on their religious or political views.

The Faculty Committee on Honorary Degrees will report back to the faculty in September 2006 to review how well the proposed timetable and procedures work, to inform the faculty about the nature of the working relationship that this Committee has established with the Trustee Subcommittee on Honorary Degrees, and to consider further changes in the Committee's charge and in the process for granting honorary degrees.

Report from the Committee on Instruction: Rich Kozick

Preliminary report on disseminating grade statistics to faculty

Some background about this initiative may be helpful. Prior to the installation of BANNER (around 1997), the university distributed a summary of the grades given by each faculty member. The listing contained an entry for each instructor, with numerical codes in place of the instructors' names. Each instructor was able to see the grade distribution for every other instructor, except that each instructor knew only his/her own numerical code. The listing showed the percentage of A's, B's, C's, etc., given by each instructor. In addition, the grade distribution for each department was included in the listing. These grade summaries were distributed in paper-form at the conclusion of every semester. When BANNER was installed (around 1997), the Registrar's Office stopped compiling and distributing the grade summaries. The primary reason was that the Registrar's Office had more pressing priorities while rolling out BANNER, and the software that was used to produce the grade summaries was not compatible with BANNER.

The faculty has not formally asked the Registrar's Office to resume the grade summaries under BANNER. However, the Registrar's Office remains willing to disseminate grading statistics in a format defined by the faculty. CoI will continue its discussions about the format and distribution of the grade statistics this spring, with the intent of bringing a detailed motion to the faculty early in the fall. We have not concluded our discussions about that motion, but nonetheless we wished to make a report for the April meeting. Suggestions would be welcomed and should be forwarded to Rich Kozick (kozick@bucknell.edu). In view of the packed agenda for April, we do not wish to take valuable faculty meeting time in advance of our detailed proposal this fall.