



## UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

The November meetings of the University Faculty will be held on Tuesday, November 1 and Tuesday, November 15, 2005, beginning at 12:00 PM in the Langone Center Forum. Professor Martin Ligare will preside. If there are any amendments to the October 2005 minutes, please send them to Philippe Dubois, Secretary of the Faculty, in advance of the meeting.

### **AGENDA**

#### **1. Amendments to October 2005 minutes**

#### **2. Announcements and remarks by the President**

#### **3. Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty**

#### **4. New Business**

- a. Report from the Faculty Council: Martin Ligare  
- Strategic Planning (see report attached at the end of this Agenda)
- b. Report from the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure  
- Guidelines for revising DRC statements
- c. Report from the Committee on Instruction: Kevin Myers  
- Report from the Composition Council (subcommittee of CoI): Tom Solomon

#### Review of the Writing Program and Assessment of Writing

In the Spring of 2004, COI charged a faculty subcommittee of the Composition Council (itself a subcommittee of COI) with the task of reviewing faculty opinion about the Writing Program and recommending revisions to the legislation if deemed necessary. The Council was also charged by COI to develop a plan for assessing student writing at Bucknell. Last year, an electronic survey was sent to the faculty. The subcommittee of the Council has examined the results of this survey and have identified a few issues that require further discussion.

This week, the subcommittee of the Council is sending a letter with a list of questions to all of the departments. We ask each department to discuss this letter and send us your views about the issues and the possible revisions to the Writing Program legislation discussed in the letter. Alternately, meetings can be set up with members of the Council to discuss these issues in person. The subcommittee plans to review the comments obtained in response to this letter and submit to COI a list of proposed

revisions to the Writing Program legislation in February, with possible action by the faculty in March.

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

CPB has been discussing its faculty compensation recommendation to the board for next year. We began, as has been the case for several years, with the 3% increase which is assumed in the present version of the strategic financial plan. The compensation process has also been attentive to our peer group for several years, with the university's expectation being that we'd seek faculty compensation to be "in the mid-range" of our peer group. We are well below that target now. Presently we predict that (when all the numbers are available) that Bucknell faculty will be at these relative positions this year on our list of peer schools:

- Assistant Professor -- 9th / 11
- Associate Professor -- 10th / 11
- Full professor -- 8th / 11

A 3% increase would make the situation worse. The average increase for our peer group has been about 5.2% over the last 5 years, so we'd need to hit that level to expect to maintain even the present positions. A target of 7th position for each rank requires a total increase for continuing faculty in the 7.6% - 8.6% range.

The committee sees that the 3% increase in the current budget is inadequate, but also knows that the resources are not available next year to make a major improvement in our rankings. The committee intends to recommend a raise of at least 5%, and to show that the market would indicate raises upwards of 9% if resources were available.

Our discussions will continue prior to forwarding a recommendation.

**5. Announcements and remarks by members of the President's staff**

## ATTACHEMENT

### Strategic Planning --- A Report from the Faculty Council

The University Council, a body consisting of administrators, students, and faculty, and chaired by the President, "is constituted to provide advice, from a broad range of perspectives, to the President in the execution of his/her responsibilities. The Council is responsible for University planning and will seek to determine the operational or functional goals of the University, and make recommendations about what those goals should be" (Faculty Handbook, Section II.E). Last year, President Mitchell charged the University Council and the University Policy Group with the task of serving as "in-house working groups" for the strategic plan that would make recommendations to the President. It is the responsibility of the Faculty Council, as the elected faculty representatives to the University Council, to report to the faculty concerning the progress in strategic planning. This report touches on both substance and process to date, with an additional focus on the future of the planning process as we begin to develop the tactical elements of the plan.

Beginning last spring the administration has solicited input from all campus constituencies. There have been open forums, consultant-led focus groups, calls for written comments and suggestions, and discussions with departments. While faculty have had the opportunity to communicate opinions to the administration, at this point in the process faculty have not played a deliberative role. No representative faculty body has helped sift through the variety of expressed opinions, debated the advantages and disadvantages of various strategies, initiatives, and tactics, or helped to craft the language that will articulate the distinctive qualities and aspirations of our university.

Up to now the Faculty Council's role in the planning process has been as a part of the larger University Council which, as stated in President Mitchell's Strategic Planning Update of October 21, "would be the in-house working group charged with review of the strategic plan." To date, the University Council has met twice to discuss our reactions to the plan: once in July to discuss early versions of a new mission statement, and once in early September to discuss our reactions to version 1 of the draft. Although we received the draft before the rest of the campus, the version we discussed in our September meeting was identical to the version all of you received. Version 1.1 was made available on Friday, and although this is not a major reworking of the draft, many of the changes that you will notice reflect the discussion that took place during the September meeting of the University Council. The Faculty Council has not yet had the opportunity to review and discuss Version 1.1; the University Council will be meeting on Thursday November 3 to continue its discussion of the plan. We hope that open and substantial discussion among faculty, students, and administrators will lead to a consensus before the next draft is produced.

At this point in the planning process the Faculty Council expresses its strong support of the five themes outlined in Version 1 of the plan. For those of us who have chosen a life of teaching and research in an academic setting, it is heartening to see the academic core of Bucknell featured so prominently in the plan. It is particularly gratifying to see recognition that the issue of faculty workload must be addressed if the academic core is to be strengthened, and it is only when this issue is addressed that we can begin to effect the more meaningful integration of the in-class and out-of-class experiences of our students that is envisioned in the plan. We also appreciate the value that is placed on both of our traditional roles at Bucknell, that of educators and that of scholars. We are pleased that the themes of Diversity and Building Bridges highlight Bucknell's responsibilities to the communities and world beyond the physical edges of our campus.

And we know that it is only with the financial strength discussed in the plan that we can attain the goals for which we strive.

Although the Faculty Council supports the themes of the plan, as we move forward in the development of the plan it is essential that the faculty role grows significantly if the present support for the broad strategies is to translate into support for the more specific (and potentially more contentious) tactics that will complete the plan. Version 1 presents us with many big questions, questions like "What do we really mean by 'distinctive centers of excellence' and how will we be deciding which centers will really support Bucknell's long-term goals?" and "What are the principles which will be guiding the development of the tactical unit action plans, and what will the faculty role be in the development of these plans?" and "How will the competing interests of various units be reconciled?"

As we face questions like these, the continued development of a broadly supported strategic plan will require a consensus that will be harder and harder to maintain, but a broadly supported strategic plan is worth the effort. The Faculty Council believes that continued forward movement requires a process that engages us in substantive discussion, wide ranging dialog, and mutually agreed upon revisions. Only then will we achieve the consensus that will enable us to articulate our common goals in a strategic plan. Bucknell has a tradition of faculty engagement in deliberative decision making processes, and we believe it is in all of our best interests to draw on that tradition as we continue our development of a strong and coherent plan.