



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

The November 2006 meetings of the University Faculty will be held on Tuesday, November 7, 2006 and, if needed, on Tuesday, November 21, 2006, 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 October 2006 minutes should be sent to Faculty Secretary Jamie Hendry prior to the meeting.

AGENDA

- 1. Amendments to and approval of October 2006 minutes**
- 2. Announcements and remarks by the President**
 - Letter to Middle States Commission on Higher Education is available on E-Reserves.
- 3. Announcements and remarks by the Chair of the Faculty**
 - Proposed motion regarding a Standing Committee on Athletics presented during the October 2006 Faculty Meeting is included in the appendix to this agenda.
- 4. Committee Reports:**
 - a. Committee on Planning and Budget**
 - Written report is included in the appendix to this agenda.
 - b. Committee on Instruction**
 - c. Committee on Complementary Activities**
 - d. Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel**
 - Written report is included in the appendix to this agenda.
 - e. Committee on Staff Planning**
 - f. Committee on Faculty Development**
 - g. Committee on Honorary Degrees**
 - h. University Review Committee**
 - i. Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure**
- 5. Unfinished business**
- 6. New business**
 - Proposed motion by Carl Milofsky regarding the athletic program is included in the appendix to this agenda.
- 7. Adjournment**

APPENDIX

FAPC Report on Faculty Merit Raises, November 2006

At the October faculty meeting, the Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee (FAPC) was charged with considering whether or not we should change merit raises from dollars to percentage terms. The concern was that we were penalizing more highly compensated faculty with low percentage salary increases because merit increases are based in dollars by rank rather than percentages. It also seemed that we were making up for low merit pay increments to full professors with higher percentage increases.

Since the adoption of the current compensation model, which targets the mid-point of the salaries of frame-of-reference institutions *by rank*, this is no longer a concern. While it is true that full professors have received high raises in recent years relative to associate professors, this was to correct years of low raises at the full professor rank relative to frame of reference schools. Now that we have reached the midpoint, there is no reason to think that high raises for full professors will continue, unless our frame of reference institutions raise full professor salaries more rapidly than those for other ranks.

In fact, with the current compensation model, the fundamental equity issue has to do with compression *within* ranks rather than *across* ranks. Because merit pay is allocated in fixed dollars by rank, newer professors within a rank will receive larger percentage increases than established professors in the same rank. So there is compression within a particular rank. This policy was the result of a conscious decision by the faculty to increase the pay of faculty more in percentage terms earlier in their careers. This is also an area where the deans make equity adjustments to limit compression within a particular rank. Thus, although there is some compression within ranks, there is now less compression between ranks than there used to be under previous compensation models.

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

CPB recommends an overall increase of 6.5% in the comprehensive fee for academic year 2007/2008 (FY 2008). It is projected that this increase will place Bucknell's comprehensive fee in the middle of the range with respect to the colleges and universities in our admissions peer group.

The Committee has begun discussions about the costs of implementing the 5-course load and will begin detailed discussions specifically about the FY 2008 budget in November.

Proposed motion by Carl Milofsky:

Many people I talk to are uneasy about the disjunction between the direction of the athletics program and the educational mission of the institution. With recent endorsements of the strategic plan by many bodies related to the University, the formation of this new Committee on Athletics provides an opportune time to address this concern.

I therefore would like to make the following motion:

In December 2007, the Committee on Athletics will report to the faculty on how well the athletic program and its strategic tactics support Strategies 1 & 2 of the Plan for Bucknell: 1) "Strengthen the academic core: Bucknell will offer an academic program that achieves the highest standard of quality across its liberal arts and professional programs," and 2) "Deepen the Residential Learning Experience: Bucknell will provide an integrated, residential learning and living experience that supports and complements the academic program." In addition to offering a general assessment, the report should include: a) specific suggestions for improving the extent to which the athletic program supports the strategic plan; b) specific information on the number of athletes receiving merit aid (scholarship assistance not related to need) by sport, including an assessment of the impact of receiving scholarship aid on students' broader educational experiences; and c) a discussion of the equality or inequality between sports in terms of coaches' compensation, facilities, and other resources, including an assessment of how that equality or inequality affects the Strategic Plan strategies listed above.