



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

Minutes of the Faculty Meeting

October 1, 2001

The meeting was called to order at 5PM by Prof. Michael Payne. He thanked faculty for their cooperation during the last few weeks of national crisis. He said he had met with the President's staff on several occasions to comment on emergency university policies, but time had been too short to call a meeting of the faculty or Faculty Council. He particularly praised the contribution of Profs. Bill Flack and Steve Knotek in informing faculty about how best to help students cope with the tragedy. He also acknowledged the passing of former University President Charlie Watts. Tributes were solicited from faculty and staff who knew him and will be distributed shortly.

Announcements by the President

President Rogers announced that the Trustee retreat had been cancelled, although a conference call will enable trustees to discuss financial issues. He echoed Prof. Payne's appreciation of faculty cooperation during the crisis, and he reported many positive comments from parents and students about faculty in general during Parents' Weekend.

Director of Admissions Mark Davies reported on the class of 2005. We saw an increase in applications to over 8000, with many students applying electronically. With a constant target for admissions, we are becoming more selective. Prof. Gary Grant asked about SAT scores. Mr. Davis replied that we require students to take the SAT or ACT but these scores do not drive final decisions. Average SAT scores recently have risen.

Prof Peter Kresl asked if Arab-American students had experienced any problems here. Deans Robert Midkiff and Rick Ferraro reported a few students had heard insensitive remarks but that these were isolated cases. Prof. Richard Chew wondered if we had been asked to turn over any information on international students to authorities. President Rogers said we had been asked but not complied.

Vice-President Charlie Pollock reported on upcoming consideration of non-need-based aid (merit aid), which we do not now give (with the exception of one scholarship). Trustee Emeritus Bob Rooke has provided funds for a scholarship for "one or more students taking courses in which securities research is a major part"; hence the impetus for discussion at the November Board of Trustees meeting. President Rogers and Vice-President Pollock support the idea of merit aid. They will recommend it be implemented on limited basis at first but want to postpone consideration of a broader plan until input can be solicited from the campus from the Vision 2010 planning process.

Prof. Grant asked how faculty would be involved in deciding on merit aid recipients; Vice-President Pollock said that has yet to be worked out. Prof. Tom Greaves asked why we need merit aid, given Bucknell's increasing selectivity. Mr. Pollock thinks of merit aid as protecting recent gains in admissions success, as well as protecting the basketball program,

as we are the only school in the Patriot League not awarding any merit aid. Mr. Rogers added we were only one of a handful of colleges in Pennsylvania not awarding merit aid.

Prof. Payne emphasized that this issue has not yet been discussed by the Board and he is confident that any policy will emerge out of the planning process. He also reminded the group that merit aid is not uniquely athletic nor would funds come out of current need-based financial aid budgets.

Prof. Ben Marsh indicated that despite his confidence in the planning process, he is concerned about an aid policy that is influenced by donor preferences. He also considered that this is a bad time to be making long-term economic commitments. Prof. Gary Sojka agreed that we need to make sure that the institution controls the whole financial aid picture. President Rogers reiterated his commitment to need-based aid, especially as the Bucknell student body seems to be increasingly drawn from more affluent families.

Turning to questions previously submitted (see October agenda for full text), Mark Davies addressed the issue of why the Assistant to the Dean of Admissions job was not benefits-eligible. He related the history of that position as being originally two part-time jobs, created in response to our recent surge in admissions applications. He is not involved in benefits decisions, but Vice-President Jo-Ann Lema referred to our previous financial plan that capped new benefited administrative positions (although 28 new positions have been added to support new buildings). Several faculty members asked if this was a fair situation for new hires. Mr. Rogers said he would like all full-time positions to be benefits-eligible, but finances may preclude this. This issue will be examined in the upcoming planning process. In response to a request by Prof. Payne, Ms. Lema said she would provide a report on this situation.

With respect to why the General Counsel position is being advertised as 2/3 to 3/4 time, Mr. Rogers said that current legal needs are best met by a part-time in-house counsel plus outsourcing specialized questions to specialized law firms. He noted that a successful candidate would have to consider Bucknell's needs as his or her top priority.

Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty

Prof. Payne will report regularly on the progress of the planning process; he had no report at this time.

Old Business

The assembly voted to take the Committee on Planning and Budget's motion off the table: *The Committee on Planning and Budget moves that its membership be expanded to include: one member of the salaried staff other than voting members of the faculty and direct reports of the president or vice-presidents, selected by vote of those eligible to serve, in an election organized by the Administrative Forum; and two members of the hourly staff selected by vote of those eligible to serve, in an election organized by the Support Staff Forum.*

Prof. Bill King, chair of CPB, spoke to the motion. CPB makes recommendations to the President on all financial matters. Some segments of the university are not represented on the committee. Although the living wage issue is not driving this motion, it was a catalyst. The motion would raise membership from 12 to 15 people. Although only 4 are faculty members, the 3 additional academic administrators (two deans and the Provost) also look out for faculty interests. Prof. Michael Moohr noted that recently, faculty salaries had risen faster

than staff salaries, and that this motion would help restore trust in the process. The motion was put to a vote and the question was carried.

Prof. Payne presented the next motion: *The Faculty Council moves that the last sentence in Personnel, Section M, read: The Faculty Hearing Committee shall consist of five tenured faculty members elected every three years, one from each of the standard groups and one at-large.* He explained that the FHC hears cases against tenured members of the faculty and an even number of members could result in a tied vote. The motion was passed.

Prof. Kim Daubman, chair of the Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee presented a report on an interim assessment of the merit system for faculty salaries (attached). A full assessment is due in three years, but for this report, FACP surveyed faculty opinion. There was a 40% return rate. She reported that a majority of the faculty understand the system, and believe we should have a merit system whose purpose is to reward performance. But large numbers of faculty also think the system has strained collegial relationships, and does not encourage them to make professional decisions in best interest of the university. Written comments from the survey will be placed on E-Reserve.

Prof. Daubman presented recommendations for some changes to the system (see report). In response to several questions, she noted that if more people get higher ratings, each rating point would have to be worth less money, to remain cost-neutral. She also agreed that one point of the recommendations is to promote the "Lake Wobegone effect", that indeed most of us are above average. As the report had only just been seen by the faculty, it was decided to postpone extended discussion and possible voting until the November faculty meeting.

New Business

Chair of the Committee on Instruction, Prof. George Exner, distributed a report of some recent COI actions (attached). Turning to Recommendation 3 first, he noted that sometimes the Board of Review on Academic Responsibility cannot be convened. Currently, in that event an Associate Dean hears the case. COI recommended the Associate Dean stay in his or her advisory role throughout the process, by substituting a senior faculty member for the adjudicator. Dean Midkiff responded to a question about records by noting that any person hearing a case would have access to the Registrar's records of previous academic dishonesty convictions

As the time had reached 6:30 PM, Prof. Payne adjourned the meeting until November, at which time Prof. Exner will conclude his report.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea Halpern
Secretary of the Faculty

Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel
October 1, 2001

After much discussion and debate, our current merit system was approved by the faculty in March of 1998. We have just completed our third year under the new system and since all tenured faculty are evaluated every three years, all tenured faculty have been reviewed once under this system. The current merit system was approved with the mandate that it would be evaluated after six years (or two cycles) by a joint subcommittee of the Faculty Council, the Faculty and Academic Personnel Committee and the Faculty Development Committee.

Although a full review of the merit system is premature at this time, sufficient faculty dissatisfaction was expressed last academic year to prompt the Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel to undertake a limited review with the goal of proposing modifications to the current system before the second cycle of reviews begins. This goal seemed appropriate in light of (1) expressed faculty dissatisfaction with the current system, (2) the fact that a motion to return to the system in place prior to the current one was defeated at the December, 2000 faculty meeting, and (3) the faculty vote to engage in a full review of the current system after 2 cycles of review.

A major piece of the current review was the survey sent to all 172 tenured and 90 tenure-track faculty last month. The purpose of this questionnaire was to systematically assess faculty opinions on aspects of the system that could be modified. We received completed surveys from 105 faculty (41% of tenured and 39% of tenure-track faculty). A table displaying faculty responses to each of the 36 statements is attached. (The number of untenured faculty responding each way is put in parentheses; the number outside of the parentheses represents tenured faculty responses.) The first page of the table displays statements on which there is substantial agreement. Substantial agreement is defined as twice as many faculty responding in one fashion (e.g., agreeing) than in the other fashion (e.g., disagreeing). (The one exception to this is statement #10, listed first. Whereas it is true that more than twice as many tenured faculty agree than disagree with this statement, once untenured faculty are added in, this ratio reduces to less than 2:1.) The second page of the table displays statements on which there is less agreement among faculty (with the one exception of statement #25 which is rendered moot by the responses to statement #22).

The data suggest that a majority of faculty (1) understands the new system, (2) believes that salary raises should be based in part on merit, and (3) believes that an appropriate purpose of merit-based salary increments is to provide rewards in proportion to accomplishments. However, (4) the majority also believes that the current system has strained relationships among colleagues, and a plurality of faculty believes that the system (5) causes faculty to make decisions that are not in the best interest of the university, and (6) does not serve to encourage faculty to consider ways to improve performance. Furthermore, the majority of faculty believes that (7) it is inappropriate for faculty to be evaluated relative to one another and a plurality believes that (8) the numerical rating system inaccurately implies poor performance of many faculty. Whereas the majority of faculty (9) does not think any of the areas (teaching, scholarship, service) should be weighted more than they currently are, a majority agrees that (10) different weightings should be used in evaluation of faculty with special roles (e.g., department chairs, program directors). Finally, (11) a plurality of faculty agrees that the current merit system needs to do a better job of indicating the value of faculty activities that are not specified in the criteria. These responses directly informed recommendations #2 and #3 below.

Recommendations for Inter-Cycle Changes to the Merit Review System

1. Change the ratings in each merit category from a 0-4 scale to a 1-5 scale with 1 being the lowest rating and 5 the highest rating in each category.
Rationale: A 1-5 scale makes it clearer that there are 5 merit ratings.
2. Remove language in merit rating definitions that refers to the relative frequency of the ratings and clarify expectations (as specified on the attached table).
Rationale: (See points #4, #5, #7, and #11 above.) The descriptions of activities expected for each merit rating may be inconsistent with the expectation that a merit rating is "rare," "unusual,"

"common," etc. Reference to frequency compels the ranking of faculty relative to each other rather than setting specific standards for each category of performance as we prefer.

3. Adjust expectations required for the merit ratings in the area of scholarship (as specified on the attached table).
Rationale: (See points #4, #5, #7 and #11 above.) The level of expectations for scholarship in order to be awarded one of the top merit categories should be consistent with the fact that faculty spend a large amount of time teaching and in teaching-related activities and are expected to participate in the governance process. The adjusted expectations should allow for more faculty to be awarded one of the top merit categories.
4. Charge the Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel to develop and propose a method for determining the weightings of each category (teaching, scholarship, and service) for faculty who have special roles (department or program chair, chair of major university committees, etc.) This method will be presented to the faculty for approval at the December meeting of the faculty.
Rationale: (See points #5 and #10 above.) Leadership within academic departments and programs and within the University governance system takes considerable time, but is essential for the good functioning of the University. Faculty who take on these leadership roles should not be penalized by the merit system.
5. Allow newly-tenured faculty who compile their files during the summer before their tenure reviews to update their files before January so that new information is not overlooked.
Rationale: For the sake of fairness, all files should include work completed in the review period up to the date the review occurs.
6. Require departments to compile tabulations and summaries of all course evaluations and student comments.
Rationale: Tabulations and summaries will reduce the amount of time the deans spend organizing student evaluation data, allowing the proportion of their time for the merit reviews to focus on the full range of submitted materials as originally expected.

Respectfully Submitted,
Kim Daubman, Committee Chair

Attachments:

1. Survey responses
2. Proposed changes to merit category definitions

Frequency of responses

**FAPC Faculty Merit System Survey 09/01
(Untenured) TENURED FACULTY
RESPONSES**

Disagree Unsure Agree

(1+2)	(3)	(4+5)		Average
(19) 15	(4) 8	(11) 48	10. I have a clear understanding of the essential differences between the old and current merit system.	3.70
(5) 18	(7) 12	(20) 40	3. Salary increments should be based on merit evaluations (within the context of the approved "Kresl motion" requiring an across-the-board component).	3.27
(4) 12	(4) 6	(27) 51	4. An appropriate purpose of merit-based salary increments is to provide rewards in proportion to accomplishments.	3.74
(5) 10	(12) 10	(16) 51	6. The current merit review system has strained relationships among colleagues.	3.99
(7) 16	(13) 18	(12) 36	33. Our merit system causes faculty to make decisions that are not in the best interest of the University.	3.53
(9) 43	(6) 14	(19) 13	32. The merit review process has encouraged me to consider ways to improve my contributions in teaching, scholarship, and service.	2.19
(15) 38	(11) 15	(8) 17	20. It is appropriate for faculty to be evaluated for merit relative to other faculty members.	2.59
(11) 13	(13) 19	(10) 38	21. The numerical rating system inaccurately implies poor performance of many faculty.	3.53
(16) 39	(9) 16	(10) 16	13. Teaching should be weighted more than it is now relative to the other categories.	2.54
(21) 43	(4) 14	(10) 14	14. Scholarship should be weighted more than it is now relative to the other categories.	2.44
(23) 34	(5) 16	(7) 20	15. Service should be weighted more than it is now relative to the other categories.	2.70
(5) 18	(4) 21	(26) 32	12. Different weightings should be used in evaluation of faculty with special roles (chairs, program directors, etc.).	3.20
(1) 14	(10) 17	(6) 25	36. The current merit system needs to do a better job of indicating the value of faculty activities that are not specified in the criteria. Specify which activities below (e.g., incorporating service learning experiences):	3.30

Frequency of responses

Disagree Unsure Agree

(1+2) (3) (4+5)

FAPC Faculty Merit System Survey 09/01
**(Untenured) TENURED FACULTY
RESPONSES**
Average

(9) 27	(6) 11	(19) 32	5. An appropriate purpose of merit-based salary increments is to motivate faculty to address goals that are priorities for the university as a whole.	2.97
(8) 36	(15) 10	(11) 25	7. The current merit system is not perfect, but it provides reasonably fair recognition and rewards for faculty accomplishment.	2.62
(18) 22	(3) 10	(13) 39	8. I have a clear understanding of how the merit system evaluation process work.	3.37
(10) 22	(13) 18	(12) 29	9. I have a clear understanding of what the merit system is intended to accomplish.	3.18
(10) 31	(10) 6	(14) 34	11. Our current weightings of teaching (5), scholarship (4) and service (2) reflect university priorities and are appropriate for most faculty.	3.00
(10) 22	(13) 18	(12) 29	16. The criteria for the ratings in the area of teaching are appropriate for my discipline.	3.06
(9) 21	(15) 21	(11) 27	17. The criteria for the ratings in the area of scholarship are appropriate for my discipline.	3.03
(6) 21	(20) 22	(9) 26	18. The criteria for the ratings in the area of service are appropriate for my discipline.	3.00
(7) 22	(9) 14	(18) 34	19. Faculty should be evaluated against fixed, objective standards, not relative to other faculty members.	3.26
(10) 32	(18) 15	(6) 23	22. Merit reviews should be conducted by a merit review committee that includes elected faculty representatives serving with the Council of Deans (Provost/VPAA + College Deans), analogous to the URC.	2.67
(2) 20	(15) 15	(16) 27	23. Election to this merit review committee should be done to enhance divisional representation (e.g., faculty within each division electing their own "representative").	3.06
(10) 24	(14) 23	(10) 19	24. Advantages of a merit review committee would outweigh concerns about the confidentiality of the merit-review process.	2.80
(15) 41	(13) 14	(6) 12	25. The role of the chair or department review committee can be bypassed if a merit review committee were established.	2.30
(12) 25	(12) 13	(10) 32	26. Our current system of 5 rating categories in teaching differentiates too finely among faculty.	3.26
(12) 27	(12) 12	(10) 31	27. Our current system of 5 rating categories in scholarship differentiates too finely among faculty.	3.19
(11) 24	(13) 13	(10) 33	28. Our current system of 5 rating categories in service differentiates too finely among faculty.	3.27
(14) 36	(8) 8	(7) 26	29. Our merit system has discouraged me from engaging in high-risk or long-term scholarly projects.	2.74
(13) 32	(7) 8	(9) 30	30. Our merit system has discouraged me from taking risks in the classroom.	2.91
(15) 28	(10) 16	(5) 26	31. Our merit system has discouraged me from participating in service activities.	2.97
(6) 19	(9) 15	(11) 35	34. In my salary letters, I find value in being provided with the composite score (in addition to the determined merit ratings for teaching, scholarship, and service), given that this score is a salary-determining number.	3.28

(6) 21	(7) 12	(15) 36	35. I find the idea of summative evaluation of my performance valuable, regardless of whether I agree with the evaluation that I received during my last merit review.	3.22
--------	--------	------------	--	------

	score	description
<u>TEACHING</u>		
outstanding	45	Evidence Documented level of extraordinary achievement in classroom effectiveness. pedagogical Pedagogical enhancement, or curricular development during review period. Rare.
superior	34	Evidence of unusual excellence in classroom effectiveness. pedagogical Pedagogical enhancement, or curricular development. Unusual.
commendable	23	Evidence of normal levels of consistent classroom effectiveness, pedagogical Pedagogical enhancement, and or curricular development. Common.
needs minor improvement	12	One or more areas of teaching performance warrant faculty member's effort to improve performance in classroom effectiveness, pedagogical enhancement, or curricular development. Unusual.
needs major improvement	01	One or more areas of teaching performance demonstrate serious deficiencies in classroom effectiveness, pedagogical enhancement, or curricular development; or longstanding deficiencies in teaching with little or no attempt at improvement. Rare.
<u>SERVICE</u>		
outstanding	45	Extraordinary record of service and leadership within University and/or departmental governance processes during review period. Rare.
superior	34	Participation in more than one major service activity or leadership in at least one University or departmental governance process. Unusual.
Normal commendable	23	Normal Engagement in University and departmental governance processes beyond that service required of all members of a department. Common.
little service	12	Infrequent engagement in University and departmental governance processes; participation in departmental activities expected of all members of department. Unusual.
minimal service	01	Little or no engagement in University and/or departmental governance processes. Does not fulfill some expectations of departmental members (attending department meetings, participating in DRC and search committees, participating in departmental functions). Rare.

Proposed Changes:**SCHOLARSHIP**

	OLD	OLD	NEW	NEW
	Score	Definition	Score	Definition
outstanding	4	Evidence of extraordinary achievement in scholarship: publication of book, major artistic show or performance, significant articles, or other exceptional scholarly accomplishment during the period of review. Rare.	5	Outstanding scholarship as evidenced by a significant contribution that may include a book, a successful grant proposal, peer-reviewed articles, performances, or exhibitions of artistic works, or other exceptional scholarly accomplishment.
superior	3	Evidence of unusual excellence in scholarship, as evidenced by peer-reviewed publication of significant articles, performances, or exhibitions of artistic works, and evidence of engagement in the external professional community (e.g., presentation of results in professional meetings, invited talks, reviews . Unusual.	4	Active scholarship as evidenced by achievement within in a peer-reviewed process. Publications or shows, or other comparable productivity.
commendable	2	Evidence of normal level of scholarly activity and engagement in a peer-reviewed process; publications; documentation of work in progress, presentations of research at professional meetings, submission of work for peer review and publication. Common.	3	Presence of a scholarly program as evidenced by some achievement within in a peer-reviewed process.
shows effort	1	Evidence of the presence of a scholarly program, without significant engagement in a peer-reviewed process during review period; few or no submissions or presentations; little progress since previous review. Unusual.	2	Presence of a scholarly program as evidenced by personal statement of research program and works in progress; no engagement in a peer-reviewed process. Little progress since previous review.
minimal effort	0	Little or no evidence of a scholarly program in progress (as evidenced by personal statement of research program and works in progress); no engagement in a peer-review process. Rare.	1	Absence of a scholarly program.

Report from the Committee on Instruction

The Committee on Instruction reports to the Faculty on three actions taken during Spring, 2001

1) CoI has approved the following change to the Catalog. The language below would be inserted at the end of the Grading System section of the Credit and Evaluation section of the Academic Regulations. In the present Catalog, it would fall on page 281.

Grade changes. Student initiated requests for changes in a final course grade must be submitted by the first day of classes of the second academic year following the year in which the course was originally taken. For example, if a course was taken in Spring 2002, the request for a grade change must come by the first day of the Fall 2003 semester. Such a time period allows for individuals to appeal grades if they have been away from campus for study abroad, leaves-of-absence, or other separations from the university.

This change is in response to two issues. First, the University wishes to avoid requests for grade changes long after the course was taken when information to determine the soundness of the request is difficult to obtain. At present, there is no limitation on the length of time that may elapse before a request for change of grade is made. Second, the change accords with a change in the length of time for which records of relatively minor infractions of the Code of Academic Responsibility will be kept (see 2 below). Since decisions by the Board of Review of Academic Responsibility may involve grade penalties, requests for change of grade must take place before records of those penalties are destroyed.

2) CoI has approved the following change in the length of time records of penalties given by the Board of Review on Academic Responsibility will be retained.

The penalties of academic suspension or a grade of "F" in the course (as assigned by the Board [of Review on Academic Responsibility]) carry an indefinite file retention period. In addition, a second offense automatically carries an indefinite file retention period. For all other offenses, information pertaining to the student's academic misconduct can be destroyed upon graduation, unless the offense is committed by a senior, in which case all information related to the case can be destroyed on the first day of classes of the second academic year following the year in which the course was originally taken (or as soon as possible thereafter).

Rationale: This change is in response to the desire to remove the record of a minor offense from the permanent record of a student. It is felt that a single such offense ought not to follow a student forever.

3) CoI approved the following change in the procedure by which the system copes with the inability to assemble a panel of Board of Review on Academic Responsibility in a timely fashion.

In the rare instances when the Board of Review on Academic Responsibility cannot be convened and a case must be heard between semesters (for example for a graduating senior or a student going abroad for the following semester), the Chair of the Board of Review or another experienced faculty member of the Board of Review to be designated by the Chair should hear the case rather than an Associate Dean.

Rationale: While Associate Deans sometimes accompany students to hearings, they do not participate in the discussions that determine responsibility/lack of responsibility and what penalties should be. They therefore lack the experience to make these determinations in a way consistent with Board precedent. Further, Associate Deans should not be placed into an adversarial relationship with students since their major role is to counsel and help students.