



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

Minutes of the Faculty Meeting April 6, 2004

[Note: Faculty meetings were not held in February or March, 2004]

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 PM

Announcements by the President

As President Rogers took the floor, Professor Payne wished him well on his upcoming retirement, which was followed by applause from the group. Associate Dean Robert Midkiff spoke to the upcoming conversion to new, randomly generated ID numbers. A website will be available with information about this process.

Turning to questions submitted for the March, 2004 meeting, President Rogers addressed his not having approved the updated *Faculty Handbook* [approved by the Faculty in October, 2003]. He said that at the time of the original question submission, we were in a search process for his successor, and so thought the approval should wait. Now that a new president has been chosen, he feels that incoming president Brian Mitchell should sign off. VP Charlie Pollock addressed a question about campus closings in bad weather. He convenes an Emergency Response Team (including representatives from Personnel, Facilities, and the Provost), which makes such decisions. Most faculty members prefer trying to hold classes to rescheduling them; all employees must exercise individual judgment about travel safety. Dean Genie Gerdes added that when classes are cancelled, numerous faculty complain because they are on campus, as are the students, and in practice, classes can rarely be rescheduled. Prof. Glyne Griffith (who unmasked himself as the questioner) asked about implications for risk management. VP Pollock acknowledged that competing aims must be satisfied and will review the wording in announcements about future weather situations.

President Rogers closed with some reflections on this being his last of many faculty meetings. He praised the Faculty for their dedication to the education of our students, mentioning that he would entrust Bucknell faculty to educate any student in the country, including any of his family members.

Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty

Professor Payne introduced the topic of a review of faculty governance, which would be a good-faith followup to the Trustee self review and was also recommended by Middle States. The Faculty Council offered a proposal to constitute an ad-hoc committee (set out in an earlier communication): *six elected faculty members, three of whom would be nominated by the current members of our five standing Faculty committees (Personnel, Development, Staff Planning, URC, and CAFT) and three nominated at large. One of the at-large positions would be for a non-tenured faculty member.* This was seconded. Discussion clarified that the nominees need not be currently on the committees. Several people suggested that the committee include

divisional representation, resulting in an amendment by Prof. Mitch Chernin to increase the at-large membership to four, one per division. This amendment was voted on and passed. The timetable includes constituting the committee in September 2004 with completion of the review by February 2005. This part of the proposal was then voted on and passed. The second part of the proposal involved the committee's charge: *The topics the committee might wish to consider include but are not limited to the following: attendance at University Faculty meetings, efficiency of the governance system, the realization of the concept and goal of shared governance, the role of the Faculty Council, willingness of faculty to stand for election to committees, the role of the President in Faculty governance, voting privileges for non-faculty members.* Prof. Ben Marsh made a motion to ask the committee to bring its own more focused charge to Faculty at its earliest convenience. This motion failed and the main motion passed.

Nominations to faculty and university committees were then offered.

Prof. Jean Shackelford rose to offer the following resolutions:

1. *The faculty wishes to thank members of the Faculty Council and others contributing to constructing reports, attending planning sessions, and meeting with the Middle States Review team. We appreciate these valuable contributions to the recent Middle States Review process.*

2. *The faculty affirms its commitment to and responsibility for shared University governance and affirms the importance of working through the University governance structure to develop policies and procedures that advance the aims of the University.*

These were both affirmed by the assembly.

Prof. Janice Mann addressed the amendment to the *Faculty Handbook* [first introduced in December, 2003] that formalizes current practice for selecting faculty representatives to general Board of Trustee meetings. After a brief discussion, the amendment passed.

Prof. Allen Schweinsberg, chair of the Personnel Committee, presented a report on the CPI issue. He said the committee favors Option A: *Continue to distribute merit increases to tenured faculty in fixed dollar amounts, provided the percent increase in the salary pool is at least 50% greater than CPI. In years when the percent increase in the salary pool fails to exceed CPI by 50%, award merit increases as percentages of salaries.* Almost no faculty received raises less than CPI this year, due to the larger pool for increases compared to last year, but this option would tend to protect the most faculty in the future. Prof. Dee Casteel moved adoption of Option A, which was passed.

Prof. Ben Marsh invited remarks on the Committee on Planning and Budget report on the cost of benefits. He said any suggestions about reducing costs will pass through the Personnel Committee. CPB is also examining the costs associated with a 5-course teaching load. A ballpark figure is \$100,000 per new faculty position per year for total compensation. Another major concern is facilities and CPB will share these numbers as plans come forward. Prof. Marsh was reminded that the committee should also consider the additional research space needed by new faculty.

Prof. Gary Steiner next presented the University Review Committee report that updates the procedures for reviews of Departmental Review Committee documents. He noted that CAFT had urged the procedure include a timetable for streamlining review of process. One editorial suggestion was made, to refer consistently to the Provost rather than VP for Academic Affairs in the URC document

The report from the Committee on Instruction was moved by Prof. Tom Cassidy, standing in for chair Prof. Ann Tlusty. The proposed policy on conflicts with observance of religious holidays came about after some students reported concerns in this area. The COI proposal is a modification of one brought by the Interreligious Council. The main message is that faculty should be mindful and try to be accommodating to students' religious obligations. One change was accepted by Prof. Cassidy, to release the religious holiday schedule at the end (not beginning) of each academic year. Further discussion concerned the role of the Associate Deans in "mediating" situations where a professor's reaction to a religious holiday situation is not satisfactory to the student. Associate Dean Robert Midkiff asserted that he and the other AD's support whatever is stated on a syllabus. Prof. Paul Susman thought the policy does not change the AD's role, but might be seen as adding another step in the discussion process, so he moved that the final sentence of the proposed policy (*The Associate Dean of the student's college can serve as an impartial mediator between faculty and student if there is difficulty in resolving a perceived conflict*) be eliminated. This amendment was seconded and passed, followed by the passage of the main motion.

The final item of discussion was the motion by Prof. Marj Kastner concerning exemptions from our final exam policy for students participating in varsity-level competitions. The proposal would allow students to reschedule finals, with the approval of the professor. Track and field is currently covered under this exemption but no other sports. A number of faculty members, joined by Dean Midkiff, had concerns that allowing exam rescheduling for one group would result in requests for exemptions for many other activities, leading to a flood of requests and difficulties upholding academic integrity in exams administered, for example, off-campus. As time was growing short, Prof. John Peeler moved that the issue be referred to COI for further consideration. After some further discussion, Prof. Dee Casteel moved the question, and it was passed.

Prof. Chernin then moved an exemption to the final exam policy be made for this year only, for any sanctioned co-curricular activity, which was seconded. He reminded the group that a faculty member can just say no to rescheduling an exam. Dean Gerdes worried that this exemption will cause other students to complain, and stated firmly that exam arrangements involving extra work for her currently understaffed office would be untenable. Other comments concerned the pressure a faculty member might feel to accede to an alternative arrangement, and the suggestion that perhaps a faculty member could be paid to travel with a team to proctor an exam. The question was then voted on and passed.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea Halpern
Secretary of the Faculty