



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

Minutes of the Faculty Meeting November 1 and 15, 2005

The meeting was called to order at 12:00PM by Professor Martin Ligare, Chair of the Faculty.

Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty

Professor Ligare announced that after he delivers a report from the Faculty Council on strategic planning, he will invite from the floor a motion to the effect that the report be considered in a Quasi Committee of the Whole. This parliamentary procedure relaxes normal rules and allows for greater freedom of discussion. No motions should be made during the time designated for our discussion. Motions can be made after we return to normal procedures. This is a chance to take advantage of time allotted by the system of split-meetings: if motions do arise in response to the Faculty Council report, a period of two weeks will help formulate well-considered motions. In a Quasi Committee, Professor Ligare will still act as Chair.

New Business

Professor Ligare reported on strategic planning for the Faculty Council (see report attached to Agenda).

Professor Tom Rich next rose to the floor and moved that *the Faculty Council report be considered in a Quasi Committee of the Whole for a time not to extend beyond 12:50 pm*. The motion was seconded, voted on and passed.

Professor Ligare highlighted two major aspects to consider when discussing strategic planning: substance (strategies, initiatives, institutional values) and process (role of Faculty, Faculty Council, University Council, governance).

Professor John Peeler offered to propose a motion prior to the next faculty meeting asking the Faculty to vote on the endorsement of the Strategic Plan by April. Professor Karl Milofsky suggested that the weaknesses (as well as the strengths) in the Plan need to be surveyed and addressed.

Professor Mitch Chernin noted that a committee of the whole would not function efficiently at the tactical phase. He recommended that an ad hoc committee for strategic planning reports to the Faculty on a regular basis. Such a committee would consider issues relating only to the academic core, and would need to be approved by the Curriculum Committee. Professor Bill Kenny added that the Curriculum Committee has been actively looking at some of these issues and is about to send its recommendation to the Office of the Provost.

Professor Ben Marsh pointed out that the Strategic Plan currently lacks explicit description of Faculty role, and suggested approving the plan only when the decision process has been clarified. Professor Ligare confirmed that the Faculty Council's role so far has been mostly a reactive part of the process. The Faculty Council was not asked to review reports from consultants. The Faculty Council was asked to respond to version 1 of the Plan but had no time to respond to version 1.1. While support to the Plan is a

given, the Faculty Council feels it is important that the Faculty has a role in fleshing out initiatives and transforming strategies into tactics.

Professor Paul Susman expressed frustration at the minimum amount of opportunities for feedback and substantive input. In order to make the process work, there needs to be a fundamental change that would allow Faculty debate and avoid one way input. Professor Ligare reminded those in attendance that the Faculty Council was charged simply to review the Strategic Plan. Then, he turned to President Brian Mitchell who confirmed that the role of the Faculty Council is indeed to provide a reaction to the document that has been produced. As the process moves forward, President Mitchell offered his commitment to continue to provide opportunities for reactions. Professor Milofsky emphasized the need to keep pushing the plan forward, and described the Faculty Council as a body that should watch over the process, especially at the tactical level.

In terms of timeline, President Mitchell explained that on Thursday morning (Nov. 3rd) he will meet to discuss version 1.1 of the draft with the University Council, that afternoon he will also meet via teleconference with the Long-Range Planning Committee of the Board of Trustees. A clean draft should be available to everybody as early as mid November. Provost Mary DeCredico added that the information received from various groups (including students) will help flesh out tactics.

Professor George Exner noted the absence of any mention of the academic core in the mission statement, and pointed to the need for an honest discussion of the tensions between the academic core and other experiences of growth in order to clearly define the kind of institution Bucknell wants to be.

To the questions concerning the relation between broad ideas and various levels of details, Provost DeCredico encouraged departments and programs to tie their tactics to the broad strategies. The ensuing discussion commented on the lack of a sense on the part of the Faculty regarding opportunities and appropriateness for broad conversation, as well as process for selecting and retaining great ideas.

Professor Ligare encouraged the conversation to continue during the next two weeks until the meeting resumes on Tuesday, November 15. The meeting was suspended at 12:52PM.

The meeting resumed at 12:00PM on Tuesday, November 15.

At this point, the meeting returned to normal operating procedure and Professor Ligare recognized Professor John Peeler, who moved *that the Faculty vote on whether to endorse the Strategic Plan in its final form (presumably in April 2006), with amendments to the document not being in order, but with the possibility to adopt specific comments when a majority finds that appropriate.* The motion was seconded. As a rationale, Professor Peeler noted that the Strategic Plan emanates from the Office of the President and is not a Faculty document; as such the Faculty has no right to amend it or authority to vote it down. The motion was voted on and passed unanimously.

Then, Professor Ben Marsh rose to the floor and presented the following motion: *The Faculty requests the Faculty Council to collect concerns about the draft strategic plan from both faculty and university committees and from individual faculty members by whatever means it sees fit, to report back a list of those concerns which it considers most important, to forward that list to the President and to the strategic planning group, and to report back to the Faculty its sense of how well those concerns were resolved prior to*

the Faculty vote on endorsing the plan. The motion was seconded. It is Professor Marsh's hope that a formalization of the Faculty Council's role as the agent of the Faculty in the University's deliberations about the draft strategic plan will strengthen an already strong document. Further discussion established that this motion concerned strategic and not tactical issues, and that the Faculty Council was in favor of the motion. The motion was voted on and carried unanimously.

Next, Professor Mitch Chernin moved that *the Faculty approve the creation of a Faculty Committee for Strategic Planning (FCSP).* The motion was seconded. Professor Chernin pointed out that this motion did not contradict Professor Marsh's previous motion since the former deals with tactical issues. He also noted that the current governance system would be respected and utilized since the FCSP would channel any initiatives through the appropriate university governance committee in order to provide perspective and tactical recommendations to the Faculty Council and the Office of the Provost. Professor Steve Stamos added that the Faculty Council and the Office of the Provost would be responsible for the composition of the committee. Also, the FCSP would strengthen the work of the Faculty Council and enhance the quality of its contribution to the overall strategic planning.

In the ensuing discussion, Professor Dee Casteel remarked that the set of charges from the proposed committee could be appropriately directed to the Faculty Council, which would then approach both strategic and tactical levels, thus avoiding the need for an additional layer within the governance system. Professor Ligare pointed out that the University Council is the body actually in charge of strategic planning. And although the Faculty Council (as part of the University Council) has been very sensitive not to overstep its charge to simply review the Strategic Plan, it would welcome the opportunity to extend its role if the Faculty would request it. Then Joel Buckman, BSG President, rose to the floor and observed that just like students are represented through the current governance system, such representation would also need to be integrated within the FCSP. Further discussion confirmed that the proposed committee would be ad hoc in nature with a separate structure not directly related to the Faculty Council. It was also pointed out that some University Committees are already working on some of these issues and that the Faculty Council could relay some of their recommendations to the University Council. Finally, the creation of an ad hoc committee of this type could be left to the discretion of the Faculty Council in consultation with the Office of the Provost if need be.

Professor Jean Shackelford then rose to the floor and spoke in favor of having the Faculty Council represent the Faculty. She proposed a substitute motion that would *empower the Faculty Council to engage in the strategic planning at the tactical level.* The substitute motion was seconded. The subsequent vote to substitute this motion to the previous motion on the floor carried. A friendly amendment was made, and the motion now would *empower the Faculty Council to engage in the strategic planning at the tactical level. As part of this, the Faculty Council can constitute an ad hoc advisory body.* The motion was voted on and carried.

Then, Professor Kevin Meyers from the Committee on Instruction introduced Professor Tom Solomon, who reported for the Composition Council (subcommittee of CoI) on the review of the Writing Program (see report attached to the agenda for this meeting). Professor Solomon encouraged all departments and programs to discuss the letter and the questions they received about the Writing Program, and send their feedback to the Composition Council.

Next on the agenda, was the report from the Committee on Planning and Budget presented by Professor Ben Marsh (see report attached to the agenda for this meeting). As the committee intends to recommend to the Board of Trustees a raise in faculty compensation of at least 5% for next year, it would be pleased to hear from the Faculty before the meeting of the Board. Professor Paul Susman pointed out that the official inflation rate was set at 5.73% by the Treasury Department.

The meeting adjourned at 12:52PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Philippe C. Dubois
Secretary of the Faculty