

Lehigh University

Minutes of the Faculty Meeting held on November 4, 2019, 4:30 pm
Venue: Sinclair Auditorium

1. Remarks by Professor Doug Mahony, Chair of the Lehigh Faculty Senate

Professor Doug Mahony provided an update on the activities and progress by the Faculty Senate. The remarks are available as Appendix 1.

[Appendix 1 available at <https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/meeting-minutes>]

2. Proposal to Revise Faculty Ranks at Lehigh

On behalf of the Faculty Senate Subcommittee on Faculty Affairs, Professor Frank Gunter presented some details about the proposal to revise faculty ranks at Lehigh. The set of slides used for the presentation is available as Appendix 2. Professor Frank Gunter noted that the work related to changes in R&P is significant and the Subcommittee is looking for faculty input to help the Subcommittee in implementing the revisions to the language in R&P.

[Appendix 2 available at <https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/meeting-minutes>]

The following are some of the salient points made during the ensuing discussion.

- Some 15% of the current Lehigh faculty will be affected by the proposed changes. [Professor Frank Gunter in response to a question from Professor Lucy Gans]
- Since there are wide variations in the responsibilities of POPs, responsibilities of different kinds of POPs at Lehigh should be more transparent. [Professor Lucy Gans]
- Currently, tenure track faculty and POPs are hired from the same pot of money. Contracts for research faculty doing externally funded research will not be rolling contracts but fixed-term. [Professor Frank Gunter in response to a question from Professor Anne Meltzer whether research faculty can be hired from undergraduate tuition revenue.]
- It is important to clearly define the meaning of “research faculty” because different universities use the phrase in different ways. [Professor Anne Meltzer]
- Potential concerns about potential reduction of tenure track faculty at the expense of non-tenure track faculty must be addressed. [Professor Seth Moglen]

- The main aim of the current proposal is to provide a robust structure for the current non-tenure track faculty. There is a 25% limit imposed on the proportion of non-tenure track faculty. [Professor Frank Gunter]
- Currently, 14% of the faculty are non-tenure track. The 25% number is less than that of our peers. [Professor Frank Gunter in response to Dr. Matt Gilchrist's question about the rationale for the 25% cap of non-tenure track faculty and that this limit could be interpreted as a way of avoiding the hiring of tenure-track faculty and having more faculty on contracts that the university can exercise more control over]
- The idea of rolling contract was aimed at increasing the certainty in employment for non-tenure track faculty. [Professor Frank Gunter]
- The current proportion of 15% non-tenure track faculty is very low compared to our peers; setting it 25% provides more flexibility; a higher number such as 50% will not get support from the faculty. [Professor Frank Gunter]
- This proposal is disastrous and it is a path toward mediocrity. Setting a limit of 25% will effectively mean that the majority of the 100 additional faculty hired under the Path to Prominence will likely be non-tenure track faculty. We should treat our current POPs well but without increasing class sizes and teaching loads, no additional non-tenure track faculty should be hired until their proportion goes below 10%, and that should be the permanent cap. [Professor Steve Weintraub]
- The motivation behind the change is not to increase non-tenure track faculty but to regularize the current practice in relation to POPs and to provide some job security to POPs. It is not productive to get fixated on the 25% number. There is no consensus in the subcommittee on this number. This is only a starting point. [Professor Kelly Austin]
- Currently, there is no limit on the number of POPs. Since the number of courses taught by POPs are higher, the total number of students taught by POPs is increasing at Lehigh. The current proposal puts a limit to this practice. [Professor Frank Gunter; Professor Jenna Lay concurred]
- Voting rights of POPs is an issue the subcommittee is still wrestling with. The rights will vary with the nature of responsibilities as well as the time spent at Lehigh. [Professor Frank Gunter in response to Professor Jenna Lay's question regarding the involvement of POPs in faculty governance]
- Since we need to account for other non-tenure track faculty members such as visiting faculty and adjuncts, we may already have more than 14-15% non-tenure-track or tenured faculty, but probably not as much as 25%, so we would need to discuss the 25% number and whether it needs to be adjusted downwards. [Professor Dawn Keetley]

- The proportion of non-tenure track faculty may vary across colleges that this must be considered before proceeding with the proposal. [Professor Henri Barkey]
- The issue is not unlike the distribution of tenure track lines across colleges. Should we leave this distribution to the Provost? [Professor Frank Gunter]
- If stipulations about the distribution of non-tenure track faculty across colleges and/or divisions are not imposed, then some departments, divisions, and/or colleges may be more adversely affected than others. Without such stipulations, administrators might effectively turn some departments into teaching service departments. [Professors Suzanne Edwards]
- We should engage with the University to increase the number of tenure track faculty; but different colleges will have different visions for the composition of faculty members and we must realize that. [Professor Doug Mahony]
- We should examine the effect on our undergraduate students when a large number of courses/students are taught by teaching faculty rather than research active faculty. Confusion related to 'Research Faculty' must be clarified since some of their work is related to teaching. [Professor Kate Arrington]
- Since Lehigh is known for its superior undergraduate teaching. We should not do anything that will adversely affect this reputation. Lehigh has a bias toward higher quality research than higher quality teaching. The current proposal provides a pathway for retaining good teachers who might not be interested in doing research. [Professor Frank Gunter]
- Visiting faculty should not be included in the cap because they are hired to replace faculty who are on sabbatical leave. We don't want to discourage sabbatical leave for our regular faculty. [Professor Ginny McSwain]

Professor Frank Gunter invited faculty to share their comments with the subcommittee.

3. Faculty Code of Ethics

On behalf of the Faculty Senate Subcommittee on Inclusive Community, Professor Ageliki Nicolopoulou presented some details about proposed Faculty Code of Ethics. The draft of the proposal is available as Appendix 3 and the slides are available as Appendix 4.

[Appendix 3 and Appendix 4 available at <https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/meeting-minutes>]

The following are some of the salient points made during the ensuing discussion.

- It will be useful to have some informal reporting structures that faculty can use when students talk to faculty members about the questionable behavior of other faculty members. Even when these behaviors do not rise to a serious level, faculty members may like to talk to someone so that the issue can be examined further. [Professor Jessecae Marsh]
- A preliminary draft Faculty Code of Ethics is available on the Faculty Senate website. [Professor Ageliki Nicolopoulou in response to Professor Lucy Gans]
- It is important to ensure that the code of ethics is actionable; that is, there should be consequences when someone violates the code. For example, can a serious violation lead to termination of employment? [Professor Peter Zeitler]
- Many faculty do not know about the processes currently existing. The goal of the proposed code also is to inform faculty about the resources available for handling violations to the code. The committee has not considered offences leading to termination but will consider the issue further. [Professor Ageliki Nicolopoulou]
- College of Engineering will be implementing sessions for faculty about preventing micro-aggression and similar behavior. [Professor Svetlana Tatic-Lucic]
- Mediation was a mechanism suggested; the goal is to provide adequate documentation to deal with the issue comprehensively. [Professor Ageliki Nicolopoulou]

Professor Doug Mahony noted that the development of the code of ethics is important to address consistently unacceptable behavior by a faculty member toward all, not just limited to a protected class.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted by

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Siva". The signature is written in black ink and is underlined with a single horizontal stroke.

K. Sivakumar ("Siva")
Arthur Tauck Chair and Professor of Marketing

Secretary of the Faculty