

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of the Meeting held on March 1, 2019, 1:00 pm

Venue: Wood Dining Room, Iacocca Hall

Faculty Senate Chair Professor Douglas Mahony called the meeting to order.

The roster of senators present for the meeting appears as Appendix 1.

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

1. Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of 02/01/2019

Professor Doug Mahony called for any corrections to the minutes of the Lehigh University faculty senate meeting of 02/01/2019. These had been posted at <https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/meeting-minutes>.

Motion to approve the meeting minutes was made and seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved.

2. Update from Senate Chair:

Professor Doug Mahony provided an update on several issues and there were discussions on some of the points. The salient points are given below. Unless otherwise noted, the points were made by Professor Doug Mahony.

- Alternatives are being explored to ensure that senate deliberations are clearly audible to all members of the committee and the sound quality is clear.
- Following up a meeting among the Senate Executive Committee, Provost, and VP (Finance and Administration), Mr. Mark Ironside has formed a committee to solicit feedback and develop proposals regarding the procedures for closing the campus due to snow emergencies. One suggestion being implemented in the near term is to make the snow closing time of the university coincide with the class-ending time and this will become easier starting Fall 2019 when the class timings are going to be standardized.
- College nominations committees have been alerted regarding elections to University standing committees.
- Library Users Committee and Online Learning Policy Committee will be combined into one LTS advisory committee to address the issues.

- These two committees' tasks are different; so, combining their activities into one advisory committee needs some careful thought. [Professor Al Wurth]
- The Advisory committee could have subcommittees to address different issues.
- The current chair's proposal to dissolve the Committee on Student Life will be considered in their next committee meeting.[Professor Amanda Brandone, who is currently the chair of the Committee on Student life]
- Chairs of all standing committees that report to the Senate in the Fall semester about their activities for the upcoming year and again in the Spring semester to discuss their accomplishments during the year.
- University standing committees are not made up of senators; but they are accountable and report to the Faculty Senate. Faculty Personnel Committee, Committee on Discipline, and Disciplinary Appeals Committee do not come under the purview of the Faculty Senate but directly report to the University Faculty. [Professor Doug Mahony in response to a clarification question from Professor Al Wurth]

Bermuda Institute of Ocean Sciences (BIOS)

- Provost Farrell had updated the Senate Executive Committee regarding Bermuda Institute of Ocean Sciences (BIOS). Provost Farrell would update Lehigh's Board of Trustees regarding the discussions so far and to inform them about the opportunities, challenges, and issues raised by Lehigh faculty. Faculty concerns about resources and integration of BIOS with Lehigh have been communicated to the Provost.
- Is there documentation that provides the rationale for initiating merger discussions with BIOS and the impact of BIOS on Lehigh faculty, student, research, and so on? Such documentation will be useful. [Professor Jenna Lay]
- Provost Farrell obtained feedback from faculty and chairpersons of the departments potentially affected by BIOS; but requesting an impact statement seems to be a reasonable request.
- The information flow about BIOS is uneven and it concerns the faculty. The rationale for the acquisition and how the faculty from BIOS will be integrated with Lehigh's activities are not clear to the Earth and Environmental Sciences Department faculty. This is an important issue because BIOS is potentially larger than the College of Health. [Professor Peter Zeitler]
- Per Provost Patrick Farrell's update to the BOT, BIOS is primarily a research entity. [Professor Ray Pearson]

- One question to ask as part of the request for the impact statement is the incremental benefit of the acquisition of BIOS over and above the current partnership that Lehigh already has with BIOS. [Professor Jenna Lay]

Parking:

Based on faculty feedback, the parking plan implementation is being revised. At the request of Professor Doug Mahony, Mr. Mark Ironside updated the Senate regarding some changes being made to the original proposal including guaranteeing of parking spaces on the same campus where faculty and staff work; longer open registration period; increased number of spaces for faculty and staff with physical or mental disabilities; reduced parking rates for adjuncts, wage employees, volunteers, and graduate students; extension of evening hours for parking; increase in the number of medical permit parking; and increase in the number of commuter lots. A detailed communication describing these and other changes will be sent to faculty, staff, and students in the coming few days as soon as the details are finalized.

Mr. Mark Ironside noted that the feedback during the ensuing discussion on the following issues will be considered as well in making subsequent changes: Bus timings (Professor Mellie Katakalos), ADA permits (Professor Ray Pearson), graduate students who are not funded (Professor Jenna Lay), time available for parking requests by wage employees and graduate students (Professor Jenna Lay), accommodation of new faculty [Professor Jeremy Littau], faculty members who are on sabbatical [Professor Kelly Austin], adjusting bus timings to ensure that faculty and students are able to get to their classes on time [Professor Kelly Austin], and self-supported graduate students [Professor Herman Nied].

3. Consent Calendar:

Professor Frank Gunter asked whether any faculty member desired to remove any of the Consent Calendar items for discussion on the floor. Hearing no such request, Professor Gunter declared the consent calendar items approved by faculty assent. The approved changes are available as Appendix 2.

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

4. First Readings:

Professors Doug Mahony (along with Frank Gunter assisting in providing an overview and answering questions) introduced the following motions for their first reading. Most of the changes are to ensure consistency between current practice and R&P and to clarify the language. All the items along with the rationale for the changes are given under March 1 2019 / R&P First Read in the meeting documents section of the Faculty Senate web page.

Salient points discussed are listed under each item. After making suitable changes, these items will come up for second reading. Furthermore, R&P 2.12 (Professor of Practice) and R&P 2.2.3 (Appointments) will need to be voted on by the entire faculty body if the Senate decides to move forward after the second reading.

R&P 3.12.3 Petition to Waive a Prerequisite

R&P 3.12 Petition

R&P 3.1.4 Transfer Credit

- The change includes the provision that a transferred course should have both high school students and college students in order to be given credit during the admission process. [Professor Frank Gunter]
- This will be verified based on Lehigh's prior knowledge of such courses taken by high school students along with college students, along with information gathering by Registration and Academic Services, as appropriate. [Professor Frank Gunter in response to Professor Jim Gilchrist's question about validation of the criterion related to the enrollment of high school and college students in a given course]
- One implication is that we may treat matriculated students differently than incoming students. For example, a course taken in a community college may transfer for an incoming student but may not transfer for a student matriculated at Lehigh. [Professor Frank Gunter]
- The academic department does not have a role for awarding transfer credits for incoming students. [Professor Frank Gunter in response to Professor Al Wurth]
- These changes are in response to an increasing number of transfer requests coming to the departments, and to create clarity for both matriculated Lehigh students considering taking courses at other institutions, and for incoming transfer students. [Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs Jennifer Jensen]

3.1.4.1 Credit for Lehigh Abroad Sponsored Programs

2.2.3 Appointments

The change relates to having a 3-year review for pre-tenure faculty members rather than the current two-year and four-year reviews. This change does not eliminate the annual review of pre-tenure faculty members. Salient comments made during ensuing discussion are given below.

- Annual reviews do not offer sufficient feedback in some departments; therefore, faculty prefer more frequent formal feedback (2nd and 4th year rather than 3rd year only). [Professor Peter Zeitler]
- There is nothing prohibiting a dean from offering more detailed feedback to pre-tenure faculty. [Professor Doug Mahony in response to Dr. Donna Mohr]
- The College of Engineering Dean favors 2nd and 4th year reviews. [College of Engineering Assistant Dean Donna Mohr]
- Many years ago, Lehigh used to follow the 3rd year review in place of the current 2nd and 4th year reviews. [Professor Robert Thornton]
- Faculty in the department of Theater favor the current system of 2nd and 4th year reviews due to more frequent feedback; this system also makes the job offer more attractive to incoming faculty members. [Professor Mellie Katalalos]
- The concern of pre-tenure faculty is less about the frequency of feedback but more about the need for detailed feedback and the rigor of the feedback process. [Professor Jim Gilchrist]
- If annual reviews are required per R&P, they must happen. [Professor Heibatollah Sami]
- Before the item comes for a second reading, R&P will be consulted and if needed, additional language will be added to ensure that the department chairs are following the process of annual reviews as specified in R&P. [Professor Doug Mahony]
- Detailed reviews for assistant professors in the intermediate years were not done in the past in the College of Engineering. The R&P seems to be clear about this – so, it is a question of colleges and departments implementing it. [Professor Tamás Terlaky]
- Since salary review is done by the department chair but annual reviews are done by all the tenured faculty, the differences between these two reviews must be examined and reconciled. [College of Engineering Assistant Dean Donna Mohr]
- R&P language should be clarified to make sure that annual reviews are not combined with salary review letters. [Professor Heibatollah Sami]
- Annual review letters should be part of the tenure review materials. [Professors Jim Gilchrist and Kellie Katalalos; concurred by Professor Doug Mahony]

Some of the faculty were unsure whether R&P requires annual review. After some discussion, it was concluded that R&P does require annual reviews of pre-tenure faculty

members but some departments/colleges may not be correctly implementing them. So, conducting annual reviews for all pre-tenure faculty is one of faithfully implementing the R&P.

- The proposed change to reduce the frequency of review may find support from the faculty due to a reduction in the workload; if the proposal is approved, there should be an appeals process by which a faculty member could request a more detailed performance review. Pre-tenure faculty can be given a choice in the frequency of review to make the process fair for them. [Professor Al Wurth]
- Pre-tenure faculty will not be comfortable in making the choice regarding frequency of reviews because their decision will have implications on the workload of tenured faculty members. Annual reviews should be included in the promotion and tenure paperwork. [Professor Craig Hochbein]
- Since annual reviews do not exist in the College of Engineering, the proposal will actually increase the workload in the College. [Professor Jim Gilchrist]
- Starting this academic year, RCEAS has been requiring all departments to carry out the annual review process for assistant professors as described in R&P. [College of Engineering Assistant Dean Donna Mohr]
- Since the second year reviews are done soon after the first year is completed, there is inadequate information and it usually results in a favorable review. [Professor Frank Gunter]
- The proposal moves the important 4th year review to the third year and that is really an advantage. [Professor Robert Thornton in response to Professor Jennifer Swann who wondered about the reason for Lehigh moving from a 3rd year review to the current practice of 2nd and 4th year reviews]
- Third year review paperwork will be assembled at the beginning of the third year of a pre-tenure faculty member. [Professors Jim Gilchrist and Doug Mahony in response to Professor Amanda Brandone]
- Third year review provides an additional year to apply for a tenure clock extension and therefore, increases the flexibility for the pre-tenure faculty member. [Professor Jeremy Littau]

Professor Doug Mahony noted that some minor revisions will be made before the motion comes up for a second reading at the next meeting.

3.2.1 Changes in Curricula or Courses

Professor Frank Gunter introduced the motion for a first reading. He clarified that the proposed change only applies to the university level process for course and program changes but not to college level process but he favored colleges simplifying the process as well and he would propose changes to the College of Business & Economics in his capacity as Chair of College Policy Committee. Salient points raised during the discussion are summarized below.

- For courses potentially overlapping with courses from other colleges, a college's policy committee is expected to contact the policy committees of the other colleges and there is a waiting period during which the other colleges can examine the changes for potential overlaps. [Professor Frank Gunter confirming the impression by Professor Susan Woodhouse]
- Even if a College Policy Committee errs in not coordinating with the other Colleges' Policy Committees regarding potentially overlapping courses, Ed Pol or GRC will be able to spot these overlaps during their review. It is not practical to share all course changes from a college to all other colleges due to their large number. [Professor Frank Gunter in response to Professor Tamás Terlaky who asked about safeguards for colleges starting courses that may encroach on another college]
- Once approved, CIM workflow elements can be changed to accommodate the new process. [Professor Frank Gunter in response to Professor Peter Zeitler regarding CIM issues]
- The proposed changes simplify the process beyond the college but does not affect the process or timeline in the respective colleges. [Professor Frank Gunter in response to Professor Mellie Katalalos]
- The proposed changes reduce the course approval from a 6-step process to a 3-step process and the program approval from a 6-step process to a 5-step process. [Professor Frank Gunter]
- The proposed process can stipulate that the respective college policy committees bring the changes that overlap with other colleges to the attention of the respective college policy committees as a matter of good faith. [Professors Frank Gunter and Doug Mahony in response to Professor Jeremy Littau]

2.12 Professor of Practice

Professor Doug Mahony noted that compared to peer institutions, the proportion of POPs at Lehigh (12%) is significantly lower. He added that the proposed changes have from the Faculty Personnel Committee based on the report of the Professor of Practice

Committee headed by Deputy Provost for Faculty Affairs Bob Flowers. The key changes are the description of what POPs do, giving them voting rights related to curricula and appointment and reappointment of other POPs, and designating POPs as Senior POPs after ten years of cumulative service to Lehigh. The salient points made during the ensuing discussion are given below.

- The overall percentage of POPs at Lehigh is misleading since some colleges can have a much larger proportion of POPs. [Professor Heibatollah Sami]

Professor Heibatollah Sami made a motion to amend the proposal by adding the following paragraph taken from the report of the committee of POPs:

“Professors of Practice should remain active in their profession to fulfil their responsibilities of adding instructional value to university programs, enhancing their research or professional missions of their departments, and/or permitting the university to expand its course offerings.”

The motion was seconded and a discussion followed. Here are the salient points made during the discussion.

- The proposal does not emphasize the “Practice” aspect of POPs; therefore, the proposed amendment is inconsistent with the spirit of the original motion. [Professor Frank Gunter]
- In that case, the entire description of the role of POPs should be modified to emphasize POPs bringing their professional experience to their teaching. [Professor Heibatollah Sami]
- The title “Professor of Practice” is a misnomer and does not reflect the current situation; only 6 of the 66 POPs actually represent the “practice” portion of the title. The amendment will not apply to the remaining 60 POPs so the description of POPs has to change. [Professor Kelly Austin]
- We should have a flexible title and description that applies to all departments. [Professor Jeremy Littau]
- After 10 years of teaching, their professional practical experience may not be relevant; therefore, calling them “senior” POP may not be appropriate. [Professor Herman Nied]
- Current reality may mean that we should use a title such as “Teaching Professor” rather than “Professor of Practice.” [Professor Tamás Terlaky]
- Something must be added to the description to signify that POPs should maintain currency to discharge their responsibilities. [Professor Heibatollah Sami]

- There are inconsistencies between the POP Committee Report that focused on the “Practice” aspect of POPs, the wording proposed by the Faculty Personnel Committee regarding the proposed changes as part of the motion under discussion, and the actual way in which POPs are being used. These must be reconciled. [Professor Doug Mahony]

Based on the assurance from Professor Doug Mahony that some wording will be added to ensure POPs remain current to discharge their responsibilities, Professor Heibatollah Sami withdrew his amendment. The discussion on the main motion continued.

- We should not continue without knowing answers to the following questions arising from the POP report: What are the roles of POPs at Lehigh – research, teaching, service? Do they have certifications? How many POPs fit the requirements stipulated for POPs? How effective are POPs in their teaching? How will the proposal change with the establishment of the College of Health? Are we moving toward two tiers of faculty – tenured, highly paid, and research faculty and non-tenured, low paid, teaching faculty? Do we know about the reputational effects of increasing the number of POPs? How can we stop losing good POPs due to the absence of long-term contracts? We should come up with a better, creative, and more comprehensive response rather than this piecemeal approach. [Professor Frank Gunter]
- Although the current proposal is limited in scope, it moves us in a positive direction and not adopting the proposed changes may send a wrong signal to (1) POPs that their role is not being recognized and (2) the people who worked on the proposal for a number of months. Therefore, it is better to pass something incremental and work on additional and more comprehensive changes in the future. [Professor Doug Mahony]
- What is the message we are sending to POPs whose actual responsibilities do not comply with the limited description in R&P? Should they be worried that their positions will be in jeopardy? [Professor Craig Hochbein]
- POP is a generic title and “practice” in the title is misleading. Even then, using “POP” will not cause any personnel issues. [Professor Doug Mahony]
- Now is the time to fix the title to include others such as research scientists rather than limiting ourselves to making the incremental changes proposed in the motion. [Professor Peter Zeitler]
- Approving an incremental measure for now may lead to complacency in solving the bigger issues; furthermore, including “research” in the proposed description of the role of POPs is problematic since they are not given any support for conducting research. [Professor Kelly Austin]

- Using a description to include some combination of research, teaching, and service will make the description applicable to all POPs. There is wisdom in passing this motion representing incremental steps since a lot of stakeholders were involved in developing this proposal for POPs after reconciling widely divergent views on POPs and we should respect the work of the POP committee. [Professor Susan Woodhouse]
- Giving voting rights to POPs on curricular issues and recognizing 10 years of cumulative service with a promotion to “Senior POP” are examples of the incremental steps that we should support now. However, the wording “integrative role of research, teaching, and service” sounds very similar to the description of tenure-track faculty, and we should carefully consider whether this is accurate to current practice or reflective of what we think POPs should be going forward before we approve this change. [Professor Jenna Lay]
- Voting privileges for POPs is a good incremental step to take; however, passing this small change may stop us from exploring the broad-ranging changes including developing a fuller description of the role of POPs. [Professor Jeremy Littau]
- President John Simon also indicated that it is not a good idea if the description of POPs looks similar to that of tenure track faculty members. However, if we pass this incremental change, with the work of the Senate subcommittee and after considering inputs from the two incoming deans, broader changes to the POP section of the R&P will be introduced by the Senate within a year. [Professor Doug Mahony]
- We should work on proper titles and job descriptions, and examine non tenure track faculty statistics with appropriate granularity. For example, many research universities have research professors; others have teaching professors and not professors of practice; there are program directors. These and other potential categories should be included in the definition and job description. [Professor Tamás Terlaky; Professor Doug Mahony concurred]
- There are simply too many unresolved issues with the proposal including the proportion of POPs relative to tenure track faculty and their roles and responsibilities; it is better to take the time to develop a more comprehensive proposal that will be welcomed by POPs and other faculty members. [Professor Al Wurth]
- Not acting on the proposal may be received unfavorably by the POPs. [Professor Doug Mahony]
- Based on the discussions, a revised proposal will be introduced for a second reading at the next meeting. At that time, the Senate can decide if we want to move forward. Amendments can be suggested by Faculty Senators prior to the next meeting or amendments can be made during the next meeting. If the Senate is in agreement, then the entire university faculty will vote on the proposal. A Senator can also move

to table the proposal. [Professor Doug Mahony in response to Professor Jenna Lay who asked about the senate's role in shaping the proposal]

4. New Business:

Professor Peter Zeitler introduced a motion to create a new senate committee called "Major Initiatives Standing Committee." The detailed rationale for the proposal is available as Appendix 3.

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

Professor Peter Zeitler also favored a special committee to carefully examine the proposed integration of BIOS with Lehigh. The proposed new committee will address such issues in the long term but the special committee should focus on BIOS in the short term.

In response to Professor Matt Melone, Professor Peter Zeitler noted that the proposed committee will be a Senate Committee but other faculty can be members of the proposed committee. A brief discussion followed. Here are the salient points made.

- One possibility is to have a Senate subcommittee that will focus on potential new initiatives (such as BIOS) by the university; the other option is for the Senate to nominate faculty members to committees appointed by the Provost to examine new initiatives to strengthen the faculty voice in examining new initiatives. [Professor Doug Mahony]
- When administrators ask senators to be members of a committee (e.g., focusing on research), there could be conflicts related to senate oversight. [Professor Jim Gilchrist]
- Early faculty involvement in evaluating new initiatives will help faculty learn more about such initiatives and may help in better implementation of the new initiatives. Faculty need not be against a particular initiative but may want to know more details before getting on board. [Professor Peter Zeitler]
- Such issues can be taken up by the Senate subcommittees on research or curriculum. [Professor Susan Woodhouse]
- A separate subcommittee should require the administration to provide a prospectus for new initiatives so faculty members have full information for evaluation. For example, clearly, the initiative for creation of the College of Health came from and was supported by the faculty; however, the how the BIOS situation came about is not clear. [Professor Peter Zeitler]
- Given the complexity of Senate Executive Committee operations and their work load, a separate subcommittee consisting of the broader senate membership will be

useful to examine the BIOS matter; such a subcommittee could take the lead on requesting an impact statement from the senior administration and seeking clarification on other relevant issues. [Professor Jenna Lay]

- Given that we do not have a standing subcommittee to examine BIOS, it is useful to have a special committee for this purpose. [Professor Peter Zeitler]

There was a discussion regarding Professor Peter Zeitler's motion to form a separate committee. Professor Doug Mahony noted that in the long term, there is a case for creating a separate committee under R&P to examine new initiatives. Professors Doug Mahony and Jenna Lay noted that no R&P change is needed to form a separate subcommittee of the senate to examine BIOS. After an assurance from Professor Doug Mahony that the Senate Executive Committee will come up with a way of addressing the BIOS-related issues, Professor Peter Zeitler did not press his motion to form a separate committee.

Professor Peter Zeitler noted that much groundwork has already been done regarding the BIOS matter and expressed concerns about the timeline. Professors Al Wurth and Kelly Austin also wanted further information about the timeline.

Professor Doug Mahony said that since he and Professor Kathy Iovine meet with Provost Farrell regularly, they will raise these issues related to BIOS with the Provost and get some clarifications. Professor Kathy Iovine agreed with Professor Peter Zeitler about the lack of information and noted that there is a need for an independent faculty committee to make its own assessment regarding BIOS and that the Senate Executive Committee can decide on the composition of the committee. Professor Susan Woodhouse noted that since there are communication issues relating to BIOS, faculty members who are very concerned about BIOS should be involved in the discussions and Professor Doug Mahony agreed.

Professor Doug Mahony said that he will try to get some answers to the questions related to BIOS during his next meeting with Provost Patrick Farrell and will report back to the Senate. Professor Doug Mahony also agreed with Professor Al Wurth that it may be useful to put together a faculty task force to examine BIOS.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 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