Lehigh Faculty Senate Bylaws

(version 1.00, approved ? ?????, 2025)

Article 1. Nature and Scope of These Bylaws **(second reading 7 March, 2025)**

These bylaws of the Lehigh Faculty Senate are supplemental to Rules and Procedures of the Faculty (R&P). A number of the senate's structures and procedures that would ordinarily be part of comprehensive bylaws are currently incorporated into Section 1 of R&P as a consequence of the faculty senate's origin. In any case where there is conflict or ambiguity, R&P serves as the guiding document.

In order to provide a more coherent picture of senate operations and to provide context for particular bylaws, this document makes reference to relevant sections of R&P governing the senate. It is important to bear in mind that while senate bylaws can be amended by a simple majority vote of the senate, particular sections of R&P require votes by various groupings of the senate, full faculty, and the Board of Trustees.

Below, "BL" is used to flag entries that are unique to these senate bylaws and can be amended by a simple majority vote of the senate.

Article 2. Senate Procedures

2.1 Rules of Order (from R&P 1.1.1) and conduct of meetings. The senate follows Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised (11th edition), as specified in R&P 1.1.1.

2.1.1. Meetings (from R&P 1.2.3.1, 1.2.3.2, 1.2.4). In each academic year the senate must hold at least eight regular business meetings per year, plus one general meeting of the faculty

2.1.2. Meeting format (BL). Senate business meetings are held in hybrid format to accommodate senators that must attend virtually. In-person attendance is strongly preferred and virtual attendance should depend on necessity, not convenience. Virtual participants bear responsibility to learn procedures for voting, commenting, on-line etiquette, and so forth. Cameras should be left on but microphones should be muted to avoid issues with feedback.

2.1.3. Asynchronous meeting component (BL). To enhance efficiency and encourage dialog, each senate business meeting will have an on-line asynchronous component for the week preceding the meeting. Document drafts for comment and editing, briefing materials related to visits to the senate, and discussion forums are posted at least one week in advance. Such postings complement the advance posting of motions required by R&P. The expectation is that at their own convenience all senators will have reviewed posted material in advance of the senate business meeting. Access to this on-line component will be limited to senators to encourage free expression, debate, and exploration of ideas.

2.1.4. Meeting attendance (from R&P 1.2.4). Senate positions can be declared vacant by the faculty-senate executive committee (FSEC) if a senator misses two consecutive meetings OR a total of three meetings across the academic year. <u>Once</u> per academic year, each senator can appoint a proxy to participate in a meeting and vote on their behalf.

2.1.4.1. Quorum. Faculty-senate business meetings require a quorum of 60% of senators to carry out any business. If a quorum is called, only discussion that requires no action can take place. It is therefore <u>extremely important</u> that senators identify proxies if they know they cannot attend a senate meeting, and if at all possible notify the chair or vice-chair if a last-minute matter arises.

2.1.5. Meeting conduct and participation (from R&P 1.2.4; BL). In discussing any one issue, in order to allow a range of views to be expressed consistent with the time available, the senate chair can limit the length or frequency of a senator or visitor's participation. In general speakers should limit themselves to a single point, and can only address an issue twice. This also applies to visitors, but before visitors are recognized by the chair, all senators must reasonably have had the opportunity to speak. These limits can be relaxed and employed by the chair at their discretion.

Non-faculty visitors should limit their comments to address clarifications or content, and should refrain from advocating for or against a position under consideration by the senate.

2.1.6. Closing of meetings (from R&P 1.2.4, BL). Senate meetings are open to attendance by Lehigh faculty, students, and staff. By a two-thirds vote the senate can choose to close a meeting and go into executive session, with only senators in attendance. Motions for closing the meeting can be made by any senator at any time. However, in the interests of efficiency and transparency in arranging the meeting agenda, it is desirable to notify FSEC of intent to close a meeting around a particular topic on the upcoming agenda. When in executive session the minutes will only note the topic of discussion and that the meeting was closed.

2.1.7. Information flow to, from, and within the senate (BL).

2.1.7.1. From faculty and campus. Members of the Lehigh community can contact the senate with questions, comments, and suggestions in several ways. They can contact any senator in person or via email; contact information for the chair and vice chair is provided on the senate web page. The senate will maintain an online suggestion box which includes the option for making an anonymous comment.

2.1.7.2. To faculty and campus. The senate will maintain a website that lists and archives where relevant information about senators, ongoing work, bylaws, R&P, the Faculty Code of Ethics, meetings, meeting documents, meeting minutes, adopted resolutions, memorial resolutions, and finally, other documents, information, and links FSEC feels useful or important to shared governance. In general access to the senate website will be open to the public but the senate reserves the option to make particular web pages or documents available only to more limited audiences. By university convention, the senate can also use email for communication to the faculty at large, but to address broader groups such as students or staff, coordination is required through the Provost's office.

2.1.7.3. Within the senate. Communications between and to senators can use all the mechanisms discussed in 2.1.7.1 and 2.1.7.2 (web sites, email, personal meetings, and suggestion box), and 2.1.3 (posted documents and forums for senators).

To suggest items for upcoming senate agendas, senators can communicate with any FSEC member, noting that in most cases FSEC meets a week or more in advance of meetings in order to post senate agendas at least seven days before senate meetings. If there are comments or concerns about particular senate meetings, it is most helpful to use the asynchronous meeting tools or other contact methods to notify the chair and vice chair in advance of the actual business meeting.

2.2 Senate voting procedures and related policies (from R&P 1.2.4; BL).

2.2.1 Voting procedures. To facilitate efficient and accurate voting given the hybrid format of senate meetings, voting will be electronic in real time. The senate chair will make arrangements that enable this for senators using computers or mobile devices. However, this requires that all senators attending the meeting must bring an electronic device compatible with the voting process. The exact details of this process may evolve consistent with changes in software, but senators must be allowed to vote "for," "against," or "present but not voting." The voting process must allow for not only votes on main agenda items but also amendments to motions, as well as matters arising from the floor, consistent with Robert's Rules. Outcomes of votes will be shared to senators attending the meeting, unless the vote is anonymous (see

next section) in which case only the vote summary will be shared and the voting process will not record names.

2.2.1.1. Anonymous voting (BL). Because the senate is a representative body, its first priority is transparency and open engagement. However, as specified by Robert's Rules, if a senator is concerned that a matter is sensitive and thinks that an anonymous vote would lead to a more accurate representation of senate (and thus faculty) views, they can make a motion for an anonymous "vote by ballot." This motion requires approval by a majority vote. If possible, to permit preparation, a proposal for an anonymous vote should be conveyed to the senate chair in advance of the meeting through the various options for communication (see 2.1.7.3, above), but prior notice is not required. If anonymous voting is approved for an issue by majority vote, all votes subsidiary to the main motion will also be conducted anonymously.

2.2.2 Decisions by voting. As stated in R&P 1.2.4, by default senate decisions are made by a majority vote, unless otherwise specified (in a number of cases) by either R&P or Robert's Rules.

2.2.2.1. Margins for approval when unspecified by R&P. In several cases R&P does not address the required margins for approval of proposed changes. This document specifies those margins as follows.

For changes to R&P sections 1.1 and 1.2, the approval process begins with a simple majority vote of the senate before the matter is passed to the general faculty for an electronic vote (reference R&P 1.2.7).

For changes to any part of R&P Section 2 or to the Faculty Code of Ethics following simple-majority approval by the senate, general faculty approval requires a simple majority vote before being passed to the Board of Trustees for approval.

2.2.3 Faculty resolutions, petitions, referendums, and appeals (from R&P 1.2.8, BL). R&P describes in detail the processes by which the general faculty may formally engage with the faculty senate in governance, or appeal senate decisions. Note that "sense of the faculty" resolutions may originate with the senate or by faculty petition.

Because R&P does not specify approval margins for "sense of the faculty" resolutions, this document applies the general policy from R&P 1.2.4 (see Section 2.2.2 above) that simply-majority votes are required for approval of such resolutions.

2.3 Other senate procedures and policies

2.3.1. Budget (from R&P 1.2.3.1, BL). In collaboration with the Provost, on an annual basis the senate chair and vice-chair are charged to negotiate support for the senate in form of an operating budget and staff support. At a minimum this support should cover course and service release or equivalent for the senate leadership, meeting space and operating costs for senate meetings and operations, but should also include a modest budget for senate outreach and activities like the faculty awards event, recruiting of new senators, and other community-building events for the campus.

2.3.1.1 Staff support (BL). As part of the support provided to the senate by the Provost's Office, a staff member should be appointed "Senate Liaison" and have senate support included in their job description, which would allow sufficient time for substantive work with the senate. The expectation is that this support goes beyond logistical support for senate meetings to include communications to and from the senate, maintenance of the senate web site and other online locations, and administrative support for the senate and its subcommittees that could include research and integrations of financial, demographic, and policy data.

2.3.2. Archiving (from R&P 1.1.4, BL). The Secretary of the Faculty serves as archivist for the senate, and coordinates with Library and Technology Services to preserve materials and provide efficient and transparent access to historical materials. At a minimum, preserved materials include all versions of R&P, the Faculty Code of Ethics, the Student Code of Conduct, senate meeting agendas, meeting minutes, senate resolutions, memorial resolutions, and faculty petitions and referenda.

To facilitate study and tracking of past and proposed changes, all changes to R&P and these bylaws must be tagged with the date of approval by the final required body. For R&P, each numbered section must be tagged with the date of approval for any change. For these by-laws, it is sufficient to append a change log to the document.

2.3.3 Memorial resolutions (BL). In cooperation with the secretary of the faculty, the senate solicits and maintains memorial resolutions to honor and acknowledge the past service of deceased faculty members. The chair solicits resolutions after learning of a death from the Provost's office, and arranges for the resolution to be read into the minutes of a senate meeting. Authors usually are department chairs or faculty who knew the individual well, individually or as groups; in general the writing of resolutions is managed by the most relevant academic departments. There is no set format for resolutions, but resolutions should if possible include an image of the person. Following long-established past practice, if possible resolutions should be accompanied with contact information for the faculty member's family, allowing the secretary of the faculty to share the resolution. Resolutions should be forwarded to the secretary of the faculty.

2.3.4 Tasty Snacks (BL). In-person attendees at senate meetings will be enticed and enchanted with an ever-evolving and even sometimes-challenging array of healthy tasty snacks. Senators participating virtually will be allowed to look but not touch. At any time during a senate meeting, any in-person senator can make a Motion for Feeding that requires only a second to go into effect.

Article 3. Policies on consultation and engagement (BL)
It is in the interest of shared governance for the senate to maintain and encourage multiple and flexible means of communication about campus issues. Experience shows that this can be a challenge and there is often confusion about how and when members of the administration, faculty and the campus community can engage with the senate. The following two lengthy sections serve as guidelines for how administrators and faculty can engage with the senate.

3.1 Guide for administrators and units heads: working with the faculty senate

Version 3.1, approved by faculty-senate vote on 4 October, 2024, with the understanding that this is a trial document that might evolve as we experiment across the year.

Introduction and context
This document provides guidance about working with the Lehigh Faculty Senate. Its intended audience is heads of administrative units and potentially faculty committees who wish to or are required to consult with the faculty as represented by the senate. We have a separate guide for individual faculty members who want to communicate or work with the senate (LINK). Please note that as much as we are describing specific procedures, *written rules about collaboration and engagement can only succeed if they are underpinned by a culture of willing cooperation and transparency.*

Consultation and collaboration are important for faculty and staff morale and the smooth operation of policies and programs across the university. As summarized in *Appendix A*, the [Rules and Procedures of the Faculty](link) (R&P) gives official guidelines on a **minimum** range of issues that **require** engagement with the faculty. *Appendix A* also includes R&P's framing of the nature of shared governance. The current document blends elements from R&P, common sense, and new procedures designed to make collaboration more effective and efficient.

Faculty senates across higher education are diverse in their procedures, but a common thread among many is some form of formal consultation process that involves clear steps and outcomes. In this guide, we use "engagement" to refer to the complete spectrum of interactions that might be involved in healthy dialog and collaboration, and "consultation" to refer to a formal process.

Engagement with the faculty through the faculty senate might take one of several overlapping forms, as follows, listed by degree of engagement.

(1) Informal communication and brainstorming with the faculty senate
We _strongly_ encourage informal communications and conversations of all types with senate leadership, the senate executive committee (FSEC), senate working groups, or individual senators. However, such ongoing engagement should be treated as informal and off the record. Valuable as it is, such communication is in no way "Consultation with the Faculty."

(2) Briefings, and campus updates and news intended for the general faculty
If it is important that all faculty be alerted to an issue or to updates to procedures or policies, the senate is **not a good outlet** for many briefings. Emails, town halls, and focused meetings with department chairs, colleges, and departments are far more effective if you wish to get your message out to larger numbers of individual faculty. Again, valuable as it is, such communication is not sufficient to be considered "Consultation with the Faculty." If you are uncertain about how to reach out to the general faculty on a particular issue, feel free to contact FSEC via the senate chair or vice-chair – it's actually advisable to let us know what you're planning so that we can stay coordinated.

(3) Explorations of new ideas with the goal of getting initial feedback from the senate. If you're interested in **initial** feedback from representatives of the faculty on a possible new initiative or a problem you hope to address, this would be the avenue to choose. FSEC can provide advice and help steer engagement. We ask that you take the following steps:

1. Contact FSEC through the senate chair or vice-chair as soon as possible. Note that the senate meets monthly, usually with a full agenda, so it will take some time to be scheduled into a meeting. FSEC sets the senate agenda and will either get you scheduled or recommend another course of action – this might just be a request to provide the senate with briefing materials, or use of some other venue.
2. Once you are scheduled, provide briefing materials 10 or more days in advance of the scheduled Faculty Senate meeting (these could be documents, slide decks, or even videos). If you can't make this deadline, your visit will be rescheduled.
3. Your visit to the senate must focus on Q&A and discussion, not presentation – your briefing documents and media will be viewed by senators in advance (keep this in mind as you prepare this material).
4. **Important**: within a week after your visit, provide a brief followup document that highlights what you heard from the senate and, if relevant, how you did or did not respond, and why. If you plan to move ahead with a plan, it would be highly valuable to note a timeline, plans for next steps, and whether you will want a formal consultation with the senate once you can provide more complete materials. This response will be posted on the senate website. In turn, the senate via FSEC will post a brief comment on the response, either verifying that all parties are on the same page or noting any disagreement with the response.

This more informal engagement process exploring an initial idea _still_ would not constitute a formal "Consultation with the Faculty."

(4) Request for Consultation (RFC): request for a formal senate (and faculty) response
For important matters that will impact large parts or all of the campus community, you should initiate a formal Request for Consultation, as we describe below. This could include both items for which faculty consultation is required by R&P (see **Appendix A**) or other issues over which an effective outcome clearly would require faculty consultation.

To clarify, reasons to initiate an RFC will vary but should be focused on matters of wide and long-term impact. RFC's would often <u>not</u> be needed if an existing governance process can handle the issue (e.g., proposal of a new academic program). On the other hand, an RFC might be valuable or necessary to address an important non-programmatic issue related, say, to adoption of a campus-wide plan or its components. Because the senate and the faculty have only limited time to manage their work, FSEC will work to manage proposed RFC's, and if FSEC feels the senate cannot respond on a reasonable time scale, it will cooperate with the requestor on an alternative plan. **Appendix B** provides some concrete examples related to engagement with the senate and when an RFC might be warranted.

Timing is critically important for an RFC to be effective. In general RFC's need to be sufficiently developed and concrete in order for the senate to be able to make an informed and timely response, but not so far developed and so invested with resources that the proposal is in effect a done deal for which input can have no impact. However, there may be cases where, in **supplement** to a standard RFC, there is merit in requesting that the senate and possibly the entire faculty consider an RFC for a final plan that leads to a binary approve/reject vote. Note that in the latter case, please view a faculty vote not as a potential obstacle but as a potentially invaluable measure of support.

Starting in AY2425, we are experimenting with a new procedure for such formal consultation. We hope this will lead to faster and better resolution of significant issues requiring formal faculty engagement, aka "Faculty Consultation." Bear with us as we fine-tune the details. Here is the proposed process for this year. Note that while we can receive an RFC at any time, parts of the process involving FSEC, the senate, and the faculty can only move forward during the academic year.

1. Contact the Senate Chair to propose a formal senate consultation, describing the matter, any time lines involved, and why the matter warrants formal consultation.
2. Within seven days, the senate chair and vice-chair will consult on whether the request is something the senate should and can handle within a reasonable time.
3. If your request goes forward, you will be asked to provide sufficient information to inform and guide a senate response – e.g. feature-complete proposals or text of proposed motions, with supporting data, a summary of any relevant research, and impact statements (funding, infrastructure, staff and faculty time needed, etc.).
4. The chair will bring your proposal and materials to the next FSEC meeting (which will usually be within two weeks) to discuss a response plan. This might include directly forwarding the RFC to the senate for consideration, delegation to a standing committee

or *ad hoc* senate subcommittee for detailed review, or consulting senators and/or faculty broadly. You might be invited to talk with FSEC or the senate about your RFC. FSEC will also set a firm timeline for a Senate response, taking into account the effort involved, whether the broader faculty need to be consulted, and whether a senate and/or faculty vote would be required.

5. The senate response will also request your formal reaction to the consultation: will senate feedback be used or not, and why; what were the outcomes of the consultation? This reaction should be provided within two weeks.
6. Depending on your reaction, the senate may write for the record a final comment on your reaction.
7. All Requests for Consultation, senate responses, reactions, and any comments to reactions will be posted on the faculty-senate website along with dates, open for viewing by all in the on-campus community (in special cases requiring confidentiality, scope of posting will be limited to just the faculty).

The goal of this process is to provide a timely, thoughtful, and documented faculty response to significant issues, and to keep decision-making as transparent as possible while keeping a focus on concrete outcomes. Because RFC's could vary in complexity, we imagine that the process will vary in length, depending on the timing of submission and its nature. Generally, we expect that well documented, concrete proposals can be acted on within about two months.

(5) Senate Request for Consultation (SRFC): request by the senate for a formal response
At times, campus issues might arise related to proposed actions by college or university administrative units for which the **senate** wishes a formal response on behalf of the faculty. Here is the proposed process.

1. A suggestion for a formal consultation external to the senate can be made by any senator (or any faculty member via a senator), by FSEC, or by the senate chair or vice-chair.
2. After approval by FSEC, all suggestions for such a consultation will be placed on the senate agenda and subject to a vote by the senate to proceed.
3. Suggestions for a formal external consultation should describe the issue, describe any desired action, remedy, or response, specify a notional timeline, and name the units or individuals to be consulted.
4. The senate chair will convey the approved SRFC to the relevant units or individuals involved, along with an expected response date.
5. If the consultation request is not approved by the senate, FSEC will consider whether the matter should be addressed by some other process.
6. The individual or groups who initiated the SRFC can draft a reaction to the response. Such reactions will be offered to the senate for approval on behalf of the faculty. Whether or not the reaction is approved, it will still be posted along with the rest of the SRFC documents.
7. The Senate Request for Consultation, responses, and any senate reactions will be posted on the senate website along with dates, open for viewing by all in the on-campus

community (in special cases requiring confidentiality, scope of posting will be limited to just the faculty).

A general word about timelines

It's important to remember that members of the Lehigh community are busy with many responsibilities. Moreover, while everyone wants to avoid unneeded bureaucracy and be agile, complex institutions do require oversight and managed compromise. In the case of the senate, it holds about eight two-hour business meetings a year, and FSEC meets about twice as often. Proposals that at some point require changes to Sections 1 and 2 of R&P require senate and all-faculty votes followed by review by Board of Trustees subcommittees and then a vote by the entire BOT, which meets only three times per year. RFCs will be sleeved into the senate workflow and generally be subject to similar time constraints. Please keep this under consideration during your planning and be patient. This also applies to program development or changes that require course and curriculum changes – while we are trying to streamline the processes involved, some degree of oversight is required and engaging the relevant parties simply takes some time.

Contacts for AY2425

Senate Chair: Prof. Peter Zeitler, EES (pkz0@lehigh.edu)
Senate Vice-Chair: Prof. Jenna Lay, English, (jdl210@lehigh.edu)
Senate liaison: Jessica Jackson, Program Manager, Provost's Office (jej221@lehigh.edu)

Faculty senate website: https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/

APPENDIX A – R&P on engagement with faculty and shared governance

Actions requiring senate involvement

Lehigh's current rules specify a number of cases where some degree of faculty engagement is **required**. Please be sure to familiarize yourself with these to avoid conflict with R&P and general university policies, and confusion that could lead to conflicts. Note that some of the required engagement might occur via elected standing committees (which coordinate with and report to the faculty senate).

Also, the [University Policy Structure](#) (UPS) addresses the role of faculty in policies. For *university policies,* the faculty are among those who should be involved, and review of proposed policies should include a vote of the faculty. For *faculty policies,* the UPS clarifies faculty roles in boh academic employment policies and the university's educational mission. Additionally the UPS welcomes sense-of-the-faculty resolutions on any campus issue. Finally, for *administrative policies* the UPS discusses the importance of representation of faculty and other groups when policies are being proposed or changed, through advisory panels and appropriate faculty

standing committees. With regard to the latter, given the need to manage service workloads, in our current interpretation the faculty senate or a subset of the senate can opt to function as an advisory panel on some policies.

Here is a non-exhaustive list of important areas where faculty involvement is mandated or addressed by R&P, as approved by the Board of Trustees.

R&P Section 1.1: shared decision-making in developing policies and programs to implement long-term university plans

R&P Section 1.1: shared decision-making in academic employment policies (much of Section 2)

R&P Section 1.1: faculty control of educational requirements and procedures (all of Section 3)

R&P 1.2.3: engagement of the senate in at least President and Provost search committees

R&P 1.2.3: consultation with FSEC about decisions to hire new Deans, and the Vice Presidents of Research, and LTS

R&P 1.2.3: consultation with FSEC about consideration of creating new senior administrative positions

R&P 1.3.1: coordination with FSEC on the creation of new temporary university committees having faculty participation

R&P 1.3.1: senate approval is required for any new permanent university committees having faculty participation

Note: for the last two items, the senate considers names such as "task force," "working group," "panel," and "advisory board'" to be equivalent to "committee." Committees expected to function for more than two years or that have no specified end date for their work are interpreted as "permanent".

While the faculty senate generally deals with issues at the university level, the senate can also engage with actions by colleges that fall within the scope of the senate as described in the above R&P sections.

Areas in which to consult the faculty

R&P 1.1 Faculty Shared Governance

Effective shared governance requires faculty to be informed and provide their opinion via consultation and shared decision-making in key areas including, but not limited to, those listed below. However, any such list is, by definition, dynamic and should evolve with changes at the University. Faculty consultation and/or shared decision-making should be sought whenever substantial choices are being considered even if the category is not listed below.

(a) <u>Consultation</u>. Areas of shared governance where the faculty seek greater consultation include: i) Long-term University planning, fundraising, and budget priorities; ii) University operation of facilities and provision of services; and iii) Research facilities and finance.

(b) <u>Shared decision-making</u>. Areas of shared governance where the faculty seek greater shared decision-making include: i) Development of policies and programs to implement long-term university plans; ii) Academic employment policies; and iii) Student conduct and campus culture development.

(c) <u>Faculty responsibility</u>. Areas of shared governance where the faculty retain responsibility encompass undergraduate and graduate educational requirements and procedures.

APPENDIX B – examples of how engagement with faculty might occur

CASE 1: Two colleges are proposing a new interdisciplinary program
Such a case can be handled by the existing course and curriculum process, with the Educational Policy Committee fielding any special questions. No RFC would be needed.

CASE 2: The provost's office has found issue and inconsistencies in R&P section 2.15, which places limits on the number of term faculty
Like many specific issues, this could be referred directly to FSEC for senate action. No RFC would be needed. The exception might be submission of a proposed change that radically changed the composition of the faculty, but generally speaking, more specific issues in which the senate has a formal role obviate the need for an RFC.

CASE 3: The leader of a strategic plan initiative wants to provide updates and gain ongoing feedback about ongoing efforts
This would not rise to the level of an RFC. FSEC should be consulted about a possible advisory committee, and in the meantime the senate could just be provided with update materials, as could the general faculty.

CASE 4: The leader of an initiative or administrative unit proposes new forms of courses and certificates that involve non-faculty instructors (current staff, outside parties).
This would likely require an RFC because faculty control academic procedures and curricula, and such a proposal would likely fall outside the normal course-and-curriculum process.

CASE 5: The university has the opportunity to purchase an independent research entity, and members of the senior administration believe it would be in Lehigh's best interest to do so.
This would require at least one and maybe two formal RFCs, following initial engagement with both FSEC and GRC, and likely involving a faculty task force to consider impacts. The first RFC would include a complete proposal with data and research exploring both the potential benefits

and drawbacks of this purchase, as well as the impact on faculty. If recommended by the senate following the first RFC, the second would represent a formal faculty vote of approval or rejection.

CASE 6: Members of the senior administration think it is in the interest of the University to move ahead on the idea of eliminating colleges at the undergraduate level and creating a unified undergraduate curriculum
This certainly would require two formal RFCs, preceded by initial informal gathering of feedback from the campus community (with which the senate can assist), and then assembling a faculty task force to consider models. The first RFC would involve development of a complete proposal with impact statements and ideally several options. The second RFC would represent a formal faculty vote of approval or rejection – depending on the details within this proposal, a second RFC might be supplanted by the normal course and curriculum process, but a change of this magnitude might also benefit from an independent vote of approval by the entire faculty.

3.2 Guide for faculty: engaging with the faculty senate

Version 1.1, approved by faculty-senate vote on 4 October, 2024, with the understanding that this is a trial document that might evolve as we experiment across the year.

This summary document describes ways you can interact with Lehigh's Faculty Senate and Lehigh's shared governance processes. This guidance blends formal elements from [Rules and Procedures of the Faculty](#) (R&P) with current senate procedures. Narrowly, the faculty senate is charged with representing only faculty, but we welcome questions and conversations with staff members about campus issues (staff members representing a unit should consult our guide about consulting with the senate). We've tried to keep this document brief – please contact us with any questions or use the [senate suggestion form](#) (also located on the [main faculty senate web page](#)).

(1) Visit the faculty senate web page
This site has information about meetings and outcomes, as well as other links to

(2) Informal communication: concerns and suggestions
Contact any senator, meet with any senator, submit to the [senate suggestion form](#), contact the chair or vice-chair (Peter Zeitler and Jenna Lay), ask questions of senators at departmental and college meetings.

(2) Participation in senate meetings
Senate meetings (in hybrid format) are open to faculty participation. We do have working rules that limit initial discussion to senators because meeting agendas are often full, but we are trying to leave some time for new business and general discussion.

(3) Changes to R&P

Changes to any part of Sections 1 & 2 (shared governance, and employment policies) require an electronic vote of the full faculty - see Sections 1.2.6 and 1.2.7. Changes to Section 3 on educational requirements and policies only require a senate vote, as do changes to the student code of conduct and any senate by-laws.

(4) General faculty resolutions, petitions, referendums, and appeals
R&P specifies a process by which general faculty can raise a petition requiring the senate to take up an issue, or a referendum requiring that a specific action be considered. See Section 1.2.8.2. Additionally, any faculty member can appeal an action voted on by the senate, as described in Section 1.2.8.3.

(5) University Standing Committees
As described in Section 1.3, there are a number of important university committees to which faculty are elected. Most though not all of these report to and coordinate with the faculty senate. Processes for managing membership of these committees as well as their mandates are described in R&P, particularly Section 1.3.1, and Section 1.3.6.

(6a) Election of senators
R&P Section 1.2.2 discusses the composition of the senate and the processes and timeline for each college electing its senators. It's important to stress that college elections must be complete and their results communicated to the senate by 1 May at the latest – this requires that the nominations and election processes be started several months in advance.

(6b) Challenges to and replacement of senators and senate leadership
R&P Section 1.2.2 includes discussion of how either the senate or colleges can vote to replace a senator. Generally actions to replace the chair or vice-chair would be taken through the senate itself (R&P 1.2.8.3).

(7) Faculty Code of Ethics (FCOE)
The FCOE is maintained by the senate and—along with the Provost's office—the senate executive committee plays a key role in managing cases of alleged infractions. The FCOE document goes to great length to establish its scope, processes for handling alleged infractions, and consequences of any infractions. Please see the FCOE to learn more and to understand your options if you are aware of and/or involved in a possible infraction. If you have general questions about the FCOE, please feel free to consult the senate chair and vice-chair, and if you want general advice about a possible case, please contact the Provost's office.

A word about time lines. Across the year, the senate chair and vice-chair and also the executive committee are charged to represent the faculty regarding time-sensitive matters that cannot wait for monthly senate meetings during the academic year, or that arise across the summer. Beyond that, please keep in mind that the senate holds about eight two-hour business meetings during the academic year, and FSEC meets about twice as often. Various rules in R&P require first and second readings of motions to amend R&P, and specify when full faculty electronic votes are needed (such votes must be open for two weeks). Section 1 and 2 R&P

changes require senate and all-faculty votes followed by review by Board of Trustees subcommittees and then a vote by the entire BOT. Because the BOT meets only three times per year, there can be a significant time lag between when the senate learns about proposals and when a change comes into effect. This also applies to program development or changes that require course and curriculum review – while we are trying to streamline the process, some degree of oversight is required and engaging the relevant parties can simply take time.

Contacts for AY2425
Senate Chair: Prof. Peter Zeitler, EES (pkz0@lehigh.edu)
Senate Vice-Chair: Prof. Jenna Lay, English and WGSS, (jdl210@lehigh.edu)
Senate liaison: Jesica Jackson, Program Manager, Provost's Office (jej221@lehigh.edu)
Faculty senate website: https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/

Appendix A. Summary of R&P sections applying directly to senate operations and structure

1.1.1 Rules of Order
1.1.2 Definition of voting faculty
1.1.3 University Parliamentarian
1.1.4 Secretary of the Faculty
1.2 Faculty Senate
1.2.1 Mission of the faculty senate
1.2.2 Size and composition of the faculty senate
1.2.3 Senate Leadership
1.2.3.1 Chairperson of the senate
1.2.3.2 Executive committee of the senate`
1.2.4 Senate meetings
1.2.5 Responsibilities of members of the faculty senate
1.2.6 Senate process for amending R&P
1.2.6.1 Electronic voting
1.2.6.2 Consent calendar
1.2.7 Amendment process (R&P and by-laws)
1.2.7 Resolution of inconsistencies
1.2.7.2 R&P is the superior document
1.2.8 Faculty resolutions, petitions, referendums, and appeals
1.2.8.1 Sense of the faculty resolutions
1.2.8.2 Faculty petitions and referendums
1.2.8.3 Faculty appeals
1.3 Faculty Committees
1.3.1 In general

APPENDIX B. Approvals required for changes to R&P, Senate Bylaws, Faculty Code of Ethics, and Student Code of Conduct

Item	Descriptor	Approval sequence
R&P 1.1	Faculty shared governance	Senate majority*, two-thirds approval by at least simple majority faculty e-vote, Board of Trustees
R&P 1.2	Faculty senate	Senate majority*, two-thirds approval by at least simple majority faculty e-vote, Board of Trustees
R&P 1.3	Faculty committees	Senate majority*, Board of Trustees
R&P 1.4	College faculties	College vote, Board of Trustees (senate notified)
R&P 1.5	Graduate studies	Senate majority*, Board of Trustees
R&P 2 (all)	Employment Practices for Academic Employees	Senate majority*, simple majority faculty e-vote, Board of Trustees
R&P 3 (all)	Educational Requirements and Procedures	Senate majority (Board of Trustees notified)
Senate bylaws		Senate majority
FCoE	Faculty Code of Ethics (2.2.11.1)	Senate majority*, simple majority faculty e-vote, Board of Trustees
SCoC (1.2.6)	Student Code of Conduct	Senate majority*, Board of Trustees

* "Advice of the administration" required before senate (and faculty) vote (R&P 1.2.6)

NOTE for this draft: Items in the table highlighted in orange are unspecified in R&P. **Absent a change to R&P, this bylaws document is the source for the required procedures**