Approved on 10/03/2025

MEETING OF THE LEHIGH UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of the Meeting held on September 5th, at 1:10 pm

UC 375 and Via Zoom

Do the Minutes include R&P Changes? Yes/~~No~~
Do they require a vote of the entire Lehigh Faculty? ~~Yes~~/No
Do they require Board of Trustees approval? – ~~Yes~~/No

The roster of senators present at the meeting is listed in Appendix 1.

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

1. Minutes of the Prior Faculty Senate Meeting

The minutes of the 05/02/2025 Senate Meeting were included in the consent calendar. The minutes were deemed approved since no request was made to discuss them separately.

The approved minutes are available at https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/meeting-minutes.

2. Updates on Senate Operations

Professor Peter Zeitler noted that the Senate Executive Committee is focused on getting things done by selecting the most critical items. He asked the senators to engage with the faculty at large and bring issues to the attention of the Senate and the Senate Executive Committee. One more university-wide faculty meeting is scheduled for February 2026.

3. R&P 3.7.1 Quizzes and Exams (1st reading)

The changes were moved and seconded. The details are available at https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/sites/facultysenate.lehigh.edu/files/DRAFT%203.7.1%20Quizzes%20and%20Examinations.docx.pdf
The following points were made during the discussion:

- There is no rule against final projects being due during the last week of classes or during exam week. [University Registrar Michael Dills-Allen]

- Professors not using the exam week for some course-related activity may be violating the 15-week rule by Middle States Accreditation. [Professor Frank Gunter]

- In some courses, final projects must be completed during the last week of classes to avoid logistical challenges. This needs to be clarified. [Professor Will Lowry]

- No rationale is provided for the change. [Professor Mike Spear]

- The purpose of this change is to provide a simple clarification on what can be done during the final week of classes. There is no attempt to address larger issues. [Registrar Michael Dills-Allen, Professor Peter Zeitler, and Professor Jenna Lay]

The revised version, along with a more detailed justification for the changes, will be available for the second reading.

4. R&P 3.1.2 Scheduling of Classes (2nd reading)

The proposal was moved and seconded. Details are available at

https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/sites/facultysenate.lehigh.edu/files/updated%20DRAFT%20REVSION%203.1.2%20Scheduling%20of%20Classes.docx.pdf

After a brief discussion, the changes were approved. The approved text is given below.

> ***3.1 Miscellaneous Provisions***
> ***3.1.2 Scheduling of Classes***
> *Undergraduate periods are normally of either fifty minutes three times per week or seventy-five minutes twice per week in duration. Seminar classes may be scheduled once per week for 150 minutes. Recitation periods are fifty minutes in duration. Laboratory periods may not be more than three hours in length without special permission of the faculty.*
>
> *Student participation in extracurricular and co-curricular activities, such as the performing arts, student organizations, community service, and athletics at the intercollegiate, club, and intramural levels, is an important element of the balanced educational experience that the University offers its students. Lehigh has a long-established tradition of scheduling classes to allow its students to participate in these activities during the late afternoon hours. For this reason the Registrar shall limit rostering undergraduate lectures, recitations, and laboratory periods between normal*

class dismissal times at or around 4 PM and until at least 7 PM to the extent that this does not impose undue constraints in achieving academic goals, securing the approval of the Deputy Provost for Undergraduate Education in making this determination.

5. R&P 3.10 Scholastic Probation (2nd reading)

The changes were moved and seconded. The details are available at

https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/sites/facultysenate.lehigh.edu/files/DRAFT%203.10%20Scholastic%20Probation.pdf

The changes were approved.

The approved text is given below.

3.10 Scholastic Probation

3.10.1 The Committee on Standing of Students uses the following guidelines to evaluate whether students are in Good Standing, on Scholastic Warning, on Scholastic Probation, or Academically Suspended.

1) A student is in Good Standing if their cumulative GPA is greater than or equal to 2.0 and they are making at least minimal progress towards their degree.
2) Undergraduate students with fewer than 19 completed credits while in residence at Lehigh can be in Good Standing, on Scholastic Warning, on Scholastic Probation, or Academically Suspended. Undergraduate students with 19 or more completed credit hours while in residence at Lehigh can be in Good Standing, on Scholastic Probation, or Academically Suspended.

3) Implications of Scholastic Warning, Scholastic Probation or Academically Suspended:

    a. Students on Scholastic Warning will meet with their advisors and the Undergraduate Associate Dean of their College to develop a detailed plan of study, consultation with course instructors, etc., intended to achieve a rapid return to Good Standing. If the student fails to develop such a plan with their Undergraduate Associate Dean within the first two weeks of the semester, they will be put on Scholastic Probation.

    b. Students on Scholastic Probation are ineligible for: (a) intercollegiate competition and other extracurricular activities in which they publicly represent the university, (b) major office (elected or appointed) in any university organization, and (c) other activities which require more time than should be diverted from primary purposes by students whose

academic survival is at risk. The Dean of Students shall monitor and enforce this ruling. (See Lehigh University Student Code of Conduct on band regulations.) Scholastic probation will be effective at the end of each semester and the second summer session. Students who, while on scholastic probation, attend either or both summer sessions will have their status reviewed at the end of the second summer session by the SOS Committee.

c. Students who are Academically Suspended may be granted reinstatement by the Committee on Standing of Students. The student will be required to present a plan of study endorsed by their Undergraduate Associate Dean and approved by the Committee on Standing of Students. If a student is granted reinstatement, they will be on Scholastic Probation until they achieve Good Standing.

4) If a student fails to meet the standards for minimal degree progress, the Committee on Standing of Students may place the student on Scholastic Probation or Academic Suspension. Note that courses with grades of W, F, or that were repeated during a later semester, do not count as completed credit hours. The standards for minimal degree progress are:

a. Complete at least 24 credit hours prior to the second year of enrollment.

b. Complete at least 48 credit hours prior to the third year of enrollment.

c. Complete at least 72 credit hours prior to the fourth year of enrollment.

5) The cumulative grade point average (GPA) is the weighted point average of all grades received in residence or at institutions specifically approved for grade transfer. The cumulative average is computed at the end of each semester and the second summer session. The term GPA (TGPA) is a student's GPA in the most recent semester or summer session. Note: for students who have completed only one semester, their TGPA=GPA.

6) Students with fewer than 19 completed credit hours while in residence at Lehigh.

TGPA greater than or equal to 2.0: Good Standing
TGPA greater than or equal to 1.7 and less than 2.0: Scholastic Warning
TGPA less than 1.7: Scholastic Probation or Academically Suspended

7) Students with 19 or more completed credit hours while in residence at Lehigh, who are making at least minimal degree progress.
   a. Students with GPA equal to or greater than 2.0

		Previous Semester Status	
		Good Standing	**Scholastic Probation**
Term GPA	1.7 ≤ TGPA	Good Standing	Good Standing
	TGPA < 1.7	Scholastic Probation	Continued Probation or Academically Suspended

b) Students with a GPA less than 2.0

		Previous Semester Status		
		Good Standing	**Scholastic Warning**	**Scholastic Probation**
Term GPA	2.0 ≤ TGPA	NA*	Scholastic Probation	Continued Probation
	1.7 ≤ TGPA < 2.0	Scholastic Probation	Scholastic Probation or Academically Suspended	Continued Probation or Academically Suspended
	TGPA < 1.7	Scholastic Probation or Academically Suspended	Academically Suspended	Academically Suspended

*This is an empty set since a student must have had a 2.0 or better in their previous semester to be in good standing. If they receive a TGPA of 2.0 or greater, they must still have a GPA of 2.0 or greater.

8) The Committee on Standing of Students will determine a student's academic status if the student's cumulative GPA fails to meet the requirements for good scholastic standing as a result of a conversion of an N, X, or Z grade on the tenth day of instruction.

9) Students who, while on scholastic probation, attend either or both summer sessions will have their status reviewed at the end of the second summer session by the Committee on Standing of Students.

10) Special Cases

a. Certain categories of students (e.g., those on financial aid, or those participating in intercollegiate athletics) will be expected to maintain whatever credit hours are required for eligibility.

b. Non-degree students with fewer than 12 credit hours attempted will not have their progress evaluated until they earn at least 7 credit hours. A

non-degree student with two or more F grades is eligible to be reviewed by and may be placed on Scholastic Warning, Scholastic Probation, or Academic Suspension at the discretion of the Committee on Standing of Students.

c. Students who, regardless of their cumulative average, have failed more than eight credits of coursework during a semester or during Summer Sessions I and II combined, may be placed on Scholastic Warning, Scholastic Probation, or Academic Suspension at the discretion of the Committee on Standing of Students.

3.10.2 Academically Suspended /Reinstatement Status

Students are removed from probation at such time as they meet the minimum standards. Refer to section on requirements for good standing, 3.10.1.

3.10.3 Academically Suspended/Reinstatement Status

1) If a student is placed on scholastic probation for the second but not consecutive term, a review by the Committee on Standing of Students will determine whether the student will continue on Scholastic Probation or be Academically Suspended.

2) If the conversion of an N, X, or Z grade on the tenth day of instruction makes the student eligible for a change in academic status, the Committee on the Standing of Students will review each individual case to determine the student's status.

3) A student may be granted the privilege of reinstatement for summer session(s) only by the Committee on Standing of Students. The student will be required to present a plan of study endorsed by their advisor and Academic Dean and approved by the Committee on Standing of Students. At the completion of the summer, the student's status will be determined through review by the Committee on Standing of Students.
4) A student may be granted reinstatement for an academic semester on probation by the Committee on Standing of Students. The student will be required to present a plan of study endorsed by their advisor and Academic Dean and approved by the Committee on Standing of Students. At the completion of the semester, the student's status will be determined through review by the Committee on Standing of Students.

3.10.3 Living Group Probation

Any organized living group which in any one semester fails to attain for that semester an average of 2.00 or better is placed on social probation for the next succeeding regular semester, and thereafter until it attains a semester average of 2.00 or better. A living group on social probation shall not be allowed to hold any social affairs during the period of its probation.

6. Senate working groups: updates and expectations

Professor Peter Zeitler noted the following: (1) the expectation is that every senator is part of at least one working group; (2) the working groups will undertake well-defined issues that can be completed during the academic year; (3) some working groups can incorporate faculty other than Senators.

7. Update on Benefits Review working group

Professors Subhrajit Bhattacharya and Angela Hicks provided an update. The slides used by them are available in Appendix 2.

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

During the follow-up discussion, the Senators raised questions about (1) whether the intention is to cut some benefits or addressing faculty skepticism about grandfathering the benefits for all current faculty members [Professors Angela Hicks and Frank Gunter], (2) the need for explaining the reason for the review including comparing with peer institutions [Professors Beibei Dong and Angela Hicks], (3) the need to consider prior review reports [Professor Chengshan Xiao] and (4) the need for benefit changes to be less abrupt [Professor Al Wurth]. Regarding Professor Will Lowry's question about medical benefits review, Professor Subhrajit Bhattacharya noted that it is not the charge of the current working group. Provost Nathan Urban stated that minor tweaks are made to health benefits annually, and a significant review is expected within the next two years.

8. Updated Policy on Responsible Conduct of Research

Director of Research Policy and Compliance Naomi Coll provided an update. The slides are available at

https://coursesite.lehigh.edu/course/section.php?id=6243273

In response to faculty questions, Director of Research Policy and Compliance Naomi Coll clarified that (1) departments should decide who needs to complete the training [in response to

Professor Chengshan Xiao], (2) this training is only for current Lehigh personnel involved in sponsored research activities [in response to Professors Jenna Lay and Mike Spear], (3) VPR internally tracks faculty inputs including consultation with the Senate [in response to Professor Peter Zeitler], and (4) suggestions related to the larger research environment at Lehigh should originate from the faculty [in response to Professor Mike Spear]

9. Chicago Principles: Preamble and Adoption Process

Vice President for Communications and Public Affairs Brett Ludwig and General Counsel Matt Lahey provided an update. They were joined by Professor Vassie Ware and Associate Director of Development and Alumni Relations Kyle Brett.

The associated documents are available at

https://coursesite.lehigh.edu/course/section.php?id=6243273

Vice President Brett Ludwig noted that the goal is to create a succinct document for adoption by Lehigh. In response to comments from Professors Frank Gunter and Jenna Lay that the last sentence of the preamble contradicts the Lehigh R&P and Chicago Principles respectively, Vice President Brett Ludwig clarified that the sentence articulates appropriate limitations and boundaries that are already outlined in the Chicago Principles. He also noted that further consultation will be taking place with the Undergraduate and Graduate Student Senates.

Other salient points made include addressing the relationship with R&P and whether R&P takes precedence [Professors Anders Knospe, Mike Spear, and Peter Zeitler], clarifying why the word "alumni" appears in the preamble while not being included in R&P [Professor Mike Spear], clearly defining the meaning of the university community and who is included in the community [Professor Mike Spear], and clearly stating that the Chicago Principles are being adopted by Lehigh [Professor Angela Hicks].

General Counsel Matt Lahey stated that no hierarchies are envisaged between different documents. Provost Nathan Urban noted that the Chicago Statement is a moral force, not a policy force; we can change our policies and ensure that our R&P changes are consistent with the Chicago Principles. General Counsel Matt Lahey concurred with Professor Jenna Lay's suggestion that Provost Nathan Urban's point should be reflected in the preamble.

In response to Professor Haiyan Jia's question about the power of the Chicago Principles, Vice President Brett Ludwig noted that adopting the Chicago Principles is a symbolic and public stand that can guide our actions. General Counsel Matt Lahey concurred, stating that adopting the Chicago Principles can be more powerful than a policy statement because people can point to this in evaluating our actions. Professor Vassie Ware noted that the committee struggled with the language of the preamble without making it too long. Associate Director of

Development and Alumni Relations Kyle Brett pointed out that staff are generally not included in policy documents, but the Chicago Statement also empowers staff.

Vice President Brett Ludwig asked faculty senators to share their comments and feedback on the proposal for the committee's consideration.

Respectfully submitted by

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