

If you have questions, please contact K. Sivakumar (kasg@lehigh.edu).

## **MEETING OF THE LEHIGH UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE**

Minutes of the Meeting held on **October 6, 2023, at 1:10 pm**

EWFM 520 and Via Zoom

**Do the Minutes include R&P Changes? Yes/~~No~~**  
**Do they require Board of Trustees approval – Yes/~~No~~**

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

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

### **1. Memorial Resolution for Professor Emeritus Karen Collins (College of Business)**

Professor Marietta Peytcheva presented a Memorial Resolution for Professor Emeritus Karen Collins. The Senators observed a moment of silence. They approved the motion to include the resolution in the meeting minutes. The memorial resolution is available in Appendix 2.

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

### **2. Minutes of the Prior Faculty Senate Meeting**

Professor Peter Zeitler called for any corrections to the minutes of the combined Faculty Senate and the Lehigh University Faculty meeting **of 09/01/2023**. A motion to approve the meeting minutes was made and seconded. The Senate unanimously approved the minutes.

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

### **3. Senate Chairperson's Remarks**

Professor Peter Zeitler provided an update on the following items.

- . Purchase of Academic Regalia with professional funds (Effective 28 August 2023)

- . Reconciliation of course/program approval between R&P 3.2.1 and CIM (In progress): A shortcut has been developed by the Registrar pending the completion of the reconciliation.
- . Senate Subcommittees
  - . New Senate Subcommittee – Budget and Finance – will also consider issues related to merit raises
  - . Requests for Senate members' participation in five subcommittees
  - . Each subcommittee has initial questions and should report monthly on progress; the first person in alphabetical order in each subcommittee will organize the first meeting to choose a chair. To avoid overburdening the Senate Executive Committee members, some Senate subcommittees can have a chair who is not a Senate Executive Committee member; however, a Senate Executive Committee member will be a member of the subcommittee to provide a link to the Senate Executive Committee.
- . The statement that grades are required to be submitted to the Registrar 72 hours after the final exam is not correct. The sooner, the better, but semester grades are not due until 8:30 AM on Saturday, December 23<sup>rd</sup>.

#### **4. Processing of R&P Changes**

Changes to R&P that do not require Senate action – motivated mainly by the creation of term faculty:

- a. Non-substantial Changes to R&P 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.5 – Already approved by Parliamentarian.
- b. College revisions to R&P 1.4 concerning which college faculty may vote and serve on college committees – After all colleges approve, they will be submitted directly to the Board of Trustees (BOT).

WHEN ALL CHANGES ARE READY, these R&P changes will be sent to BOT as a single set.

#### **5. Consent Calendar (Second Readings)**

Note: If approved by the Senate, changes to Section 1 require a second reading and, if approved, a vote of the university faculty (R&P 1.2.6.2).

- a. R&P 1.2.2: Size and Composition of the Senate
- b. R&P 1.2.3.1: Chairperson of the Senate

- c. R&P 1.2.6.2: Motions and Consent Calendar
- d. R&P 1.2.8.2: Faculty Petitions and Referendums
- e. R&P 1.3.1: In General (General guidance for faculty committees)

The proposals are available at

<https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/consent-calendar>

All the above items, except R&P 1.2.3.1, were deemed approved since no senator wanted to discuss the items separately.

The approved changes are given below.

#### **1.2.2 Size and Composition of Senate**

***The voting members of the Senate will be elected directly by their Colleges. These elections will be completed, and results posted no later than May 1st. Representation of each College among the elected members of the Senate will be proportional to the number of voting members of each college (rounded to the nearest whole number), such that, each college will have at least three Faculty Senators, and the number of elected Faculty Senators from any one college shall be no more than 45 percent of the total number of elected senators. Each College shall ensure that the composition of their respective Senate representatives reflect their existing divisions or structures. To accommodate routine changes in number of Faculty, the size and distribution of Senate membership may be adjusted every leap year. In the event of significant changes to the faculty composition (e.g. the creation of a new college), the size and distribution of Senate membership will be adjusted at the beginning of the first Fall semester following the change.***

#### **1.2.6.2 Motions and Consent Calendar**

***Changes in the Rules and Procedures may be proposed by a voting member of the Faculty Senate at any meeting of the Faculty Senate. Motions incorporating such changes must receive an initial reading at a Faculty Senate meeting before being put forward for a vote at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate. Motions must be made available to the faculty and Senators in writing at least seven days prior to the meeting in question and must be clearly marked as the "initial reading" or "final reading."***

***Amendments to a motion do not necessitate postponing a vote until a subsequent Faculty Senate meeting. Any or all these restrictions may be waived by a two-thirds majority of the voting members of the Faculty Senate who are present at the meeting. Motions to amend R&P that the Senate Executive***

***Committee considers routine and non-controversial shall normally be placed on the Consent Calendar for two successive Senate meetings, posted at least seven days prior to the first of these meetings. The customary rules for removing items from the Consent Calendar for open discussion at Faculty Senate meeting shall apply. If after the second Faculty Senate Meeting there have been no objections, the motion is deemed to have passed. A copy of each amendment, change, or modification of the rules adopted by the trustees or the faculty senate shall be posted on the Faculty Senate website.***

#### **1.2.8.2 Faculty Petitions and Referendums**

***Faculty have the right to bring a petition (for a topic to be discussed) or a referendum (proposing a specific change) before the Senate or a general meeting of the Faculty. Such a petition/referendum may seek to redefine the governance responsibilities of the Senate. Any referendum submitted takes the form of a resolution to be approved or rejected. The referendum should contain the exact wording of the resolution that is to be put to a vote to be approved or rejected.***

#### **1.3.1 In General (General guidance for faculty committees)**

***All standing committees must meet at least once each academic year and shall report to the Faculty Senate those activities which are of general importance and consequence. Any member of the faculty may address a written statement regarding faculty business to a faculty committee.***

A discussion took place related to the revised version of R&P 1.2.3.1. The following were the salient points made:

Senators raised several issues related to the timing of the election and its implication for faculty service time [Professors Nancy Carlisle, Eugene Han, Mayuresh Kothare, Will Lowry, and Doug Mahony], the nature of service of the chair in terms of having an independent agency or otherwise [Professor Dinissa Duvanova], eligibility for participation in the election [Professors Angela Hicks, Will Lowry, Damien Thevenin, and Peter Zeitler], who is eligible to contest for the post of Vice Chair [Professors Angela Hicks and Damien Thevenin], varying timelines for colleges completing the election for senators [Professor Doug Mahony], and the work that the incoming team must complete during summer to prepare for the coming year [Professors Doug Mahony and Peter Zeitler].

After the discussion, Professor Peter Zeitler called for a vote to approve the motion as is. The Senators approved the changes.

The Revised Wording is given below.

#### **1.2.3.1 Chairperson of the Senate**

***The Chairperson of the Senate - as the senior representative of the faculty and the leader of the faculty component of the University governance system - shall be a Tenured Associate or Full Professor and a current member of the senate. The Chairperson will serve a two-year term with the possibility of a single two-year extension in the case of extraordinary circumstances such as absence of a Vice Chairperson. The chairperson will notify the Executive Committee requesting an extension at least two weeks before the final senate meeting of the academic year. An extension for the Chairperson requires a majority vote of the Senate. Except in the extraordinary circumstances discussed below, the Vice Chairperson will be elected no later than the final senate meeting of the academic year by a majority vote of the current voting members of the Senate for a two-year term. The qualifications for the Vice-Chairperson are the same as the qualifications for the Chairperson.***

***If the Chairperson has reached the end of their term in office or the position of Chairperson is otherwise vacant, then the Vice-Chairperson will automatically become Chairperson of the Senate unless two-thirds of the Senate vote to block this automatic promotion. If the Senate votes to block this promotion or the position of Vice-Chairperson is vacant, the Senate will elect a new Chairperson and a new Vice-Chairperson by a majority vote as soon as possible.***

***If at the end of their term as Vice-Chairperson, the current Chairperson has received an extension then the Vice-Chairperson will automatically serve an additional two years as Vice-Chairperson unless two-thirds of the Senate votes to block this extension. However, if a two-year extension of the Vice-Chairperson would result in them continuously serving more than eight years in the Senate then the Senate will elect a new Vice-Chairperson by a majority vote.***

## **6. R&P Changes Requiring a Vote by the Entire Lehigh Faculty**

Professor Peter Zeitler noted that several changes in R&P would require approval by the entire Lehigh faculty, and it may be helpful to combine all items into one rather than asking faculty to vote for each change. Provost Nathan Urban noted that if the items are individually voted, based on which items are approved, some combinations of approved items may not be consistent overall. Professor K. Sivakumar suggested combining similar changes into one item for voting may be a practical solution instead of several individual changes or a single item that includes all changes.

Professor Peter Zeitler provided a list of recent R&P changes and the approval process.

- . Changes to R&P Sections 1.1, 1.2, and Section 2 require a vote of the entire faculty before being sent to the Board of Trustees (See R&P 1.2.6 and 1.2.7)

- . After the minutes of this Senate meeting are approved at the November 3 Senate Meeting, FSEC intends to send two initiatives to faculty for electronic vote.
  - i. All Section 1.1 and 1.2 changes
  - ii. Section 2 changes
- . Faculty will have the option of voting “Yes,” “No,” or “Present, but not Voting” (“Present but not voting” counting only to establish a quorum.) For electronic votes, a quorum is one-third of the total voting faculty, not including those on leave. Electronic voting is confidential. (See R&P 1.2.6.1)
- . Changes to Section 3, “Educational Requirements and Procedures”

## 7. Lehigh Strategic Plan

Provost Nathan Urban provided an update. The slides are in Appendix 3.

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

The following were the salient points made during the discussion. The points were made by Provost Nathan Urban unless otherwise indicated.

### Student Retention Issues

- There is a significant correlation between a sense of belonging felt by the students and the retention rate. Therefore, better advising can potentially address retention issues.
- There are six courses with D, F, W, and I grades totaling more than 30%. This rate is higher for first-generation students and students from underrepresented groups. Should we inform the parents about this statistic?
- Many of these courses are large classes [Provost Nathan Urban in response to Professor Eugene Han]
- College administrations should be made aware of the failure rates in these courses. [Professor Angela Hicks]
- It is important to know more about the nature of these courses (first-year courses, colleges offering these courses, etc.) [Professor Mayuresh Kothare]
- It would be good to know if the same students fail multiple courses on the list or if they only fail in one course and do well in others. That level of detail may provide more diagnostic information. [Professor K. Sivakumar]

- Enhanced tutoring, advising students about the suitable courses to take, faculty being more approachable, and communicating to students that it is normal to overcome struggles can reduce the problem. [Provost Nathan Urban in response to Professor Doug Mahony]
- Director of Coordinated Advising Emily Ford is examining the issue in more detail. The College of Business has moved more toward dedicated staff for advising, and student satisfaction with advising is higher for the College of Business. [Provost Nathan Urban]
- It will be helpful to know the practice of our peer and aspirational universities. [Professor Kristi Morin]
- The data shows that advising is not the main culprit for students not returning after the first year. [Professor Damien Thevenin]
- Although first-generation students have several issues, they often do not indicate the real reason for leaving. [Professor Lindsey Reuben]
- There is a realization that the retention issue should be handled at the human level rather than purely from a legal perspective. For example, the “Section 3” document's name has already changed.

#### “The Lehigh Commitment” Program

- “The Lehigh Commitment” program offering free tuition for students with less than 75K annual family income (and 500K in family assets) provides a level of clarity that cannot be provided when using FAFSA. 30-40 universities in the country have similar programs. The program is expected to cost about \$1M. It is hoped that this will help in fundraising. [Provost Nathan Urban]
- Implementing a similar program for graduate students should be decided by the colleges. [Provost Nathan Urban in response to Professor Kristi Morin]
- The implementation is based on the absolute dollar amount of \$75,000 family income. [Provost Nathan Urban in response to Professor K. Sivakumar’s question about international applicants whether purchase power parity is considered in deciding student eligibility]
- The program details were based on what was felt reasonable and what Lehigh could afford. \$75K is roughly equal to the median family income in the U.S. This number is in the middle range of other universities. Lehigh wanted to make a statement with this program regarding the accessibility of Lehigh education. [Provost Nathan Urban in response to Professor Peter Zeitler]

- Some 30% of the current students may benefit from this program. [Provost Nathan Urban in response to Professor Damien Thevenin]

Respectfully submitted by

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