

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

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

Venue: University Center 308

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 12/07/2018

Professor Doug Mahony called for any corrections to the minutes of the Lehigh University faculty senate meeting of 12/07/2018. 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. The slides used by him are available as Appendix 2.

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

The salient points are given below. Unless otherwise noted, the points were made by Professor Doug Mahony.

- Senate meetings dates have been finalized for the next three academic years. The meetings will occur on the first Friday of every month the University is in session for the Fall and Spring semesters. The schedule is available on the Faculty Senate website.
- Senate meeting organization rules were discussed: (1) Attendees should be recognized by the chair before they speak; elected senators will be given priority to speak before ex officio members and others present at the meeting; the senate chair will set time limits for discussion of topics; each senator is limited to two opportunities to speak until all the other senators have an opportunity to contribute (Professor Jenna Lay's suggestion of allowing senators to yield their own opportunity to speak to other senators will be examined in consultation with the parliamentarian);

new items for discussion would be taken up only after all the scheduled agenda items are discussed

- Senate Executive Committee is charged with the task of representing the Faculty Senate and the faculty; it is also charged with finalizing the agenda for the Senate meetings; as and when issues are brought before the Senate Executive Committee by faculty, staff, or students, it would decide if the issue should be brought up at the Senate Meetings, resolved by other means, or not take any action at all and explain the rationale to the concerned parties; there is a provision for faculty members to bring something directly to the University faculty meeting by getting the requisite number of signatures (10% of the total faculty strength) to override the Senate action; the schedule of Senate Executive Committee meetings and the meeting notes (with redactions as needed) will be available on the senate website. [In response to the points raised by Professors Heibatollah Sami, Al Wurth, and Peter Zeitler; Professor Zeiter further noted that to serve as a representative of the faculty, we need to know what the Executive Committee is doing, and be able to discuss decisions and actions they have taken. There is a Senate focus on efficiency, which is good, but in the limit, governance can appear to the general faculty to be channeled too much into this small group. Also in the process outlined above, it's not clear how Senators can formally place an item on the agenda – what if a Senator wants to discuss an item, but the Executive Committee decides not to address it?]
- Regarding parking, Mr. Mark Ironside and Facilities Services are working on making some revisions to the plan in response to faculty and staff concerns and the changes are likely to be announced in late February, 2019.
- Snow emergency policies followed by Lehigh are not clear and there seems to be problems in implementation. An upcoming Senate Executive Committee meeting will be devoted to discussing this issue with the administration.
- Recent issues brought to the Senate Executive Committee regarding CAS dean search were discussed with the senior administration. The Committee concluded the problems in the process did not prevent the committee from making its recommendation. Professor Jenna Lay noted that it is important to record what actions will be taken to prevent such problems from occurring in the future. Professor Doug Mahony noted that the senior administration is aware of the issues and formation of future search committees will be suitably modified in consultation with the Faculty Senate.
- Dr. Henry Odi and Dr. Greg Reihman are working to ensure that inclusion and diversity are integrated into the class room. Professor Mahony noted that faculty should work toward building awareness of the need for inclusion and diversity and ultimately incorporating this as a formal part of performance appraisal of faculty. Programs initiated by HR are limited to staff.
- The Senate is working to simplify the approval process for course changes and

program changes while at the same time recognizing inter-collegiate issues. Professor Mahony requested the senators to discuss with departments and programs so the changes can be discussed in an upcoming meeting.

- The goal is to make the college policy committee to examine the issues in detail and to avoid delays caused by infrequency occurrence of college faculty meetings.
- While most cases can be handled by the simplified process, it is worth considering college level or full senate approvals for controversial changes that overlap different departments and colleges. [Professor Jenna Lay; Professors Mark Bickhard, Craig Hochbein, Jeremy Littau, Susan Woodhouse, and Al Wurth also pointed out issues related to cross-departmental and cross-college courses and programs; Professor Peter Zeitler asked why the streamlined process eliminates the Colleges, but retains several levels of extra-College bodies – if it's truly a College-level change, why not stop with the College after vetting by the Senate course subcommittee, or alternatively, Ed Pol.]
- Respective college policy committees and the Educational Policy Committee and Graduate and Research Committee together should address any intercollegiate issues. The principle is that we should trust the respective college policy committees to do the right thing and alert other colleges of potential overlaps. Ed Pol and GRC will also be able to examine inter-collegiate issues related to course and program changes.

R&P Changes related to POPs and Pre-Tenure Faculty

- Proposed changes to the R&P language regarding POPs (Appendix 3) and the review process for pre-tenure faculty (Appendix 4) were not being introduced as formal motions. These proposed changes would be made available to all faculty members to enable detailed discussion. Thus, when the motions are actually brought forth for formal discussion in the Senate, they can incorporate faculty feedback.

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

- The proposed change in pre-tenured faculty review process will continue to include the annual review process. The proposed streamlining will help the faculty members and also will reduce the needless burden felt by the Provost's office [in response to questions from Professors Heibatollah Sami and Luis Zuluaga].
- When the changes are approved, suitable arrangements will be made by means of opt-in options for the current faculty members [in response to questions from Professor Bridget Dever and Craig Hochbein].
- Feedback from the entire faculty will be useful over and above the department chairperson's feedback based on PAR. [Professor Jim Gilchrist]

- Typically, annual reviews are conducted by the all the tenured faculty in the department although the department chair writes the summary letter to the assistant professor. [Professors Kathy Iovine, Ageliki Nicolopoulou, and Heibatollah Sami]
- The administration feels that the second year review of assistant professors is not very useful and therefore, the 3-year review makes more sense [concurring by Professors Mark Bickhard and Ray Pearson; in response to Professor Jim Gilchrist who stated that faculty feedback in surveys is favorable toward more frequent reviews and less frequent formal reviews prior to tenure may adversely influence faculty attitude]
- Perhaps, we should consider 3rd year review and 5th year review [Professor Yaling Liu; Professor Doug Mahony said that he was not convinced about the need for a 5th year review because it will be too late]
- Faculty senators were urged to collect feedback from the faculty so the discussion on the issue at the next senate meeting can be informed and productive.
- These motions once passed by the Faculty Senate must be voted on by the entire faculty by means of electronic ballot. Changes can be made prior to the senate vote but after that, the entire faculty can vote on the motions but there will be no amendments allowed. After that, they will go to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Senate Subcommittee Reports

Professor Doug Mahony noted that the subcommittee names, composition, and objectives are evolving based on ongoing discussions. Chairs of the four Senate Subcommittees provided an update on the progress. The salient points are given as part of Appendix 2. Additionally, summaries from the committees are also available on the Senate website. The following points were made during the discussion of the subcommittee reports:

- There should be a limit to the overall ratio of POPs in relation to tenured and tenure track faculty members. [Professor Al Wurth]
- One point being considered is for the Provost to provide a report when the number of POPs exceeds 15% of the total faculty.
- Some colleges have more than 15% [Professors Heibatollah Sami and Doug Mahony]
- The number of standing committees has been reduced from 21 to 13. The number will ultimately end up being 11 or even lower.

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 5.

[Appendix 5 available at <https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/meeting-minutes>]

4. Second Readings:

R&P 3.4 Auditors

Professor Frank Gunter introduced the motion for a second reading. The motion was put to vote and passed. The approved motion is given below.

3.4 Auditors

A student who has incurred no scholastic conditions or failures during the previous semester may be admitted as a listener in not more than one course, which course shall be outside the curriculum requirements. Application for such admission is by petition approved by the course instructor and the student's advisor. In no case shall a student who has attended a course as an auditor be given an anticipatory examination for credit or register for the same course in the future.

A student must submit the audit petition form no later than the end of the fifteenth day of instruction. Summer/Winter session deadlines are prorated according to the length of the session.

R&P 3.1.5 Full-time undergraduate students

Professor Frank Gunter noted that the word change has already been approved by the Senate during its September 2018 meeting. Thus, the proposed change is not necessary since it is based on a version prior to September 2018. Thus, withdrawal or rejection of the motion is the prudent path to pursue.

Parliamentarian Robert Thornton and Professor Frank Gunter noted that changes to section 3 of the R&P become effective as soon as they are approved by the Senate.

Professor Jenna Lay reviewed the changes approved during the September 2018. To a question by Professor Al Wurth about housing implications for students who take fewer than a full-time load and to a question by Professor Jennifer Swann about financial aid implications, Professor Frank Gunter noted that the motion only deals with students in the final semester. Professor Robert Thornton added that graduate students with three credits who are completing their degree in their last semester are considered as full-

time students; thus, there is precedent for students not losing privileges when taking a less than full-time load.

Professor Jenna Lay moved that the motion be withdrawn as the issue has already been addressed by the changes in September 2018. The motion to withdraw was unanimously approved.

4. *New Business:*

Professor Peter Zeitler expressed his concern at the status of the revenue and budget model followed by the university over a long period of time (as indicated by the freezing of the budget for TAs and the discontinuation of all revenue streams to some departments in CAS). This difficulty in budgeting must be addressed. He argued for more senate representation in the budgeting process.

Professor Doug Mahony noted that discussions on more Senate involvement are ongoing and the President is in support of the same.

To a question from Professor Frank Gunter, Professor Peter Zeitler commented the specific budgeting issues associated with CAS which plays a role in educating students from all Colleges. The problem is specific to CAS because revenues do not follow increases in enrollments, and historically (up to today) changes external to CAS are not smoothly tracked into dollars following enrollment. Viewed in this narrow light, the current increase in the student body and the College of Health represent a serious exacerbation of this problem. Whether or not the Provost and Dean agree on internal budget allocations, the core costs associated with CAS helping non-CAS students meet degree requirements needs to be addressed sustainably, not year-by-year.

Professor Jenna Lay noted that the issues related to TAs affect our undergraduate students as well; and it is not productive to spend time on this issue every year. Professor Jenna Lay further noted that budgeting and class sizes should be based on pedagogical needs rather than what is needed for ranking by U.S. News and World Reports. Professor Kelly Austin added that her department lost half of the TA lines and classes with 150 students do not have TAs.

Professor Al Wurth noted that his understanding from the BOT meetings do not indicate aggressive strategies for improving the university budgeting process. Professor Doug Mahony added that increasing the number of first-generation students will require additional financial aid and Professor Al Wurth noted that increasing diversity will result in reduced revenue but foreign students typically pay full tuition. Professor Frank Gunter noted that veterans come with good financial resources. Professors Al Wurth and Doug Mahony agreed on the need for more faculty involvement in the budgeting process. Professor Mark Bickard agreed about the seriousness of the budgeting problem and the need for faculty involvement.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 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