LEHIGH UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of the Meeting held on April 5, 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 03/01/2019

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. Memorial Resolution for Professor Richard Vinci

A Memorial Resolution for Professor Richard Vinci (Professor, Department of Materials Science and Engineering) was presented by Professor Ray Pearson. Senators observed a moment of silence to honor Professor Vinci's memory. They approved the motion to include the resolution in the meeting minutes. The memorial resolution is available as Appendix 2.

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

3. Update Regarding Bermuda Institute of Ocean Sciences (BIOS)

Provost Patrick Farrell updated the senate regarding BIOS. The slides used by him are available as Appendix 3. The following are some of the salient points made during the discussion.

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

 BIOS would like things to move faster since they have determined that the proposed relationship with Lehigh is the right one to pursue. From Lehigh's side, July 1, 2019 or January 1, 2020 are potential possibilities. If we do not decide by then, it is equivalent to telling BIOS to seek alternative partners. [Provost Patrick Farrell in

response to Professor Peter Zeitler]

- Integrating tenured or tenure track faculty from BIOS will follow a process similar to
 the cluster hires we followed in the past. There is no change in the requirement for
 agreement from the concerned department, faculty vote, etc. [Provost Patrick Farrell
 in response to Professor Jeremy Littau's question about faculty onboarding]
- Lehigh has a good sense of BIOS' financials, facilities, and other details. [Provost Patrick Farrell in response to Professor Matt Melone's question about due diligence]
- Based on BIOS' work with their consultant and after considering several potential
 partners, they concluded Lehigh is the right-sized institution with sufficient resources
 and expertise while at the same time the potential to allow BIOS to thrive without
 losing its identity (a potential concern if it chooses a university much larger than
 Lehigh). A BIOS Board of Trustees member, also a Lehigh gradudate, played an
 initial role in mentioning Lehigh as a potential partner for BIOS [Provost Patrick
 Farrell in response to Professor Herman Nied]
- If some of the BIOS faculty are not acceptable to Lehigh, that situation needs to be handled just like other hiring situations. Under our current system, the only way faculty can be hired into a department is by means of a faculty vote. [Provost Patrick Farrell in response to Heibatollah Sami's question about movement of faculty from BIOS to Lehigh]
- Current BIOS faculty on soft money will ultimately be funded by the permanent budget from Lehigh, although it is possible that some portion of the salary may continue to come from soft money in the early stages of transition. [Provost Patrick Farrell in response to Professor Mark Bickhard's question about financial responsibility for the new faculty from BIOS]
- Typically, cluster hire proposals are initiated by the department; now, the process seems to be different for BIOS since the departments are asked to absorb new faculty. Such faculty additions will also impact the future replacement and faculty additions to the department in which BIOS faculty members will be a part. [Professor Kelly Austin]
- Given the process followed for BIOs, the departments being asked to react rather than proactively request lines cannot be avoided. However, this is a unique situation that normally does not happen. [Provost Patrick Farrell]
- A comprehensive impact statement beyond the financials (e.g., research and teaching opportunities; faculty perceptions of the BIOS proposal) will be useful to evaluate the pros and cons of the BIOS proposal. [Professor Jenna Lay]
- Other institutes at Lehigh are not subjected to this level of detailed scrutiny. [Provost Patrick Farrell]

- Faculty senate should be involved in evaluating proposals for new institutes and performance of existing institutes. [Professor Jenna Lay]
- Discussions with several groups were part of the process in the run up to the proposal regarding BIOS. [Provost Patrick Farrell]
- GRC plays a role regarding oversight of institutes. [Professor Jim Gilchrist]
- Independent research institutes such as BIOS are looking for university partners and that is not a new development. [Provost Patrick Farrell in response to Professor Hugo Caram regarding other models of relationships between universities and research institutes]
- Affiliating with Lehigh will help BIOS recruit and retain faculty of a higher quality compared to the present situation. Will it be useful to delay the integration of BIOS faculty with Lehigh by allowing them to continue on soft money until the end of the current funding arrangements with external agencies? That will also help us see how BIOS is able to attract better personnel after their affiliation with Lehigh. [Professor Doug Mahony]
- Integrating BIOS future faculty with Lehigh is a possibility but BIOS would like to integrate their current faculty with Lehigh as well. [Provost Patrick Farrell]
- In the short term, the number of BIOS faculty joining Lehigh (6 to 8) will be similar to the number of faculty in the College of Health. However, in the long run, the College of Health will have close to 50 faculty and thus the number is much larger than the number of faculty in BIOS. [Provost Patrick Farrell in response to Professor Al Wurth]
- Although there is no set date for Lehigh taking a go/no go decision on BIOS, if Lehigh takes much longer, BIOS may look elsewhere for partners. If Lehigh does not take a decision before December 31, 2019, the BIOS opportunity may not exist [Provost Patrick Farrell in response to Professor Al Wurth]

Professor Doug Mahony noted that if there are additional questions on BIOS, they can be sent to the Senate Executive Committee.

4. Update from Senate Chair on BIOS:

Professor Doug Mahony provided an overview of issues (SWOT – strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) related to BIOS. The slides used by him are available as Appendix 4. Salient points mentioned during the ensuing discussion are given below.

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

- A proposal such as BIOS does not require a faculty vote. [Professor Doug Mahony in response to Professor Al Wurth]
- Provost Patrick Farrell has been making an effort to keep the Senate Executive Committee involved, although more information on financials is still expected. Much more information on BIOS is available now compared to a few months ago. [Professor Doug Mahony]
- There will be a meeting soon among the Senate Chair, the BOT Chair, BOT Vice
 Chair who is also the Chair of the Governance Committee, and the Student Senate
 President to explore the possibility of faculty senate and student senate being given
 ex officio membership in the BOT. [Professor Doug Mahony]
- Teaching and research responsibilities of the new tenure-track faculty hired from BIOS must be carefully analyzed before finalizing their appointment. Previewing the upcoming discussion of the role of Professors of Practice (POP), once the role of POPs is properly defined, it will be easier to hire faculty from BIOS with appropriate titles and responsibilities. [Professor Doug Mahony in response to Professor Kelly Austin's question regarding how the BIOS faculty will perform the integrated role of teaching, research, and service as required by Lehigh's tenure-track faculty members]
- There does not seem to be an enthusiastic and affirmative response to the BIOS proposal. [Professor Hugo Caram]
- The President has been asked by the Senate Chair about the overall strategic vision for Lehigh and how new initiatives such as BIOS that are sure to come up in the future must be evaluated. [Professor Doug Mahony]
- More transparency is needed in how the cost and benefits of BIOS are evaluated in the context of Lehigh and its research ranking. [Professor James Gilchrist]
- Professor Doug Mahony noted that after more detailed information about BIOS is circulated among all the senators, a "Sense of the Senate" vote will be taken. Furthermore, the Senate's position will be communicated to all Lehigh faculty members as soon as the voting is completed on or prior to the Senate meeting on May 3, 2019.

5. Update on the Principles of Our Equitable Community:

Dr. Henry Odi, Deputy Vice President for Equity and Community and Associate Provost for Academic Diversity, provided an update. He proposed that a framed copy of the Principles and the Dialog guidelines be placed in every classroom at Lehigh. The

Senate voted unanimously to endorse the proposal.

6. Consent Calendar:

Professor Doug Mahony 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 course changes are available as Appendix 5 and the graduation motions are available as Appendix 6.

[Appendix 5 and Appendix 6 available at https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/meeting-minutes]

7. Second Readings:

7.1. Second Reading: 2.12. Professor of Practice

Professor Frank Gunter introduced the motion for a second reading. The motion is available at

https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/meeting-documents

Salient points discussed are listed below.

- There are continuing issues related to the role of POPs, distinguishing POPs from the tenure track faculty, and the added benefit of the promotion to "Senior POP."
 [Professor Kelly Austin]
- POPs in CBE do not view the proposal favorably. [Heibatollah Sami]

The note circulated by Professor Heibatollah Sami is given as Appendix 7.

[Appendix 7 available at https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/meeting-minutes]

More systematic processes must be instituted to recruit and retain high caliber POPs.
 [Professor Liang Cheng]

The note used by Professor Liang Cheng is given as Appendix 8.

[Appendix 8 available at https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/meeting-minutes]

• We are nowhere close to agreeing on the proposed changes and therefore, it is better to table the motion and send it back to the Faculty Affairs Subcommittee of the

Senate for considering additional changes. [Professor Ray Pearson; the motion was seconded]

- Passing something that we can all agree on will send a positive message and we can work on other changes later on. [Professor Jeremy Littau]
- Sending the motion back to the committee will enable the committee to consider other competing proposals, consult with the deans, get support from the Provost so that if and when the senate passes the proposal, the BOT is more likely to approve. [Professor Doug Mahony in response to Professor Jennifer Swann]

The motion to refer the proposal back to the Faculty Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate for considering additional changes was approved by the Senate.

7.2. Second Reading: 2.2.3 Appointments

The motion was introduced for a second reading. A brief discussion ensued. Salient points are summarized below.

- Early career faculty response is not favorable for this proposal due to the reduced frequency of feedback. [Professor Liang Cheng]
- Annual reviews are not being discontinued. [Heibatollah Sami]

The senate endorsed the change. The proposal will now go to the entire university faculty for a vote. The approved wording is given below.

2.2.3 Appointments

Before filling positions, the department chairperson shall consult with the faculty members of the department about the specific areas of teaching and research in which faculty expertise is to be sought and about the rank at which the appointment should be made. After candidates have been screened and interviewed, voting members shall again be consulted to secure their opinions on the relative qualifications of the candidates. Large departments may substitute a departmental personnel committee for this purpose. The chairperson shall forward the recommendation of the department including dissenting opinions, if any, to the dean of the college.

Initial full-time appointments are at the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, as appropriate. The rank of instructor is reserved for persons who are working for a terminal degree or equivalent professional certification in their fields, who have not completed all of the requirements, and who are expected to complete those requirements within two years. Instructors must be promoted to the rank of assistant professor within three years of the date of initial appointment or else not be reappointed for a fourth year. Initial appointment at one of the professor ranks is appropriate for

persons holding a terminal degree or equivalent professional certificate. In the absence of this, equivalent scholarship may be recognized. Persons who hold a terminal degree or equivalent professional certification may not be appointed as instructors.

The initial appointment at Lehigh is normally for one year as an instructor; for three years as an assistant professor, an associate professor, or a professor; and for one year at a visiting or adjunct rank.

7.3. Second Reading: 3.1.4 Transfer Credit

The motion was approved by the Senate. The revised wording is given below.

3.1.4 Transfer credit

The University Registrar has the final authority to determine whether to grant the advanced standing to students transferring from other schools and students already admitted who take work at other schools for transfer to Lehigh University. Credit transfer rules may vary for credits taken prior to matriculation versus those taken following matriculation.

A course taken at an institution in the United States other than Lehigh must meet the following conditions to be accepted for credit toward a Lehigh baccalaureate degree:

- 1. The course must be taken at a college or university that is accredited in the United States by one of the six regional accrediting associations.
- 2. The course must be a part of the normal undergraduate curriculum published in the host institution's catalog and be one that the host institution will accept for credit as part of its degree programs.
- 3. The course must require the equivalent of at least 14 contact hours per credit.
- 4. The course must not be a continuing education unit course, or have been taken by correspondence, or as an independent study.
- 5. In order to count for credit for a course in the Lehigh Catalog, the content of a course must be evaluated for equivalency and appropriate rigor by the appropriate Lehigh Department or College and must meet minimum standards for transfer credits as determined by the University Registrar. Transfer courses not equivalent to courses in the Lehigh Catalog, yet appropriate to the Lehigh curriculum and meeting other standards of 3.1.4, may be transferred as general credit (e.g., credit as 0XX, 1XX, 2XX, 3XX, as determined by rigor) toward the Lehigh degree. Online courses considered for transfer must be at least 3 weeks in duration for intercession and at least 5 weeks for summer.

6. The course must not have been taken as audit, pass/fail or credit/no credit.

Exceptions to any of these conditions will be made only with prior approval of a petition to the Lehigh University Committee on the Standing of Students.

In addition,

- Courses to be taken at another institution for transfer credit by a student already admitted to Lehigh must be approved by the appropriate department beforehand.
- Grades from institutions other than those in the LVAIC system will not transfer. A grade transferred from an LVAIC college will not replace a grade earned in a Lehigh course and will not be calculated in the Lehigh GPA.
- Credit will not be granted for courses taken at other institutions in which a grade of C- or lower was received.
- Credit will not be given for a course taken at other institutions in which the student has already received credit for its equivalent at Lehigh.
- Credit will not be given for a course if used towards a bachelor or advanced degree at another university unless the joint program has been previously approved.
- A course taken at another institution will not be granted more credit at Lehigh than was granted by the other institution as shown on the student's transcript.

Students who have taken college level courses while in high school may petition the registrar to have this credit transferred, provided the enrolled section is comprised of both high school and college students. The petition must be submitted during the student's first year of study at Lehigh.

The registrar has the authority to accept the transfer of a specific number of credits for work done at the medical schools in Lehigh's combined-degree programs on a noncredit basis.

Advanced standing granted in accordance with the foregoing provisions may be applied in satisfaction of any curricular requirements in the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Business and Economics, or in satisfaction of non-technical requirements in the P.C. Rossin College of

Engineering and Applied Science. Such advanced standing may be applied toward technical requirements in the engineering curricula only by petition approved by the chairperson of the department concerned after consulting with relevant faculty.

No examination is required of students admitted with a baccalaureate degree from another college. Their programs of study for baccalaureate degrees are recommended by the appropriate department chairperson to the committee on standing of students for official approval and authorization.

Courses taken outside the U.S., either through an accredited American university program or at a foreign institution, will not be credited toward a Lehigh undergraduate degree unless that institution's program has been approved in advance by the Study Abroad Faculty Policy Board (a standing subcommittee of the Educational Policy Committee.) Determination of transfer credit for incoming freshmen and transfer students who have studied abroad before enrolling at Lehigh will be made by the university registrar.

7. 4. Second Reading: 3.1.4.1 Credit for Lehigh Abroad Sponsored Programs

The motion was approved by the Senate. The revised wording is given below.

3.1.4.1 Credit for Lehigh Abroad Sponsored Programs

Courses taken through Lehigh Abroad approved programs and assigned passing grades will count toward fulfillment of the undergraduate residency requirement. Such courses will transfer on a credit only basis. Grades assigned to these courses will not be used in calculating grade point averages or in determining class rank (except as noted in Section 3.11.1 – Graduation Honors). Students studying in Lehigh Abroad approved programs may transfer up to, but not more than, two regular terms of study abroad credit toward a single Lehigh undergraduate degree. Summer study abroad in approved programs will not count toward this limit.

7.5. Second Reading: 3.12 Petition

The motion was approved by the Senate. The revised wording is given below.

3.12 Petitions

The right of petition is open to all students at all times. Petitions must be submitted to the committee on standing of students for curriculum transfers, makeup exams, senior re-exams, special exams, reinstatement or readmission in the university, and for other special action. The regular petition form must be complete with signature and a brief recommendation from the instructor (when appropriate), advisor, and academic dean.

Petitions are acted on:

- 1. by the committee itself.
- 2. for the committee on the basis of power delegated to academic deans or the executive secretary of the committee. Any petition denied by a delegated authority may be appealed to the committee.

7.6. Second Reading: 3.12.3 Petition to Waive a Prerequisite

The motion was approved by the Senate. The revised wording is given below.

3.12.3 Petition to waive a prerequisite

Prerequisites may be waived upon presentation of evidence of substantially equivalent preparation, if satisfactory to the instructor in charge of the course, the teaching department chairperson, and the chairperson of the student's major department or program if applicable.

7.7. Second Reading: 3.2.1 Changes in Curricula or Courses

Professor Jenna Lay moved to amend the motion to make the process of approving new courses the same as the process for approving curriculum changes. Professor Jeremy Littau supported the idea of new courses being treated as curricular changes. Professor Frank Gunter noted that since the relevant colleges, Ed Pol and GRC look at new courses, there is no need for the Senate to be involved. The amendment was put to vote and passed. The revised motion with the amendment was put to vote and passed.

The approved R&P changes are given below.

3.2 Curricula

3.2.1 Changes in Curricula or Courses

Proposed course and curricular changes are deemed substantive if they meet one or more of the following five criteria:

- 1) They propose new courses or programs not previously approved by the university faculty. (Numbers and prefixes for all new courses must have the approval of the registrar.)
- 2) Changes in requirements and focus for existing programs.
- 3) They affect programs or departments other than the one proposing the changes.
- 4) They propose changes in prerequisites, course level, content, and credit hours for existing courses.
- 5) Dropping a course from the catalog for reasons other than its not being offered for more than two years.

3.2.1.1 Substantive course and curricular changes that meet criteria 1, 2, or 3

The university approval process for these substantive proposed course or curricula changes consists of consideration of proposed changes by either the Graduate and Research Committee (for proposed curricula or courses affecting graduate students) or by the Educational Policy Committee (for proposed curricula or course changes affecting undergraduate students) and then by the Senate Subcommittee on Academic and Student Affairs. When proposed substantive curricula or course changes affect both graduate and undergraduate students, those changes shall be reviewed by both committees before going to the Senate Subcommittee on Academic and Student Affairs.

Proposed substantive curricula or course changes must have college approval before coming to either the Educational Policy Committee or the Graduate and Research Committee, and proposed changes must have approval from one or both of those committees (according to which level of student is affected) before coming to the Senate Subcommittee on Academic and Student Affairs. for approval. Once proposed changes have received Senate Subcommittee on Academic and Student Affairs approval, the faculty secretary notifies the Registrar's Office to ensure that such changes are incorporated in the university catalog.

If a proposed curricula or course change involves an interdisciplinary program, substantial participation by students from another college, is expected to substantially change course registration in another college, or concerns a topic that is generally considered to be in the remit of another college; the policy committee of the college that originated the proposed change will directly notify the other college(s)' policy committee(s) about the issue(s).

All concerned policy committees will submit their recommended approval or disapproval to either the Graduate and Research Committee (for proposed curricula or courses affecting graduate students) or by the

Educational Policy Committee (for proposed curricula or course changes affecting undergraduate students). If the Graduate Research Committee or Educational Policy Committee approves the curricula or course change then it will be sent to the Faculty Senate Subcommittee on Academic and Student Affairs for its evaluation and, if approved, the faculty secretary will notify the Registrar's Office to ensure that such changes are incorporated in the university catalog.

3.2.1.2 Substantial course changes that meet criteria 4 or 5

The university approval process for substantive proposed course changes consists of consideration of proposed changes by either the Graduate and Research Committee (for proposed graduate student courses) or by the Educational Policy Committee (for proposed undergraduate courses). If approved by either of these committees, the proposed changes will be submitted to the Registrar for incorporation in the university catalog. When proposed substantive course changes affect both graduate and undergraduate students, those changes shall be reviewed and approved by both committees before they are submitted to the Registrar for incorporation in the university catalog.

If a proposed course change involves an interdisciplinary program, substantial participation by students from another college, is expected to substantially change course registration in another college, or concerns a topic that is generally considered to be in the remit of another college; the policy committee of the college that originated the proposed course change will directly notify the other college(s)' policy committee(s) about the issue(s).

All concerned policy committees will submit their recommended approval or disapproval of the course change to either the Graduate and Research Committee (for proposed graduate courses) or by the Educational Policy Committee (for proposed undergraduate courses). If the Graduate Research Committee or Educational Policy Committee approves the course change then it will be submitted to the Registrar's for incorporation in the university catalog.

Non-substantive changes require only the department's approval. They are forwarded to the Registrar's office to ensure that such changes are incorporated in the university catalog.

3.2.2.1 Cross-Listed Courses

All proposals to list a course in more than one department/program must be submitted by the appropriate college faculty for recommendation to the

educational policy committee, which reviews the proposals before the faculty secretary will notify the Registrar's Office to ensure that such changes are incorporated in the university catalog. Courses that are in programs in multiple colleges must be approved by the policy committees of all colleges involved prior to being submitted to the Registrar for incorporation in the university catalog.

- 1) A specific set of cross-listed courses will satisfy all requirements regardless of department prefix. This includes but is not limited to major, minor, grade point averages and distribution requirements.
- 2) A cross-listed course must have the same number and title in each department.
- 3) A student may change the department prefix of a cross listed course on his/her transcript only once, but no later than the end of the next regular semester after the student registered for the course. In no circumstance may the department prefix be changed after the awarding of the degree.
- 4) A cross listed course must have the same number of credits.
- 5) A cross listed course must have a primary or home department designated in the course description whenever possible.
- 6) A permanent course in the catalog may not be cross listed with a provisional course number with a different prefix.
- 7) All versions of the cross-listed course must have the same course description.

4. First Readings

The following were introduced for a first reading. The details are available on Faculty Senate Course Site along with the meeting materials. Salient points mentioned during the discussion of the respective motions are given below each motion.

- 1.3.2.1.1 Standing Subcommittee on Writing Instruction
- 1.3.2.1 Educational Policy Committee
 - 1.3.4.2 Study Abroad Faculty Policy Board (Dissolve)

Professor Jenna Lay said that it is her understanding that there was some reservation among Ed Pol members about this proposal and that the original conversation about incorporating the Study Abroad Faculty Policy Board into Ed Pol had included the creation of a subcommittee within Ed Pol. Professor Lay also raised the broader unintended consequence of dissolution of committees: the absence of faculty voice on the topics under the purview of the dissolved committees. Professor Doug Mahony referenced his discussion with Ed Pol and said the following: (1) Ed Pol has concluded that the subcommittee approach would not work; (2) the decisions requiring inputs by Ed Pol are expected to be few; however, if the cases become too many to handle by Ed Pol, the issue can be revisited; (3) under the current system, the Office of International

Affairs solicits a significant amount of input from faculty in matters related to study abroad.

To a question from Professor Tamás Terlaky related the role of the Department of Modern Languages in Study Abroad matters, Professor Doug Mahony noted that their participation is based on a specific request from the Study Aboard Office. Professor Kelly Austin added that most study abroad programs in the country are structured this way.

- 1.3.2.5 Faculty Committee on Student Life (Dissolve)
- 1.2.2.3 Graduate and Research Committee
- 1.3.4.x Library and Technology Services Faculty Committee
 - o R&P 1.3.4.1
 - o R&P 1.3.4.3

These motions will come up for second reading during the next meeting.

4. New Business:

In response to Professor Al Wurth's question about the income tax implications of the increase in parking fees, Professor Doug Mahony said that he has had discussions with VP for Finance & Administration Patricia Johnson and they will be looking into the issue carefully.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted by

K. Sivakumar ("Siva")

Arthur Tauck Chair and Professor of Marketing

Secretary of the Faculty