

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of the Meeting held on May 1, 2020, 1:00 pm

Via Zoom

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 04/24/2020

Professor Doug Mahony called for any corrections to the minutes of the Lehigh University faculty senate meeting of 04/24/2020.

Motion to approve the meeting minutes was made and seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved.

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

Professor Frank Gunter suggested that there should be a separate space on the senate webpage for listing the “sense of faculty resolutions” in addition to their being mentioned in the meeting minutes. Professor Doug Mahony concurred.

2. Discussion in Response to Faculty Questions/Clarifications

- Senate Chair and Vice Chair are members of the small group working group established by the university. Provost is willing to provide periodical updates to the Senate. Professor Ageliki Nicolopoulou is also putting together a small group to offer input on these issues. [Professor Doug Mahony in response to Professor Al Wurth about faculty participation in university groups working on Covid-19 related issues]
- Vice President for Research is part of the research group set up in light of Covid-19 and Professor Jim Gilchrist is on the Safety Committee. [Professor Jim Gilchrist]
- There is a concern about exempting businesses from liability due to reopening. [Professor al Wurth]
- The senior leadership is fully cognizant of the safety needs as well as the higher susceptibility to Covid-19 of some faculty members than others due to underlying conditions. [Professor Doug Mahony]

- Information about funding obtained by Lehigh from the CARES Act (for example, the 3.6 million dollars Lehigh obtained recently) and how the money was spent should be communicated by the university administration to the faculty. [Professor Heibatollah Sami]
- President John Simon is expected to inform the university community about budgetary and related issues in the coming few weeks. [Professor Doug Mahony]
- Change in senate leadership will occur effective July 1, 2020. The new Vice Chair for the senate needs to be elected. Colleges should elect their representative to the Senate Executive Committee as well. The senate retreat will likely take place in August 2020. [Professor Kathy Iovine]

3. Second Readings

3.1. Extension of Probationary Period

Changes to R&P 2.2.5.7.3 Elective Extension of Probationary Period for Any Reason in the Year Prior to the Final Probationary Year

Changes to R&P 2.2.5.8 Maximum Length of Probationary Period

These motions were introduced for a second reading. Salient points made during the ensuing discussion are summarized below.

- “Opt out” clause discussed in the last meeting should be reinstated; furthermore, reluctance by the Provost or the BOT to approve a “blanket extension” should not govern our approach; several other universities are providing a blanket extension; we should support the faculty. [Professor Heibatollah Sami]
- Requesting tenure clock extension due to Covid-19 using the personal hardship provision needs detailed documentation by the requesting faculty; automatic extension is preferred. [Professor Bridget Dever; supported by Professor Haiyan Jia]
- The urgency of this proposal is due to two faculty who are immediately affected by the “eight year” maximum limit for tenure clock extension under the current policy. The broader issues such as those related to the Provost’s discretion involved in 2.2.5.7, reasons faculty can use for seeking extension, blanket extension, and “opt out” clause should be considered in detail at a later time. [Professors Frank Gunter and Doug Mahony]

The motions were put to vote and passed 22-1. The motions will be voted on by the entire university faculty and if passed, will be forward to Lehigh Board of Trustees (BOT) for approval.

The sections incorporating the revised wording is given below.

2.2.5.7.3 Elective Extension of Probationary Period for Any Reason in the Year Prior to the Final Probationary Year

An untenured faculty member (assistant, associate, or full professor) may, in the year prior to his or her final probationary year, request from the provost a tenure-clock extension of one semester or one year for any reason, provided that he or she has not already been granted extensions constituting the maximum of probationary period as stated in R&P 2.2.5.8.

The faculty member will request the extension from the provost in writing as soon as possible after the faculty member decides he or she wishes to request the extension and will inform the department chair of the request for an extension. Notification must be received by the provost prior to the date on which the faculty member's tenure package is required to be sent to external reviewers (that is, on or about August 1 for Fall Cycle tenure review; January 2 for Spring Cycle tenure review).

If granting the extension would not violate the maximum length for the probationary period, the provost shall grant the request and send a letter to the faculty member informing him or her of the revised reappointment and tenure review schedule. The faculty member will sign the letter to confirm acceptance of the new dates. The provost's office will inform the dean and department chair of the new dates.

Expectations for meeting tenure criteria shall not be increased for tenure candidates who receive extensions. During tenure review, therefore, the department chair shall inform internal and external evaluators that the candidate must be evaluated with the same tenure criteria as candidates who have received no extensions and with the same expectations for accomplishments as would be applied to candidates who received no extensions.

2.2.5.8 Maximum Length of Probationary Period

The maximum length of the probationary period of a faculty member, with all extensions, is eight years with the following exception:

Under extreme circumstance, such as a prolonged shutdown of University facilities, the Provost may consider extending the maximum length of the probationary period beyond the established eight year limit.

The Faculty recognizes the significant disruption that COVID-19 may have had on faculty and their ability to pursue their respective research programs. Consequently, tenure track faculty may request an extension, see R&P 2.2.5.7.2 (7), of their probationary period due to disruptions in their progress toward meeting applicable tenure standards due to COVID-19. The grant of an extension due to COVID-19 to a faculty member shall result in a corresponding extension to such faculty member's maximum probationary period.

3.2. Common Hour Exams

Changes to 3.7.2. Common Hour Exams

The motion was introduced for a second reading. The motion was put to vote and passed 22-0. The section incorporating the revised wording is given below.

3.7.2 Common Hour Exams

Common hour exams shall be scheduled by a common hour exam committee, which shall be made up of the registrar and at least one faculty representative from each department proposing a course for exam scheduling. The common hour exam schedule shall be created before the registration period for the semester in which they will be used. The common hour exam committee is charged with soliciting requests for common hour exams and approving the schedule for entry into the registration system by the deadline for inputting schedules.

Common hour exams shall be held over two sessions each semester, taking place in the fifth and sixth weeks for the first session, and then in the tenth and eleventh weeks of the second session. One exam period per day, from Monday through Thursday, may take place during each week of these periods, for a total of eight common hour exam times over each two-week period. The common hour exam committee may add a common hour exam time on Friday if necessary. Common hour exams may not be scheduled for more than 75 minutes, with the exception of students with documented disabilities.

Priority for scheduling exams will be given to multi-section courses with greater than 100 enrolled students. Exams will only be scheduled for courses which offer a common exam. A single instructor may be assigned an exam time if that instructor's multi-section schedule has more than 100 students and other sections of the course do not qualify for an exam. If an undergraduate class does not qualify for a common hour exam or if the instructor does not schedule a common hour exam through the common

hour exam committee then any exam must be given during the regularly scheduled class period, or a take-home exam may be used.

In cases of conflict between two exams, the course with the largest number of students enrolled takes precedence. In cases of conflicts where the courses have the same number of students, the course which has the fewest sections shall take precedence. Any further unresolved conflicts will be settled by the common hour exam committee.

In cases of conflict between a common hour exam and a regularly scheduled course that meets weekly, the regularly scheduled course will take precedence, and faculty offering the exam must provide a make-up exam. Courses that refuse to provide make-up exams will be denied an exam schedule. It is recommended that courses with scheduled exams give students appropriate release class time, or use those two class periods for non-mandatory review sessions.

3.3. Final Examinations

Changes to R&P 3.7.3.1 Final Examinations

The motion was introduced for a second reading. The motion was put to vote and passed 26-0. The section incorporating the revised wording is given below.

3.7.3.1 Final examinations

If an instructor chooses to require a proctored final exam, a take-home exam, or a final project in a given course, the end of semester exam period shall be used as follows:

- 1) Proctored exam – the examination is proctored and will be administered on campus during a time block assigned by the Registrar. The time allowed to complete the exam must be announced to the students in advance. The time allowed may not exceed 3 hours. hours.1 Courses in fully online programs that require proctored exams need not be scheduled by the Registrar, but must still use proctoring services and protocols approved by the University.***
- 2) Take home exam - no take home exams can be due until at least 72 hours after the beginning of the exam period and must be due by the last day of the final exam period.***
- 3) Final project (e.g. presentation or final paper) - final projects must be due no later than the last day of the end of the final exam period.***

Faculty should be available during the final exam period until all semester grades for his or her courses have been submitted to the Registrar. No final examinations shall be given or scheduled in one- or two-credit laboratory courses during the final examination period. No final exams in other full-semester classes shall be given prior to the start of the final period.

Formal withdrawal from any course before the end of the semester automatically cancels the student's rights to an examination in that course.

Final examinations are scheduled for three-hour periods by the registrar. For a course not requiring a proctored final exam the instructor shall notify the Registrar that no exam time need be scheduled. Conflict examinations are provided wherever a student cannot take a regular examination because of a conflict in examinations on the published examination schedule. In all cases of conflict, the course having the smallest number of rostered sections takes precedence, except that in cases of conflicts in courses having the same number of sections, the course having the fewest students shall take precedence. Conflicts in the regular examination schedule must be reported by the students to the registrar not later than the third day following the publication of the examination schedule.

3.4. Transfer Credit

Changes to R&P 3.1.4. Transfer Credit

The motion was introduced for a second reading. The motion was put to vote and passed 23-0. The section incorporating 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.**
- 7) Coursework undertaken between 1 January 2020 and 1 January 2021 in which the student received a non-letter grade analogous to a Pass, Satisfactory, or Credit on their transcript will be eligible for transfer and awarded appropriate credit at the discretion of the Registrar. All courses undertaken either before 1 January 2020 or after 1 January 2021 must not have been taken as 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, 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.

4. First Reading: Faculty Ranks Proposal

The documentations are available at the following link (under April 24, 2020)

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

Professor Frank Gunter introduced the motion for its first reading. The motion was moved and seconded. Professor Kelly Austin provided an update on the proposed changes. The slides used by Professor Austin are available as Appendix 2.

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

After presenting the details of the proposal, Professor Kelly Austin urged the senators to consider the overall merits of the proposal rather than focusing on some specific details. She noted that a major change such as this is unlikely to be perfect or satisfy everyone. Salient points made during the ensuing discussion are given below.

- Clarification should be made about participating in some faculty committees (e.g., Faculty Personnel Committee). [Professor Doug Mahony]
- Promotion process when the faculty members are holding administrative positions must be clarified. We should be less strict than we are with tenured and tenure track faculty. [Professor Jim Gilchrist]
- Whether the upper limit of 23% includes research faculty not supported by university funds should be clarified. [Professor Jim Gilchrist]
- The ceiling will not include externally funded research faculty. [Professors Kelly Austin and Frank Gunter]
- How the Post Docs moving to assistant professor position are treated should be clarified. [Professor Yaling Liu]
- It is not clear why we are adding a separate category of research faculty. The distinction between a research staff and research faculty is also not clear. [Professor Peter Zeitler]
- Currently, there is no ceiling on faculty in the non-tenure track. The current proposal streamlines the current hiring of POPs who do not strictly satisfy the qualifications mentioned in R&P by offering them titles based on whether their primary activity is teaching or research. [Professors Kelly Austin and Frank Gunter]
- It is possible that some of the internally funded research faculty can be funded by internal cost recovery. [Professor Liang Cheng]
- It appears that the proposal will chip away university faculty rights. We are changing the notion of what it means to be a university faculty, student/faculty ratio, the undergraduate student experience, etc. It is important to get feedback from all departments. [Professor Al Wurth]

- The proposal was developed after getting feedback from college faculty; the proposal does not decrease the number of tenured and tenure track faculty. [Professor Kelly Austin]
- There is no mention of compensation of different types of faculty. Furthermore, is there a possibility of retiring tenured faculty lines being filled by non-tenure track faculty? [Professor Heibatollah Sami]
- If the administration replaces tenure track lines with non-tenure track lines, the ceiling will be reached quickly. That is why the upper limit is useful. [Professor Frank Gunter]
- The dean can refuse to hire a tenure track faculty even now. The current proposal puts an upper limit on non-tenure track hiring. [Professor Kelly Austin]
- POPs should demonstrate currency of industrial experience and teaching faculty should demonstrate teaching experience. Some current POPs may like to become teaching faculty after some years as POPs because they will not be able demonstrate currency of professional experience in the industry. [Professor Kelly Austin in response to Professor Matt Melone's question about criteria for teaching faculty and whether POPs not meeting the current R&P requirements will be converted to teaching faculty]
- Some faculty may be eligible for appointment as POPs or as teaching faculty. [Professor Liang Cheng]
- While calculating the upper limit of non-tenure track faculty, we should include full time faculty as well as part time faculty. [Professor Tony DiMaggio]
- The language will be examined to avoid any confusion. [Professor Kelly Austin]
- We should consider avoiding the situation of a POP request being denied because we are close to the 23% limit. [Professor Craig Hochbein]
- There is some leeway available for such situations; even now, the Provost approves all faculty lines. [Professor Frank Gunter]
- The committee considered but decided against setting limits for individual colleges due to differences in the number of faculty as well as the nature of faculty in each college. [Professor Kelly Austin in response to Professor Doug Mahony]
- With increasing number of non-tenure track faculty and if they teach larger classes, more and more students will be taught by non-tenure track faculty. This is a fundamental shift in the role of tenured and tenure track faculty and the role of scholarship in educating students. There is an incentive for the administration to

increase the non-tenure faculty due to the lack of academic freedom normally afforded to tenured and tenure track faculty. [Professor Al Wurth]

- The goal of the proposal is to recognize the good work being done by some POPs. It is not intended to increase the number of non-tenure track faculty. [Professor Frank Gunter]
- The proposal brings a level of transparency to faculty ranks. [Professor Kelly Austin]
- The timing of the proposal should be examined in light of the uncertainty in the incoming class for next year. [Professor Al Wurth]
- The rolling contract idea in the proposal and the flexibility it offers in faculty hiring are useful aspects. [Professor Peter Zeitler]
- POPs are making a valuable contribution to support the educational mission of Lehigh. [Professor Kelly Austin]
- In that case, why not increase the ceiling to 50% rather than 23%? [Professor Al Wurth]
- Let us start with 23% and revisit it later. [Professor Frank Gunter]
- Current POPs at Lehigh should be protected and they should be offered a career path. We should not be distracted with the future scenarios. [Professor Hugo Caram]

Professor Frank Gunter noted that the feedback will be considered in revising the proposal for a second reading.

5. Remembering Dr. Nelson Markley, Former Provost

Professor Peter Zeitler noted that former Provost Nelson Markley passed away recently. Senators observed a moment of silence to honor Professor Markley's memory.

Professor Hugo Caram suggested that faculty obituaries can be part of the commencement booklet every year. Professor Doug Mahony noted that typically the home department informs the senate about a retired faculty member's passing and we mourn the loss in the Senate and include a memorial resolution in the Senate minutes.

6. University Safety Committee

Professor Jim Gilchrist noted that the University Safety Committee is considering some procedural changes related to the purchase and delivery of laboratory chemicals. He requested the Senate Executive Committee to seek the report from Mr. Brent

Stringfellow, review it, and offer feedback. Advance feedback on the draft proposal from the Senate can be helpful to come up with the final proposal.

7. Recognizing Professor Doug Mahony's leadership of the Faculty Senate

Professor Frank Gunter noted that this meeting is the last official meeting of the Faculty Senate with Professor Doug Mahony as Chair. The senators joined Professor Frank Gunter and incoming chair Kathy Iovine in applauding the role of Professor Doug Mahony in the formation of the Faculty Senate and his contributions as the chairperson of the Faculty Senate for two academic years.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 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