Faculty Senate Chair Professor Frank Gunter called the meeting to order.

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

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

1. Minutes of the Prior Faculty Senate Meeting

Professor Frank Gunter called for any corrections to the minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of 09/02/2022. 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.

2. Chairperson’s Comments

Professor Frank Gunter noted the following:

- The items scheduled for their second reading are not ready; they will be considered at the November 2022 meeting.
- Senate subcommittees are being formed; senators are asked to nominate themselves for the subcommittees.
- Senators were asked to choose priorities from the list of items generated.
- President Joe Helble will choose senate representatives for the “Respectful Dialog and Debate” committee from the list of senate volunteers.
3. Senate Engagement with Strategic Planning

Senate Vice Chair Peter Zeitler initiated a discussion on this topic. The following are some salient points discussed.

- Most ideas shared by faculty on the idea portal for strategic planning seem to be tactical rather than big-picture ideas. [Professor Peter Zeitler]

- Senate must be involved in shaping the initiatives. [Professor Peter Zeitler]

- Some initiatives chosen by the Strategic Planning Committee are expected to be revealed on October 15th. It is better for the Senate to be involved early in the process but not too early. [Professor Peter Zeitler]

- Faculty are underrepresented in the working groups. [Professor Peter Zeitler]

- There is an absence of deep discussion about issues. [Professor Peter Zeitler]

- Discussions will be more open at the department level. Our focus should be on differentiating Lehigh from other universities. [Professor Kevin Narizny]

- Working groups attending the department meetings can be helpful; the administration did not respond to comments about inclusion in the initial large meeting with faculty. [Professor Mellie Katakalos]

- Different working groups operate differently in getting faculty input. It is worth engaging with these groups. [Professor Jenna Lay]

- The appropriate senate subcommittees should be involved in discussing specific projects identified by the strategic planning working groups. [Professor Angela Hicks]

- Provost Nathan Urban and Vice President Chris Cook should attend the faculty senate meeting later in the fall semester when they have compiled the ideas and are in the process of prioritizing them. [Professor Jenna Lay]

- The senators should be willing to work to engage with strategic planning, although there is a sense of additional workload. [Professor Peter Zeitler]

- We should avoid the working groups focusing on individual work group member needs and focus on more significant issues. [Professor Damien Thévenin]

- At this point, the strategic plan should focus less on specific initiatives (since focus areas often become obsolete) and more on how we operate and support what we do. [Professor Peter Zeitler]
4. Additional Item Discussed: Mid-Semester Teaching Evaluations

The following were the salient points made.

- Formative mid-semester course assessments seem to have become permanent; the Faculty Senate should be consulted. [Professor Jenna Lay]

- These mid-semester evaluations discourage experimentation and adversely impact junior faculty when shared with department chairpersons. [Professors Al Wurth and Lindsey Reuben]

- These evaluations help make improvements in courses, but they tend to focus more on superficial issues rather than more significant issues about courses. [Professor Ethan Van Norman]

- Teaching evaluations should be confidential; the faculty should have the option of sharing these with their department chairpersons. [Professor Marck Bickhart]

- Mid-term evaluations can help improve one’s teaching; they may also create an expectation that something will change. Not making changes may be counterproductive; it is more beneficial if these evaluations are made optional rather than mandatory. [Professor Beibei Dong]

- The merit of the mid-term evaluations and the process followed for faculty consultation are both important but separate and should each be given attention. [Professors Frank Gunter and Peter Zeitler]

- Since the issues involved in such evaluations are nuanced and complex, the continuation of these evaluations in the future should be based on broader faculty consultations. [Professor Jenna Lay]

5. Update on Faculty Salary Study

Deputy Provost for Faculty Affairs Jackie Krasas and Vice Provost for Institutional Research and Strategic Analytics Yenny Anderson provided an update. The slides used by them are available at

https://facultysenate.lehigh.edu/salary-study

The following were the salient points made during the discussion.
● AAUP data is at the university level; therefore, department-level comparison across universities is not possible. [Deputy Provost Jackie Krasas in response to Professor Angela Hicks]

● A more detailed analysis of outliers in salary distribution is necessary. [Professor Mark Bickhart]

● What are we doing to move the needle? [Professor Hyunok Choi]

● If we include summer compensation, the salary inequities may be exacerbated (since summer research compensation is most often available in higher-paying fields). Furthermore, we should take steps such as hiring women in high-paying fields, promoting women more quickly, and hiring women at senior levels. [Professor Jenna Lay]

● Efforts are being made to collect gender identity information. [Vice Provost Yenny Anderson in response to Professor Will Lowry]

Salary Study Follow-Up Discussion by the Provost

Provost Nathan Urban made some additional remarks, followed by a discussion. The salient points are given below.

● That Lehigh does not see systematic gender differences in salary after controlling for field and length of service is something noteworthy. Efforts are being made to address individual cases. The goal is to make some salary adjustments rather quickly to reflect in the January 2023 paycheck. The department chairpersons and deans would be asked to identify outliers whose salary needs adjustment along with justification for salary adjustment. Individual faculty members are not going to be involved in these discussions. The university has decided to begin the process by allocating some money for salary adjustment without knowing the exact extent of the problem; this adjustment is not a one-off but is expected to continue. [Provost Nathan Urban]

● Inter-departmental salary differences are not possible to address since several factors are involved in such differences, and the tools to address such differences are unclear. [Provost Nathan Urban in response to Professor Jenna Lay]

● There is limited publicly available data on discipline-specific salaries. [Deputy Provost Jackie Krasas]

● It would be helpful to get an update in February 2023 after the salary adjustments in January 2023. [Professor Jenna Lay]
6. R&P Changes

Professor Frank Gunter noted that efforts are being made to identify inconsistencies in the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty. Minor changes will be done quickly in consultation with the respective College Policy Committees. Major changes will follow a more elaborate process.

Respectfully submitted by

K. Sivakumar (“Siva”)
Arthur Tauck Chair and Professor of Marketing

Secretary of the Faculty