

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes of the Meeting held on November 1, 2019, 1:00 pm
Venue: Linderman Library 200

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 10/04/2019

Professor Doug Mahony called for any corrections to the minutes of the Lehigh University faculty senate meeting of 10/04/2019.

Motion to approve the meeting minutes was made and seconded. Professor Ray Pearson proposed some corrections to the wording of the minutes related to course approvals and common exams. The amended minutes were unanimously approved.

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

2. Consent Calendar

The customary graduation motions were approved as part of the consent calendar (Available as Appendix 2).

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

3. Remarks by Senate Chair Doug Mahony

Senate Chair Doug Mahony provided an update. The salient points are listed below. Unless otherwise noted, the points below were made by Professor Mahony.

- There is a need for more financial transparency, especially, at the college levels. For example, insufficient information is available about revenue generating graduate programs and endowments. It will be good for the faculty to see a “profit and loss” statement for these activities and information to ensure that the endowment funds are being used for the purposes intended by the donor, and how revenues and endowment funds are distributed among departments.
- Due to the changes made in revenue stream allocations over the years, department budget allocations have become less transparent and the money allotted to departments has

reduced over the years. [Professor Peter Zeitler]

- We should set up a process in which the deans are accountable to inform the faculty and program directors about details about revenues and their allocation. [Professor Doug Mahony in response to Professor Ageliki Nicolopoulou]
- Lehigh does not have a transparent budget model and budget allocations are often based on individual negotiations. Transparency is important to ensure that the donors' intentions are followed in the spending of the money and that revenues from the masters programs are allocated fairly among the departments. If the revenues from programs are retained by the deans, there is no incentive for the departments to propose new programs [Professor Tamas Terlaky]
- Problems in budget allocation also occur when a new dean does not honor the agreements already in place regarding the allocation of money to departmental programs. [Professor Heibatollah Sami]
- Since the University already provides an income statement for its activities, it is straightforward for the colleges and centers to do the same. [Professor Frank Gunter]
- Transparency will help to ensure that gifts are spent according to the memoranda of understanding signed between the University and the donor. [Professor Jim Gilchrist]
- The spending details related to restricted gifts should already be available because they are typically provided to the external auditors. [Professor Matt Melone]
- The General Counsel's Office has the details of agreements with the donors; but faculty members and centers often do not have this information.

There was a general agreement that the issue of financial transparency should be further pursued.

4. Updates by Senate Subcommittees

Updates were provided by the various Senate Subcommittees.

On behalf of the Inclusive Community Subcommittee, Professor Ageliki Nicolopoulou noted that a "Faculty Code of Ethics" will be introduced at the University Faculty meeting on 11/04/2019.

On behalf of the Research Environment Subcommittee, Professor Bridget Dever noted that the subcommittee will meet with the incoming Provost to discuss about research priorities.

On behalf of the Academic and Student Affairs Subcommittee, Professor Ray Pearson noted that the issue of common exams is a complex one and therefore, the Subcommittee is yet to finalize a full motion for consideration by the Senate – an amended motion can be used as a basis for discussion; the subcommittee is also having discussions regarding the revival of the Committee on Student Life and the

duties of the Visiting Lecturers Committee being performed by a subcommittee of the Committee on Student Life.

On behalf of the Faculty Affairs Subcommittee, Professor Frank Gunter said that a “Proposal to Revise Faculty Ranks at Lehigh” will be a topic of discussion at the upcoming University Faculty meeting on 11/04/2019. After obtaining feedback from the faculty, changes to the R&P will be considered. The subcommittee is also having discussions related to compensation of faculty members such as comparison of salary across genders and comparison of department salaries with the peer university faculty salaries.

Professor Doug Mahony noted that when the College of Health hires a faculty member, that faculty member will become a member of the Senate and the Senate Executive Committee.

5. First Readings

The motions are available at the following link (under November 1, 2019)

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

Motion to Dissolve (R&P 1.3.2.7) Faculty Committee on Advancement and (R&P 1.3.2.3) Faculty Compensation Committee

The motion was introduced for a first reading. The motion was moved and seconded.

With the proposed dissolution of the Faculty Committee on Advancement, Professor Jim Gilchrist noted that it would be useful for a faculty to have a link with the Alumni Affairs Subcommittee of the Board of Trustees (BOT). Professor Doug Mahony noted that a senator will be designated for this purpose and the Senate Executive Committee will confer with the appropriate BOT subcommittee regarding advancement matters.

Regarding the Faculty Compensation Committee (FCC), Professor Jenna Lay wondered if the language in R&P regarding the senate needs to be modified to include the duties of the FCC. Professor Doug Mahony responded that the Senate Executive Committee can take up these matters and if needed, can assign the matters to one of the subcommittees. Remarks by Professors Frank Gunter, Mellie Katakalos, Jenna Lay, Matt Melone, Tamas Terlaky, Jennifer Swann, highlighted the need for further clarity regarding who is responsible for the activities currently under the purview of FCC. Professor Jenna Lay asked that that prior to the second reading, the language related to the Faculty Affairs and Major Initiatives Subcommittees should be revised to improve clarity. Professor Tamas Terlaky noted that since Senate Subcommittee descriptions are not part of the R&P, changes to the R&P should be considered to ensure that faculty jurisdiction on compensation issues is maintained. Professor Doug Mahony agreed that the language should be examined and revised as needed.

Motion to Amend Faculty Personnel Committee Composition and Charge

The motion was moved and seconded.

Professor Scott Gordon (Chairperson of the Faculty Personnel Committee -FPC) noted that restricting administrators from serving on FPC will put undue burden on colleges with fewer number of full professors; furthermore, the amendment is unnecessary because there is already a recusal clause. A brief discussion followed. Some points made related to the perceived lack of independence of FPC when administrators serve on FPC (Professor Heibatollah Sami), letting administrators serve on FPC only in those cases when there is no other eligible faculty member from a college (Professor Heibatollah Sami), need to clarify and strengthen the recusal clause (Professors Jim Gilchrist, Scott Gordon, Craig Hochbein, Jenna Lay, Matt Melone, and Heibatollah Sami), complexities due to the 5-year term for the FPC membership and the possibility of faculty members taking up administrative roles when they are already on the FPC (Professors Jim Gilchrist, Scott Gordon, and Craig Hochbein), and allowing a faculty member to serve a second term when there are no other eligible faculty to serve on FPC (Professor Robert Thornton). Professor Doug Mahony responded that the Senate Executive Committee will work with the FPC and propose a revised wording for the second reading.

Motion to Dissolve the Visiting Lectures Committee (R&P 1.3.5.3) and Motion to Amend R&P 1.3.2.5 Faculty Committee on Student Life:

The motion was moved and seconded. Professors Jenna Lay and Doug Mahony noted that the motion is being put forth by the Senate Executive Committee and not by the Academic and Student Affairs Subcommittee. Professors Jenna Lay and Jeremy Littau noted the dissolution of the Visiting Lecturers Committee was not discussed in the Subcommittee and we should wait to move on the dissolution of the Visiting Lectures Committee.

Motion to Amend Common Hour Exams

Professor Doug Mahony noted that this is a complex issue and needs to be resolved quickly since a large number of students are adversely affected. The motion was moved and seconded. The salient points discussed are summarized below.

Student Affairs Subcommittee unanimously opposed this motion at the current time, and suggested the importance of more discussion among the Subcommittee members, discussions with faculty affected by the common exams, and consultation with the broader faculty about the potential impact of the proposed changes. The motion should not be rushed through. [Professor Jeremy Littau; Professor Jenna Lay concurred]

The most urgent issue is to deal with conflicts between exams and classes and to amend R&P to ensure the primacy of classes in such cases. The rest of the issues can be handled after more deliberation over a period of a few months. [Professor Jenna Lay]

It is important to recognize that the issues related to common hour exams are much broader and relate to student disability, medications, timing of the exams, and conflict with classes. [Professor Doug Mahony; Professor Jenna Lay concurred and read relevant portions from the rationale from the long-term proposal by the Senate Subcommittee on Student Affairs to highlight that the points mentioned by Professor Mahony are included]

The issue of availability of space for final exams for large classes must be addressed. [Professor Frank Gunter]

Need to clarify whether the proposal relates to undergraduate students, or graduate students, or both. [Professor Jim Gilchrist]

There is a need to examine the issue further before formulating definite policies due to the potential for unintended consequences of any changes. [Professor Mellie Katakalos]

Professor Jenna Lay circulated an amendment to the proposed motion. [Appendix 3]

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

The reason for having common exams should be clarified in R&P. [Professor Hugo Caram]

More time is needed to follow a proper process before proposing a motion related to common hour exams. [Professor Jenna Lay]

The Mathematics department was blindsided by the proposal. This is bad governance since the department was not consulted even though it is the most impacted department. Many of the conflicts in Fall 2019 between common hour exams and scheduled classes may also be pertaining to the Math Department. [Professor Garth Isaak]

The proposal to eliminate common hour exams was not posted on time. It is important to follow a proper process. Furthermore, courses from departments other than Math were also affected by conflicts. [Professor Jenna Lay]

The impact of not offering some Math classes after 4 pm to reduce conflicts with exams must be examined. [Professor Craig Hochbein; Professor Garth Isaak responded by stating that those classes are now scheduled after 7 pm]

More discussion is needed before we act on the main proposal. [Professor Mellie Katakalos]

There was a brief discussion about how to handle the change proposed by Professor Jenna Lay. Professor Doug Mahony decided that the proposed change will be considered as an amendment to the original motion in order to move things faster. Prior to the second reading, other changes can also be made to the original motion. Professor Jeremy Littau concurred. Professor Peter Zeitler also supported a deliberate approach by taking the needed time.

There is a need to act fast on this motion so we can do the second reading in the next meeting.

Professor Jenna Lay moved to amend the motion (presented in Appendix 3). The motion was seconded. The amendment was approved unanimously.

6. New Business

Professor Liang Cheng proposed a change in calendar to not hold classes on Labor Day and the following Tuesday; and for eliminating pacing break. The reasons are high student absenteeism, difficulty due to staff being unavailable, the closure of child care center and the resultant difficulty for faculty, to recognize the significance of Labor Day for Lehigh Valley. A brief discussion followed the salient points are summarized below.

How about other holidays such as Martin Luther King Day? [Professor Mellie Katakalos]

We can consider extending the semester to ensure classes offered on different days are treated the same way since we have 3 days of break for Thanksgiving. [Professor Frank Gunter]

According to the Provost, there is a huge fixed cost for extending student housing. [Professor Doug Mahony]

It is not practical to have classes when the university is closed. [Professor Kathy Iovine]

We can reduce the number of days allotted for RCS prior to exams. [Professor Jennifer Swann; Professor Peter Zeitler concurred]

RCS period is important for student learning. [Professor Frank Gunter]

Implementation issues should be considered. For example, should staff be paid overtime for working on Labor Day? [Professor Doug Mahony]

Senate can make a recommendation on this issue to the administration. [Professor Mellie Katakalos]

Professors Peter Zeitler and Liang Cheng proposed that the Senate Executive

Committee should consider the issue come up with recommendation. Professor Doug Mahony concurred. The Senate unanimously supported the idea.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted by

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Siva". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above a thin horizontal line.

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

Secretary of the Faculty