

---

---

## FINAL REPORT

---

---

**TO:** PATRICK FARRELL  
**FROM:** BOB FLOWERS, SCOTT GORDON, SUSAN PERRY, LARRY TAYLOR,  
GARY HARLOW, TOM HAMMOND  
**SUBJECT:** PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT  
**DATE:** 6/20/2018  
**CC:** PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

---

In the Fall of 2016, a report on the professor of practice position was completed by Vince Munley. The report made a number of recommendations and a committee was appointed to address the report and make recommendations to the Provost and Personnel committee.

The committee began meeting during the spring 2017 semester to evaluate the report and determine a list of topics and questions to discuss with deans, department Chairs, and professors of practice. During initial meetings, the committee agreed that the description of the professor of practice position contained in R&P (2.12) should define the position as it is currently used, since the description presently in place does not match the current practice at Lehigh. Using this approach for guidance, the committee formulated a set of questions and met with administrators, professors of practice, and department chairs to obtain feedback. The list of questions and responses from various groups of colleagues are contained in Appendix A.

After meeting with relevant colleagues, the committee met throughout the fall 2017 semester to consider the feedback. We also examined practices of other institutions with similar appointments (University of Delaware, Cornell University, and University of Maryland). After considering the needs of departments, colleges, and peers, we rewrote the description of the professor of practice position (section 2.12 in R&P) to conform with the current practice at Lehigh and address feedback we received. After continued discussion with the Faculty Personnel Committee during the spring of 2018 we recommend elimination of the lecturer position and converting several remaining lecturers to professors of practice when they come up for reappointment. The proposed changes are contained in Appendix B. The committee also rewrote the professor of practice guidelines and the suggested changes are contained in Appendix C. The committee's major recommendations are that professors of practice be able to vote on curricular issues at the department and college level, that a rank of 'senior professor of practice' be created, and that senior professors of practice vote on the reappointment of other professors of practice for reappointment.

There are several issues that arise from the proposed changes:

1) Professors of practice currently comprise 13% of the total faculty. We recommend that, if the total composition of non-tenure track faculty reaches 15%, the Provost acknowledge and discuss this in his annual report to the Faculty Senate.

2) The proposed definition of professors of practice leaves in place the flexibility that has made the position so valuable to academic units. However, the committee and most of the colleagues interviewed do not believe it is in the best interest of the University to have appointments that look like tenure-track faculty appointments. There is concern among faculty and some administrators about mission creep in the professor of practice position and the load distributions (teaching, research, and service) should not look like those of tenure-track faculty, especially in the area of scholarship.

3) At times, there may be tenured and tenure-track faculty who wish to alter the terms of their employment and convert the terms of their employment to a professor of practice. We have added this to procedures for appointment and reappointment in the supplemental guidelines as shown below:

Tenure-track faculty who wish to alter the terms of their employment and become a professor of practice must apply for the position through a regular search process. Similarly, professors of practice who wish to alter the terms of their employment and become a tenure-track faculty member must apply for the position through a regular search process.

## Appendix A

### List of items and questions to address

- 1) What service on standing (and other elected) committees is appropriate for Professors of Practice?  
–advising, administrative roles, etc.  
-build in service to the workload in a way to provide flexibility in the appointment.

### **Groups to Meet with: Professors of Practice, Department Chairs, Personnel Committee**

- 2) Should faculty be permitted to move from a tenure-track to a Professor of Practice position?

### **Groups to Meet with: Deans, Chairs**

- 3) Should we increase flexibility to permit appointments of Professors of Practice in programs? Or maybe dual appointments?  
-is it appropriate in non-academic units with an academic function?

### **Groups to Meet with: Deans, Chairs**

- 4) Should the funding approach be evaluated?  
-currently funded from the same pool as tenure-track faculty?

### **Groups to Meet with: Deans, Chairs**

- 5) Should there be more consistency in identifying responsibilities?

### **Groups to Meet with: Chairs, Professors of Practice**

- 6) What should the University do to help Professors of Practice maintain currency in their discipline?  
-career development, conference attendance, etc?

### **Groups to Meet with: Chairs, Professors of Practice**

7) Should Professors of Practice be able to consult outside of normal University workload?

-what extent can they do work outside of the University?

**Group to Meet with: Chairs**

8) Is the current number of Professors of Practice and the current percentage of courses taught/grades issued by Professors of Practice--relative to those of tenure/tenure-track faculty--acceptable?

- I think this is a question our colleagues will have differing opinions about--and my opinion is that we should affirm that these colleagues perform valuable and necessary service.

**Groups to Meet with: Deans, Chairs, possibly the Provost.**

9) Should the language that defines POP in R&P and elsewhere be revised to match current practice, which includes long-term POPs rather than just the short-term appointments that the original language seemed to envision?

**Groups to Meet with: Personnel Committee**

Other items we addressed moving forward.

-Building our report and recommendations to encourage departments to do the right things to create a collegial environment. All agreed that Professors of Practice are faculty and artificial designations, etc. should be removed to create a more inclusive environment for our colleagues.

-Committee on Faculty Governance is proposing Professors of Practice being elected representatives on the proposed faculty senate.

Professor of Practice  
Summary of Conversations  
from Various Meetings  
Recorder: Larry Taylor

Meeting with the Provost: Spring 2017

There is no push from the Provost's Office to use POPs in our classes, but yet the proportion of our undergraduates taught by POPs is increasing. There are even POPs that do not have a departmental home, such as the POPs serving the ESL (now ICAPE) program. Given the increasing importance of POPs on campus, we need to help ensure that they have robust careers, and have the privilege of serving on appropriate committees and the right to vote on selected curriculum issues. In general, POPs should hold the respect of tenured faculty and the administration.

Lunch Meeting with College Deans: April 7, 2017

- 1) What service on standing (and other elected committees) is appropriate for Professors of Practice?

While all of the Deans support a system of promotion for POPs, there are strong opinions concerning their roles. On the other hand, everyone supports POPs to vote on matters related to teaching.

CAS: No POPs should serve on the Faculty Senate, although serving on curriculum committees (such as the Ed Pol committee) are fine.

Engineering: Make a distinction between General-Faculty versus Tenured-Teaching-Faculty. The roles will follow.

CBE: No POPs should serve on the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and likewise none should serve on doctoral committees or dissertation committees. We need to move more heavily into research, and this is the job of tenured faculty. The responsibilities of the GRC are too general in scope, and it is more important for this committee to focus on getting more doctoral students. It follows that POPs should not serve on GRC.

- 2) Should faculty be permitted to move from a tenure-track to a POP position?

There is support from the Deans.

CBE: If you do not make it as a tenure-track professor, then you can become a POP, although with a 20 percent decrease in salary. Even senior faculty are expected to be active in high-quality research if we are to make it as a Research 1 university. POPs are focused purely on teaching and service.

Engineering: Tenure-track faculty who do not earn tenure should be able to switch to a POP position without delay. The POPs assist us by allowing others to concentrate on their research.

- 3) Should we increase flexibility to permit appointments of Professors of Practice in programs? Or maybe dual appointments? Is it appropriate in non-academic units with an academic appointment?

There is no consensus among the Deans.

LTS POPs? Why do we call them POPs?

CAS: The Dean is in favor, and gave an example concerning Women and Gender Studies. Regardless of the hiring strategy, the Dean expressed the idea that we need rigor in programs.

CBE: How does an interdisciplinary program tie to departments?

- 4) Should the funding approach be evaluated? Currently POPs are funded from the same pool as tenure-track faculty.

There appears to be no problem with the current practice.

- 5) Is the current number of Professors of Practice and the current percentage of courses taught/grades issued by POPs (relative to tenured/tenure-track faculty) acceptable?

For the purpose of keeping ourselves research oriented, we need to keep the number of POPs down. The Deans are happy with the flexibility, but we need to keep the POP title for actual POPs. Perhaps we need a new title for those who primarily teach.

Lunch Meeting with POPs: May 12, 2017

- 1) What committees are appropriate for POPs?

Certain faculty help make curriculum decisions at the departmental and college level, but feel no reason to participate on university committees. A consensus view is that POPs should have voting rights on the committees for which they are permitted to serve. This includes voting at the departmental level.

- 2) Should there be more consistency in identifying responsibilities?

In the CBE, POPs are not allowed to consult, whereas, this is not so in other colleges. Yet, consulting should be okay if the instructor can bring back real-world examples that help the students learn the material. Regardless of the outcome, the decision on consulting should be consistent across colleges. Likewise, having a 3/3 or 4/4 across colleges is inequitable unless the hours devoted to teaching are about the same across POPs in different colleges. For example, a POP with a lot of contact hours with students might not be expected to teach as many courses. Other POPs may be allowed to substitute some service activities for teaching responsibilities. However, trying to reward extra service activities with additional compensation is very difficult to implement.

3) Should there be ranks for POPs?

This is a relatively new topic for the POPs, and there was not a consensus. Some felt that those POPs with more experience should be given a better title with better pay, while others felt that being a POP was akin to giving back to the community. Most felt that there was no need to have a grand title without increased compensation of some sort. Perhaps a better title should translate into a longer contract.

4) What should the University do to help POPs maintain currency in their discipline?

- a) Allow POPs to continue consulting practices.
- b) Formalize funds to attend conferences.
- c) Reduce the teaching load for POPs who are expected to remain current in their fields, or at least reduce the number of preps in a given semester.

Overall:

Some POPs expressed that they are happy with their positions, but should be allowed to serve on committees if they are willing to do so. They really want to have voting rights in order to fully participate. They generally like the flexibility, but would like clarity in terms of their expected teaching and service contributions.

Private Conversation with a POP:

- 1) Voting Rights in College Meetings (and even, perhaps, the Faculty Senate)
- 2) Longer Contracts for Seasoned POPs.

- 1) What service on standing (and other elected) committees is appropriate for Professors of Practice – advising, administrative roles, etc...

In the College of Education, POPs are encouraged to serve on dissertation committees, but by R&P they cannot serve as the Chair. There is some concern about opening up all committees. We probably need to identify spots on committees for service. Maybe we should reconsider the definition of a lecturer or POP, and then voting rights will naturally follow. For instance, it was mentioned that a POP/Lecturer should allocate a minimum of 40-50% of his or her time teaching in order to have voting rights in teaching matters. Some POPs are really administrators who nonetheless have the POP title; others are young POPs who will eventually obtain tenured-faculty positions elsewhere; others still have been at Lehigh for many years and should be giving the respect of the vote on teaching matters. One shoe does not fit all. In no case should a POP be able to vote on the hire of an Assistant Professor, but maybe the POP can vote on the hire of another POP. Currently we are not following the definition of a POP, and this is causing problems in determining voting rights. In the Arts and Science College, many POPs are hired not to teach, but rather to run interdisciplinary programs. With the new Health College, we need to be flexible since we will probably be hiring many POPs.

- 2) Should faculty be permitted to move from a tenure-track to a POP position?

No, do not move to POP position directly from tenure-track; this creates the POP position as a consolation prize. Rather, advertise the POP position, and allow anyone to apply, including tenure-track faculty members.

- 3) Should we increase flexibility to permit appointments of POPs in programs? Or maybe dual appointments? – is it appropriate in non-academic units with an academic function?

The question was never directly addressed. However, there was much discussion about the healthy percentage of POPs. It has become ever more expensive to hire assistant professors. They need expensive labs or substantial course reductions to get them started in their careers. POPs provide a valuable service in teaching introductory courses and the like that professors would otherwise have to teach. On the other hand, a POP is unlikely to develop the long-run research record of a newly-hired assistant professor. There is thus an opportunity cost associated with hiring a POP instead of an assistant professor. We do not wish for POPs to crowd out tenure-track professors who will ultimately form the backbone of the University. In other words, the long-run steady state solution may be less desirable if we hire too large a proportion of POPs. We

should not hire a POP just because it is less expensive to do so, and Chairs do not wish to have a department consisting largely of POPs. Furthermore, having too large a proportion of POPs might send a negative message to those outside the Lehigh community. For instance, will there be an erosion of tenure? On the other hand, hiring POPs does not have to be a zero-sum game. The POPs should feel welcome on campus and have a say in curriculum matters.

- 4) Should the funding approach be evaluated?

A lot of POPs are funded through soft money. The Chairs seem to be content with the status quo.

- 5) Should there be more consistency in identifying responsibilities?

For the ESL (now ICAPE) program, the English Department is asked to house ESL POPs, but it really isn't in their interest to do so. It is difficult to oversee the POPs. We need to be careful about the POP title, especially if the position is more like a staff appointment. One Chair whose responsibility it is to evaluate the POP was told by the POP that the Chair really was not in a good position to evaluate the course content. However, if we attach POPs to non-academic units, this creates an even more difficult task to identify responsibilities and evaluate performance. The Deans and Chairs agree on this point.

- 6) What should the University do to help POPs maintain currency in their discipline – career development, conference attendance, etc...

The question was not directly addressed. However, there was a sentiment that Chairs would rather concentrate their attention on assistant professors rather than supervise POPs.

- 7) Should POPs be able to consult outside of normal University workload – what extent can they do work outside the University.

The question was not addressed. There was no voice expressed against it.

## Appendix B

### Present definition of Professor of Practice in R&P

#### 2.12 PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE

Individuals will be appointed professor of practice for term appointments of one to five years, with the approval of the department voting faculty, the appropriate dean, and the provost. There are no rank differentials within the professor of practice title. Because of their prior occupational experience, professionals appointed to these positions add instructional value to university programs, enhance the research or professional missions of their departments, and/or permit the university to expand its course offerings, often in cutting-edge areas.

Professors of practice are not required to fulfill the integrated role of teaching, research and scholarship, and service provided by tenured and tenure-track faculty, though some professors of practice may have responsibilities in each of these areas. In addition, as faculty members, professors of practice are distinguished from administrative staff and must fulfill teaching and/or scholarly responsibilities in addition to any administrative service. They may serve as principal academic advisors to undergraduate and master's students, direct academic programs, serve on department and program committees, and provide other service consistent with their expertise and academic credentials. A professor of practice who has a doctoral degree may serve on a doctoral committee with the written approval of the college dean but may not serve as committee chair (see 3.23.3).

Appointments are not tenurable and may be renewed for specified terms. Appointments and reappointments are considered by the provost upon recommendation by the voting faculty of a department and the dean. Reappointments are based on performance and a continuing need. Notice of reappointment or non-reappointment shall be given, whenever possible, at least four months before the terminal date of the appointment. The department chair and/or appropriate college dean shall provide the professor of practice with an annual performance assessment, which may be coordinated with salary review. An assessment of unsatisfactory performance may result in termination prior to the end of the appointment.

Professors of practice are not voting members of the university faculty. They may not be elected to university faculty standing committees. They also may not be elected to college standing committees, although they may be invited to participate as non-members on such committees. As discussed above, professors of practice may provide service to the department/program but they may not participate in appointment, reappointment, and tenure/promotion decisions.

## **Proposed Changes to 2.12**

### **2.12 PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE**

Individuals will be appointed professor of practice for term appointments of one to five years, with the approval of the department voting faculty, the appropriate dean, and the provost. Appointments are not tenurable and may be renewed for specified terms.

Professors of practice fulfill an integrated role of teaching, research/scholarship, and service similar to that provided by tenured and tenure-track faculty, but they devote at least 50% of their effort to teaching-related activities. They may serve as principal academic advisors to undergraduate and master's students, serve on department and program committees, direct academic programs, and provide other service consistent with their expertise and academic credentials. A professor of practice who has a doctoral degree may serve on a doctoral committee but may not serve as committee chair (see 3.23.3).

Professors of practice may not vote on appointment, reappointment, and tenure/promotion decisions of tenure-track faculty.

Reappointments are considered by the provost upon recommendation by the voting faculty of a department and the dean. Reappointments are based on performance and a continuing need. Notice of reappointment or non-reappointment shall be given, whenever possible, at least four months before the terminal date of the appointment. The department chair and/or appropriate college dean shall provide the professor of practice with an annual performance assessment, which may be coordinated with salary review. An assessment of unsatisfactory performance may result in termination prior to the end of the appointment.

After 10 years of service at Lehigh, a professor of practice may advance to "senior professor of practice" with a department's (and/or program's) recommendation and the dean's approval.

## Appendix C

### Supplemental Guidelines on the Professor of Practice Position See also R&P 2.12

The following guidelines address issues raised during the review of the professor of practice position conducted by the Provost's office in 2017-2018. The review involved several groups, including the Council of Deans, Faculty Personnel Committee, current professors of practice, and ad hoc Faculty Working Group on the Professor of Practice Position. These guidelines supplement the revised R&P 2.12 that was approved by the Lehigh Faculty and Board of Trustees in (Date here).

#### A. Definition of Professor of Practice Position, Credentials, and Responsibilities

1. Professors of Practice must be hired at 50% effort or more. As with other Lehigh faculty and staff positions, 75% effort or more is required for full-time status, with accompanying benefits. A professor of practice will typically devote 50-80% of their effort to teaching. For those spending 80% of their effort on teaching, the balance of 20% effort is usually for service related to coursework (administration, recommendations, etc.) as well as service on non-elected committees at various levels.
2. Full-time professors of practice may not hold a full-time position elsewhere; those who hold part-time or consulting positions elsewhere must conform to the rule in R&P 2.5: *"The university recognizes the value to both the individual and the university when a faculty member engages in activities of a professional nature for added compensation. These activities may include but are not limited to consulting, short courses, liaison activity, and corporate board activity. The university approves and encourages that participation when it is complementary and non-competitive to the duties and goals of both parties, and contributes to the professional growth of the individual. . . . activities for additional compensation should not exceed an average of one day per week."* As noted in R&P, Lehigh recognizes the value of faculty engaging in such external activities. For professors of practice, such activities may help them remain current in their field. Full-time professors of practice must obtain approval for all such external arrangements from the department chair and dean. Part-time professors of practice must inform the department chair and dean about their additional full-time, part-time, or consulting positions.
3. Professors of practice should remain active in their profession to fulfill their responsibilities of adding instructional value to university programs, enhancing the research or professional missions of their departments, and/or permitting the university to expand its course offerings.
4. Professors of practice may serve as Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator on research grants.
5. Professors of practice should vote on matters related to curriculum.

Department Chairs and Deans are encouraged to allow professors of practice to engage fully in department and college matters, especially voting on curricular matters and hiring other professors of practice within a department or program.

6. Professors of practice are encouraged to seek professional development opportunities and department chairs are encouraged to extend professional development funds when possible.
7. Professor of Practice are ineligible for academic leaves, but senior professors of practice may be eligible for course reduction for professional development if resources allow.

#### B. Procedures for Appointment and Reappointment

1. For appointment and reappointment procedures, please see the Provost's web site, Faculty Information and Resources, Professors of Practice.
2. Like other faculty, every professor of practice must hold an appointment in an academic department.
3. Because the specific responsibilities and criteria for evaluating performance of professors of practice vary significantly, each professor of practice will discuss specific evaluation criteria with the department chair at the time of appointment. A workload document that describes these criteria will be produced and the department chair will submit the document to the dean for approval. The professor of practice and department chair will meet annually to discuss and, if necessary, draft a revised document for the dean's approval with agreement of both parties.
4. When the professor of practice has significant responsibilities for an interdisciplinary program (such as serving as director or contributing to program development), the dean will appoint one or more of the program's voting faculty to participate and vote with the department voting faculty in the professor of practice's reappointment review. The voting faculty on professor of practice reappointments include tenured, pre-tenure faculty, and senior professors of practice.
5. Tenure-track faculty who wish to alter the terms of their employment and become a professor of practice must apply for the position through a regular search process. Similarly, professors of practice who wish to alter the terms of their employment and become a tenure-track faculty member must apply for the position through a regular search process.

### C. Annual Merit Review

1. The approved document specifying evaluation criteria (see B3 above) serves as the basis for annual merit review as well as review for reappointment.
2. The annual merit and salary review of professors of practice follows the same procedures developed in each college for other faculty. Like tenured and pre-tenure faculty and lecturers, professors of practice submit professional activity reports annually. Department chairs evaluate and make recommendations about their merit levels.