

NEXT MEETING: 4:10 PM 13 March 2000, University Center Room 308.
Refreshments at 3:30 PM in the Faculty Lounge.

Lehigh University

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

7 February 2000

Presiding: Gregory Farrington (University Center 308)

President Farrington called the meeting to order at 4:13 PM.

1. **Minutes.** The minutes of the December 6, 1999 faculty meeting were APPROVED.
2. **Unfinished Business.** None
3. **New Business.** None.
4. **Committee Reports.** Professor Jim Largay, on behalf of the Faculty Compensation Committee provided a written [see Attachment 1] and verbal report on three items: meetings with college deans, FCC proposal for a new salary administration process, and viability of the FCC. He noted it wasn't likely the faculty would see an 8 percent increase in compensation this year [laughter]. He expressed the FCC's frustration with the compensation process, but indicated that the FCC will continue to try to work with the administration.

Professor Bob Folk inquired whether it was sensible to combine the efforts of the FCC with those of the FFPOC. He stated he had mixed feelings, but thought it might be a good idea to investigate the entire financial structure of the university.

Professor Steve Krawiec wondered whether Lehigh administrators compensation was in line with reference institutions. He observed that there might be an issue of resource allocation.

Professor Largay said this was an open item with the Faculty Steering Committee.

Professor Richard Decker noted that the FFPOC was reluctant to undertake roles and responsibilities reserved for the FCC but that FFPOC is willing to have discussions with the FCC.

Professor Ron Hartranft wanted to know if any other university goes

through such a painful salary administration process.

Professor Rich Aronson asked if a reference group for salary comparisons actually exists

Professor Largay stated that he was not sure the existing reference group is valid

Professor Frank Gunter noted that R&P calls for the 'participation' and 'consultation' of the FCC in faculty compensation determination and gave the history including the trustees' approval of this language at its October 12, 1990 meeting. He pointed to 35 separate references in R&P to 'faculty consultation' questioning, that if such consultation is abandoned in compensation will it be abandoned in other areas?

Professor Largay said there was a difference between 'participation' and "consultation."

Nonetheless, Professor Gunter wanted to know if the trustees' statement was still valid.

President Farrington chose this point to step into the fray. He acknowledged that it was true, if you look at the meaning of the word "participate," that he failed to do that. But, he stated it was not deliberate or malicious. He reiterated the need to establish a policy for faculty compensation that comprehensively addresses process, peer groups and the way the administration should work with the FCC. He said it was well worth it to sit down and create a process.

He expressed a willingness to sit down with any legitimately constituted faculty committee and discuss the financial forces driving the budget. He said there is common ground between the administration and the faculty, and that such consultations ought to happen. He made it clear the former reference group of 14 universities has not been valid for a decade and that clinging to it was not rational. Reference groups do exist, but, more fundamentally at the department and college levels. He said he was not willing to conclude that Lehigh faculty is underpaid until rational reference groups are established to determine comparative levels of compensation.

He did observe that faculty compensation has outpaced the CPI in every year of the past decade except one. He cautioned that Lehigh's ability to raise its tuition is constrained by what Yale and Princeton do with their tuition. Decreasing graduate tuition cost the university about \$1 million. He pointed to enormous opportunities to raise revenue outside of undergraduate and PhD education. He cautioned that it is not easy to

balance the university budget when income is dropping. Lehigh is living off a brisk stock market and the university must develop alternative sources of revenue or shrink in size.

He cited the virtue of a college based merit system and concluded that the only way to judge salaries is against equally productive schools. The former 14 reference schools are not valid

Professor Aronson asked if there was a substitute for the 14.

President Farrington agreed there was no systematic effort for establishing reference groups, but that he would be happy to participate in the development of said groups. Progress involves more than just an annual meeting with the FCC. He gave high praise to Professor Largay for stating the importance of exploring relevant reference groups, but cautioned that the process must be rational, and that the faculty must accept whatever results are obtained.

President Farrington talked about issues relating to FFPOC as well, specifically that he preferred to talk about choices rather than diverting resources from one area to another. The university must face its income issues because there is a long list of neglected areas across the university.

Professor Folk addressed the need to seek other sources of income and stated that academic departments have been "taking a hit" in the budget for a long period of time.

President Farrington said that assessing macro trends in the budget is difficult. The stock market performance has buffered drops in other revenues.

At this point, Professor Largay chimed in that this discussion was "music" to his ears and hoped the faculty secretary was taking good notes. He addressed a number of points raised: the FCC is in the process of engaging the faculty in developing reference groups that such a process needs "buy in" in the data gathering phase, and that the FCC needs confidence that when the data comes out the administration will commit to a multi-year plan to redress the issues.

President Farrington made it clear most universities are suffering the same financial challenges, noting Penn's cuts in their Arts and Engineering colleges. The same is true of Lafayette and Moravian. He said it was not a matter of "buy in" – saying it was like buying into rationality.

Professor Decker, on behalf of the FFPOC, reviewed university budget allocations over the past decade. Net university revenue has increased from \$150 million to \$180 million with approximately 57 percent allocated to the provost's stem. Colleges are receiving approximately the same percentage of net revenue as they did in 1991-92. Net spendable income is rising at approximately the rate of the CPI. There is a slight percentage decline in the total allocation to the provost's stem.

President Farrington reiterated that the solutions to Lehigh's budget challenges are the same as they are for other universities. He pointed to one key problem. In terms of space, Lehigh is a Research I university; in terms of resources it is a Research II university.

Dean Ron Yoshida provided a written [see Attachment 2] and oral update on the LEWIS Project. It will provide a self-service environment enabling for example, students to register on-line. It will also permit prospective students to file a common, on-line application for Lehigh and many other schools increasing the applicant pool. For alumni, it will be easier to request academic records and to secure addresses of classmates. For faculty, access to student records will be fast. For the administration, it will permit real time access to data and the development of standardized reports.

The intended goals of the LEWIS Project include: increasing the number of applicants, improving academic quality, improving student yield, improving retention rates, improving graduation rates, reducing inquiries to university offices, reducing the time to prepare reports and improving alumni communications.

The executive committee for the project includes Rhonda Gross, Nelson Markley and Don Bolle. There is also a steering committee comprised of faculty and staff overseeing the project. In April students will be able to register on-line.

The system does not support Mac users at the network level. A complete rollout of LEWIS will occur in July 2001.

Registrar Bruce Correll summarized a number of student benefits of LEWIS, namely that pre-registration will become registration. Holds out the prospect that students will register for courses they actually want to take. Ultimately, LEWIS will make students responsible for their own actions.

Associate Dean Art King noted the difference between pre-registration this

spring and next spring. This spring a slightly different registration form will be used. The Web-based products will be enabled in the fall. Grade products come on-line next spring. Priority for enrolling in classes will be given to seniors first, then juniors sophomores and freshmen. It will be possible to use a different priority scheme, for example, a department may override for its courses.

Professor Barbara Traister asked about staff training for LEWIS. Registrar Correll indicated there would be three sessions of 2-3 hours each with 90 minutes per day allocated to practice. The staff training will be staggered. The advising training is under development now.

Professor Mohamed El-Aasser asked about the time frame for requesting staff training. Registrar Correll stated the goal is mid-March.

5. **President's Report.** President Farrington thanked all faculty who contributed to the discussion on compensation. He spoke of the trustees meeting last week. The major challenge for the university over the next 5-8 years is investing in academic infrastructure. He said he was spending a great deal of time raising endowments for faculty chairs.

He discussed the SASAKE project and its 3 foci: 1) what to do with the Mountaintop Campus; 2) how can the university partner more effectively with the city; and, 3) inventorying existing space to establish priorities for renovation projects.

As for admissions, the university has received 9,100 undergraduate applications – up 300 over this time last year. The emphasis continues to be on offering the best programs so that the best students enroll, placing less pressure on financial aid. The president concluded by stating he will personally greet all visiting prospective students and their parents each morning.

The meeting stood adjourned at 5:49 PM

Stephen F. Thode
Secretary to the Faculty
304 Rauch Business Center
(610) 758-4557
FAX: (610) 882-9415
E-mail: sft@



James A. Largay III
Arthur Andersen & Co. Alumnus
 Professor of Accounting

Department of Accounting
 621 Taylor Street
 Bethlehem, PA 18015-3117
 610.758.3409 Fax 610.758.6429
 e-mail: jal3@lehigh.edu

MEMORANDUM

February 7, 2000

TO: Lehigh University Faculty Colleagues
FROM: Jim Largay
SUBJECT: Interim Faculty Compensation Committee Report

This brief report encompasses three items: meetings with college deans, FCC proposal for a new salary administration process, and viability of the FCC.

Meetings with College Deans

We completed our meetings with the deans on January 17, 2000. All four meetings were both cordial and candid. We emphasized our concerns over:

1. faculty compensation levels in general,
2. last year's salary administration process in particular,
3. how salary adjustments are to be administered this year, and
4. the impact on morale of a compensation policy too heavily weighted toward the top 20%-25% of the faculty.

All four deans empathized with us and agreed that department chairs provide critical input into faculty performance evaluation. In fact, the Business College is introducing a new merit review system which calls for all department chairs to be heavily involved in evaluating all college faculty. We believe the deans left their meetings with us having a better appreciation of how the current compensation policy impacts faculty morale.

FCC Proposal for a New Salary Administration Process

This document was distributed to you and we have been presenting it at college faculty meetings to obtain feedback. Its principal provisions involve more focused benchmarking, salary administration remaining largely in the department chairs, and performance evaluation linked to professional development plans for achievements in scholarship, teaching and service.

Viability of the FCC

Like many previous Faculty Compensation Committees we are frustrated by our inability to produce results for the faculty. R&P specifically charges the FCC to "participate in the formation of compensation policy and the distribution of fringe benefits." This has not been the case. Unfortunately the FCC learned about the recently-announced 3.5% increase in the compensation pool the same way the rest of you did—via the campus-wide e-mail. Although we believe that some mechanism for promoting the faculty's interest in fair compensation levels and administration is essential, we are not sure that the FCC is the best mechanism and welcome suggestions from the faculty and the administration for alternatives.

LEWIS FAQ's FOR LEHIGH FACULTY
February 2000

1. What is the LEWIS project and what will it do?

LEWIS stands for Lehigh's Enterprise-Wide Information System. It is a project to install and implement an enterprise wide integrated system that will include Web-based access. The "Banner 2000" suite of applications will offer improved services for students, faculty and staff. Lehigh will be installing and implementing Banner Student, Financial Aid, Human Resources/Payroll, Finance and several Web related products over a two-year period.

2. What will LEWIS do for Lehigh faculty?

Once the appropriate systems are up and running, LEWIS will provide Lehigh faculty with secure access, from on-campus or home computers, to whatever information they may need to manage courses and advise students. They'll be able to grade and advise at their convenience with almost any Web browser. For the first time at Lehigh, faculty will have a Web-based interactive interface to a centralized database for grading and academic advising.

The new Banner software in LEWIS will also allow for more flexible scheduling of courses. Within one term, it will be possible to have variable starting and ending dates for different courses which will provide flexibility for summer long courses or briefer sessions. Policies for how this will work will be developed before it is fully implemented in Summer 2001.

Faculty will also eventually have access (as will all employees) to their individual employment and benefits information. Faculty who manage accounts will access their accounts through the same LEWIS database. Faculty committees will have access, when authorized, to current and historical data on students, courses, and finances.

3. When will LEWIS become available?

LEWIS is being implemented in a "controlled rollout," which means some of its services will become available sooner than others. All of the LEWIS services should be up and running before the end of 2001, with the Financial Aid and Student systems the first to be implemented. Portions of Financial Aid will "go live" in mid-February 2000 in order to generate aid award letters to incoming freshmen (Class of 2004). The Student part of LEWIS will be used for pre-registration for Fall 2000 which begins in mid-April. The Web for Student component that allows for Web-based access should be available in Fall 2000.

4. What changes in the registration process and advising will occur with LEWIS?

The use of baseline Banner for registration and the Web for Faculty and Web for Student will allow a staged rollout of a different methodology for assigning students to sections and will allow deans and chairs to manage section and course enrollments. Students will be permitted to register by a ticket system that prioritizes registration by class (seniors, juniors, sophomores, and freshmen). There are a few exceptions for earlier registration that will be defined later.

Once the Web products are online and completely enabled, decentralized data entry of course and section selection will be able to be done by either the advisor or the student. Students will obtain a PIN number from their advisor (this can be linked to a traditional face-to-face session), but then students will be able to register directly once they have the PIN.

The biggest changes are that 1) sections of courses may be capped and rules implemented to include only certain groups of students with defined pre-requisites or attributes, and 2) students will be able to select their section up to the cap. The Registrar's office will retain the right to move a student to a different section to balance section size.

5. How will I access LEWIS?

Lehigh community members will eventually access LEWIS through the World Wide Web. Links will be added to the university's existing Web site to provide students, faculty, staff, and alumni access to a wide variety of information and services.

6. What equipment do I need to access LEWIS?

For most everyone, the standard Windows-based Pentium PC should be sufficient for accessing LEWIS. When procuring a new PC from one of our recommended vendors, the PC should be configured with at least 128 MB of memory. Information Resources Client Services should be contacted for specifics associated with this matter.

7. What reports will be available out of LEWIS?

Each of the functional project teams is currently working with the list of reports that have been generated out of our existing mainframe systems to determine which reports are still needed and what is readily available from Banner 2000. With the implementation of LEWIS, information currently in printed reports will be easily accessible online, thereby reducing the need for centrally printed reports. The individual user will be able to print some data directly from his or her own desktop. This approach will be more efficient, and is possible, in part, because of the anticipated greater availability of the LEWIS system.

8. What are the plans for training faculty and staff to use LEWIS?

Shortly, the LEWIS Steering Committee will be publishing a schedule for the training of staff from dean and departmental offices. Bruce Correll is also meeting with faculty from the four colleges to update them on LEWIS. It is essential that key staff be given the time to attend formal training sessions and then be given ample opportunity to familiarize themselves with and practice on the Banner system.

9. What involvement do faculty have in the LEWIS implementation process?

Faculty are represented on the LEWIS Steering Committee and on several working groups including a recently formed Registrar's advisory group coordinated by Bruce Correll. More input in specific areas is welcomed.

10. How will students learn about the changes that LEWIS will bring?

As part of the overall LEWIS communication plan, presentations will be made to the Student Senate, the Graduate Student Council, the Council of Student Presidents and other groups. Contacts will be made with the *Brown and White* and other appropriate publications in addition to the inclusion of more general articles in the university press and the use of e-mail bulletins.