

NEXT MEETING: 4:10 PM 24 September 2001, University Center Room 308.
Refreshments at 3:30 PM in the Faculty Lounge.

Lehigh University

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

30 April 2001

Presiding: Ron Yoshida (University Center Room 308)

Provost Yoshida called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM.

1. **Minutes.** The minutes of the March 19 2001 faculty meeting were APPROVED.
2. **Committee Motions.** Registrar Bruce Correll MOVED the four customary motions for the June 2001 graduation [see Attachment 1]. The motions were SECONDED and PASSED.

Professor Ed Kay, on behalf of the Educational Policy Committee, MOVED a waiver of the "10-Day Rule." The motion was SECONDED and PASSED. Professor Kay then MOVED a change to R&P Section 3.16 with a minor correction to strike the second 'level' from the proposed change [see Attachment 2]. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

Professor Christine Cole, on behalf of the Graduate and Research Committee, MOVED a waiver of the "10-Day Rule." The motion was SECONDED and PASSED. Professor Cole then MOVED a course title change and description for Ed 451 [see Attachment 3]. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

3. **Unfinished Business.** None.
4. **New Business.** Provost Ron Yoshida MOVED to incorporate the title of Professor of Practice into R&P Section 2.12 [see Attachment 4]. The motion was SECONDED.

Professor Rick Matthews asked whether Professors of Practice (hereafter referred to as "PoPs") would be considered voting faculty, and whether PoPs would send appeals to the Personnel Committee. Provost Yoshida answered in the affirmative to both questions.

Professor Bob Folk inquired as to the impact on the number of full-time tenure-track faculty.

Provost Yoshida noted that PoPs would be of the highest caliber and must have the approval of the faculty. In response to the possibility of creating two tiers of faculty, Provost Yoshida observed that PoPs bring different talents that contribute to the mission of the university.

Professor Steve Krawiec asked whether it would be possible to hire PoPs to teach introductory courses exclusively. Provost Yoshida said that would be for the faculty to decide.

Professor Richard Decker wondered how PoPs would be different from lecturers. It was noted that the PoP title would attract talented individuals who might not otherwise choose to affiliate with Lehigh.

Provost Yoshida identified three funding sources for PoPs: college budgets, restricted funds, i.e., endowments, and soft money.

Professor Frank Gunter offered a friendly amendment placing a ceiling of 5 PoPs per college for the first 3 years.

Provost Yoshida stated he did not believe the amendment was "friendly." He said the university couldn't predict the need for PoPs or the cost. He did note that reviews would take place after the third and fifth years.

Professor Geraldo Vasconcellos identified several leading universities that employ PoPs – among them Michigan, Columbia and Harvard.

Professor Philip Blythe wondered whether PoP was the best description or whether a "sexier" title might be developed.

Provost Yoshida articulated a 5-month discussion of the proposal failed to produce a sexier title.

Dean John Chen expressed his support for the title noting it protects academic programs, gives colleges flexibility in staffing, permits interaction with practicing professionals and should enhance educational quality.

Professor Sudhakar Neti related Personnel Committee discussions of the title. He expressed agreement with Dean Chen and noted that the Personnel Committee endorsed the idea of caps. He also stated that PoPs do not help the university in the long-term, especially with respect to scholarly output.

Professor Neti then MOVED to amend the proposal to establish a cap on

PoPs equivalent to no more than 5 percent of the FTE tenure-track faculty. Professor Jim Largay SECONDED the motion.

A rather animated discussion among several faculty ensued.

Professor Ken Sinclair CALLED the question (the proposed amendment to the original motion). The question was CALLED.

The amendment FAILED.

Professor Sinclair then CALLED the question on the original motion. The question was CALLED.

The original motion PASSED.

5. **Committee Reports.** Professor Kay, on behalf of the Educational Policy Committee, announced that Professor Elizabeth Fifer would be the new chair of the committee.

Professor Ron Hartranft, on behalf of the Faculty Steering Committee, provided a report on the state of university governance [see Attachment 5]. He noted it was his privilege to serve as chair of FSC and announced that Professor Judith Lasker would be the next chair.

Professor Neti, on behalf of the Personnel Committee, provided the committee's annual report to the faculty [see Attachment 6]. He announced that Professor Rich Aronson would be the new chair.

Professor Largay, on behalf of the Faculty Compensation Committee provided a year-end report [see Attachment 7] and announced that Professor Neal Simon will be the new chair.

In response to a question about whether the FCC had made a difference, Professor Largay said he believed FCC was 'not doing any harm.'

Professors Roger Simon and Judith Lasker raised issues regarding the Phased Retirement Program and its discontinuance. In response, Provost Yoshida stated that, after extensive discussion, the decision was made not to renew the program.

Professor Gunter MOVED to suspend the rules so that the faculty committee elections could be held. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

Professor Beall Fowler, on behalf of the Nominations Committee, distributed election ballots.

Professor Bruce Hargreaves, on behalf of the Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee, presented the FFPOC's annual report to the faculty [see Attachment 8]. He noted the dramatic rise in exempt staffing levels and the increase in the student faculty ratio from 10.7 in 1993 to 11.9 at present. He also pointed out that the number of credits awarded per faculty in the CBE has climbed 44% since 1993.

6. **Intellectual Property Policy.** Senior Vice President Nelson Markley updated efforts to draft a policy on intellectual property. He provided background on the framework, noted the end of the process was in sight and observed that the process was a constructive enterprise that should help recruit and retain good faculty.
7. **Provost's Report.** Provost Yoshida began his remarks by thanking the faculty for their support over the last 8 months. He noted that Lehigh is in transition and articulated a number of issues and goals including: the need to ask and address good questions; a proactive effort at diversity; development of a productive faculty environment; and, the tradeoff of dollars versus needs.

For the coming year, the provost emphasized the need for units to work together to achieve university goals. He concluded his remarks by reiterating his commitment to enhancing the academic infrastructure.

The meeting stood adjourned at 6:00 PM

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



April 30 2001

GRADUATION MOTIONS

- I. That, with the approbation and consent of the Board of Trustees signified by their mandamus, the appropriate academic degrees be conferred at the end of the current semester on those individuals who shall have completed all requirements for graduation no later than 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 30, 2001, and that the President of the University and the Secretary of the Faculty be authorized to sign, on behalf of the Faculty, diplomas issued to those individuals;
- II. That the appropriate graduation honors be awarded to those individuals whose averages as computed by the Office of the Registrar shall entitle them to be graduated with honors, high honors, or highest honors, according to regulation 3.11.1 of the current edition of the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty.
- III. That the Committee on Standing of Students be empowered to act for the Faculty on any special cases involving candidates for bachelor's degrees which may arise between now and the close of the semester; that the Graduate Committee be empowered to so act in cases involving candidates for graduate degrees;
- IV. That prizes awarded to the appropriate individuals and that the announcement be made in the commencement program.

To: The University faculty
From: Edwin Kay, Chair
Educational Policy Committee

At the 30 April University Faculty meeting, on behalf of the Educational Policy Committee, I will ask the faculty to waive the "10-day rule" so that I may move the enclosed motion to amend R&P.

Motion: Revise section R&P 3.16 General College Division as follows (change is underlined)

3.16 General college division

For admission to the general college division, the applicant must submit an application at least one month prior to the start of the semester in which they hope to enroll. The applicant must show maturity, seriousness of purpose, and evidence of ability to pursue with profit the program of studies he or she desires. The student must have the established prerequisites for courses as he or she wishes to enroll and may register for course up to and including the 300-level.

Students accepted into the division as exchange students through the auspices of the Lehigh Abroad Office may take 400 level graduate level courses with the approval of the appropriate department chair and dean's office. Additional admissions requirements may be requested above those normally required for a student seeking admission into the division.

[The remainder of R&P 3.16 follows the above]

Rationale:

At present there are no rules governing exchange students wishing to take 400-level courses. Some foreign exchange students come from institutions with 5-year programs whose content extends beyond our undergraduate curriculum so that the students are well-prepared to take 400-level courses.

Proposed Course Title and Description Change

Present Course Title: Educ 451 (Psyc 451) Theories of Learning

Proposed New Title: Educ 451 Applied Principles of Cognitive Psychology

Present Course Description:

In-depth study of major classical and contemporary learning theories. Review of experimental research relevant to theories.

Proposed Course Description:

Basic principles and contemporary theories of cognitive psychology will be covered, especially regarding the application of these principles to education. Experimental research relevant to contemporary theories of cognitive psychology and the application of these theories in educational settings will be reviewed.

Rationale:

The change in title and description is proposed to reflect a change in the emphasis in this course from a broad coverage of theories of learning to a more specific focus on cognitive psychology and applications to educational settings. There are two reasons for this change in emphasis. First, most of the contemporary research in learning theory emanates from the field of cognitive psychology. Thus, this change is in keeping with the current direction of the field. Second, feedback from students who have taken this course in the past highlighted a need to connect theory and research in cognitive psychology to actual applications in school settings. In response to this feedback, the course currently is being taught with greater emphasis on the educational applications of cognitive theory, and student response has generally been positive.

Resources Required:

There are no additional library materials, computing services, or other resources needed beyond those already available for instructors and students of this course.

Change in cross-listing of course:

Drop cross-listing with Psychology Department.

Rationale:

The Psychology Department has requested that we drop the cross-listing of this course with their department. This course is taught by College of Education faculty and has never been taught by Psychology Department faculty. There are no resource implications of this change.

Provost Yoshida will present a motion to incorporate the title of Professor of Practice as described in bold below into R&P as Section 2.12.

Proposed Additional Title Category and Terms

As Lehigh strives to enhance its academic quality, we must be known for the excellence and innovation of our undergraduate, graduate and lifelong education programs as well as for highly distinguished research and scholarship. In addition, Lehigh must take advantage of a number of opportunities by offering programs that will advance the university's efforts to achieve its educational and research goals. Tenure-track professors are the core of these efforts.

Over the last few months, the four deans have been working closely together, in consultation with members of the Personnel Committee and the executive committee of department chairs, to develop additional categories and titles for non-tenure track faculty appointments at Lehigh, which will allow us to increase our flexibility in meeting our research and teaching missions. The specific title being proposed at this time is:

- Professors of Practice

The Professor of Practice title is intended to enhance our flexibility in attracting the best faculty to Lehigh. It will also help us meet the staffing challenges that will face us as our strategic initiatives unfold.

The Provost, in consultation with the Personnel Committee, will review and evaluate the usage of the Professor of Practice title in the third academic year (2003-04) and in the seventh year (2005-06) following its implementation.

Professor of Practice

As fields rapidly change, many practitioners are well suited to bring their recent skills and wisdom to the faculty ranks. To attract these professionals to the university, and recognize their experience and expertise, the title of non-tenure track Professor of Practice is proposed. Professionals appointed to these positions will add instructional value to university programs, enhance the research or applied missions of their departments, and permit the university to expand its current course offerings, often in cutting-edge areas. Examples of such Professors of Practice are as follows:

- Personnel from corporations who are on leave to teach at the university;
- Retired K-12 superintendents, principals, and teachers;
- Corporate managers retired or currently employed; and

- Individuals with specialized applied skills such as architects, designers, and photographers

There will be no rank differentials within the Professor of Practice title. Individuals will be appointed Professors of Practice for term contracts of one to five years, with the approval of the voting faculty the appropriate dean, and the provost. Contracts may be renewed for specified terms, subject to the approval of the faculty, dean, and provost. Professors of Practice will be considered non-voting members of the academic department with which they are affiliated. However, at the discretion of the department they may be invited to participate in some departmental activities, excluding appointment and tenure/promotion decisions.

The funding for these positions may come from Lehigh funded budgets (hard dollars) or contract or grant dollars. The funding levels for these positions may range from 0% (no dollars – donated time) to 100% (complete funding during the academic year).

Subject: FSC: Final report - University Governance 2000-2001

Date: Thu, 03 May 2001 07:29:01 -0400

From: "Ronald J. Hartranft" <rjh2@Lehigh.EDU>

Organization: Lehigh University

To: "STEPHEN F. THODE" <sft0@Lehigh.edu>

To: Steve Thode, secretary to the faculty
cc: Members of FSC and others
Subject: FSC: Final report - University Governance 2000-2001

I'm attaching the text of the report I gave at the faculty meeting April 30.

--
Prof. Ronald J Hartranft
Dept. of Mech. Engr. & Mechanics
Lehigh University
19 Memorial Drive West
Bethlehem, PA 18015-3085

--
<Phone:610-758-4109> <Mailto:rjh2@Lehigh.edu>
<<http://www.Lehigh.edu/~rjh2/rjh2.html>>

The State of University Governance
(at Lehigh University)
Report of the Faculty Steering Committee for 2000-2001
Given April 30, 2001 by R. Hartranft, chair

It has been my privilege to serve as chair of the faculty steering committee (FSC) during this academic year. I'll make a few observations later in this report on Lehigh's governance system. But let me first say that it has been a pleasure to work with those of my colleagues who also served on the steering committee this year. In addition to the four of us who were elected to represent our four colleges, the committee includes representatives of five other university committees, the president and the provost.

Judith Lasker is chair-elect of the committee and will begin her term as chair on July 1. As chair of the FSC subcommittee on regulations and procedures, she has played a key role this year in the initial phases of the trustee-mandated review of "Rules and Procedures of the Lehigh University Faculty." More on that later. Matt Melone will be the 2001 - 2002 chair of the subcommittee.

Regarding governance at Lehigh, this faculty almost always approves, and rightly so, the recommendations of our faculty committees. But remember that the final decisions are made here, by this faculty, except for those areas in which the trustees have retained the final say. In areas in which faculty committees are inactive the administration steps in to make the day-to-day decisions. Our colleague, Bob Folk, has been reminding us every year of the decreasing percentages of both people and budgets in the academic stem of the university. One of the major shifts since the 1960s is unlikely to be reversed. Would you really want to hear detailed reports from the dean of students on disciplinary actions? Such reports used to take a significant part of faculty meetings – I think I even remember a long discussion followed by a vote on sanctions to be applied to a fraternity whose members managed to get caught while ...

But I digress. The faculty can reassert themselves, but the price is the diversion of even more

of their time away from teaching and research. The FFPOC (Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee) has begun studying this issue. I'm sure they will welcome your input.

On the matter of the review of R&P, you may wish to use your web browser to connect to the URL <http://www.lehigh.edu/~inrp/> Nelson Markley, senior vice president, is conducting the review with the advice of, and frequent meetings with, the FSC R&P subcommittee. Both Nelson and Judy have given reports to this body on the process. The collaboration between Nelson and the R&P subcommittee has been intense and cooperative. In much of the following, I'll use 'we' as shorthand for "Nelson Markley, with the advice of the FSC R&P subcommittee."

Part of the review process involves creation of five task forces to study and make recommendations to the faculty on different sections of R&P. You may be able to influence university policy without greatly adding to your workload. The proposed task forces can make a major impact in a relatively short time. We have given President Farrington the names of several of you as candidates for the first task force, on diversity and harassment. We expect that he will soon be asking you to agree to serve, to begin work immediately, and to complete your work by next spring. Other task forces will be formed over the summer and we hope that they will be able to conclude their efforts by next summer.

By setting up task forces as partnerships of several components of the university, we expect not only that many points of view will be represented, but that there will be administrative support, too. The support may be provided through the participation of staff members who have special expertise as well as in the form of help from their secretarial staff.

You may be interested in the last of the task forces we expect to propose -- on governance. Several faculty have reminded us, as if we could forget, of the tremendous effort that went into the proposal for a faculty senate a few years ago. As a member of Ed. Pol. at the time, I was very aware that the core of that proposal would have restructured our committees, streamlined our processes, and increased faculty influence, all for the better. I can't say I blame the faculty for rejecting the idea of the senate, but it did seem a shame to me that all the work on other aspects of university governance was wasted. Perhaps a task force on governance can review the senate proposal, strike out references to a senate, and use the remainder as the core of a new version of the R&P section on governance.

I'd like to highlight two important functions of the FSC, steering and communication. Let me emphasize first the fact that the FSC does not vote on items discussed. That's the prerogative of other faculty committees and the faculty as a whole. Faculty initiatives may take any of several paths to consideration by the university faculty, but the most direct, as well as the most common, is through appropriate faculty committees. Proposals sent directly to the FSC would be steered to one anyway. At meetings of the FSC, representatives from these committees review their new business and provide updates on their progress on other items. Many topics spark lively discussions and elicit views from the perspective of other committees, who may then opt to consider on their own some aspect of the topic. The president and the provost also bring items to be discussed and provide their own points of view in the discussions.

You can influence university policy. But you need to participate. Don't wait until a year from now to worry about a task force report or committee recommendation. Be part of the process and make sure the outcome will have the support of all members of the Lehigh family.

For next year, I wish you the best.

REPORT OF THE FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
April 30, 2001

As required by section 1 2.2.6 of the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty, the Personnel Committee is making its annual report to the faculty. We have three responsibilities under R&P: to advise the administration on high-level appointments; to hear cases brought by faculty alleging arbitrary or capricious action in promotion and tenure decisions; and bring to the faculty legislation regarding personnel issues. We discuss briefly recent developments in these areas.

Since our April 2000 annual report, we had several requests for hearings and have some pending cases, and we have not heard any cases appealing tenure or promotion decisions.

As you have witnessed, we have had a large turn over and some growth in the higher levels of administration. We have had a busy year in this regard, and the personnel committee advised the president on the appointments of the new provost vice president for university relations, vice president for finance and administration, interim dean of education, deans of engineering and education, the university general counsel, and were informed of the appointment of the new vice president for government affairs.

We have had discussions with the administration on matters related to policies on endowed chairs, additional professorial titles, and policies under the Family and Medical Leave Act. In the last case, we insured the continuation of Long Term Disability in conjunction with FMLA. We are in the process of looking at the review of R&P currently underway.

As always, through out the year, we have rendered informal advice to both faculty and administration on various personnel matters. There is a lot of activity of this kind, quite a bit more than one would imagine. Such informal discussions make for better and smoother operation of the University in general and minimize the number of formal cases that come to the committee.

The College of Arts and Sciences representative, Professor Roger Simon has completed his five-year tenure with the committee and we thank him for his unflinching service. Professor Joan Spade, the at-large member of the committee is leaving the University and we will miss her wisdom. As per the usual rotation, the chair of the personnel committee next year will be Prof. J. Richard Aronson of the Economics Department.




James A. Largay III
 Arthur Andersen & Co. Alumni
 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

April 30, 2001

TO: Lehigh University Faculty Colleagues
FROM: Jim Largay, Chair, Faculty Compensation Committee 
SUBJECT: Final 2000-2001 Faculty Compensation Committee Report

The 2000-2001 Academic Year We Inherited

The past 1999-2000 academic year was an adjustment year for the Faculty Compensation Committee. How the FCC pursues its objective of achieving fair and competitive faculty compensation—salary and benefits—had to adjust to the perspective of a new Administration. Publicly committed to fair and competitive faculty compensation, the new Administration is unwilling to base salary adjustments on the aggregate database of prior years. Moreover, relations between the FCC and the Administration were strained to the point where the FCC became marginalized. We needed a new working arrangement with the Administration to reopen channels of communication, restore trust, and develop a plan to raise faculty compensation to a higher priority.

During 1999-2000 we negotiated a new operating agreement and formed a plan to base compensation adjustments on data from more narrowly-construed comparative reference groups. Thus the FCC entered the 2000-2001 academic year tempered by our experiences but cautiously optimistic.

The New Operating Agreement During 2000-2001

During 2000-2001 the FCC had ample opportunity to communicate our views to the Administration, as agreed, but how much impact we had is unclear. In compensation, more is better than less, and this year's 4% increment represents an improvement over last year's 3.5%. However, I attach a comparison of Full Professor compensation based on AAUP data, prepared by our permanent but unofficial FCC consultant, Frank Gunter. Lehigh slipped to 85th place from 77th in 2000-2001 even though 18% fewer schools participated in this year's AAUP survey.

My impression is that the reference group exercise is proceeding unevenly across campus, especially in my own unit. This is of great concern because these comparative reference group compensation data must be available before the 2002-2003 budget cycle begins if we are to test the Administration's commitment to competitive compensation.

Review of Phased Retirement Program

We mailed an 11-question survey on the Phased Retirement Program to the 17 colleagues participating in the program; 9 were returned. After reviewing these responses the FCC recommended (1) that the Phased Retirement Program continue for at least another three years, (2) that the process be made more friendly and its conditions be made more transparent and (3) that a mechanism be devised to address any issues/concerns that arise during administration of the Phased Retirement Program. Nevertheless, at a meeting on March 23 Provost Ron Yoshida informed me—before the public announcement—that the Phased Retirement Program will not be extended. Try as I could, though, I was unable to extract any explanation from Ron beyond the factual statement that the program is ending and it is time to move forward.

Intellectual Property Policy

As many of you know, Senior Vice President Nelson Markley has been developing a policy in intellectual property—what it is and who owns it—and sharing it with faculty and committees. Nelson briefed me individually and then briefed the entire FCC on his latest draft. I had several comments; probably the most substantive involved protecting the Faculty's "Traditional Academic Rights" in intellectual property. In the draft's hierarchical scheme of ownership principles, I think that "Traditional Academic Rights" should top the list, and not have to survive the three ownership principles ranked above it. I urge all faculty members to look sharply at the proposed intellectual property policy.

Other Issues

At the March 23 meeting with Provost Ron Yoshida, when I was informed that the Phased Retirement Program will not be continued, I made two other formal requests:

1. We believe the availability of tuition remission to faculty dependents is a benefits issue. Any proposed change in policy is a serious matter and must follow the process that includes FCC involvement. We are formally requesting that any restrictions on the ability of faculty dependents who are eligible for tuition remission to enroll in summer courses, or to count toward minimum required enrollments in those courses, be deferred until next year when the proper process can be carried out.
2. We think the campus will benefit from a better understanding of the distribution of salary raises and how this might be changing over the past few years. As you know we have been urging those making compensation adjustments to recognize that more faculty members are meritorious than previously thought and to assign more of the raise pool to the department chairs. We sense some movement on these matters and request that documentation be provided. For example, understanding how the portions of the raise pool administered at different levels are changing and, perhaps, the % of faculty in different deciles of the raise distribution, will help.

Final Thoughts

During the past year the Faculty heard on several occasions from the Administration that Lehigh's financial problems are due to two principal developments:

1. Substantial secular decline in graduate tuition revenue.
2. Substantial secular decline in indirect cost recovery on externally-funded research projects

At the last University Faculty meeting Professor Krawiec asked for an analysis of what caused these developments. The lateness of the hour precluded a comprehensive response to that question.

In my opinion these problems have been laid at the Faculty's doorstep, as if the size of the Faculty and the cost of compensating it are responsible for such financial difficulties. I can tell you from my vantage point in the Rauch Business Center that during many of the last ten years Lehigh failed to react to challenges and exploit opportunities. For example, where were the investments needed to keep our graduate programs, particularly the MBA program, cutting edge, competitive and growing? Where were the investments in infrastructure needed to support major-league funded research activities? Where were the investments that would have avoided, or minimized, the need to play catch-up signaled by the major new infusions of resources in academic programs announced earlier this year?

It has been my privilege to serve as Chair of the Faculty Compensation Committee for two years. I urge you to energetically support the FCC, new Chair Neal Simon, and Vice-Chair Tina Richardson, in the next academic year.

Attachment

Friendly amendment to Protocol Practice Motion

The Provost or the appropriate College Dean shall provide the Professor of Practice with an annual assessment of performance and need, which may be coordinated with salary review.

1

-----DRAFT-----

Annual Report of the FFPOC, Academic Year 2000-2001

Date: 30 April 2001

Committee Members (* continuing next year):

- Bruce Hargreaves, chair and At-Large Representative
(replacement by election 4/30/01)
- Richard Decker, former chair and CEAS Representative
(replacement: Alastair McAulay, EECS)
- Jim Hall, CBE Representative
(replacement by election 5/7/01)
- *Ed Lotto, CAS Representative (two years remaining)
- *Asha Jitendra, CE Representative (three years remaining)

BRK

Objectives for this year

We set three primary goals for the year:

- 1 To improve communication with both faculty and administration on FFPOC issues;
- 2 To identify important issues in the financial planning and operations of the University where we felt we could make a contribution;
- 3 To establish mechanisms and measurements to allow the administration and future FFPOC's to track Lehigh's performance in key sectors in order to guide policy decisions

Progress toward our objectives.

Communication. During the semester we developed content and links on a new FFPOC Web page to provide a repository (for reports and other materials) that is accessible to the campus community. Currently there are four sections: Links to the FFPOC charge in R&P, a list of committee members maintained by the Provost (modified at our request to provide links to members by email and to our Web page), a section with summary graphs that limits access to those with a Lehigh user name and password, and a section with FFPOC reports. We intend to use the Web page to post information and notify faculty and administrators of new content via email.

Another aspect of communications is scheduling meetings with the provost, president, and other members of the administration on a regular basis. Several of these meetings will in the next two weeks. We also plan to meet with new members soon (after elections are completed) to provide some orientation to the FFPOC.

Important Issues. Our primary concern, shared by many others, is determining how to maintain Lehigh's strengths while at the same time moving strategically in new areas of teaching, scholarship, and community service. FFPOC's traditional focus is on major fiscal plans and budget items.

We hope to obtain an important perspective on fiscal strategy by comparing the annual expenditure on "academics" by the top-rated national universities with our own expenditures (as used by USNEWS in their annual rankings). We hope to obtain comparative numbers later this year with the help of Lehigh's Office of Institutional Research. As we hope to be able to track the expenditure of one-time dollars from the Lehigh 2020 Plan.

A key fiscal issue is how funds are allocation relative to the academic mission of the University. This year we became concerned about a recent growth in exempt staff positions (75 added since 1995, offset by a loss of 8 slots at the non-exempt level). During the same time the number of fulltime faculty has declined by 6. Since 1993 the undergraduate student faculty ratio has increased from 10.7 to 11.9 (counting all faculty, including those in the College of Education). The number of credits awarded per faculty in the College of Business and Economics has climbed 44% since 1993.

The dollar impact of growth in staff positions is significant. The unrestricted pool for faculty salaries has grown by 4.6% per year since 1997 while the exempt salaries have grown by 8% per year. If the exempt staff salary pool had grown at the same rate as the faculty there would have been \$1.5M available to spend on something else. We cannot judge whether the expenses were justified or even whether they will continue (some may have represented Y2K staff whose job may now be done). Yet we have a concern that hiring of additional staff may be too easy at Lehigh, and that a critical test of the benefit of each position to the core mission may not have been passed.

Concerns are raised frequently about the scholarly productivity of the faculty, but we recognize constraints at Lehigh. When examining data on grades and credits awarded per faculty in each college, but see large differences between colleges. These trends undoubtedly reflect reduced participation in teaching when research is funded at a high level. But it also means that each college has a somewhat different culture and that we should not all be held to the same standard of research productivity. It should be possible to equate teaching load with research load and assess the corresponding fiscal yield to the university in each case. We expect that in cases of high intrinsic value of a discipline or reputation of specific faculty the university should support a modest teaching load together with a modest yield from funded research. But as a goal we would like to see more balance so that those who wish to invest themselves more in teaching or in research will have some latitude, while encouraging all to participate in both areas to some degree.

Tracking Performance. FFPOC will continue to research such budget allocation and performance issues in the future. We believe that comparisons of staff numbers with other universities may be helpful, but only if the proper sufficient details are available to discriminate between different styles of doing business (e.g. outsourcing versus services provided by employees). We are still hoping to **find some measure of performance appropriate for administrative groups**, and challenge our administrative leaders to help us. Especially useful, we believe, would be a comparison of **average research dollars per faculty** and **average annual publications per faculty** by college and **average credits awarded annually per faculty** by college for reference universities.