Lehigh University

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

19 October 1998

Presiding: Gregory Farrington (Perella Auditorium)

President Farrington called the meeting to order at 4:12 PM.

1. Minutes. The minutes of the September 14, 1998 faculty meeting were APPROVED.

2. Committee Motions. Professor Arnold Spokane, on behalf of the Educational Policy Committee, MOVED a change in the application date for January graduations from December 1 preceding to November 1 preceding. The proposed change permits more time for the clearance process; allows departments and students more time to react to problems; and permits timely ordering of diplomas. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

Professor Ed Shapiro, on behalf of the Faculty Compensation Committee, presented a proposal, not a motion, to close the faculty compensation gap [see Attachment 1].

Professor Frank Gunter noted that the current compensation gap is 12 percent using the FCC’s “traditional method” and 8 percent using the provost’s method which does not adjust for academic fields.

Professor Arnold Spokane called for a general adjustment to compensation to close the gap.

Professor Bob Folk raised two points: 1) that he believes the current compensation gap is the result of a decades-long lack of faculty concern about university priorities; and 2) he is opposed to the FCC’s proposal as he believes it demeans the concept of tenure because it does not call for “pedestal” levels of compensation.

President Farrington made several observations: 1) field specificity is real in his mind and a key point. Analysis of compensation should be done department by department even more than college by college; 2) he repeated his theme from his Founder’s Day speech. For Lehigh to be
great. It must be competitive on salaries. However, the problem cannot be corrected overnight. There are no magic words to make the problem disappear. To close the compensation gap immediately would cost $4 million—more than 25 percent of the athletic department budget. Closing the gap immediately would empty the Alumni Memorial Building; 3) the budgeting process is excellent at balancing the budget, but ineffective at achieving strategic goals. He said the budget process must be changed, but that it would take a couple years; 4) he will be aggressive on salary increases this year, but not as aggressive as he would like. Closing the compensation gap is something he would like to do as quickly as possible, but a 9 percent compensation increase this year is fiscally indefensible.

Provost Markley noted that Lehigh can do better on compensation than many of its peers and asked for more faculty understanding of the salary problem. He emphasized there was a common goal to make progress on the gap problem, but that the faculty may not agree with him on the size of the problem.

Professor Folk questioned university priorities, especially with respect to the elimination of many faculty positions and stated that the faculty had done a poor job of thinking strategically.

President Farrington framed the issue in terms of choices. Universities have to make much more difficult choices today than in the past. He said he does believe Lehigh is awash with opportunities.

Professor Colleen Callahan, on behalf of the Personnel Committee, moved a change to the Rules & Procedures of the Faculty, Section 1.2.2.6 to delete the phrase “and may not begin a term after his/her sixty-fourth birthday” [see Attachment 2]. The motion was seconded and passed.

Professor Folk inquired about the status of his second proposal [see Attachment 3].

Professor Callahan stated that the Personnel Committee was not prepared to act on the second proposal now since the committee had not come to a consensus. She promised action by the next faculty meeting. The question was called. President asked that the motion be restated. After the motion was restated, it passed.


5. **Committee Reports.** Professor Susan Szczepanski, on behalf of the Graduate and Research Committee, presented the timetable for this year's evaluation of graduate programs, which will involve the faculty of seven graduate programs. Forms have been sent to the program coordinators and department chairs, and a question and answer meeting will be held in November. Important dates: February 15, 1999 - program profiles and program reports are due in deans' offices; March 15, 1999 - profiles and reports to be forwarded to GRC along with deans' reports.

Professor Folk asked whom is responsible for notifying graduate students of due dates. Professor Szczepanski replied that graduate students are advised by the dean's office or department graduate academic coordinator.

Professor Richard Decker, pinch-hitting for Professor George White on behalf of the Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee reported that FFPOC has had three meetings so far this fall.

The SAFARIS - IR project has been scaled back to a student resources/human resources project. Deloitte & Touche found serious issues with respect to the Y2K problem. Nelson Markley and Rhonda Gross are taking the lead in this area. While a full-blown SAFARIS - IR implementation would cost $12-30 million, the SR/HR piece is expected to cost $5-7 million.

There will be a new mainframe computer for critical systems. In the area of telecommunications, the system will be upgraded as the switch is now 13 years old. FFPOC supports the FCC position on faculty compensation but has its own view, which it will present.

Professor Decker also noted that FFPOC hopes the new budget process is priority-based, not incrementally based. The academic infrastructure of the university should be a top priority. Professor Decker concluded by encouraging interested faculty to send e-mail to George White at GPW1.

Professor Callahan, on behalf of the Personnel Committee, responded to Professor Folk's second motion. Professor Folk, in turn, asked that the procedures be documented so as to shield the committee and to help the appealing party.

6. **President's Report.** President Farrington noted the Stillwater review is coming along having received good comments. He expressed a desire to move the budget process to a system that is non-incremental. He stated that, if we are to arrive at strategic priorities, the budget process must address long-term goals. Where one establishes priorities, the...
whole brings excellence. The budget process will take longer. A Christmas deadline is not wholly rational. Working budget decisions will take more time.

He stated the need for an effective student records system. He also noted that the Rossins (donors of the named College of Engineering and Applied Science) had a wonderful time on campus and will be coming back, which is good. Three more colleges to go in terms of named college donors. $5 million has been raised for an academic initiatives fund. He acknowledged the helpfulness of the provost in sorting out priorities, and the uncommon generosity of the trustees.

Professor Bruce Smackey expressed interest in the use of benchmarks and, with that in mind, asked the president to share statistics with respect to faculty meeting attendance at Penn compared to Lehigh.

President Farrington first expressed amused admiration for Lehigh’s rules and procedures that go to 4 decimal places, which he said put Lehigh way ahead of Penn. He noted faculty meeting attendance at Penn was erratic and reiterated his belief that Lehigh has the ability to be the best.

The meeting stood adjourned at 5:03 PM.

_____________________________________________________________
Stephen F. Thode
Secretary to the Faculty
304 Rauch Business Center
758-4557
FAX: 882-9415
E-mail: sftO
October 13 1998

To: Voting Faculty

From: Faculty Compensation Committee

Re: Proposal to Close the Compensation Gap

As indicated in our report at the September faculty meeting, the FCC has constructed a proposal to close the compensation gap and has presented this in a meeting with the President and Provost. The proposal assumes a gap of approximately 12%, using the across ranks mean gap between Lehigh and the 14 traditional peer reference schools. The committee learned that the gap using the Provost's set of benchmark schools places this gap at approximately 8%. The proposal, which seeks only to close the current gap and not to recoup compensation lost in prior years while the gap developed, is attached.

The FCC presented this proposal in the spirit of collaboration with the administration to successfully address this long-term problem. The committee likewise recognizes that the solution to the problem will require an on-going commitment from the administration and that the faculty goals for closing the compensation gap may not proceed exactly along the lines proposed by the FCC. The FCC has been encouraged by the public and private statements of the President and Provost and anticipate being involved in the budget process that will move the faculty toward compensation parity with our peer institutions.
FCC Resolution for Closing Compensation Gap

Since 1990, the gap between the average compensation of faculty at Lehigh and the traditional 14 peer reference institutions grew to between 7.0% and 13.9%, with an average of 11.3% across ranks. A comparison with the list of schools recently developed by Provost Markley shows the gap in 1996-97 alone against the U.S. News top 50 (not the highest group for comparison) to range between 2.8% and 6.7%.

For the six year period FY 91-92 through FY 96-97 using Provost Markley's comparison schools, Lehigh faculty have foregone a cumulative compensation per faculty member averaged across ranks of at least $25,000. The faculty recognize that recouping this financial loss under current financial conditions is unrealistic. Foregone accumulated wages should be recognized by administration and trustees as a contribution to the financial security of Lehigh by the faculty to the tune of over $1 million.

The FCC therefore recommends:

1. To close the existing compensation gap, but not recoup the accumulated wage loss, Lehigh needs to go beyond the peer institutional compensation rate. In our proposal below, we assume a 3.5% annual peer institutional increment. The actual increments would vary directly with actual peer institutional increments. To correct the deficiency, the FCC recommends that total faculty compensation be increased by a total of 12% above the 3.5% annual level over a specified period. We offer both 3- and 4-year models to meet the goal of bringing Lehigh up to its peers in faculty compensation.

THREE YEAR MODEL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>Expected Peer Increases + gap closure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>(3.5% + 6.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>(3.5% + 4.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>(3.5% + 2.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOUR YEAR MODEL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>Expected Peer Increases + gap closure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>(3.5% + 6.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>(3.5% + 3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>(3.5% + 2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>(3.5% + 1.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Funds for the above faculty salary increases should be obtained from (i) reordering priorities for the use of operating revenues, and (ii) prudent use of endowment and other restricted funds.

3. Current methods of distributing salaries within departments need to be carefully scrutinized across Colleges. Plans developed and implemented must be monitored in all academic units to assure that merit-based decisions consider broadly the concept of merit and the long-term performance of faculty. Thus, when the first year's salary increments are determined, faculty performance over at least the last 5 years should be considered.

4. Examination of the existing gap shows greater discrepancies at some ranks than at others. In addition, the gap within ranks across disciplines is considerable. The FCC recommends that the distribution of salary increments eliminate the gap between LU and peer institutions in each of the three ranks and reduce the inequities across disciplines.

In closing, the FCC offers this proposal in the spirit of improving the University's national stature. As faculty, we look forward to participating in an active partnership with the Lehigh Trustees and Administration.
MEMORANDUM

To: Voting Faculty
From: Roger Simon, Chair Personnel Committee
Subject: Change to R&P
Date: October 5, 1998

At the October 19 faculty meeting the Personnel Committee will propose the following change in R&P, Section 1 2.2.6:

Delete the phrase from statement on qualifications for membership: “and may not begin a term after his/her sixty-fourth birthday.”

The original intent of the clause was to insure that elected members would be able to finish their terms. Since there is no longer any mandatory retirement, this clause now is discriminatory. The Committee recommends it be deleted from R&P.
Motion to Change Section 1.2.2.6 of the Rules & Procedures of the Faculty

Motion # 1

Omit the words:

and may not begin a term after his/her sixty-fourth birthday

at the end of the first paragraph.

Motion # 2

Insert the following sentence as the second sentence in the third paragraph:

"The appealing part; will be given copies of all documents and either be present or be given a recording of all oral testimony in his/her case."

from Bob Folk
ext. 83308

From the writings of Albert Einstein:

For an academic career puts a young man into a kind of embarrassing position by requiring him to produce scientific publications in impressive quantity—a seduction into superficiality which only strong characters are able to withstand. Most practical occupations, however are of such a nature that a man of normal ability is able to accomplish what is expected of him. His day-to-day existence does not depend on any special illuminations. If he has deeper scientific interests he may plunge into his favorite problems in addition to doing his required work. He need not be oppressed by the fear that his efforts may lead to no results. I owed it to Marcel Grossman that I was in such a fortunate position.
This committee is composed of five tenured faculty members each serving a five-year term on a staggered basis. The four members elected by the faculty of the university to represent the four colleges must be at the rank of professor. The fifth member must be an associate professor at the time of his/her election to the committee. This fifth member is to be elected at-large by the university faculty. A faculty member may not be reelected to a second full term and may not begin a term after his/her sixty-fourth birthday.

In the event that the personnel committee decides that any current member should not participate in hearing a particular case because of a conflict of interest, the committee will designate as his/her substitute for that case the former member of the committee who most recently represented the college or school of the temporarily disqualified member. If no former committee member of that college is available, the committee will select the most recent former member of the personnel committee who is available to hear the case. As used above, availability implies that the individual is willing to serve and is not disqualified because of a conflict of interest.

In considering any appeal the personnel committee is empowered to examine all letters and other documents and to question members of the faculty and the administration for the purpose of establishing facts in the case. The personnel committee may, at its option, petition the provost, the president, or the board of trustees for reconsideration of the decision that caused the appeal. Representatives of the administration, the personnel committee, and the appealing party may participate in any hearing before the board of trustees or its designated committee. When the personnel committee considers the appeal of a member of an under-represented minority group (as currently defined by United States government guidelines for eliminating discrimination in employment) the president will appoint a tenured member of the university's affirmative action/equal opportunity commission to serve as part-time voting member of the committee for the duration of that specific case, unless the appealing individual declines such an appointment in advance or unless his/her group is already represented on the committee.

The committee always advises the board of trustees on an appointment to the office of president and the office of vice president and provost.

Whenever an appointment is to be made to academic and research positions at the rank of dean or above without advertising the vacancy and/or without utilizing a search committee the committee will render advice to the president. E.g., Associate or assistant provost, director of libraries, vice president for graduate studies and research, vice president for academic services, and vice president for student affairs. Recognizing that titles and responsibilities of positions may change the above list is meant to be representative.

The committee is authorized to make inquiries which are necessary to carry out these duties.

The committee shall report to the university faculty at least once a year. It will undertake the development of general principles based on its decisions and will report in writing on those general principles to the university faculty.

from Bob Folk

September 1996