Lehigh University

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

1 November 1999

Presiding: Gregory Farrington (University Center 308)

President Farrington called the meeting to order at 4:18 PM.

1. **Memorial Resolution.** A tribute to John W. Vanderhoff, late Professor Emeritus of Chemistry, was read by Professor Keith Schray who then MOVED that his remarks be incorporated in these minutes [see Attachment 1] and that a copy be sent to the family. The President declared the motion APPROVED by acclamation and the faculty STOOD for a moment of silence in memory of John W. Vanderhoff.

2. **Minutes.** Professor Steve Thode MOVED that a correction to the September 13, 1999 requested by Professor Yong Kim [see Attachment 2] be appended to the minutes of this faculty meeting. The motion was SECONDED. The motion PASSED. The minutes of the September 13, 1999 faculty meeting were APPROVED.

3. **Unfinished Business.** None

4. **New Business.** None.

5. **Committee Reports.** Professor Ron Hartranft, on behalf of the Faculty Steering Committee, provided a review of the R&P charge procedures. A message to the faculty will be forthcoming. He also gave the URL at the Lehigh web site. E-mail to faculty on revisions discusses legalities of when changes to R&P become effective. He encouraged faculty to read the e-mail.

Professor Richard Decker, on behalf of the FFPOC, provided a report on activities. The "Sasaki" plan is in full swing. He encouraged input on the faculty's usage. As for the budget, he pointed out there would be a new level of detail in next year's budget and a rollout of the process proposed last spring. He noted that President Farrington has encouraged FFPOC to distribute copies of the new budget plan to the faculty.

The LEWIS Project will aid in the budgeting process. As for the Sasaki draft report, it stresses the importance of integration with the academic plan and integration with the facilities plan. He stressed the importance of
faculty development, and welcomed input.

Professor Frank Gunter repeated his same concern from last year – that slippage in faculty salaries continues.

President Farrington remarked that he believes the salary increase goals are ‘on line’ and is the subject of discussion with the various deans and vice president for finance. He did note the declining graduate tuition revenue, and cautioned that Lehigh is increasingly living off the stock market.

Professor Decker articulated the FFPOC position which is to support the FCC. FFPOC does not wish to become ‘another voice.”

Professor Gunter noted that overall spending increases for the university are far greater than faculty compensation increases and wondered if this should be a priority of FFPOC.

Professor Decker replied that FFPOC has not made this an explicit priority.

Professor Jim Largay, on behalf of the Faculty Compensation Committee, provided a written [see Attachment 3] and verbal report. He stated that FCC shares Professor Gunter’s concerns noting there ought to be a way to shift funds and that FCC wouldn’t give up trying.

FCC has had three meetings – two on benefits and one on salary administration. He observed that benefits choices are being reduced and that the “buydown” category and credits shifting have been eliminated. For long-term disability insurance, he advised the faculty of the differences between after-tax and pre-tax contributions. He noted that a faculty member must be on the “after-tax” election for 3 years to qualify for tax-free disability benefits. He recommended a discussion of the change in benefits philosophy and a discussion of the costs and benefits of more choices versus less.

On the issue of salary administration, Professor Largay noted some faculty discontent with the process the past year and observed that the college deans would distribute salary increments this year. FCC hopes to address these (and other concerns) via invitations to all the deans to meet with the FCC. The invitations were extended on October 27, and he encouraged the deans present to respond to the invitation.

Professor Bob Thornton asked why the benefit choices were reduced. Professor Largay said there was a trend toward standardization and simplification.
Vice President Rhonda Gross explained the adverse selection problem with life insurance, the need to recalibrate and realign medical insurance premiums to meet IRS guidelines, and the fact that, historically, having so many different medical plans with different co-pays, premiums, etc. often led faculty to choose plans for marginal reasons.

Professor Largay reiterated that FCC wouldn’t give up on the dialogue on redirecting university funds to faculty compensation. He promised to make a “vivid” presentation in the spring.

Professor Sudhakar Neri questioned the idea of vesting the salary increments with the deans – observing that he believes his department chair knows him better.

Provost Nelson Markley summarized his views on the subject indicating he had sent a memo to the academic deans about his expectation that the deans would work closely with the chairs, but that the final decisions will rest with the deans. He noted that all four colleges are different – one has just one department; another has 18 departments, but that the chairs should be engaged in all four colleges. The provost said he was looking for a normal distribution of increments with a known standard deviation.

6. President’s Report. President Farrington acknowledged that faculty salaries were in the hands of the deans, but that, if he were a dean, he would ask every department chair to recommend a specific raise for each faculty member. Salary increments are all subject to a non-negotiable mandate from the trustees to establish a meritocracy based on productivity and excellence in teaching and scholarship. Uniform raises don’t accomplish that goal. The deans are “naturals” when it comes to establishing responsibility and accountability for both revenues and expenditures.

The president introduced Bonnie Devlin, Vice President for Advancement, as definitely Penn’s loss and Lehigh’s gain. He reiterated his focus on faculty development and the top priority of securing a large number of fully endowed faculty chairs. The other advancement priority is undergraduate financial aid. Both are solid investments that flow directly to the academic bottom line.

The president announced that John Chen and Dick Durand both made presentations to the trustees at their meeting in October. The afternoon was set aside for presentations instead of committee reports. These presentations connect the trustees with the academic life of the university. He reminded the trustees that Lehigh had too few fully endowed chairs, and sees progress on that front.
Graduate enrollment cash flow and research cash flow continue to decline, putting pressure on other parts of the budget. Lehigh is becoming a four-year undergraduate institution.

The search for a new vice president for research should be concluded by the end of the semester. Great teaching and great research go together. Dual emphasis will make it possible to attract the best possible students. Faculty must participate in the process.

Professor Neti asked about the CEAS dean's search. The president had no comment.

Professor Decker noted that Lehigh once had a 'graduate school' and asked for the president's thoughts on integration of graduate programs. The president suggested that one of Lehigh's problems is that, since the vice president for research position went away, Lehigh's graduate image has also gone away. The university has to change the perception that Lehigh is not a graduate institution. Professor Decker asked if there was an overlap between the vice president for public affairs and other areas. The president stated there was no overlap. Ken Smith serves as an assistant to the president for community and government affairs.

Professor Barbara Traister asked if service has been eliminated from the faculty equation. The president said that any interpretation that eliminates service from the equation is not his interpretation. Service is required of everyone, and exceptional service should be rewarded. However, he cautioned that a faculty member couldn't make a professional life strictly in service.

Professor Thornton asked about a replacement for departed study abroad head Cas Sowa. Provost Markley stated there was a search under way. Professor Rich Aronson asked how the study abroad office would be organized. Provost Markley stated it would be organized under the registrar's office.

Professor Todd Watkins noted a disconnect between the vagueness of the compensation system and how the teaching, scholarship and service components play into it. He inquired about incentives and emphasis, expressing a sense that no consistent message was being sent. The president said the message is to demonstrate productivity and excellence in teaching and scholarship, and he hoped every dean and every department chair could explain to each faculty member who does not get the raise they might like why the situation is the way it is.

Professor Decker said he believed the study abroad office was in disarray and wanted to know the university's commitment to international study.
The president noted the global council meeting in London next week, that the university cannot cut itself off from the rest of the world, and that the preparation for the global council has been intense.

Professor Decker indicated that the registrar had been acting for Cas Sowa and wondered whether he was still acting for Cas Sowa. Provost Markley observed there is a changed model for international affairs. As a result of the Stillwater Report, the university is moving to a decentralized model. The global council communicates through Mark Erickson; there is a new person in student affairs – Bill Hunter; and, Lorna Hunter is charged with international recruiting. The provost said a replacement for Cas Sowa would be found.

The president summarized by stating that good academic departments are automatically international, and that the university should be much more active in international activities – especially in the Far East. He is committed to an integrated approach involving alumni, advancement, athletics, and admissions.

The meeting stood adjourned at 5:31 PM.

______________________________
Stephen F. Thode
Secretary to the Faculty
304 Rauch Business Center
(610) 758-4557
FAX: (610) 882-9415
E-mail: sftø
John W. Vanderhoff
Memorial Resolution
November 1, 1999

The faculty of Lehigh University record with sorrow the death of Dr. John W. Vanderhoff in his home on Thursday, September 16, 1999. He was born on August 2, 1925 in Niagara Falls, NY, a son of the late John L. and Eleanor (McCabe) Vanderhoff. He obtained his BS in Chemistry from Niagara University in 1947, and his PhD in Chemistry in 1951 from the former University of Buffalo, now known as State University of New York at Buffalo. He worked for Dow Chemical, Midland, Michigan as a research chemist, project leader, and associate scientist for 20 years. He joined the faculty of Lehigh University in 1970 as a Professor of Chemistry and Director of the National Printing Ink Research Institute. He taught chemistry at Lehigh University for 27 years and retired with emeritus status in January 1997 at the age of 71.

Professor Vanderhoff was a specialist in polymer, colloid, and surface chemistry, and was particularly interested in emulsion polymerization, uniform particle size latexes, characterization of latexes, and application of latexes in paints, paper coatings, cements and immunology. While at Lehigh he was the founder and co-director of the Emulsion Polymer Institute and a co-organizer of the short course Advances in Emulsion Polymerization and Latex Technology. He was the principal investigator along with two Lehigh colleagues for a joint university and NASA experiment in 1982 which produced the first commercial product to be made in space. He and his colleagues were named “Inventors of the Year” by NASA for their work in developing a process in which monodisperse latex microspheres were produced in space on the shuttle flights. He received the Borden Award from the American Chemical Society, the Union Carbide Chemicals Award twice, the Lehigh Libsch Award for outstanding achievement in research, and an honorary doctor’s degree from Niagara University. He also co-authored over 200 scientific papers, and held 12 U.S. and 30 foreign patents.

He was a member of numerous professional societies: Polymer Colloid Group, American Institute of Chemists, American Chemical Society, American Institute of Chemical Engineers, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Sigma Xi, American Institute of Aeronautics, Federation of the Coatings Society, Technical Association of the Pulp and Paper Industry, Society of Manufacturing Engineers, and American Association of University Professors.

Professor Vanderhoff is survived by his wife Joan T. (Moir) Vanderhoff, his daughter Jane A. of Bethlehem, his son John M. of Center Valley, sisters Rosemary K. and Eleanor V., wife of Eugene Asklar, both of Niagara Falls, and a grandson.

Mr. President, on behalf of the faculty of Lehigh University, we move that this expression of appreciation of Professor John W. Vanderhoff be spread on the minutes of this faculty meeting and that copies be distributed to his family.
Vanderhoff Memorial Resolution

Professor Mohamed S. El-Aasser

Professor Fortunato J. Micale
The President replied that uncertainty was a fact of life and the faculty should learn to live with it, and that the administration should preserve the resources needed to pursue the new opportunity. He also stated that hiring of less than the best candidates would not be allowed to happen anymore.

Professor Kim agreed that the financial flexibility was important to have and that predictable hiring rate would indeed provide such flexibility because faculty attrition would actually take place at a rate greater than the most conservative rate on which to base the hiring rate. If a department chose to hire more established faculty and thus shorten the average faculty lifetime, the department would gain increased hiring rate while the University would preserve the flexibility. He concluded by stating that the present policy needed to be modified if the University was to realize the goal of increased faculty productivity.
Lehigh University

CORRECTION TO THE FACULTY MEETING MINUTES

13 September 1999

7. **President's Report.** On the President's open invitation, Professor Yong Kim expressed two concerns pertaining to the apparent University policy. He stated that he fully supported the President's goal of increased faculty productivity but the policy seemed at odds with this goal in two regards. One had to do with the reports and memoranda that cost sharing requirements for new research proposals were being scrutinized in length. Given that proposal submission was one area where the faculty could figure prominently, he felt that this addition of thresholds was counter to the call for increased external research funding. If the funding agency required cost sharing and allowed indirect cost recovery at the same time, a prompt pledge of cost sharing would be a prudent policy. It would encourage the faculty and yet present no risk to the University. Denying it would put the Lehigh faculty at a great disadvantage, and it would effectively shrink the legitimate pool of accessible resources. He argued that the level of such support should be significant enough a fraction of the indirect cost recovery for a proposal to be competitive. The University would still gain financially and in her measure of reputation as well.

The President replied that he and the Provost were planning to make an announcement of a new allocation to help address the cost sharing matter. He stated that the University could not afford to underwrite all faculty research.

Professor Kim responded that this would not be the case of charity. His second concern was the complete opaqueness of the faculty-hiring plan. He believed that the increased expectation for the faculty productivity could be met only by reshaping the faculty profile through disciplined hiring of new faculty. In his view hiring was a two-pronged process of finding excellent candidates and selling Lehigh University and the particular academic department as the future home. He had observed over and over again that the process could not be successfully executed without the cooperation of the departmental faculty and their purposefulness. He said the academic leadership could help elevate by insisting on high quality but it would be far from being sufficient for the success. He said that empowering the departmental faculty for the task would require their engagement in the planning of where the departmental strengths should reside. Each department should be able to anticipate addition of new faculty at a regular rate, consistent with the faculty size and the average faculty lifetime in the department. He did not see how Lehigh could attain the goal of increased faculty productivity without its faculty actively participating in reshaping of the faculty profile.
MEMORANDUM

November 1, 1999

TO: Lehigh University Faculty Colleagues

FROM: Jim Largay

SUBJECT: Interim Faculty Compensation Committee Report

We had three meetings in September and October, following the initial August 31 meeting that I reported on last time. Two meetings dealt with the benefits changes you are now familiar with. The third addressed, among other things, our response to the changes in salary administration scheduled for this year.

Benefits Issues

Human Resources presented their proposed benefits changes to us on October 14. We had some ability to modify the proposals and responded to Human Resources after our October 21 meeting. However, time constraints prevented us from fully addressing a major change in the benefits plan philosophy—the ability to make choices within benefits categories and to shift “credits” from one category to another. For example, if you didn’t want all the life insurance you were entitled to, previously you could shift the excess credits to reduce your medical plan cost. This is no longer possible. Moreover, because all medical plan options have some standard features, such as drug and vision benefits, the ability to discriminate among the plans due to those benefits is gone.

We were able to soften the blow of the proposed total removal of the $40/month rebate for those covered by spousal plans and retained the annual election to pay for LTD premiums out of before-tax or after-tax dollars.

We recommend that a full-blown discussion of the structural change that deletes many choices, along with the costs and benefits of having more choices, be scheduled for a spring 2000 University Faculty Meeting. And, in general, we need to have more advance notice of proposed changes to present a more effective and comprehensive response.

Salary Administration

As you know, salary administration is vested in the four college Deans this year, with the Provost retaining approval authority but not directly administering any pool of raise money. To engage in a dialog on this new scenario, and to better understand the results of last year’s salary administration process, we invited the four Deans to meet individually with the FCC this semester. These invitations were extended on October 27 and remain outstanding. To those Deans in the audience, we encourage you to work with us in addressing concerns over salary administration by responding quickly to our invitation.