

Lehigh University
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING
(Sinclair Auditorium)
December 7, 2009

Presiding: President Alice Gast

President Gast called the meeting to order at 4:15 PM.

1. Minutes: The November, 2, meeting minutes were approved unanimously by acclamation of the Faculty, as posted in the folder “Secretary of the Faculty/2009-10” on the Lehigh University Faculty Blackboard.

2. Consent Calendar: (See page with this motion at the end of these minutes.) There were no Consent Calendar motions posted on the “Lehigh University Faculty” Blackboard. However, Registrar Bruce Correll had not been able to post the “usual” graduation motions for the January 10, 2010, graduation ceremonies, so Prof. Lotto moved to waive the 7-day rule which passed unanimously. Registrar Correll moved that they be approved, Prof. Fry seconded his motion and the faculty voted unanimously to approve them.

3. Old Business: None.

4. New Business: (See materials at the end of these minutes.)

R&P Subcommittee: Professor Vince Munley presented the first reading of a motion to revise R&P’s charge to and structure of the University Nominations Committee. With the current committee composition of 2 at-large members and the 4 college Nominations committee chairs, there has been increasing concerns among faculty that the college chairs are often new and inexperienced faculty members without sufficient understanding and perspective about the needs of particular candidate skill sets and knowledge bases for effective service on University standing committees. In order for this committee to provide a slate of good candidates, the R&P committee recommends two additional members for Nominations: A third at-large member so that all 3 faculty ranks are represented; and another who would be the fourth year member of the R&P Subcommittee of the Faculty Steering Committee (Past Chair of FSC) to serve as an *ex officio* member of the University Nominations Committee. By increasing the size of University Nominations, the desired effect would be to increase the range of knowledge and expertise to identify qualified potential candidates. Furthermore, this motion would revise the charge of University Nominations to require at least one in-person meeting of the committee at the beginning of each academic year, instead of the recent use of only email to communicate to do committee business. Also, in the middle of the spring semester, as the search process begins, the committee would be required to make a presentation at a University Faculty meeting to remind everyone about the specific committees’ roles in University governance, and all faculty members’ responsibility to help identify qualified candidates for open positions to Nominations.

The following discussion generated constructive suggestions to make the information dissemination more efficient about specific committee roles and needs for particular candidate qualifications. Prof. Sivakumar asked whether the motion’s requirement for one face-to-face meeting was too much micromanagement via legislation. Prof. Munley replied that R&P wanted to ensure that the quality of communications to identify qualified nominee would improve upon the current practice of using only email. Prof. Deily commented that a spring presentation at a Faculty meeting probably would miss the mark (“preaching to the choir”) because those of us who attend regularly usually are aware of various committee roles. She suggested

developing and posting information on the Faculty Blackboard web site. Prof. Munley indicated that he welcomed a formal motion to amend this first-reading version. Prof. Kodama suggested using college faculty meetings as an appropriate forum because of better attendance. Prof. Lopresti offered that faculty awareness might be raised with a short announcement in a University Faculty meeting about open committee slots, rather than a longer, more formal presentation. Prof. Szczepanski said that a preliminary slate circulated to all faculty early in the spring nominations-seeking process could include position descriptions and specific desired qualifications for nominees. Prof. Munley responded that he would welcome a motion to clarify what the wording in our R&P document should state for protocol. Prof. Morgan made a motion for the R&P committee to return for the second reading at the next University Faculty meeting with revised wording to specify that the Nominations Committee would make a presentation to the Faculty about the open positions during the spring term and any other conditions about that meeting R&P deems appropriate.

This motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Graduate and Research Committee: Prof. Lynn Columba presented a motion on a Graduate Student Parental Leave Policy for consideration by the faculty at this meeting. Because this does not involve any changes to R&P, there was no need for two readings and a vote could be taken at this meeting to approve the motion for a university-wide policy. She noted that this motion was the result of about 5 years of deliberation and revision, with involvement by the University General Counsel, Frank Roth. It is the policy already in place and followed in some colleges and departments. Prof. Columba explained that the 5-week length of the leave was determined by tax implications for the graduate student. Also, both parents could take 5 weeks each, but not simultaneously. The GRC motion recommended a faculty review in 3 years, or sooner if GRC determined a reason to do so. Prof. Cates added that funding for a replacement grad student for the leave will come from the Provost's Office. Prof. Columba also mentioned that, based on past experience, the demand for leave would be about 1 or 2 grad student per year in each college, but could be cost neutral to the student's department. Prof. Thornton asked for a legal clarification, with respect to current labor law, of the wording in the first line of the proposal which states that "assistantships are financial aid, not employment." Both Prof. Columba and General Counsel Roth asserted that this agreed with current law. President Gast added that in universities without unionized grad students, this was common policy. Deputy Provost Carl Moses also mentioned that this was the reasoning for Lehigh Grad students being exempt from paying FICA taxes. Also, he responded to another faculty colleague's question about whether this policy had been cleared by Lehigh's Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. Because a principal investigator must report the level of effort for a research assistant paid under a research grant, the proposed policy allows for the student in question to be paid from a source other than the grant. Accordingly, the principal investigator can report zero pay for zero effort and is also able to pay another student to do the work of the grant while the student is on leave.

Prof. Narizny asked why Lehigh should implement this policy, because the choice of having a baby is a personal-life matter and not Lehigh's responsibility. Prof. Columba replied that currently, this policy is not uniform across all departments and approving the motion will give equal coverage to all graduate students. Deputy Provost Moses added that Lehigh's peers offer this benefit and we need to be competitive for good graduate students. Prof. Stavola mentioned that some professional societies track member schools' employment policies for data bases used by their graduate student members in selecting target employers in their job searches. Prof. Szczepanski commented that, after many years without an official policy, this is now a humanizing, kind gesture for Lehigh as "the right thing to do;" faculty instructors have this benefit, so graduate student instructors should also be able to benefit from this specific family time. Prof. Lotto added that as a school pursuing gender equity, this will add to Lehigh's welcoming institutional attitude. From a University-welfare standpoint, we do not want to

lose in the competition for the highest quality human capital we can acquire. Prof. Morgan moved that this motion be approved. With a second from Prof. Cates, the motion passed with a voice vote.

Presentation of the Deming Lewis Award: -

Bob Wolfenden, Assistant Vice President for Alumni Relations, explained this award is made by a vote of the 10-year graduating class (1999, for this year) for the faculty member who had the most impact on the class. In the past, has been made during the Alumni Reunion Weekend in the late spring, but often faculty peers are not present. Thus, the Alumni Council, chaired by its President, Sarat Sethi, '92, decided that a better venue would be a University Faculty meeting. Bob was pleased to present the award to Prof. Perry Zirkel who received a warm round of applause from colleagues.

5. Committee Report:

Faculty Committee on Student Life: Prof. Linda Lowe-Krentz announced the availability of Core Competency Grants that have the objective of developing our students' core competencies. The guidelines and application process are available on the Student Affairs web page, following the button-link on the right-hand side of the screen titled "Core Competency Grants." She mentioned examples of the types of projects anticipated in the strategic planning process, such as developing new classroom activities, community outreach programs, fundraising and other non-class-based student activities. It is likely that applications would be made by teams of faculty or staff combining with other faculty or students with professional staff from student life or other staff directly working with students. Applications will have 2 deadlines per year, usually mid-fall and mid-spring. For the first submissions, the deadline will be January 18, 2010, the first day of classes so that these can be evaluated and approved for the funds use during the spring, 2010, semester. These will be announced in college faculty meetings and in an announcement to all faculty. Prof. George White asked if both graduate as well as undergraduate student-focused proposals are possible. Prof. Lowe-Krentz enthusiastically replied that this was the case, also in any combination. Prof. Ripa asked if "core competencies" were defined in the strategic plan and whether Ed Pol had considered or recommended a specific set for a faculty vote. Prof. Lowe-Krentz responded that there was no specific document that precisely defined their meaning, but that the strategic planning process had included extensive discussion with faculty about these, which has a brief record on Lehigh's strategic planning web site. Another faculty colleague asked about the funding amounts, to which Prof. Lowe-Krentz replied that the current maximum is \$2500, which could be augmented with a follow-up grant application, for example for evaluation of the impact of the improvement or program introduced with the first grant.

6. Reports and Announcements: (See materials and PowerPoint slides at the end of these minutes.)

Council for Equity and Community (CEC): Professor M. J. Bishop was introduced by President Gast, who encouraged discussion within a regular University Faculty meeting on this important topic. Prof. Bishop began her presentation with the comment that this was the first report ever to the Faculty from a University standing committee with the charge to promote equity and community at Lehigh. The committee members represent a wide range of Lehigh community members across campus, faculty, staff both exempt and non-exempt, grad and undergrad students. This group was formed as a result of several campus-wide initiatives, some of which originated almost 2 decades ago in the June, 1990, report of the Commission of Women and Minorities. There have been numerous reports and surveys on diversity, most languishing in the archives. The CEC website, "Achieving Equity and Community at Lehigh," was created in spring '09 to make these and other resource materials available to as wide an audience as possible. The CEC has focused on 4 major areas to provide some direction to the discussions and recommendations that are now in process: Curriculum in the classroom, research and

other key broad learning/academic foci, recruitment of new community members at all levels (students, faculty, staff), and inter-group relations to engender mutual respect, safety and equity among all University community members. Today's discussion will be directed towards the accountability that each and every community member must bear for the success of any initiatives implemented.

A number of the objectives set forth in the 1990's reports still need to be pursued actively in response to the demographic trends identified in these reports whereby Lehigh had to increase and improve diversity in all of its dimensions on campus. We are still attempting to deal with similar if not identical root causes of the human tendencies that hinder our improvements. There have been extensive and long running "blame games" that identify others or other groups who are at fault as the basic instigators of ill-will in this regard. We have tried an approach that attempts to deconstruct or disaggregate the main problem into a series of smaller ones that can be resolved individually. However, the CEC realizes that there has been some definite progress on individual issues, but only slowly and incompletely with regard to the size of our problem that needs attention. Prof. Bishop posed the following questions for our discussion:

- "What is your own level of commitment to resolving these issues? To what extent is equity and community "front-of-mind" in everything you do as a member of the Lehigh community?"
- Where do we want to be with regard to these issues in another 20 years? 10 years? 5 years? How can it be different this time?
- What do we need to [do, have, be, understand] in order to get there?
- What should our next steps be? As individuals? As a faculty? As administrators? As students? As staff?"

She then introduced three concerned students each of whom made brief presentations to illustrate specific points as discussion starters.

Dominique Hugg mentioned the reprehensible behavior of some Lehigh students after the fall 2008 Presidential election, students who created a negative, defamatory and accusatory atmosphere that had no place in a community that promotes acceptance of a wide variety of viewpoints among its members. She stated that Lehigh needs a vice presidential position for equity and community (VPEC) who would be charged with proactive changes instead of the reactive changes we have relied upon in the past. This top-down approach would be a good start towards introducing meaningful change. She appealed to the faculty for ideas and recommendations for the 19 and 20 year-olds who are looking for direction to make the changes needed. Karl Brisseaux also advocated the establishment of a VPEC position, which also was strongly supported in the 2007 Lehigh-wide campus climate survey. As our oft-quoted metaphor of the "Lehigh family" suggests, we need to develop these types of relationships to improve our community for future students. We need to avoid temporary fixes or relying on the regular turnover of students and faculty to "buy extra time" to institute change from our leadership. Khalil Uqdah commented that Lehigh's aspirations as a leading university requires demonstration of commitment through an assertive, responsible and fully-charged, centralized leader within the senior management. All Lehigh students who seek jobs in the "real world" need to be trained as active change agents as they enter their future career paths. In addition, while there are staff members in the Global

Union to help in this regard, international students also are part of our diversity efforts and need the advocacy of a VPEC. Unfortunately, as Prof. Bishop has amply illustrated with her pile of previous Lehigh diversity reports, with their recommendations we have seen recycled so many times, there has already been too much talk, and a person who reports directly to the President is long overdue. There are too many students from too wide a variety of groups who feel as if they are unwanted guests at Lehigh, rather than members of “the family.” These young Lehigh colleagues received a warm round of applause from the audience.

Prof. Bishop opened the floor for discussion. Prof. Narizny asked how we would know progress on diversity has occurred. What would resolve or meet the concerns we now have? In what specific ways have we failed? Does globalization, which Lehigh does well, not fit towards meeting diversity goals? Prof. Morgan responded that the next survey of the Lehigh community could show fewer complaints about diversity issues. However much the international students are already assisted on campus, this does not help US student groups that are marginalized. Prof. Lasker, as one of the authors of the 1990 report, mentioned that that early report had included very specific numerical goals. Has the CEC made any comparisons between these goals and our current numbers? Prof. Bishop replied that they have not yet done this because some of their concerns are qualitative in nature and difficult, if not impossible to quantify. They have not determined a picture of the end state of their committee charge. Prof. Cates opined that we may never arrive at a stabilized set of characteristics and we might worry about ourselves if we think we have “arrived” at such a state. We need to start and move forward with both some quantitative and qualitative goals to determine what impact the CEC will have on our community. Along the way, we continually need to ask ourselves whether there are still some groups who feel discriminated against and marginalized. Prof. Lasker observed that the VPEC issue was addressed in 1990 and for some time there were 2 individuals in the Provost’s Office charged with coordinating, directing and improving diversity across the campus. Now, no one appears to be doing these promotional jobs. Are these recommendations for a VPEC heard by Lehigh’s senior management?

President Gast said that these are valid concerns and that she is glad to hear them from students. We are not ignoring these issues but are weighing the change agent and leadership efforts carefully. Some benchmarking has been done to determine what would be the expected outcomes from a single individual, because the problems and issues are so complex and varied. What should be the characteristics of the person to be a/the change agent? Not only do we need to consider the person generating change, but also the receptors of the changes. This person will have to work with faculty, staff, students and others in a very broadly based constituency. The challenge within an academic institution is very different than in other organizations. It is possible for one major group to become disaffected and thereby create an unworkable situation. There is no single “magic bullet” by which the academy can be redirected quickly and uniformly, as an institution that operates by consensus and cooperation. Prof. Kashi Johnson observed that we need consistent ongoing action to take place for progress to occur. What will be the vehicle for Lehigh to move forward? If not a VPEC, then how will we address this issue? Prof. Morgan, as a CEC member, commented that, for some time now, the CEC has essentially served in the “role” of a VPEC. The CEC has met with a wide range of groups across campus to become informed about their concerns. But CEC members have full time jobs of their own and are particularly challenged to achieve their own responsibilities and goals in addition to sustaining the mission of the CEC. Also, no one from the CEC is ever “at the table” when major decisions are made or issues are discussed... like introducing a new senior staff position. Prof. Fry offered that it is a daunting task to overcome prejudice. Do other institutions have such a person [VPEC]? Prof. Bishop responded that there have been numerous benchmarking studies that supply information about the myriad institutions that have a VPEC or similar position, the most recent one for

the CEC by Henry Odi, Executive Director, Academic Outreach Office, during the summer, 2009. This report will be available on the CEC web site soon.

Prof. Lasker asked whether there is any chance of this position being established and noted that it might make sense to commit to the idea of the position first, then work out the structure, job description, and other details. President Gast explained that we are following up on the benchmarked schools to find out about their specific, real outcomes achieved by the person in such a role beyond their title, salaries, orientation of changes for faculty, staff, students, etc. We need to know what works, what doesn't, because unfortunately, these efforts are not always successful. Prof. K. Johnson asked whether this benchmarking process will lead to a "yes/no" decision on a VPEC. President Gast responded that it would and that decision would be forthcoming as soon as possible. As a point of information our student colleague Khalil said that in the last 5 years, 30 schools have established a VPEC, for example Vice President Shirley Ramirez has been appointed at Lafayette College. Provost Farrell commented that he wants to give change a chance at Lehigh. Student colleague Khalil suggested in this direction that it would be important to train faculty to handle certain situations in the classroom. He also offered that the students have already created a list of characteristics that would be advantageous for a VPEC. Another faculty colleague asked whether there was a backup "Plan B" from the Lehigh administration for another option or alternative to a VPEC. Prof. Sivakumar observed that "a problem well-defined will be a problem half-solved." Prof. Bishop reported that the CEC has worked very hard over the past 18 months with the bulk of the work being project-management oriented –following-up on projects, attending meetings, addressing emails, and the like. Having a full-time VPEC Office to manage these efforts would offer a centralized, sustained approach to this issue. Student colleague Karl observed that most of the Diversity Committee Board meetings have been held sequentially with administrators, student groups, etc. It has been a very difficult task to keep all of the information and suggestions coordinated. Unfortunately, it often has been a too-disaggregated and atomistic process. When can we all sit at the same table to think together and make a decision? Prof. Bishop responded that we need a sustained effort by a specific group or person, not just volunteer members of the CEC. She is concerned that these issues be kept in front of everyone all the time so that everyone will be consciously accommodating change. Prof. Hyclak commented that it is critical to have the "right person" in the "right place in the organization" in order to be effective and successful. That person's peers and to whom s/he reports is essential to success.


President Gast thanked all of today's participants for their comments and serious discussion of this critical issue as Lehigh moves forward in the future.

President's Report: President Gast said that she had been working with the Faculty Steering Committee to involve as many standing committees as possible, working on implementation of the Strategic Plan, relevant to their committee's charge. Also she was quite pleased with the Nominations Committee's efforts to improve the effectiveness of committee membership to represent faculty viewpoints on important issues for Lehigh. She urged faculty to contribute their ideas and proposals for the Core Competency Grants, Innovation Grants and nominations for the 2 presidential endowed professorships in health for which search committees have been formed (see PowerPoint slides at the end of the minutes). The searches will be conducted across college and department lines, with a focus on talent and leadership in the areas of social sciences and humanities, as well as science and engineering..

Provost's Report: Provost Farrell had yielded his time to the CEC discussion and thus had no formal report.

7. Adjournment: It was moved, seconded and approved unanimously by acclamation to adjourn at 5:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Anthony King".

Next Meeting: February 8, 2010, 4:10 p.m., Sinclair Auditorium, 3:30 p. m. reception.

UNIVERSITY FACULTY MEETINGS REMAINING for Spring, 2010

1. March 22, 2010
2. May 3, 2010