Lehigh University

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

15 September 2003

Presiding: Gregory Farrington (Sinclair Auditorium)

President Farrington called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM.

1. Minutes. The minutes of the May 5, 2003 faculty meeting were APPROVED.

2. Memorial Resolution. Professor Herman Nied read a tribute to Ferdinand Beer, late Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Mechanical Engineering and Mechanics, 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 Ferdinand Beer.

3. New Faculty Introductions. Several new faculty were introduced by the deans of their colleges.

4. Committee Motions. None.

5. Unfinished Business. None.


7. Committee Reports. Professor Alwyn Eades, on behalf of the Faculty Steering Committee, presented a set of proposals to change R&P with respect to promotion and tenure. After discussion and voting on amendments offered by faculty, a subsequent electronic ballot on the entire set of changes will be presented to the faculty for voting [see Attachment 2]. Professor Eades first MOVED an amendment to change Proposal 6.

Professor Pat O Seaghdha spoke to the amendment motion that Alwyn introduced. It recommended deletion of current proposal 6 and that the matter be referred back to the P & T committee. He noted that he liked most of the work. However, he stated that he found Proposal 6 (role of the president) to be problematic. He made five points: 1) The rationale for Prop 6 merely asserts that the president should have sweeping powers and is therefore not a rationale; 2) the powers assigned to the president
are likely to undermine the effectiveness of the proposed University Committee; 3) unlimited power does not correspond to the rationale presented in the proposals; 4) no process is specified for the president's consultation; and, 5) even with a coherent rationale, that rationale will be stripped from the final document. He suggested that the rationale should be incorporated into the language of the document.

Professor Jim Gurton replied that he felt the amendment was 'unfriendly' and would cause more work. The proposal changes the process from the provost taking the recommendation to the trustees to the report being presented to the president before taking the recommendation to the trustees. He said this was not unusual based on a survey of 25 private universities that found that 23 had the president involved.

Professor Raj Menon disagreed that the proposal gave the president final authority and unlimited power. He noted that the Personnel Committee was still available to hear appeals.

The original motion was SECONDED.

Professor Steve Kraviec asked if the board had ever disagreed with a provost's recommendation. President Farrington responded that, in recent years, the answer is 'no.' However, the president said that the board does not act hastily. It does not act as the provost's 'rubber stamp.'

Professor O'Seaghdha observed that it would simply be a different person making the recommendation to the board.

Professor Mary Beth Deilly noted that if a promotion and/or tenure decision is appealed, the Personnel Committee makes a recommendation to the president and to the board.

Professor Judy Lasker said that the president has the right to overturn recommendations all along the process.

Professor Roger Simon said he believed the current system is automatically adversarial, and that the inclusion of a University P&T was a good thing.

Professor Nandu Nayar said it was naive to assume the president doesn't have a role in P&T decisions. He stated his belief that the formalization of the president's role is a great improvement.

The question was CALLED.
The motion was **DEFEATED**.

Professor Eades then **MOVED**, separately, two sets of small changes in wording. Both sets of changes were considered friendly. Both motions were **SECONDED**. Both motions **PASSED**.

Professor Eades then proposed a policy statement on academic freedoms and responsibilities [see Attachment 3]. As with the change to R&P, this statement, after amendments, will be sent by electronic ballot to the faculty for a vote.

Professor Rick Matthews **MOVED** an amended policy statement [see Attachment 4].

Professor Matthew's motion was **SECONDED**.

Professor Ted Morgan spoke in support of Professor Matthew's amended policy.

Professor Al Wurt said the College of Arts & Sciences supported Professor Matthews' amended policy.

After much discussion, Professor Steve Weintraub **MOVED** to **TABLE** the amended policy. The motion failed for lack of a second.

University counsel Frank Roth advised the faculty to be careful about invoking the First Amendment since Lehigh is a private institution.

The amended policy statement **PASSED**.

Professor John Chen, on behalf of the Faculty Governance Review Committee, presented an update to the faculty [see Attachment 5]. He reviewed the committee's activities and the essence of the committee's conclusions and recommendations.

8. **President's Report.** President Farrington began by noting that the matriculating first year class is arguably the best in Lehigh history. He observed that today was the first day for the new dean of admissions. He lauded the wonderful crop of new faculty.

The president said the key financial indicators of the university are all strongly positive. Total research expenditures have risen to the early 90s level. Graduate tuition is rising.

Many capital improvements are taking place.
The administration continues to take a careful, thoughtful look at the Greek system. Chi Psi has been moved to Warren Square for safety reasons.

9. **Provost’s Report.** Provost Ron Yoshida announced the reconstituted search for a new dean of the College of Arts and Sciences is under way. He encouraged faculty to forward recommendations to the search committee’s chair, Professor Jean Soderlund.

The university has 33 faculty searches active. International Affairs has moved to Coxe Lab.

The provost will be sending a memo on merit evaluations. He will also be developing a report on the status of centers and institutes. A report on progress to date of the 20/20 program will be sent in October.

The meeting stood adjourned at 5:54 PM

__________________________________
Stephen F. Thode
Secretary to the Faculty
304 Rauch Business Center
(610) 758-4557
FAX: (610) 882-9415
E-mail: sft@
LEHIGH UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERING AND MECHANICS

Memorial Resolution in Remembrance of Prof. Ferdinand P. Beer
September 15, 2003

The students, faculty, and administration of Lehigh University note with deep sadness the passing of Ferdinand P. Beer, University Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Mechanical Engineering and Mechanics, on April 30, 2003, at the age of 87.

A native of Bièvre, France, Ferd obtained a B.S. degree in Mathematics from the University of Geneva, Switzerland, in 1933 and his Ph.D. from the same school in 1937. He held an M.S. degree from the University of Paris, and received an honorary Doctor of Engineering degree from Lehigh University in 1995.

In 1946, while teaching mathematics and physics at Williams College, Ferd learned through a former colleague that Lehigh University was looking for staff for the newly created Mechanics Division in the Civil Engineering Department. Ferd joined the Lehigh faculty in 1947, where he began by teaching dynamics and fluid mechanics. In 1957 he was appointed Head of the new Mechanics Department and in 1968, he was appointed Head of the newly merged Mechanical Engineering and Mechanics Department. He served with distinction in this position for nine years until 1977.

Ferd did not shy away from serving the university during the tumultuous times of protest in the early 1970s. He was appointed the first Chair (1970–71) of the University Forum, a legislative body whose 125 members consisted of students, faculty and administrators. While students were rioting and conducting sit-ins at other universities, Ferd, perhaps more than any other member of the faculty or administration, gained the confidence of the students. His reasoned and rational approach for solving all problems, whether mathematical or societal, had a calming influence on students. In this capacity, as Chair of the University Forum, he did great service for the Lehigh community.

In his lifetime, Ferd received many accolades and awards. In 1971, he received Lehigh’s R. R. and E. C. Hillman Award for “advancing the interests of the university,” and in 1983, he earned the engineering college’s Service Teaching Excellence Award. In 1974, the Middle-Atlantic Section of the American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE) gave Ferd the Western Electric Fund Award for excellence in teaching of engineering students. In 1980, he received the Distinguished Educator Award from the Mechanics Division of the Science Society.

Ferd’s research in the response of structures, principally aircraft, to random loads was supported by a number of research agencies, including the U.S. Army Chemical Corps, Federal Civil Defense Administration, NASA, and the Boeing Company. In the beginning, his work on random loading was in response to his questioning, in connection with shelter construction, of the likelihood that a bomb would actually hit its target. From this uncertainty and the uncertainties associated with how reliably bureaucrats could predict targets, Ferd concluded that
it was precisely the areas that the bureaucrats assumed could be left unprotected which would be the most likely to benefit from the protection of a shelter!

Ford is probably most renowned for his authorship of three best-selling undergraduate engineering textbooks. These texts: Mechanics for Engineers: Statics and Dynamics, Vector Mechanics for Engineers, and Mechanics of Materials, have been used by thousands of engineering students and have been translated into a dozen languages. All three books were co-written with E. Russell Johnston Jr., who served as a professor of civil engineering at Lehigh before heading the same department at the University of Connecticut. In terms of engineering education, these books have had an astounding and enduring impact. Multiple generations of engineers have learned the fundamental principles of engineering mechanics from these texts, which have sold at the rate of 40,000 copies per year in the US alone. The writing and revision of these texts was a continuous process in which Ford often solicited help from the undergraduate students by offering $1 for each typo. Sufficient to say, not many were found. He continued to revise these texts after his retirement in 1984 (one is now in its 7th edition) and took great pleasure in developing new problems and diagrams for these books.

Ford is probably less well known for the influence he had in cultivating and encouraging the research activities of others. However, for those that knew him well, it is acknowledged that he was responsible for bringing together the mix of young faculty and talented students that resulted in some of Lehigh University’s greatest research achievements. He was a firm believer that graduate students should develop their own thoughts with minimal supervision. This philosophy resulted in some remarkable achievements by young freelancing faculty and creative students. For example, joking about how fracture mechanics started at Lehigh he once said, “The success of the fracture mechanics group did not derive from the support of some vice-president for research or some established research institute or center. In the topsy-turvy world of Lehigh in the late fifties and early sixties, this success was due to the initiative of a graduate student and two young assistant professors.” He was very proud of such achievements and of a department that fostered an environment of exploration based on what he truly loved - the fundamentals of mechanics.

There is much to remember about Ford Beer. He was a highly educated and cultured individual in the renaissance sense. He had a wonderful sense of humor that blended perfectly with his French accent. He loved music, travel, mathematics and mechanics. But to him, the most important goals and responsibilities were associated with teaching and education of the next generation of students. For this he will be fondly remembered by the large number of engineering students worldwide, who have his books on their shelves and who still use them during the everyday practice of their professions.

The Lehigh University faculty have lost a great friend and respected colleague. We offer our deepest condolences to his daughters, Marguerite and Michelle.

Respectfully submitted,

Herman F. Nied         Forbes I. Brown         Charles R. Smith
Fazil Erdogan          Ronald J. Hartranft  Robert A. Lucas
President Farrington, I move that this memorial resolution be made a permanent part of the faculty record by being included in the minutes of this meeting, and that copies be sent to the members of his family.
PROPOSED CHANGES TO R&P SECTION 2

1. Department

A. Current: Section 2.2.6.4 (Departmental Evaluation for tenure) concludes with 
"...each tenured voting member (including the chairperson, if tenured) submits a 
written evaluation of the candidate’s qualifications based on the criteria."

Similarly, in Section 2.2.9.4 (Departmental Evaluation for promotion) "Each 
participating faculty member (including the chairperson if tenured and holding a 
rank above the candidate) writes an evaluation of the candidate based on the 
criteria specified in the preamble and applied in the triennial evaluations of the 
faculty member."

Proposed Change: Add the sentence to each of these sections: “These letters of 
evaluation must be substantive letters that appraise the candidate’s record in 
teaching, research, and service and that address the question of whether or not 
the candidate merits tenure/promotion and the reasons for the 
recommendation.”

Rationale: The committee has heard testimony that letters of evaluation 
sometimes are inadequate in appraising the candidate’s record based on the 
criteria. This does not serve the best interests of either the candidate or the 
department.

B. Current: Section 2.2.6.2 (External Evaluation) ‘’...The chairperson then advises 
the candidate of the people being considered as external evaluators. The candidate 
may nominate his/her own external evaluators. The Dean, in consultation with the 
chairperson, approves the final selection of at least three evaluators, at least one of 
whom must be one of the candidate’s nominees.”

Proposed Change: ‘’...The chairperson then advises the candidate of the people 
being considered as external evaluators. The candidate may nominate his/her 
own external evaluators. The Dean and Provost, in consultation with the 
chairperson, approve the final selection of a pool large enough to obtain five or 
more external evaluations, at least one of whom must be one of the candidate’s 
nominees. Should any additional letters be solicited, the above procedure must 
be followed.”

Rationale: There are two parts to this recommendation. The addition of the 
Provost to the process is to ensure that the Dean and Provost agree on the 
external evaluators, preventing the need for subsequent solicitation of 
information from other external sources. The increase to five or more external 
evaluations is to bring the process into agreement with existing practice in the 
four colleges.
2. College Committees

A. **Current:** The charge to the college tenure and promotion committees is inconsistent across the colleges. These college committees are described in Sections 2.2.6.9, 1.3.3.1.2.1 (CAS), 1.3.3.2.2 (CBE) 1.3.3.3.3 1.3.3.4 (CEAS), and 1.3.3.4.1 (CE)

*Proposed Change:* The College committee is to make its own substantive and independent recommendation on whether or not a candidate merits tenure or promotion.

*Rationale:* This statement affirms the defining role of the committee, namely that it must make a recommendation that addresses the merits of the case, and not simply whether the correct procedural steps have been taken. The recommendation of the committee would thus be based on a careful review of all the relevant information in the candidate's tenure or promotion file.

B. **Current:** There is considerable structural variation among the college tenure and promotion committees in the university. Two of our colleges have separate tenure and promotion committees and two have combined tenure-promotion committees. In addition, the sizes of these committees vary from college to college.

*Proposed Change:* At least 5 members of each committee must vote without abstention on any tenure or promotion case. The committee will write a letter that summarizes the vote and the majority recommendation.

*Rationale:* The above proposal would ensure some consistency across the colleges, but still permit a variation in the nature and size of these committees. The need for at least five members to vote on any tenure or promotion case is to ensure a broad view of the candidate as opposed to the limited view of just a few individuals. It is the recommendation of the committee that the minimum number to make this very important determination is five.

C. **Current:** There is no formal requirement for a minority report from a college promotion or tenure committee.

*Proposed Change:* In the absence of a unanimous committee recommendation, the committee chair designates a member representing the minority opinion to write a letter to the Dean expressing the reasons for the vote of the minority. This would modify several sections in R&P: 2.2.6.9, 2.2.9.9, 1.3.3.1.1, 1.3.3.1.4, 1.3.3.2.1, 1.3.3.3.1, 1.3.3.3.3, 1.3.3.3.4, 1.3.3.4.1.

*Rationale:* Minority positions should be formalized and should be expressed clearly with a strong rationale.

D. **Current:** CAS currently requires (number 9, R&P 1.3.3.1.4) that "When a committee considers a member of an under-represented group (as currently defined by U.S. guidelines for eliminating discrimination in employment), the Dean will
Dear Colleagues

appoint a tenured member of the university’s affirmative action/ equal opportunity commission to serve as a non-voting member of the committee for the duration of that specific case. The AA/EOC member will send a separate report to the Dean.”

Proposed Change: Remove this requirement.

Rationale: This procedural requirement is unclear, unique to CAS, and could expose the university to claims of unlawful “reverse” discrimination. Currently there are no U.S. government guidelines for defining “under-represented group” in this context; the category therefore relies on self-definition and could result in an endless proliferation of “under-represented groups” and in individuals being identified as members of under-represented groups against their own wishes. The procedures of college tenure and/or promotion committees across the University should be as consistent as possible; this requirement applies only to the College of Arts and Sciences. Furthermore, existing University equal opportunity policies and external legal requirements already mandate that all tenure and promotion reviews must be performed in a non-discriminatory manner. We recommend that education and training of tenure and promotion committees on these non-discrimination principles be undertaken on a regular basis.

3. Replacement of “faculty recommendation” by “College recommendation”

Current: The term “faculty recommendation” is currently used if the department and college tenure or promotion committee concur on a recommendation. R&P Sections 2.2.2.1, 2.2.6.9, 2.2.6.11, 2.2.9.9, and 2.2.9.11.

Proposed Change: At the College level there shall be three recommendations: the department, the College tenure or promotion Committee and the Dean. The “College recommendation” refers to the majority of two or three of these recommendations.

Rationale: The proposed change strengthens the role of the Colleges in the tenure and promotion process. This change also is to recognize the formal role of the Dean in the tenure and promotion process. The Dean plays a pivotal role in the process of appointment, promotion and tenure and should have a formal recommendation. The significance of “College recommendation” is spelled out in item 5.

4. Role of the Provost

A. Current: Section 2.2.9.11 Administration’s recommendation: “In the absence of a faculty recommendation” (that is, when the departmental recommendation and the promotion and tenure committee’s recommendation do not agree) the Provost will review carefully both the departmental recommendation and the promotion and tenure committee’s recommendation and evaluate the candidate’s qualifications in terms of the criteria (as stated in 2.2.1.5) and as applied in the triennial evaluations) before making his/her final recommendation.”
**Proposed Change.** If the Provost accepts the college recommendation, he or she will communicate this in writing to the President, providing the rationale for the recommendation.

**Rationale:** This proposal is to take into account the proposed change in terminology and accompanying process from “faculty recommendation” to “College recommendation” and the proposed new role of the President. Otherwise it is in accord with existing practice.

**B. Current:** Section 2.2.6.11 - Administration’s Recommendation: "...In the event that the Provost is considering a recommendation contrary to a "faculty recommendation" as described in section 2.2.2.1, the following procedures will be observed: The Provost will call a meeting with the Dean, the college promotion committee, and the voting members of the department who participated in the evaluation of the candidate. The Provost will provide reasons for non-concurrence. All those involved will seek to resolve their differences. In the event that the issue cannot be resolved, the college promotion and tenure committee and the department will select three advocates for the "faculty recommendation". This group and the Provost will present their respective positions to the academic affairs committee of the Board of Trustees, first in writing and then in person. The Academic Affairs Committee will then render an opinion on the matter for the consideration of the President and the Board of Trustees."

**Proposed Change.** The Provost may decide to reject a college recommendation following his or her review of the candidate’s file. In this event, the following procedures will be observed: The Provost must notify the Dean, the college tenure or promotion committee, and the voting members of the department who participated in the evaluation of the candidate and provide compelling reasons for non-concurrence. The Provost must refer such a case to the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion in a timely fashion so that the Committee has adequate time to complete its review before the deadline for a tenure or promotion recommendation.

**Rationale:** The candidate’s departmental colleagues work closely with the candidate and work in academic fields either the same as or closely related to the candidate’s field. For these two reasons, typically the department is the best judge of the candidate’s contributions to the university and the academic discipline. The college promotion and tenure committee and Dean ensure that the college-wide standards are applied consistently across the departments. If the Provost disagrees with a college recommendation, then it is incumbent on the Provost to notify and to provide his or her reasons for non-concurrence to the department, the college tenure and promotion committee, and the Dean. The Provost must then refer the case to the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion (see item 6 below).

5 [Creation of a University Committee on Tenure and Promotion](#)
Dear Colleagues,

**Current:** As stated in Section 2.2.6.11 above, in the event that the Provost disagrees with a faculty recommendation... "the college promotion and tenure committee and the department will select three advocates for the faculty recommendation." This group and the Provost will present their respective positions to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, first in writing and then in person. The Academic Affairs Committee will then render an opinion on the matter for the consideration of the President and the Board of Trustees.

**Proposed Change:** Create a University Committee on Tenure and Promotion whose charge is the following: The University Committee on Tenure and Promotion is charged with the responsibility of reviewing tenure and promotion recommendations when the Provost does not concur with a college recommendation. It is a standing body to which shall be appointed the Chairs of the Promotion and Tenure Committees from each of Lehigh University's four colleges. (There are currently a total of six such Chairs.) The Chairs will each serve staggered terms of three years, with two chairs rotating off each year. When the period of service of a given committee Chair expires, that Chair will be replaced by the current Chair of his or her college committee. If a committee member voted on a given case earlier in the process, the member will participate in the discussion of that case, but not vote in the university committee. The Chairs of the Tenure committees will vote on tenure cases; the Chairs of the Promotion committees will vote on promotion cases. The university committee will receive the official tenure or promotion dossier, containing all the material assembled by the department, the letters written by the college tenure and promotion committee, the Dean and Provost. Under normal circumstances the accumulated file on the candidate is the basis for the committee's recommendation. Once the committee reaches a recommendation, it shall submit a report describing its recommendation to the President of the University. If the committee is divided, there shall be two letters, one expressing the majority position, a second representing the minority position.

**Note on Suggested Implementation:** Initially the Chairs will each serve staggered terms of from one to three years, in order to reach a steady state in which each member serves for three years. The initial terms will be as follows:

Chair of College of Arts and Sciences Promotion Committee: one year  
Chair of College of Engineering and Applied Science Promotion Committee: one year  
Chair of College of Business and Economics Tenure and Promotion Committee: two years  
Chair of College of Education: two years  
Chair of College of Arts and Sciences Tenure Committee: three years  
Chair of College of Engineering and Applied Science Tenure Committee: three years

**Rationale:** In concurrence with the external reviewer's suggestion that the members of the Board of Trustees should not be directly involved with the process of tenure and promotion formation of a university committee is
recommended. It is further recommended that this university committee be composed of the Chairs of the Promotion and Tenure Committees who have direct experiences with various promotion cases. Their collective academic expertise representing all four Colleges will help ensure consistency across the University.

6. Role of the President

**Current:** The President currently has no formal role in the process.  
**Proposed Change:** The President shall receive the materials that constitute the candidate’s tenure or promotion file, along with the recommendation of the Provost, and when applicable, the recommendation and report of the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion. The President shall review all materials pertinent to a recommendation on tenure or promotion and make a written recommendation to the Board of Trustees. If the President does not agree with a recommendation of the University Committee, he or she shall first meet with the committee to review the case and the committee's recommendation. If the President does not agree with a College recommendation that the Provost supports, the President shall first meet with the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion to review the case and discuss his or her recommendation. This proposed change should be appended to the end of revised R & P sections 2.2.6.11 and 2.2.9.11.

**Rationale:** Tenure and promotion recommendations are not final until approved by the Board of Trustees. In most cases, the President's role would simply involve transmitting the recommendation of the Provost to the Board of Trustees. In cases that are reviewed by the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion, where the Committee concurs with the Provost's recommendation, the President will transmit this recommendation to the Board of Trustees. When the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion does not concur with the Provost's recommendation, the President shall review all materials pertinent to the recommendation, consult with the Committee and the Provost, and make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The ultimate responsibility and accountability for faculty personnel recommendations should unambiguously reside with the President.

7. Role of the Personnel Committee

The above changes do not in any way affect the current rights of the faculty to appeal to the Personnel Committee.

**Rationale:** The right of appeal to the Personnel Committee is essential to protection of faculty due process. Further, nothing in these proposals limits the Personnel Committee's right to petition the Board of Trustees regarding a personnel recommendation, as outlined in R&P 1.2.2.6. The powers of the Personnel Committee are outlined in R&P 1.2.2.6.


Preamble: The Larger Purpose

As an academic community defined by love of learning, dissemination of knowledge, bold inquiry, and civic responsibility, Lehigh aims not only to preserve its achievements but to surpass them, not only to retain its reputation but to extend that reputation nationally and internationally, by persistently improving the quality of teaching and scholarship. Lehigh University’s standards and procedures for faculty tenure and promotion should foster these aspirations.

A university can be no better than its faculty. The quality of the faculty will attract superior students to Lehigh, enhance its atmosphere of learning, and strengthen the University’s standing as a premier center of learning. The university expects its faculty to excel in all three areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. Lehigh’s students deserve teachers who demand the best of them, who foster intellectual independence and critical thinking, and who are dedicated advisors. Faculty must also distinguish themselves as scholars by advancing the boundaries of knowledge and inquiry. Beyond the attainments in teaching and scholarship are the professors’ contributions to the University, their profession and the surrounding community.

Lehigh will thus award tenure and promotion for excellence in all three domains. Scholarship will be judged excellent when there is compelling evidence that a professor’s academic achievements are recognized and valued in a wider intellectual universe. Detailed assessments of the professor’s work by scholars of proven stature are essential for the University to judge whether this latter standard has been met and will supplement the appraisals made by Lehigh’s own academic departments. Faculty must demonstrate excellence in teaching, which must be assessed on the basis of a faculty member’s performance at Lehigh, through evaluation by university colleagues. Command of the subject, clarity of communication, the active pursuit of new knowledge and insight, and attention to the intellectual development of students are indispensable qualities of effective teachers. Although untenured faculty members are expected to contribute to University governance and community service, their records in this sphere matter less during tenure reviews than their accomplishments as teachers and scholars. By contrast, tenured faculty seeking promotion to the rank of full professors are individuals to whom the University has made a permanent commitment, and they must demonstrate regular and substantial involvement in governance and community service in addition to continuing achievements in instruction and research.

While the standards and procedures for tenure and promotion at Lehigh flow from the vision just articulated, their design and implementation are also grounded in four cardinal criteria of an operational nature.

First, the requirements and procedure for tenure and promotion must be conceived
and applied by the faculty, for these guidelines are more than a set of rules; they embody a belief in and commitment to sustaining an intellectual community and will remain formulaic constructs unless the faculty has helped define them, is actively involved in implementing them, and embraces them.

Second, the principles and procedures must be as clear and transparent as possible—to those to whom they are applied and to those who apply them. This ideal can be realized in part through explanatory documents that are precise, but the department chair, the Dean, and the Provost have an equally vital role to play. Professors seeking tenure or promotion will look to these officers of the University for clarification about standards and procedures, and these officers must do their utmost to ensure that candidates understand what the expectations are and how their record stands in relation to them.

Third, the standards and procedures must be fairly applied to all faculty members. Candidates for tenure and promotion must be thoroughly protected from arbitrary and capricious behavior, and there must be mechanisms in place to prevent such conduct and to allow candidates to seek redress.

Fourth, the standards and procedure must not hinder efforts to advance the caliber of teaching and scholarship at Lehigh; they are orderly and reasoned means for betterment, not formulations to defend stasis. As such, they must enable decisions on tenure and promotion that serve the interests of the University and promote its intellectual vitality and growth.
Academic Freedoms and Responsibilities

DRAFT

Introduction

The success of Lehigh University, like all universities, depends upon the academic freedoms and responsibilities of all members of its community. The foremost general statement on academic freedom is the American Association of University Professors' 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. The present policy, on academic freedoms and responsibilities for Lehigh University, borrows from the AAUP 1940 Statement, builds on its principles and language, and extends academic freedoms and responsibilities to staff and students as well as faculty. In approving this Policy on Academic Freedoms and Responsibilities, the Board of Trustees delegates to the President the responsibility for executing all aspects of this policy.

Academic freedom and responsibility are essential to the search for truth and its free expression by all members of the University Community, and apply to teaching, learning, research and community discourse. Accordingly, the principles set forth herein should inform, and be embodied in, performance standards and policies approved by the Board of Trustees or its delegates.

The intellectual climate of the campus and its environs is set by the freedoms and responsibilities of community discourse. It is the responsibility of every member of the Lehigh community, in all cases, to encourage civil and reasoned discussion, and to respect the opportunity for presentations of opinions different from their own. The Faculty, in particular, has a responsibility to promote the conditions for free inquiry. Lehigh should always be a place where different views may be presented freely, debated, and weighed on their own merits.

The Policy

Teaching and Learning
Academic freedom in teaching and learning is essential to the core mission of the University. In fulfilling their teaching obligations to the University, instructors (of all ranks) are entitled to freedom in presenting, and discussing their subject, and in making it understandable to their students. Students are entitled to the freedom of questioning the premises, theories, methods, and conclusions of a subject they are studying.

Research

Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Faculty, staff and students are entitled to full freedom in research, in scholarship and in publication, subject to prior agreements pertaining to specific research projects.

Community Discourse

Freedom of discourse is an essential component of the scholarly activity of the University. The Lehigh University community is entitled to the freedom of public discussion of any subject.

Faculty, staff, and students are also citizens and frequently members of other organizations external to Lehigh University. When they speak as citizens or as members of other organizations, they are entitled to freedom from institutional censorship or discipline. (They are, however, responsible to make it clear that they do not speak for Lehigh University. As members of the University community, they should remember that the public might judge them, their profession, Lehigh University, or universities in general by their utterances.)
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Please email any comments or questions to policy@Lehigh.Edu

Office of the Senior Vice President
Lehigh University
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Bethlehem, PA 18015
Statement

The success of Lehigh University, like all universities, depends upon Academic Freedom. The foremost statement on academic freedom and tenure is that of the American Association of University Professor’s written in 1940. This policy on academic freedom for the Faculty of Lehigh University freely borrows from the AAUP statement, subsequent comments by the AAUP, and Stanford University’s Research Handbook.

Policy

Academic freedom is essential to the unfettered search for truth and its free expression by all members of the University Community. Lehigh’s mission of teaching, learning, research and scholarship depend upon an atmosphere in which freedom of inquiry, thought, expression, publication, and peaceful assembly are given the fullest protection. Protection must be given not only for ideas that are widely accepted but also for those that shock or disturb. The widest range of viewpoints should be encouraged, free from institutional orthodoxy and from internal or external coercion.
Faculty Governance Review Committee
Update to Faculty
15 September 2003

Charged on 9/13/03 to:

1. Assess state of faculty governance.
3. Recommend future structure and communications of faculty policies.

- Ray Bell
- Shane Cargill
- John Chen
- Joe Hartman
- Ned Heindel
- Tom Hyekak
- Mike Raposa
- Art King
- Hanna Stewart-Gambino
- Barbara Erster, Chair
- Frank Roth, by invitation

To Date

- Review of documents for LU and other institutions.
- Survey of faculty.
- Survey of major faculty committees, meeting with Chairs.
- Presentations/discussions at four colleges.
- Drafting of Preamble and recommendations.
- Open discussions at brown-bag lunches.
- Meetings with President, Provost, Senior VP, Deans.
Essence of Conclusions and Recommendations

Faculty governance needs improvement in participation and accountability.

Recommend reaffirmation of shared governance.

Recommend representative based structure to replace current committee-of-whole structure.

Recommend restructuring of some major university faculty committees.

Recommend improved communications on faculty personnel policies, educational requirements, and procedures.

Next Steps

Seek input from Trustees.

Report to President and Faculty Steering Committee.

Recommend FSC to hold special meeting(s) of faculty to consider, act-upon recommendations.