Lehigh University

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

01 February 1999

Presiding: Gregory Farrington (University Center 308)

President Farrington called the meeting to order at 4:17 PM.

1. Minutes. The minutes of the November 30, 1998 faculty meeting were APPROVED.

2. New Business. Vice President Jill Sherman provided an update on new development initiatives with an academic purpose. So far, the university has raised $14 million of a target $37 million for such purposes. Giving is ahead of projections.

The advancement area has been reorganized following the recommendations of the Stillwater Report. John Van Ness will lead the advancement effort for the academic side of the university.

President Farrington made a number of calls on constituents in the fall. Specifically, the “Critical Moment Fund” has received $5 million. In addition, the president and provost’s discretionary fund has received a total of $1.2 million in pledges over 5 years from Ron Freeman and Gene Mercy.

Pete Rossin has increased his gift by $2.5 million; and, smaller gifts have been received from Arthur Tauck and Joyce Michaelson.

President Farrington noted that endowed faculty chairs are a high priority and several ‘irons are in the fire.’ He observed that alumni and other constituents are solidly behind the university.

3. Committee Reports. Professor Sudhakar Neti, interim chair of the Personnel Committee, presented a report, dated February 1, 1999, expressing the committee’s concern regarding the appointment of Don Bolle as (interim) Vice Provost for Information Resources [See Attachment 1]. Specifically, Professor Neti took exception to making the appointment without faculty consultation.

President Farrington solicited a comment from the provost who had none. President Farrington promised to have a conversation with the Personnel Committee and Professor Neti assured the president that the committee
would work hard with the administration.

Professor Arnold Spokane, on behalf of the Educational Policy Committee, moved to suspend the '10-day rule.' The motion was seconded and passed.

Professor Shapiro then moved to reschedule one-half day of classes on April 9, 1999 to support activities scheduled for President Farrington's inauguration. The motion was seconded.

Professor Rich Aronson inquired whether safety issues had been addressed. Professor Spokane replied that they had not been addressed directly. Professor Chisholm noted that Eco 1 rostered both Friday mornings and Friday afternoons. Professor Folk wondered aloud why the inauguration could not take place on a weekend. An unidentified faculty member noted that Passover continues through Thursday night.

The motion passed by a count of 51 yeas to 19 nays.

Professor Ed Shapiro, on behalf of the Faculty Compensation Committee, encouraged the administration to come forward with a plan to close the faculty compensation 'gap.' Although the committee sees the announced 5.5 percent increase in faculty compensation as a step in the right direction, the number of faculty may be constricted by the funding mechanism for the increase since a portion of the increase must be funded through existing college budgets.

Dean Harvey Stenger responded that he was unsure how the College of Engineering would fund the increase given that the college must 'find' $225,000. Dean Stenger noted the options are not very desirable—eliminate half of the TA positions; cut support staff by 8; cut 3 to 4 faculty positions; or, raise new money. He observed that, according to his data, Lehigh engineering faculty compensation ranks 4th of 17 engineering schools in Pennsylvania.

Professor Frank Gunter expressed pessimism, presuming that faculty positions will have to be eliminated to fund the increase.

President's Report. President Farrington stated that the compensation issue is best approached on a department-by-department, program-by-program basis. He noted that the university couldn't make promises it cannot fulfill.

He then reviewed the changes in the university's revenue streams over the past 6 years. Both contract research (indirect cost recovery) and graduate tuition continue to shrink. Undergraduate net tuition has risen
modestly and endowment spending has increased faster than inflation. Combined revenue has been increasing at less than 2 percent over the past 6 years.

Because the days of large tuition increases are over, the key to improving faculty compensation is to increase both contract research and graduate tuition, which, the president noted, are rising at many universities.

The proposed budget does raise endowment spending rates of which an incremental $500,000 will go to increase compensation. Financial aid continues to rise at a pace faster than tuition increases – a situation not sustainable in the long run.

In summary, the president observed that there is approximately $1.46 million in ‘new’ money for compensation and articulated the following long-run ‘solutions:’

1) Accept deficits in the budget. This is ‘suicide’ in the president’s view;

2) Retain the status quo. This strategy results in compensation increases becoming a residual item in the budget;

3) Look at income and programs, making hard decisions about where you invest and where you don’t invest. In this strategy compensation is an independent variable that forces other budgetary decisions.

The president outlined the following strategies: 1) do a ‘hard sell’ to the Spring Scholars; and, 2) use a “venture fund” to make Lehigh more competitive at the undergraduate level, to create more competitive, cash generating graduate programs, and to make strategic investments that grow research funding.

President Farrington also noted that the university could generate a surplus this year. If so, the surplus would be used to establish a fund to invest in research, and be invested back in the colleges. He reiterated his commitment to grow the faculty, not shrink it.

The president concluded his remarks by raising one final issue. The university must determine the ‘true’ salary gap, and establish where the gap is worst, and where it is less of a problem.

Professor Bob Folk encouraged the administration to slash non-academic budgets. The president indicated he had no tolerance for wasting money.
Professor Carole Gormey wondered whether lump sum increases would be better than percentage increases since there is a "gender gap" in compensation. President Farrington reiterated that all faculty raises would be based strictly on merit, but that gender equity would be addressed field-by-field.

The meeting stood adjourned at 5:53 PM.

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

It is with a sense of regret that I have to report to you yet another high level administrative appointment without faculty consultation. I am referring to the appointment of Dr. Donald M. Bolle as Vice Provost for Information Resources. We realize this is an interim appointment, and note that Dr. Bolle does not intend to be a candidate for the permanent position.

According to R & P section 1.2.2.6 --- 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.

We believe the Personnel Committee has a great deal to offer in the process, and possibly make a positive contribution in such "quick" appointments that do not go through the search process.

Over the last couple of years, there have been several of these incidents, and the administration has consistently ignored the Personnel Committee with regard to appointments. We reported the state of affairs at the April 27, 1998 faculty meeting. It is time for the administration and the faculty to reaffirm the importance of faculty governance, and prove this point with deeds.

I hope I have reason to be optimistic about the future.

Sudhakar Neti, Interim Chair
February 1, 1999.
February 1, 1999

To: University Faculty

From: Bruce Correll, Secretary, Educational Policy

Re: Educational Policy Committee Motion for Inaugural Day Classes

This motion was not distributed in the normal timeframe for submission for today's faculty meeting. The committee is requesting a waiver of the ten day rule to consider a motion. At its January 20, 1999 meeting the committee unanimously supported the following motion:

That one-half day of classes scheduled for Friday, April 9th be rescheduled to support activities scheduled as part of President Farrington's Inauguration Ceremony. These classes, either morning or afternoon classes, may be rescheduled along the following guidelines:

- Labs and three hour seminars normally held on Friday afternoons be rescheduled for the evening of January 15th.
- Courses with Four O'clock quizzes be excused from classes for Friday in the normal pattern of canceling classes when a quiz is used.
- Other classes find a time to reschedule convenient to all. Every effort should be made to avoid forcing student conflicts particularly during the 4-7 time period.
January 26, 1999

To: Voting Faculty

From: Faculty Compensation Committee
    Ed Shapiro, Chair
    Pete Beidler, Vice-Chair

Re: Response to announced compensation increase

At the faculty meeting on Monday, February 1, 1999, the FCC will deliver the attached in response to the announced compensation increase. The meeting is being held at the University Center, Room 308 at 4:10 PM. We anticipate that the President and/or Provost will make some remarks in response to our report. The FCC asks for your attendance at the meeting.
January 26, 1999

To: Voting Faculty

From: Faculty Compensation Committee
Ed Shapiro, Chair
Pete Beidler Vice-Chair

Re: Response to announced compensation increase

The FCC views the recently announced 5.5% overall increase in faculty compensation for the 1999-00 academic year as an initial step in the right direction. This level will modestly narrow the continuing gap between Lehigh University faculty compensation and that of its various comparison groups. The exact degree of gap closure will become evident after July 1 when compensation data from peer institutions are known.

Regrettably, the 5.5% announced increase is far below the level the FCC proposed to the administration. In that proposal, we pressed for a total increase of 9.5%, which reflected an increase of 6.0% above the 3.5% anticipated level of peer institutions. This would have been a significant and substantial step in improving the position of Lehigh’s faculty relative to its peers. We also urged the administration to adopt a formal multi-year plan to close the compensation gap. Although the FCC sympathizes with the new administration’s inability to do more at this time, we continue to urge development of a multi-year plan to address the compensation problem.

Because public comments of President Farrington have been so encouraging, however, and because the problem is not of his making, we counsel patience. Indeed, several months remain in his academic year during which a multi-year plan can be formulated and presented to the faculty. This would substantially enhance the goodwill already created by the initial 5.5% increase.

Notwithstanding the above, the FCC wonders whether the mechanism by which the 5.5% announced compensation increase for the coming academic year will produce undesirable side effects. The current proposal is framed within college revenue estimates sufficient to fund only a part of the 5.5% compensation increase. To present balanced budgets for 1999-2000, college Deans must find the rest of faculty compensation increases from their remaining budgets.
In the longer term, increasing revenues are the likely means for improving a college's ability to meet compensation objectives. However, in the short term, the FCC fears that the action taken for the 1999-2000 academic year will be to reduce the number of open faculty positions to be filled or to replace existing faculty lines with adjunct faculty. We believe, and believe that the new administration believes, that the faculty are the heart and soul of the University. Accordingly, the FCC seeks clarification that faculty compensation increases will not be funded by contracting the size of the tenure track faculty.

In conclusion, the FCC seeks an active partnership with the administration leading to formulation of a multi-year plan that demonstrates long-term commitment to addressing faculty compensation issues without reducing overall faculty size.