Presiding: Alice Gast

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

1. Minutes: The minutes of the April 30, 2007, were approved by the Faculty unanimously.

2. Memorial Resolution: (See end materials included with these minutes.)
Professor Bob Leight delivered the Memorial Resolution for Alice Reinhart, Professor Emerita of Education and Human Services; the faculty observed a moment of silence. The Faculty approved this motion by acclamation and requested that a copy of it be sent to his family.

3. Introduction of New Full-time Faculty:
Provost Mohamed El-Aasser introduced the 19 new tenure-track faculty who have joined us this year and invited them to say a few words about themselves. This information was also available in a booklet provided by the Provost’s Office:
- Eugene Albuescu (Music)
- Liuba Belkin (Management)
- Jill Brown (Management)
- Paul Brown (Dean, CBE, and Accounting)
- Deepa Chandraskearan (Marketing)
- Xuanhong Cheng (Materials Science and Engineering)
- Thomas Hammond (Education and Human Services)
- Sabrina Jedlicka (Materials Science and Engineering)
- Marilyn Jones (Art and Architecture)
- Virginia McSwain (Physics)
- Joanna Michelic (History)
- David Moore (Chemistry)
- Sean Mullen (Biological Sciences)
- Kevin Narizny (International Relations)
- Iveta Silova (Education and Human Services)
- Bob Watts (English)
- Alex Wiseman (Education and Human Services)
- Tae Sup Yun (Civil and Environmental Engineering)
- Yuping Zhang (Sociology and Anthropology)

4. Committee Motions:

R & P Subcommittee (See end materials included with these minutes.)

Professor Ed Shaprio, filling in for the committee chair, Professor Dan Lopresti, moved the recommendation from the committee to make R&P consistent with actual practice. The changes to R & P will include additional attendees at the Faculty Steering Committee meeting (Parliamentarian, Deputy Provosts, President’s Assistant, making the overall number 13 vs. 12
previously listed in R&P; the President’s Office will provide clerical support for the committee. There were no questions and no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Unfinished Business No items.

6. New Business:

Disaster and Emergency Preparedness Planning (DEPP) (See end materials included with these minutes.)
Treasurer Denise Blew provided information on the updated plan that will include procedures to deal with natural or man-made disasters, beyond the emergencies envisioned in the earlier, 2002, plans. Severe weather-related problems, bomb scares or other campus security-related issues, etc., have been thought through by a wider group of Lehigh community members. The main source for emergency information (prior to the event) will continue to be www.lehigh.edu/emergency, which will be updated with the new procedures this fall. LUAlert system for cell phone notification of emergencies to campus members has been in place since the first week of this semester, F '07, thanks to the efforts of Bruce Taggart and his LTS staff. About 47% of all Lehigh community members have registered with their emergency contact information.

The next part of the planning process will involve administrative and academic departments to customize a plan for each specific location (on campus, within a building, etc) and situation (classrooms, labs, etc). This would include identifying building and department liaisons to work with the LU Emergency Response Team to improve communication links as widely as possible.

There is now a Pandemic Plan folded into the DEPP with specific roles for, e.g., the Environment and Safety Office, Student Affairs, Provost, Health Center, for keeping the University open and running with a “skeleton crew” for services and classes, for obtaining the required amounts of food, medical supplies, etc., or for evacuation or closing the University. The likely scenario foreseen is for a rapid spread of a disease such as “bird flu.” Experts predict that such a pandemic would cross the US from LA to Boston in about 3 days.

Treasurer Blew then responded to faculty questions:
Prof. Neti remarked that he was surprised that “only” 47% have yet registered, with similar proportions of students, faculty and staff. Denise responded that our system is an “opt-in” one that requires participant action to register. Benchmarking with other schools with similar systems revealed that their participation is approximately 30%.

Jessica Berkowitz, student guest and reporter for the Brown and White, suggested that faculty should recommend registering to their classes.

Prof. O’Brien asked if a pandemic strikes, would we really want to have classes. Denise responded that it would depend on the numbers of affected students. Lafayette College has already made a strategic decision that they would close if a pandemic hits. However, in Lehigh’s case, there could be other options, such as distance ed for some classes, depending on the time of the semester we were hit. For example, if we were close to exams (say, at Thanksgiving), we might be able to finish the term without requiring students to return physically to campus.
Prof. Hargreaves asked if there would be regular tests of the Alert communications system. Denise answered affirmatively and also said that simulations may be planned to test the load on the system or other unforeseen obstacles.

Prof. Bishop asked what if students were in class or lab and, as usually requested by faculty, had turned off their cell phones. Denise replied that this is a reason to have a building or department emergency coordinator who could contact people in person.

Prof. Mullen suggested silent, but visible flashing alarms or phone lights. Denise speculated that campus phones might be replaced or retrofitted with emergency warning devices, or other technological solutions.

Prof. Gans inquired if any/all buildings are lockable electronically. At this point, no one in the meeting knew the answer.

Treasurer Blew invited faculty who had questions or suggestions to email or phone her, so that she could pass them on to the task force.

Global Lehigh
Prof. Gunter asked if this was an appropriate moment to raise an issue of new business. President Gast responded, “It depends (long pause),” to which the faculty let out a great laugh. Our Parliamentarian, Prof. Kay, interjected that this was an appropriate time, seeing that no further new business items were listed on the agenda. Prof. Gunter continued that he would like to know the next step for this exciting set of proposals that have been circulated to the faculty. The President responded that Prof. Menon is currently making the rounds to each college faculty meeting to discuss the details and request feedback from their specific perspectives.

7. Committee Reports:

Faculty Compensation Committee (See end materials included with these minutes.)

Professor Nagel provided a report and update for the FCC committee after meeting with college deans over the summer; each meeting with an individual dean was more than 2 hours in length. The FCC was able to see and have copies of the data received and/or used by each dean for making decisions about annual salary raises, e.g., from CUPA – “College and University Professional Association for Human Resources”—a national data base with a large number of schools reporting their salaries by field. FCC needs more time to analyze the data before providing specific conclusions to the faculty. However, the FCC has learned that each dean uses data on peer schools for each department, has similar procedures for consulting with all department chairs to rank faculty across the college, communicates the raise-determination process clearly to college faculty, checks whether some faculty have fallen behind their Lehigh peers for identifiable reasons that should be corrected, and consults regularly with the Provost on the salary determination process and results.

The FCC strongly recommends that at least one or two meetings with the deans continue each year so that the committee can learn about “best practices” and make recommendations to other colleges or departments on process. They have been well-pleased with the degree of cooperation this summer and note that Scott Knauss will continue to provide the point of contact for everyone
with the Institutional Research Office. Finally, Prof. Nagel briefly described the 2007-08 agenda items for the committee (see attached materials).

**Personnel Committee** (See end materials included with these minutes.)
Professor Kolchin provided a first reading of the following revisions to sections of R&P in order to gather faculty input about these proposed changes.

a) Proposal to revise 1.2.2.6 – Description of Faculty Personnel Committee
Prof. Kolchin pointed out that the proposed change would omit from the description of the appeals process situation involving a faculty member of an under-represented group. This change was recommended by several outside reviewers due to potential liability for reverse discrimination. Also, the description of FPC duties in this section has been expanded to reflect the current practice, similar to the changes that were proposed for the most recent Faculty Senate proposal. The actual practices followed by FPC at that time had been included in the Senate proposal. These proposed revisions are simply bringing R&P up to date.

Prof. Rick Matthews asked if the types of cases heard by FPC included ethical misconduct. Prof. Kolchin said that they had not been included, but harassment policy is basically an attachment to R&P, but could be brought into the document. Procedures for ethical misconduct appeals are not currently in R&P, but he would take inclusion of both types of cases as a friendly amendment to the proposal, especially because the FPC is designated as the current body to hear such appeals. He will revise the proposal for a vote in on it the next faculty meeting on October 29.

Furthermore, Prof. Kolchin indicated that the FPC has noted the need for procedures for cases involving “dismissal for cause” to be investigated and recommendations brought to the faculty. Currently, R&P does not provide advice on what to do for charges of serious faculty infractions, but with penalties lesser than required dismissal.

b. Proposal to revise 2.2.6.13 – Administration’s recommendation in a tenure/promotion case
Again, Prof. Kolchin requested faculty input on the proposal to revise this section of R&P dealing with the process for establishing the “Administration’s Recommendation” when it will be contrary to the Faculty Recommendation for a specific faculty member’s case. In at least two recent faculty cases, their appeals included elements that depended on how many meetings were supposed to occur when the Provost was considering a contrary recommendation. Unfortunately, the grammatical interpretation of the current language appears to be unclear whether the Provost is required to call one meeting with all participants or multiple meetings (dean, college T&P, voting department members). Prof. Kolchin recalled that the original language was framed during the Likins years, when he spoke with one of the original committee members, that person’s memory of the intent was for single meeting of all constituents. However, a number of unresolved questions remain, for example, whether the Provost has already decided before the meeting(s), which grouping (together or separate) will best promote the interests of the candidate by allowing free(r) exchange of evidence, evaluation and opinion.

Prof. Baylor asked how this meeting requirement has been interpreted. Prof. Kolchin replied that up to 3 meetings with dean, T&P, and voting department members could be possible.

Prof. Sivakumar suggested that there could be a confidentiality problem for the specific T&P voters if the meeting required open identification of who voted which way.
Prof. Shapiro commented that once there is a contra-recommendation in the Provost’s mind, the meeting objective becomes one of “reconciling differences” instead of providing more information to the Provost to make the initial decision. In this case, reconciliation could be facilitated with a single meeting with all parties who can express what their differences are to be reconciled.

Prof. Cates disagreed because the votes would be discussed as aggregate totals rather than in terms of a specific faculty member casting a specific vote.

Both Profs. Kolchin and Sivakumar agreed that an open discussion with all parties would most likely reveal at least some indication of the “side” taken by specific department members because of their explanation for specific points about the candidate.

Prof. Shapiro stated that, if everyone relevant to the decision is in the meeting simultaneously, then no separate opinions will have to be resolved from separate meetings.

Prof. Kolchin expressed concern if the meeting(s) would be come confrontational, as to how the differing groups could be brought together, once opinions had hardened sufficiently.

Prof. and Assoc. Provost Soderlund pointed out that we cannot assume that the Provost has made a hard and fast decision by the time any meeting(s) occur. Possibly, the Provost needs to find or develop more information. If the objective of the meeting is to allow her/him to learn more towards an informed decision with the best interests of Lehigh in mind, probably separate meetings with each group would be better. Also, she noted that at any stage of the T&P process, any group involved in evaluating the faculty candidate can request more information, for example a department member can go to the chair. The Provost should have the same opportunity to seek additional information. Thus, this whole section of R&P needs review and revision.

Prof. Nagel observed that there are 2 separate situations here: First, if the Provost is thinking about his as-yet not-made decision, the meeting objective is consultative. Second, if the Provost has a decision firmly in mind, but is willing to listen to other viewpoints to make sure important factors haven’t been overlooked, then the Provost must meet to inform others.

Prof. Szczepanski said that no one can compel the Provost to seek further information. However, the current R&P does require that the Provost must meet with various groups to hear their views. The principle behind the process is to involve the most qualified faculty to decide the long term relationship between Lehigh and an immediate faculty colleague; the Provost is also a faculty member.

Prof. Kolchin also suggested another motive for the Provost to meet with the required groups. If s/he will disagree with the Faculty Recommendation, then the Trustees become more involved in the T&P decision. If the Provost is able to change enough minds and decision of one of the faculty components (T&P and/or department) so that there is no Faculty Recommendation, then there would be no need to go to the Trustees for a final decision. Prof. Kolchin added that R&P language about the dean’s role and disagreement process at that level also needs review and revision. If there is only a single meeting with all parties, differences can be cleaned up all in one place and time.
University Counsel Roth observed that this entire procedure allowing for a “Faculty Recommendation” is not at all common among other colleges and universities outside of Lehigh. The college dean makes a recommendation to the president or trustees and that is the extent of the input. Prof. Kolchin replied that this was precisely President Likins objective, to include faculty with a stronger role in the T&P decision process.

Prof. Deily asked what would be the most productive next step(s). Will we see this proposal at the next meeting with a motion for a vote?

Prof. Kolchin remarked that this discussion will be very helpful to the FPC in deciding what they will do. He asked a straw poll question of the faculty whether colleagues would support a single meeting or change the R&P wording to reflect specifically multiple meetings. Most of the present faculty responded affirmatively for the first option of a single meeting. There was no response from anyone in favor of the second option.

Prof. Kolchin mentioned some previous history about the preference of Provost Yoshida for a single joint meeting and that of Provost El-Asser for multiple meetings.

Prof. and Dean Meltzer urged the utmost care in any specific recommendation or policy adopted by the faculty, to consider giving the fairest hearing to a candidate who has received a split vote. For this reason it will be important to diminish confrontation as much as possible to arrive at a dispassionate resolution which holds the candidate in mind.

Prof. Cates requested, as a member of the FPC, that any one with suggestions about the language for the revision(s) and inclusion of a specific viewpoint should send them to any member of the FPC.

Prof. Kolchin ended the discussion with a promise for the FPC to meet with Provost El-Asser and Assoc. Provost Soderlund and then bring back a proposal, possibly for a vote, at the next meeting.

c. Committee agenda for 07/08
Prof. Kolchin called attention to the agenda items for the FPC for the coming year as listed in the attached document.

Faculty Steering Committee (See end materials included with these minutes.)
Professor Shapiro explained to the faculty about the improvements to access to information and communication that the FSC with Profs. Kay, King and Kolchin were developing. All agenda items for faculty meetings should be available on Blackboard well before the meeting. Meeting minutes will be available via either Blackboard links or on the Registrar’s home page where they will be archived.

Prof. Deily requested that Blackboard be updated to reflect the current committee chairs. Also, she asked that the minutes be archived on Blackboard rather than on the Registrar’s web site.
R & P Subcommittee – (See end materials included with these minutes.)
Professor Shapiro brought a proposal to the faculty about requiring two readings at two faculty meetings for motions involving changes to R & P before a vote is taken. Revisions or amendments could be proposed in either meeting, but the concern of this committee and other faculty is to avoid a vote on a motion without a fair discussion by a larger group of faculty than often was present at the end of faculty meetings in years gone by.

Prof. Gunter asked for clarification whether there was a process ad infinitum (or ad nauseam) in which the faculty would always have to wait for the next meeting for a vote on any proposal that was amended in the current meeting. Profs. Shapiro and Kolchin assured there was no intent to delay needed legislation, but only to make sure that the faculty has take appropriate care to consider proposals fully.

Prof. and Assoc. Provost Moses asked if someone could “call the question” in the first meeting. Prof. Kay responded that this motion was always allowed and the faculty present could vote to suspend the rules.

Prof. Munley observed, however, that the vote to call the question requires a super-majority not a simple one. But he opined that this proposal was a good one to prevent hasty and ill-considered last minute changes to well- and long-deliberated legislation at the end of a late faculty meeting.

Prof. Ann Anderson suggested that after a first reading, a motion could be made to vote electronically on the legislation, after the first meeting but before a second reading. This would avoid having to wait, for example, over the long summer break for the vote.

Prof. Gunter also clarified that this proposal for two readings would not necessarily apply to simple faculty approvals, e.g., for graduation motions. Prof. Shapiro responded that these are not changes to R&P.

8. President’s Report:
President Gast began her brief report with thanks to faculty and administrative colleagues who had been working through the summer on various issues, such as the FCC meetings with deans, the DEPP planning with departments and units adding their own details or participating in one “desktop” simulated disaster/emergency. Also, over the summer she met with the South Bethlehem Development Study Group to discuss Lehigh University interaction with the local community. With regard to strategic goals and objectives, there have been a number of discussions and meetings, including an early summer administration retreat that encouraged cross-department and cross-discipline engagement about aligning goals with activities and budgets. President Gast would like to use faculty leadership structure to help identify likely colleagues who can provide useful input for meeting long term goals.

During the coming year the President will be focusing her attention on fund-raising for the resources to achieve objectives and will keep the faculty posted on her progress. For future faculty meetings, she would like to make them as informative as possible, time permitting, such as the presentation made today on the DEPP by Treasurer Denise Blew, who has been in the thick of the planning process. President Gast asked faculty to let her know what kinds of reports or presentations from senior administration leaders would be the most informative and helpful.
9. **Provost's Report:**
Middle States Accreditation (See end materials included with these minutes.)
Professor and Associate Provost Moses made a brief report on the progress of the Middle States Accreditation process: “This is the year for visitation.” There will be two team visits, one at the end of October, 2007, and the second in mid-March, 2008. The first on-site meeting (see attached outline with names of the Accreditation representatives), will cover the “Compliance Report,” including eight of the 14 goals. The second visit will cover three selected topics (First Year Experience, Technology Support for Learning and Advancement of Student Learning).
The draft reports will be made available soon to the faculty for their comments. Finally, Prof. Moses thanked the more than 50 Lehigh colleagues and senior administrators who have helped with the research and writing of the reports.

Provost El-Asser added his thanks to Prof. Moses for his leadership for the oversight of the Middle States review process for the past three years. The Provost gave some brief statistics about the entering class, reminded everyone about the brochure listing new faculty and ended with thanks to the 35 search committees for their diligently to bring 26 net new faculty members to campus.

10. **Other business:** No items.

11. **Adjournment:** Approved by acclamation of the faculty at 6:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

\[Signature\]

**Next Meeting:** October 29, 2007 in Sinclair Auditorium,
3:30 p.m. reception;
4:10 p.m. meeting.
Memorial Resolution for Alice D. Rinehart,
Professor Emerita, Education and Human Services,
to be read at the September 24, 2007 meeting
of the Lehigh University Faculty.

Alice Duffy Rinehart served on the Lehigh faculty from 1965 to 1984. It was one of four careers for this remarkable woman.

Alice Duffy, from Hartford, Connecticut, graduated from Smith College with a major in Sociology, and was fluent in French, after having spent her junior year abroad in Geneva. For seven years she taught Sociology in Amherst High School, and became its first guidance counselor.

Her second, and most important, career began when she met and married Robert Rinehart, an electrical engineer, and moved to the Lehigh Valley, where they raised their three wonderful children, Ward, Bradford, and Janice. During this time she was instrumental in creating Parent Teacher Associations in two of the public schools her children attended, and headed each in turn, a noteworthy achievement.

After the children were grown she entered Lehigh’s graduate School of Education, achieved a Master’s Degree, and began study for the Doctorate in Education. The coin of the realm at the time was rigorous study involving quantification and experimental design. Although fully aware of the caveats against qualitative studies Alice was a strong advocate of the humanistic approach to educational research. Her dissertation featured taped, structured, in depth interviews of teacher interns that sought to evaluate their program. She had to literally defend her study, but did it so well that upon graduation she was appointed to the faculty.

She taught Sociological Foundations, and became Director of the intern program. In that capacity she taught and advised hundreds of young teachers over the years as they prepared to enter the profession. The excellence of her work was self evident to both the students and colleagues who were graced by their contact with her.

Finally, technically, Alice retired, but a better description of her final career would be that she emerged. During this period she published five books:

With Professor Bob Leight: Country Memories, An Oral History of the One Room School. I noticed this morning that it’s still available on Amazon, recently reduced to $89.25. Four of her books are available on Amazon.

With Professors Bob Williamson and Tom Blank: Early Retirement: It’s Triumphs and Pitfalls.

She wrote Mortals in the Immortal Profession, a four hundred page book of interviews with thirty-eight highly experienced teachers. Almost every page of this book is alive with personal recollections.
To national acclaim she edited and completed *One Woman Determined to Make a Difference: the Life of Madeleine Zabrinski Doty*. A fellow alumna of Smith and a well known lawyer who specialized in cases involving women’s liberation.

And during a visit a few months ago she was frustrated because she thought her publisher was not fast enough with her book about the work of Dean John Stoops of Lehigh with the Middle States School organization.

Obviously Alice had many gifts, but I would like to highlight two that those who knew her would immediately recognize: she was intensely interested in people; and she was honest to an unusual degree. She listened carefully to what you said, but if she disagreed she would let you know, politely but firmly, and explain why she disagreed. It didn’t matter whether you were a colleague, a Dean, a University President, or a cleaning lady – she treated all of us the same; if she thought we needed correction she supplied it. At the core Alice was a teacher. We believe her epitaph is obvious – Alice Duffy Rinehart – Teacher.
September 13, 2007

To: University Faculty

From: R & P Subcommittee of Faculty Steering Committee

Motion:

Propose a change from the following:

1.2.2.1 Faculty steering committee

The faculty steering committee consists of twelve members: the president, the vice president and provost, the chairperson of the educational policy committee, the chairperson of the graduate and research committee, the chairperson of the faculty compensation committee, the past-chairperson of the financial planning and operations committee, the senior (fifth-year) member of the faculty personnel committee, the secretary to the faculty, and four faculty, one elected by each college faculty. The four college representatives will be elected to four-year staggered terms.

Membership on the steering committee will be limited to the twelve designated individuals. The committee may open its meetings to other individuals in the university.

The committee will be assigned one graduate assistant per semester to provide staff support to the steering committee, the subcommittee on regulations and procedures, and, where feasible, standing faculty committees.

To the following:

1.2.2.1 Faculty steering committee

The faculty steering committee consists of thirteen members: the president, the vice president and provost, the chairperson of the educational policy committee, the chairperson of the graduate and research committee, the chairperson of the faculty compensation committee, the past-chairperson of the financial planning and operations committee, the senior (fifth-year) member of the faculty personnel committee, the faculty parliamentarian, the secretary to the faculty, and four faculty, one elected by each college faculty. The four college representatives will be elected to four-year staggered terms.
Membership on the steering committee will be limited to the thirteen designated individuals. The committee may open its meetings to other individuals in the university. Members of the faculty and administrative staff may be invited to attend meetings as guests on an ongoing basis.

The committee will receive clerical support from the president's or provost's office for the steering committee, the subcommittee on rules and procedures, and, where feasible, standing faculty committees.
Disaster & Emergency Preparedness Plan
(LU Faculty meeting presentation, 9/24/07)
Denise Blew, Treasurer

Original EPP Plan developed in 2002 through the leadership of LU Police.


Renamed Disaster and Emergency Preparedness Plan (DEPP)
Pandemic Plan incorporated into the overall DEPP
Development of Emergency Preparedness Website
Revision of plan includes:
- Emergency Notification system, LU Alert (initiated at the beginning of this semester)
- Emergency procedures for the Lehigh community in responding to disaster or emergency.

Next steps:
- Continue to promote and accumulate emergency contact numbers/e-mail addresses for LU Alert – 47% of LU community have enrolled to date.
- Place Emergency procedures on Emergency Preparedness Website
- Develop emergency protocols for both academic and administrative departments
- Identification of building/department liaisons who will work with emergency responders during an emergency event.

Fall 2006 - Initiated Development of Pandemic Plan (an additional component of the EPP)

- Pandemic Plan Committee formed
- EH&S headed effort to develop plan
- Provost Office and Student Affairs involved in development of plan
- Address implementation issues, including continuation of students’ education, provision for food, medical supplies, staffing, etc.
- Both Academic and Administrative Departments will be asked to develop Pandemic Plans for their areas (EH&S will be available for consultation)
FCC Agenda AY 2007-08

Contextual Notes:

At the end of the spring semester, FCC agreed to meet with all four Deans in order to be briefed on the process by which each college handles faculty salaries and raises.

At that time, the FCC chair and one representative from the committee also began a series of meetings with the then Director of Institutional Research—both to understand better the data being used by the Deans and to communicate more clearly what FCC needs in order to carry out its tasks. Over the course of those meetings we were able to reach an agreement, in principle, regarding longitudinal data that FCC will receive and to make some enhancements to the data that the Deans receive.

As the summer progressed, we met with each of the Deans individually. All four meetings were attended by multiple members of FCC and the Director of Institutional Research. The meetings were cordial and informative. Among the things discussed, we learned:

- That the set of peer schools used for salary comparisons by each Dean for each department needed to be revisited and/or reconfirmed. During the course of our conversations we learned that in many cases, the head of Institutional Research had added schools to make the data statistically relevant in his mind. Our discussions with Deans about the problem indicated a willingness to revisit the lists with the aid of departmental chairs and faculty in each department.

- That each college has its own formula for evaluating and ranking faculty, as well as informing faculty of the results. We observed some best practices that we would recommend be shared.

- That each college has a methodology for identifying special cases where individual faculty have fallen behind and each Dean has his or her own methodology for selecting some cases to bring to the Provost for a special one-time boost.

Late in the summer, the individual in the Office of Institutional Research with whom we had reached agreements and from whom we expected more data, resigned from Lehigh and the office changed leadership. We have communicated with the President and Provost and been assured that, with a small delay for reorganization within the Office of Institutional Research, we would not lose any of the valuable progress we have made. They are aware of and pleased with what has been happening.

Agenda for AY 2007-08

1. Meet with the President and Provost periodically to participate, as appropriate, in the faculty compensation processes and maintain good communication and expectations.

2. Identify the general principles that should be followed by Lehigh colleges as each evaluates faculty performance and determines faculty compensation.
   b. Meet with each Dean annually (or more often, as needed) for good communication.
3. Recommend a process for the review of peer schools used in the departmental comparisons in consultation with the Office of Institutional Research and the administration.

4. Find some metrics that reflect an integrated, but statistically valid way of forming a big picture for how Lehigh and each of its colleges are doing with respect to salary comparisons for different faculty groups.

5. Participate actively in the review of benefits at Lehigh that is beginning this year.

6. Continue the review of retirement benefits and negotiated retirement package policies.

7. Postpone our report to the faculty so that we may have time to analyze the data we have collected to date and report at the first meeting of the spring semester on the following:
   a. What we learned in the meetings with the Deans.
   b. What we conclude from the longitudinal data that we expect to receive soon from the Office of Institutional Research.
   c. Our suggested set of baseline guidelines or “best practices” that the Deans might follow—with variations for local implementation—in the process of faculty evaluation and compensation.
   d. Why each department has its own list of comparison schools and the way in which data is compiled and used generically.
   e. Our ongoing assessments of retirement benefits and packages.
Current R&P article defining the committee.
(under consideration for improvement)

1.2.2.6 Faculty personnel committee
This committee is composed of five tenured faculty members, each serving a five-year term on a staggered basis. The four members elected by the faculty of the university to represent the four colleges must be at the rank of professor. The fifth member must be an associate professor at the time of his/her election to the committee. This fifth member is to be elected at-large by the university faculty. A faculty member may not be reelected to a second full term.
In the event that the personnel committee decides that any current member should not participate in hearing a particular case because of a conflict of interest, the committee will designate as his/her substitute for that case the former member of the committee who most recently represented the college or school of the temporarily disqualified member. If no former committee member of that college is available, the committee will select the most recent former member of the personnel committee who is available to hear the case. As used above, availability implies that the individual is willing to serve and is not disqualified because of a conflict of interest.
In considering any appeal, the personnel committee is empowered to examine all letters and other documents and to question members of the faculty and the administration for the purpose of establishing facts in the case. The personnel committee may, at its option, petition the provost, the president, or the board of trustees for reconsideration of the decision that caused the appeal. Representatives of the administration, the personnel committee, and the appealing party may participate in any hearing before the board of trustees or its designated committee. When the personnel committee considers the appeal of a member of an under-represented minority group (as currently defined by United States government guidelines for eliminating discrimination in employment) the president will appoint a tenured member of the university's affirmative action/equal opportunity commission to serve as pro tem voting member of the committee for the duration of that specific case, unless the appealing individual declines such an appointment in advance, or unless his/her group is already represented on the committee.
The committee always advises the board of trustees on an appointment to the office of president and the office of vice president and provost.
Whenever an appointment is to be made to academic and research positions at the rank of dean or above without advertising the vacancy and/or without utilizing a search committee, the committee will render advice to the president. E.g., Associate or assistant provost, vice provost for information resources, vice president for graduate studies and research, provost and vice president for academic affairs, and vice provost for student affairs. Recognizing that titles and responsibilities of positions may change, the above list is meant to be representative.
The committee is authorized to make inquiries that are necessary to carry out these duties.
The committee shall report to the university faculty at least once a year. It will undertake the development of general principles based on its decisions and will report in writing on those general principles to the university faculty. The senior committee member in years of service represents the personnel committee as a member of the faculty steering committee.

Current R&P articles referring to the responsibilities of the committee:

2.2.1.3 Tenurability of slots
Decisions regarding the tenurability of a slot are made at the time of the initial appointment. If there is a change in the status of an occupied slot (from tenurable to nontenurable) that change must be communicated at least two years prior to the start of the occupant's terminal year and must be reviewed by the appropriate college promotion and tenure committee and the personnel committee. A person occupying a tenurable slot is in the tenure track.

2.2.1.6 Appeals
An appeal alleging arbitrary or capricious action arising from the procedures described in section 2.2 may be made to the faculty personnel committee as provided in section 2.3. An appeal may be initiated by any aggrieved member of the faculty or administration. After investigation, the personnel committee shall make a written recommendation to the president. Should such recommendation not be accepted, the president shall explain his/her decision in writing to the personnel committee; and the committee may then, at its option, appeal to the board of trustees. During an appeal involving an untenured person, no contract, which will result in tenure, may be offered to such person. (See also sections 1.2.2.6 and 2.3.)

2.2.11 Dismissal for cause
The personnel committee and the board of trustees (or a committee of the board of trustees) shall consider any move to dismiss a tenured faculty member for cause. When facts are in dispute, the faculty member shall be given charges in writing before any hearing and shall be invited to be heard by all bodies that pass judgment on the case. The faculty member shall be invited to choose and be accompanied by counsel. There shall be a full stenographic record of all hearings available to the parties concerned.

2.3 Appeals concerning alleged arbitrary or capricious action
The personnel committee shall hear appeals concerning alleged arbitrary or capricious action on the part of the administration or a department chairperson that allegedly affects the rights, privileges, continued employment, or academic freedom of a faculty member.
Proposed Change to the Description of the Faculty Personnel Committee
R&P Section 1.2.2.6

Proposal: To modify the language in the description of the faculty personnel committee in R&P section 1.2.2.6 as noted under proposed language.

Rationale:

When R&P was reviewed under the Markley administration, several reviewers indicated that the university was exposing itself to charges of reverse discrimination because of language that existed in the second paragraph of the description of the committee listed in R&P. This paragraph discusses the situation when a faculty member of an under-represented minority group is appealing his/her case that the president will appoint a tenured member of the university’s affirmative action/equal opportunity commission to serve as a pro tem member of the committee for the duration of the case. Two problems occur with this language. First, we no longer have a university affirmative action/equal opportunity commission; and, second, such representation could lead to a charge of reverse discrimination against the university. The deleted section is underlined and highlighted in red in the document titled current listed below.

In addition, the personnel committee made a number of changes to the description of the committee when the faculty senate proposal was being written. This description is written more along the lines of the descriptions of the other faculty governance standing committees and now includes a fuller description of what the committee does.

Current language of R&P 1.2.2.6

Current R&P Language

1.2.2.6 Faculty personnel committee
This committee is composed of five tenured faculty members, each serving a five-year term on a staggered basis. The four members elected by the faculty of the university to represent the four colleges must be at the rank of professor. The fifth member must be an associate professor at the time of his/her election to the committee. This fifth member is to be elected at-large by the university faculty. A faculty member may not be reelected to a second full term.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The senior committee member in years of service represents the personnel committee as a member of the faculty steering committee.
Proposed language for R&P 1.2.2.6

Proposed Changes to R&P

1.2.2.6 Faculty Personnel Committee

The faculty personnel committee acts as the appellate committee of the university faculty. To this end, the committee shall hear appeals concerning alleged arbitrary and capricious actions on the part of the administration or a department chairperson that allegedly affect the rights, privileges, continued employment, or academic freedom of a faculty member (See section 2.3). Included among its appellate duties, the committee shall:

Hear all appeals alleging arbitrary or capricious action arising from the procedures described in section 2.2 (See section 2.2.1.6).

Hear appeals regarding a decision in a harassment case in which a faculty member was accused (See appendix A, section A8).

The committee is composed of five tenured faculty members, each serving a five-year term on a staggered basis. The four members elected by the university faculty to represent the four colleges must be at the rank of professor. The fifth member must be an associate professor at the time of his/her election to the committee. This fifth member is to be elected at-large by the university faculty. A faculty member may not be reelected to a second full term. The committee member that is senior in years of service represents the personnel committee as a member of the faculty steering committee.

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

In considering any appeal, the personnel committee is empowered to examine all letters and other documents and to question members of the faculty and the administration for the purpose of establishing facts in the case. The personnel committee may petition the president or the board of trustees for reconsideration of the decision that caused the appeal (See section 2.2.1.6) and representatives of the administration, the personnel committee, and the appealing party may
participate in any resultant hearing before the board of trustees or its designated committee.

In addition, the personnel committee has other duties that include:

Reviewing all decisions to change the tenurability of a faculty position. (See section 2.2.1.3)

Considering any move to dismiss a tenured faculty member for cause. (See section 2.2.11)

Advising the board of trustees on appointments to the office of president and the office of vice president and provost.

Advising the president whenever an appointment is to be made to an academic and/or research position at or above the rank of dean (such as, but not limited to, an associate, deputy, or vice provost) without advertising the vacancy and/or without utilizing a search committee.

Reviewing proposed appointments and making recommendations on those appointments to the administration in cases where a proposed appointment of a visiting faculty member would be for more than two consecutive years. (See section 2.2.3)

The committee may also assume other duties as delegated by the faculty or requested by the administration or board of trustees.

The committee is authorized to make inquiries that are necessary to carry out its duties.

On the basis of the personnel committee’s considerations, wherever appropriate, the committee shall derive general principles designed to enhance processes and/or outcomes within its purview and shall report these in writing to the university faculty. The committee shall report to the university faculty at least once a year.
Proposal to Change the Language in R&P Section 2.2.6.13

Proposal: To change the language in the second paragraph of R&P section 2.2.6.13 from:

"The Provost will call a meeting with the dean, the college tenure committee, and the voting members of the department who participated in the evaluation of the candidate.

to:

"The provost will call a single, joint meeting with the dean, the college tenure committee, and the voting members of the department who participated in the evaluation of the candidate."

Rationale: During the investigation of several appeals to the committee, it became apparent to the committee that there is some confusion around the current language. Some individuals interpreted the current language as meaning a single, joint meeting while others felt that the language could be interpreted as separate meetings with each of the groups listed. The proposed language attempts to clarify the language.

Proposed Language:

2.2.6.13      Administration's recommendation

In the absence of a "faculty recommendation" (that is, when the departmental recommendation and the tenure committee's recommendation do not agree), the provost will review carefully both the departmental recommendation and the tenure committee's recommendation and evaluate the candidate's qualifications in terms of the criteria (as stated in section 2.2.1.5 and as applied in the annual evaluations) before making his/her final recommendation. In the event that the provost is considering a recommendation contrary to the recommendation of the department or the college tenure committee, the provost will meet with the college tenure committee, the voting members of the department who participated in the evaluation of the candidate, and the dean and provide reasons for non-concurrence.

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 single, joint meeting with the dean, the college tenure 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 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.
Faculty Personnel Committee
Agenda for 2007-2008

1. A faculty appeal against an arbitrary and capricious action.

2. Revision of 2.2.11 (Dismissal for cause)

3. Revision of 1.2.2.6 (Faculty Personnel Committee)

4. Revision of 2.2.6.13 (Administration’s recommendation)

5. Review of Professors of Practice

6. Sloan Board

7. Review of probationary period
   - Going up more than once
   - Going up early
   - Extending the clock
   - Creating a window
   - Expanding reasons for extension of the clock

8. Get Membership on Faculty Personnel Committee Back in Synch
September 4, 2007

To: Faculty Steering Committee

From: Ed Shapiro, Chair, Faculty Steering Committee

Re: Improving faculty access and communication

Art King (Secretary), Ed Kay (Parliamentarian), Mike Kolchin (past chair of FSC), and I met this past week to try to develop strategies that would improve the communication process to the faculty. At the meetings, we agreed that the following items would be useful. Please feel free to suggest revisions or other ways that we can effectively improve communication to the faculty.

1. Registrar will maintain web pages of:
   a. EdPol motions
   b. GRC motions
   c. Faculty minutes

2. Blackboard will have files organized by committee, each committee’s files will be organized by year.

3. Secretary’s entry on Blackboard will have a link to the registrar’s web pages who will maintain the faculty minutes.

4. Faculty minutes will contain both minutes and all related documents in a single pdf file.

5. EdPol and GRC will have a link to the registrar’s pages on their Blackboard page.

6. Motions emanating from sources other than EdPol and GRC will be posted on Blackboard under their respective committees.

7. Agenda and motions other than those from EdPol and GRC will be sent to the president’s office for circulation immediately after the corresponding FSC meeting.

8. On August 1 and February 1 of each academic year, LTS will load the current faculty list to the Blackboard site. This will maintain a current listing of all faculty who recently began or ended their Lehigh affiliation.
September 13, 2007

To: University Faculty

From: R & P Subcommittee of Faculty Steering Committee

Items for Discussion:

Proposed changes to Rules & Procedures arise from a variety of sources, most commonly from standing committees of the Faculty Steering Committee. Before bringing forth a motion to change R & P, the R & P Subcommittee solicits input from members of the university community, and also publicizes the language of such changes in advance of Faculty Meetings on the Faculty Blackboard website.

On occasion, questions about a motion arise during a Faculty Meeting that would be best addressed through additional research or deliberation, without having to worry about the time constraints of a meeting in progress.

The R & P Subcommittee would like to initiate a discussion with the faculty about whether it would be desirable to institute of policy of presenting motions to change R & P at two successive faculty meetings. The proposed motion would be read for discussion at the first meeting, with the expectation that it would be read again and voted on at the second meeting.
Middle States Accreditation Update
University Faculty Meeting
24 September 2007
Carl Moses, Chair, Accreditation Steering Committee

Our selected topics approach to the self-study involves two evaluation visits.

1. First visit: end of October
   a. Compliance with 8 of 14 Middle States standards not covered by the
      selected topics reports
   b. “Compliance Chapter” of the self-study with associated documentation
      was submitted to Middle States last week
   c. Generalist evaluators participating in the late-October visit are
      i. Dr. Donald Lehman, Provost at GWU
      ii. Mr. Ronald Paprocki, VP for Administration and Finance at
          Rochester
   d. Chair of the entire evaluation team is Dr. William Adams, Colby College
      President; he will also visit at the time the generalist evaluators are here,
      and I expect him to have a day-and-a-half of meetings with individuals
      and groups so he can get to better know Lehigh and our processes leading
      up to this accreditation review
   e. Process of producing the Compliance Chapter executed by a sub-
      committee chaired by Peggy Plympton and Hannah Stewart–Gambino
      i. Sub-committee research led to draft report
      ii. Findings and recommendations of the draft report vetted with
          senior leadership
      iii. Entire draft report available for campus comment during April
      iv. Revised report prepared
      v. Final findings and recommendations shared with senior leadership
         in July
      vi. Final draft submitted last week

2. Second visit: middle of March
   a. 3 selected topics chapters
      i. First-year experience (Barry Kroll and John Smeaton)
      ii. Technology support for learning (Ed Gallagher, Greg Reihman, and
          Bruce Taggart)
      iii. Advancement of student learning (Vince Munley and Associate
          Deans)
   b. In addition to the investigations of the special topics, those chapters
      document compliance with 6 of the 14 standards
   c. The findings and recommendations of the first two of these chapters have
      been vetted with senior leadership, and the first drafts are almost ready for
      publication to the campus community for comment—I hope that will
      happen this week.
   d. We will publish on Blackboard and announce by email.
e. In addition to hoping for voluntary comments, we will reach out specifically to key groups and individuals—faculty, students, and staff—for their comments.
f. The third chapter has been delayed, but we hope to publish it for campus comment in October.
g. After the campus comment period ends in November, we will revise the documents, vet any revised findings and recommendations with senior leadership, and aim for submitting final drafts to Middle States by late January or early February.

I want to express my appreciation to the members of the Accreditation Steering Committee and the sub-committees. All told, about 50 people have been involved in doing this work, and I’m really grateful for their dedication and effort, which has been pretty quiet and mostly un-noticed. I should also thank the senior leadership for their careful consideration of the findings and recommendations from each chapter as we work through the process of producing each one. Finally, I thank all those who provided comments on the Compliance Chapter in April and who will comment on the draft chapters we post this fall.