Department of
Education and Human Services
Procedures and Policies

Revised – February 2010

Chairperson: George DuPaul

Administrative Assistant: Donna Ball

Table of Contents
Departmental Procedures and Policies

STRATEGIC GOALS

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

bold, connected, innovative

STRATEGIC GOALS
Approved February 9,2007

Goal 1	Expand global recognition of our scholarship and practice.
Goal 2	Enhance learning through innovative research-based teaching methodologies and curricula.
Goal 3	Create a diverse and inclusive environment where professionals are challenged to become catalysts for positive educational and social change.
Goal 4	Advance signature areas of excellence that embody the extension of research to practice.
Goal 5	Create and enhance collaborative partnerships at individual, school, community, global, and interdisciplinary levels.
Goal 6	Attract and retain diverse and high quality students, faculty, and staff.

VISION STATEMENT

COE
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
bold, connected, innovative

VISION STATEMENT
Approved February 9, 2007

The College of Education is a diverse learning community committed to educational equity and excellence by advancing research and practice to make a difference in the lives of individuals and to influence the well-being of schools, organizations, communities, and societies. We aspire to address interdisciplinary and global issues in an intellectually open and respectful environment through collaboration, teaching, mentoring, scholarship and service.

College of Education Organizational Structure

Adopted May 1994, edited June 2008

The College of Education consists of a single department, Department of Education and Human Services comprised of a set of interrelated programs, Centennial School, Center for Developing Urban Educational Leaders (CDUEL), Center for Promoting Research to Practice (CPRP), and Office of International Programs.

PROGRAM DEFINITION

A program consists of a cluster of certifications and/or degrees with a similar professional or research focus.

A program coordinator will be appointed by the department chair after consultation with the program faculty. Program coordinators will serve three-year renewable terms.

PROGRAM CONFIGURATION

The Department of Education and Human Services will consist of the following six programs:

- Comparative and International Education
- Counseling Psychology
- Educational Leadership
- School Psychology
- Special Education
- Teaching, Learning and Technology

NON-PROGRAM STRUCTURE

All centers (present and future) and externally funded long term research or training programs will report directly to the dean of the college and coordinate with the chair on matters of faculty buy-off and student support. The department chair will have a voting position on the Centennial School governance council.

1.3.3.4.1 College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee

The college promotion and tenure committee will consist of five elected tenured university faculty members. Three members will be elected from the college as a whole, at least two of whom shall be full professors. The college will elect two members in related disciplines from the faculties of the other three colleges. These members shall be at the rank of full professor. Each member will serve a three-year term. No member may serve more than two terms consecutively. Each year the nomination committee will prepare a slate of candidates for each open position.

If no one from the candidate's program is a member of the college promotion and tenure committee, then the department chair, after consultation with the candidate, will appoint, on an ad hoc basis, one faculty member from the candidate's program to the committee. This member must be familiar with the candidate's area of study and will serve as a nonvoting liaison to the committee for the candidate's case.

In the initial election that first constitutes the committee, the department will elect all three members, one for a three-year term, one for a two-year term, and one for a one-year term.

The committee will elect its own chairperson, and it may establish additional operating procedures, consistent with R&P. The committee will present an annual report to the college faculty on its activities.

While the committee may establish additional operating procedures, the following may be changed only by a majority vote at a duly constituted faculty meeting.

1. College of Education members of the promotion and tenure committee will not vote when the tenured faculty of the college considers the candidate at the departmental stage of the promotion and tenure review process.
2. All five committee members must be present at any meeting where tenure is discussed. All full professors on the committee must be present at any meeting where promotion to full professor is discussed. All members will vote on all promotion and tenure decisions of assistant professors. Only full professors on the tenure committee will vote on the promotion to full professor. In the latter case, if an associate professor currently serves on the committee, then the faculty will elect a full professor to replace the associate professor on the committee for that case only.

   The composition of the promotion and tenure committee should reflect the makeup of the college faculty by including members of underrepresented groups (as currently defined by United States government guidelines for eliminating discrimination in employment) whenver possible.
3. All tenure and promotion proceedings are to be kept confidential. All cases involving tenure are the province of the full tenure committee.
4. Tenure and promotion recommendations by the committee require a majority vote, with no abstentions by eligible voters. The vote is reported to the dean with each recommendation.
5. Each candidate's complete file will be available to all committee members during the evaluation period.
6. In the event that a file is incomplete or deemed inadequate, the committee will follow the procedures in R&P section 2.2.6.9, paragraph 2.
7. The chair will present confidential summary reports to the dean on the individual cases considered. These reports will include the vote of the committee (a majority vote for the candidate constitutes a positive recommendation) and a statement of reasons for each recommendation. The letters from each member voting will accompany this summary report.
8. The committee will present annual reports to the faculty on their operations and decisions. There will be no confidential material in these reports.

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION PROMOTION & TENURE CRITERIA

April 1995, Revised October 2002

A. Research and Scholarship

Primary Importance I[i]

- Publication of specific research studies or theoretical expositions as a book or monograph
- Publication of research studies in peer-reviewed national or international journals[ii]
- Publication of nonresearch articles in peer-reviewed national or international journals
- Publication of articles in renowned national or international periodicals that have significant impact on one's field but are nonrefereed
- Publication of textbooks. (A textbook should either extend knowledge of one's field beyond what a journal article can do, promote best practices in the field, or do both.)
- Research, training, and/or demonstration grants or contracts that are funded by an external agency using a refereed process
- Patent granted for educational product
- Technology product[iii] that is instructional and/or a professional resource and has the following:
  - Validation — Recognition by national or international reviewing agency/organization or national or international commercial distribution
  - Comprehensiveness — Much material covered (breadth) and wide range of high quality materials and/or activities (richness)
- Publication of a psychological or educational test which has undergone a refereed process

Primary Importance II

- Chapters in edited textbooks, research volumes, and books of readings or conference proceedings
- Validated instrument for assessing or categorizing technology products
- Editorship of a book of readings or special issue of a journal that has undergone a refereed process
- Research, training, and/or demonstration grants or contracts that have been funded by an external agency using a non-refereed process

Secondary Importance

- Presentations at nationally or internationally recognized professional meetings
- Publication in peer-reviewed journals of nonrefereed articles (for example, editorials; comments; reviews of tests, books, or software)
- Publication of research or non-research articles in peer-reviewed journals that are not nationally or internationally recognized
- Internal faculty research grants
- Technology product[3] that is instructional and/or a professional resource and has the following:
  - Validation — If Web site, multiple external links to site and/or recognition by state/regional agency or organization.
  - Comprehensiveness — Little material covered (breadth) or limited range of materials and/or activities and/or of medium quality (richness)
- Submission of a final technical report on a funded project or an evaluation report on an externally funded project.

Tertiary Importance

- Review of books, tests, software in major national or international publications
- Publication of supplemental teaching material
- Publication of research or non-research articles in journals that are edited and/or refereed by non-academic peers (This category includes letters in newspapers or articles in popular periodicals or trade journals.).
- Presentations at state/local/regional professional meetings
- Submission of a grant or contract proposal to an external agency
- Technology product[3] that is instructional and/or a professional resource and has the following:
  Validation — Local or no recognition
  Comprehensiveness — Little material covered (breadth) and/or materials or activities not particularly rich (richness)
- Submission of an annual report as a requirement for continuation of an externally funded project

B. Teaching/Advising

Primary Importance I

- Teaching performance in didactic courses, seminars, supervision of practice, or assigned consultation to Centennial School (Note: Courses which require new preparations or courses which are newly developed and implemented and which meet specifically defined department or program goals or needs as stated in the departmental plan are weighted more heavily than are routine course assignments.)
- Chair, completed dissertation
- National teaching or mentoring award
- State/local or university teaching or mentoring award
- Development and delivery of a new online learning course
- Implementation of innovative approaches to teaching and learning (for example, design and development of a technology product[iv], modularization of courses, appropriate use of online learning, incorporation of constructivist learner-centered activities, incorporation of unusual scheduling flexibility to address learner needs, exemplary use of newer technologies in teaching and learning.)
- Mentoring student publication or presentation at a national or international conference of work conducted at Lehigh

Primary Importance II

- Development of a summer institute or continuing education program that generates revenues
- Teaching classes markedly larger than the departmental norm during the probationary period
- Mentoring student publication or presentation at state, regional, or local conferences of work conducted at Lehigh
- Assigned consultation to a local school district, agency, counseling center, or the like as part of regular academic duties
- Chair, completed qualifying project
- Consultant, statistics/research design for research project, dissertation, qualifying project, or grant
- Member, dissertation committee

Secondary Importance

- Teaching of cross-program or cross-department courses that serve the college or university
- Teaching an independent study course
- Teaching apprentice teaching
- Member, qualifying project committee

C. Service[v]

Professional Service

Primary Importance I

- Member (or chair) of national or international review panel (for example, U.S. Dept. of Education, NIMH, NSF)
- Editor, refereed journal, book series, or renowned national or international periodical that has significant impact on one's field but is not refereed.
- Elected officer, national or international organizations

Primary Importance II

- Associate editor, refereed journal
- Chair, national or international committee
- Chair, national or international conference
- Serving on a dissertation committee at another university

Secondary Importance

- Editorial or review board member, refereed journal
- Chair, regional/state committee
- Member, national or international committee
- Editor, newsletter, communiqué, or column
- Chair, state/local conference
- Editor, computer news group; computer bulletin board

Tertiary Importance

- Ad hoc reviewer, refereed journal or book series
- Editorial board member, nonrefereed journal
- Member, regional/state committee

University Service

Primary Importance I

- Chair, major university committee (for example, FCC, GRC, Personnel, FFPOC)
- Program coordinator

Primary Importance II

- Chair, other university committee
- New major, non-grant funding which supports departmental students

Secondary Importance

- Other new non-grant funding which supports departmental students
- Chair, college committee
- Coordinator of minority recruitment
- Practicum coordinator

Tertiary Importance

- Director, existing departmental grant
- Member, university committee
- Member, college committee

Community Service

- National training or consultation
- State/local consultation
- Liaison with state or regional organization or school district
- State/local workshop or inservice session

NINE BASIC METHODS OF RESEARCH

METHOD	PURPOSE	EXAMPLES
HISTORICAL	To reconstruct the past objectively and accurately, often in relation to the tenability of an hypothesis.	A study reconstructing practices in the teaching of spelling in the United States during the past fifty years; tracing the history of civil rights in the United States education since the civil war; testing the hypothesis that Francis Bacon is the real author of the "works of William Shakespeare."
DESCRIPTIVE	To describe systematically a situation or area of interest factually and accurately.	Population census studies, public opinion surveys, fact-finding surveys, status studies, task analysis studies, questionnaire and interview studies, observation studies, job description surveys of the literature, documentary analyses, anecdotal records, critical incident report test score analyses, and normative data.
DEVELOPMENTA L	To investigate patterns and sequences of growth and/or change as a function of time.	A longitudinal growth study following an initial sample of 200 children from six months of age to adulthood; a cross-sectional growth study investigating changing patterns of intelligence by sampling groups of children at ten different age levels; a trend study projecting the future growth and educational needs of a community from past trends and recent building estimates.
CASE AND FIELD	To study intensively the background, current status, and environmental interactions of a given social unit; an individual, group, institution, or community.	The case history of a child with an above average IQ but with severe learning disabilities; an intensive study of a group of teenage youngsters on probation for drug abuse, an intensive study of atypical suburban community in the Midwest in terms of its socio-economic characteristics.
CORREATIONAL	To investigate the extent to which variations in one factor correspond with variations in one or more other factors based on correlation coefficients.	To investigate relationships between reading achievement scores and one or more other variables of interest; a factor-analytic study of several intelligence tests; a study to predict success in college based on intercorrelation patterns between college grades and selected high school variables.
CASUAL COMPARATIVE or "EX POST FACTO"	To investigate possible cause-and-effect relationships by observing some existing consequence and searching back through the data for plausible causal factors.	To identify factors related to the "drop-out" problem in a particular high school using data from records over the past ten years; to investigate similarities and differences between such groups as smokers and nonsmokers, readers and nonreaders, or delinquents and nondelinquents, using data on file.
TRUE EXPERIMENTAL	To investigate possible cause-and-effect relationships by exposing one or more experimental groups to one or more treatment conditions and comparing the results to one or more control groups not receiving the treatment (random assignment being essential).	To investigate the effectiveness of three methods of teaching reading to first grade children using random assignments of children and teachers to groups and methods; to investigate the effects of a specific tranquilizing drug on the learning behavior of boys identified as "hyperactive" using random assignment to groups receiving three different levels of the drug and two control groups with and without a placebo, respectively.
QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL	To approximate the conditions of the true experiment in a setting which does not allow the control and/or manipulation of all relevant variables. The researcher must clearly understand what compromises exist in the internal and external validity of his design and proceed within these limitations.[1]	Most so-called field experiments, operational research, and even the more sophisticated forms of action research which attempt to get at causal factors in real life settings when only partial control is possible; e.g., an investigation of the effectiveness of any method or treatment condition where random assignment of subjects to methods or conditions is not possible.

Footnotes to Promotion & Tenure Criteria

[1] Publication in peer-reviewed national or international journals is required for tenure and promotion. It is the quality of this work that is important. While the number of such publications one should have cannot be quantified, an average of fewer than one publication per year is risky. At least three methods are available to evaluate the quality of a candidate's overall publications: (a) how often the candidate's work has been cited (for example, listings in the Social Sciences Citation Index); (b) the rejection rates of the journals in which the candidate publishes; and (c) invitations to the candidate to serve on editorial boards.

Research and nonresearch articles are both highly valued. For example, literature reviews, guidelines for teaching practice, and conceptual articles are all valued, provided they are published in peer-reviewed national or international journals or in renowned non-refereed journals. A candidate may make a case that a non-peer-reviewed national or international journal is renowned and therefore comparable to a peer-reviewed journal by documenting that journal's circulation, rejection rate, and likely impact on the field.

While both research and nonresearch articles are highly valued, because candidates are graduate faculty guiding doctoral students, the overall record of publications presented for tenure must include research articles. While the overall record may have a practitioner-focus or be weighted towards nonresearch articles, an absence of articles reflecting research comparable to that expected of student dissertations places the faculty member at risk.

Research articles may be experimental or nonexperimental. Both true experimental and quasi-experimental (group or single subject design) research are highly valued. Nonexperimental research may use qualitative methods, quantitative methods, or a blend of the two methodologies; all three approaches are highly valued. Examples of nonexperimental research designs have been described by Isaac and Michael (1990) [see attached table] and include: historical, descriptive, developmental, case and field, correlational, and *ex post facto*.

The primary criteria for an article being a "research article" are (a) investigation of one or more research questions; (b) using a research design (experimental or nonexperimental design) and rigorous methodology; and (c) collection of data to answer the questions posed. Candidates are encouraged to highlight their research publications in presenting their credentials.

Issac, S., & Michael, W.B. (1990). *Handbook in research and evaluation.* San Diego, CA: Edits.

[2] JOURNALS — The quality of the journal, not the method of delivery (print or online), is the key issue here. When submitting evidence, the faculty member needs to demonstrate that the journal is edited and/or refereed by academic peers, not simply by graduate students or others.

[3] TECHNOLOGY PRODUCTS FOR SCHOLARSHIP: Those things —designed and developed for use by an audience broader than simply Lehigh learners— that support, demonstrate, or advance one's research agenda. Given the collaborative nature of technology development, faculty members need to make clear what role they played in the actual development (for instance, instructional designer, programmer, resource developer, content expert, evaluator). In addition, the faculty member should make clear the relationship of the product to his or her research agenda.

Such products may be of three main types:

Instructional — must include all four of the following:

- goals or learning tasks
- learning materials and activities
- instructional strategies
- learner assessment and/or feedback

Professional Resource — such as:

- Content Collection
- Database
- Teacher Resource
- Informal Education

Neither Instructional nor a Professional Resource — such as:

- Online exhibit
- Compilation of games
- Collection of Links

[4] TECHNOLOGY PRODUCTS FOR TEACHING: Those things designed primarily for use with Lehigh learners or that do not support, demonstrate, or advance one's research agenda. Given the collaborative nature of technology development, faculty members need to make clear what role they played in the actual development (for instance, instructional designer, programmer, resource developer, content expert, evaluator).

[5] It is understood that there is a distinction between the level of an activity within the service hierarchy and the quality of performance of that activity. Excellence in service can occur at any level. It is also understood that involvement in activities at the higher levels, while expected from senior faculty, is not typical for junior faculty. In those instances where junior faculty are active at higher levels, their case is credited accordingly.

.

	Enrollments	Ratings Instructor/courses (x)	Grades Given (X)	Comments
Fall 1990				
EdL 400 - Ed Leadership: Theory & Practice	28	4.5(5.0)/4.3(5.0)	3.6	Several students from other programs
EdL 476 - School Financial Management	11	4.3(5.0)/4.4(5.0)	3.4	Revised course
Educ 492 - Middle Level Institute	23	4.8(5.0)/4.8(5.0)	3.9	New course
Spring 1991				
EdL 400 - Ed Leadership; Theory & Practice	21	___________*		*not collected
EdL 476 - School Financial Management	4	4.2(5.0)/4.4(5.0)	3.5	
[release time for tele-course program development]				Not funded but future program delivery mechanism
Summer 1991				
Fall 1991				
Spring 1992				
Summer 1992				
Fall 1992				

DOSSIER PREPARATION FOR REAPPOINTMENT REVIEWS AND PROMOTION AND TENURE IN THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Draft August 8, 2006

This document describes dossier or portfolio preparation for reappointment reviews and for promotion and tenure (i.e., Assistant to Associate Professor, Associate to full Professor). Typically, pretenure faculty work under 2-year contracts and, therefore, are evaluated by the COE and Provost every 2 years for reappointment consideration. For most, this means that you will need to prepare and submit reappointment dossier materials in years 2 and 4. Your promotion and tenure review will occur in year 6, unless you request an earlier review. For more information about the annual timeline for reappointment and promotion and tenure activities, refer to the Provost's website at http://www.lehigh.edu/~inprv/reappointment.html.

In addition to the reappointment reviews, the College of Education also performs "annual reviews" of dossier materials in years 3 and 5. The intent behind these, more informal reviews is to provide feedback to the candidate on her/his progress in the years between reappointments. The materials to be submitted for annual review will be the same as the reappointment review materials.

Tenured faculty at the Associate Professor Rank are reviewed "triennially" or every three years from the time of initial appointment. The candidate must be considered for promotion to full in the 9th year in rank. Triennial reviews will continue until promotion to full professor is achieved.

The reappointment and tenure/promotion dossier should consist of a separate summary binder followed by all supporting documentation, in as many additional binders as necessary.

Summary Binder

The summary binder is comprised of three sections, 1) personal statements, 2) vita, and 3) summary of accomplishments. The following information needs to be in each section:

1. Personal Statements

The overall purpose of the scholarship, teaching, and service personal statements is to help faculty determine if the candidate has met the criterion in P&T as well as provide a context for understanding his/her accomplishments and goals for the future. The candidate may also wish to describe how his/her achievements in these areas are integrated or overlap. There are three personal statement documents that address scholarship, teaching, and service separately. Each should begin with a short introduction and be written in a way that permits educated laypersons to understand the significance of the candidate's work in that area.

Research and Scholarship: The research and scholarship statement should provide a general narrative of the candidate's scholarly interests, achievements, goals, and methodologies. While this statement can take various forms, the purpose is to provide a clear indication of the substance of the candidate's current and future scholarship and its contribution to her or his academic discipline. It should also include the impact of the candidate's own contributions in these areas (e.g. when collaborating with others specify the candidate's contribution). For specific content guidelines, see the Provost webpage.

Growth: For tenure and promotion, the research and scholarship personal statement must show that the candidate has had a significant positive impact on his/her field over the 6 years of pretenure service.

Teaching and Mentoring: The teaching and mentoring statement should discuss the candidate's achievements, goals, and methodologies. This should include the candidate's teaching philosophy and explanations of why he or she teaches various courses in a particular way. The candidate should also discuss her/his contributions in course and curriculum development and emphasize the ways in which her/his courses contribute to the mission of her/his department and the university as a whole. In addition, the candidate should discuss how he/she mentors students outside the classroom to engage in research, scholarship, and professionalism.

Growth: Over the 6 years of pretenure service, candidates for tenure and promotion must provide materials that demonstrate they are effective teachers in the classroom and strong mentors who foster professional development among their students.

Service: The service statement should cover the candidate's achievements and goals in service including university service (e.g. departmental, college, and university-wide) and professional service (e.g. leadership in professional organizations, reviewing for journals and conferences).

Growth: As with teaching and scholarship the university expects candidates for promotion and tenure to demonstrate increasing levels of professional service over the 6 years of pretenure service.

2. Vita

Include a personal curriculum vita that follows the provost's guidelines (see Provost webpage and attached).

3. Summary of Accomplishments

In this portion of the summary binder you will supply specific details on how your accomplishments match the College of Education Promotion and Tenure criteria (see attached). Like the personal statement, this section should be divided into research and scholarship, teaching and mentoring, and service and should include the following details:

Research and Scholarship: This section consists of a summary of research and scholarship accomplishments according to the COE P&T criteria (Section A), information on the journals in which you are published, and a report of works cited.

- COE Promotion and Tenure Criteria: Break out research and scholarship accomplishments according to Primary Importance I, Primary Importance II, Secondary Importance, and Tertiary Importance. If you have nothing to report in an accomplishment area, there is no need to list it.
- Journal information: Supply information on the journals in which you are published (name of journal, circulation, acceptance rates, journal impact where possible according to your field).
- Works cited: After your second reappointment review, report on your works cited through Social Citation Index.

Teaching and Mentoring: This section consists of a summary of teaching and mentoring accomplishments according to the COE P&T criteria (Section B) and an overall summary of courses taught.

- COE Promotion and Tenure Criteria: Break out teaching accomplishments according to Primary Importance I, Primary Importance II, and Secondary Importance.
- Summary of Courses Taught: Provide an overall summary of courses taught organized by semester (see sample table, attached). This summary should include:
  - Name of course
  - Any special circumstances (e.g. taught online, new prep, large enrollments, cross program, service course).
  - Number enrolled.
  - Mean course evaluation ratings for instructor and course quality (items 1 & 2).
  - Mean class grade.

Service: The service section consists of a summary of accomplishments according to the COE P&T criteria (Section C).

- COE Promotion and Tenure Criteria: Break out service accomplishments according to professional and university service. Within those categories further classify accomplishments according to Primary Importance I, Primary Importance II, Secondary Importance, and Tertiary Importance.

Supporting Documentation

In one or more binders, supply evidence of your accomplished work in scholarship and teaching. Generally no additional documentation is required for service accomplishments.

Research and Scholarship Documentation

Include copies of all scholarly works to date organized according to COE P&T document/accomplishments. Scholarly works include articles, chapters, technology products, grant proposals, presentations, and patents (see P&T for complete list). Where possible, include actual copies of your published work. Manuscripts or prototypes may be used for works in press. You may also include materials submitted for review in order to demonstrate scholarly works in progress. Documentation for national/international presentations is required for pretenured faculty. You may include proposals, powerpoints, or the presentation paper.

Teaching and Mentoring Documentation

For each course taught, include a syllabus and student evaluations (include course summary sheets, course graph, and individual student responses). Organize all course materials by semesters taught (e.g. Fall 2005, Spring 2006, Summer 2006…)

OPTIONAL: Include any additional documentation to demonstrate innovations in teaching and learning.

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY
BEST PRACTICES FOR COLLEGE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEES

The following guidelines regarding procedures and practices of college promotion and tenure committees are based upon national guides such as *Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation: Advice for Tenured Faculty, Department Chairs, and Academic Administrators* (American Council on Education, American Association of University Professors, and United Educators: 2000)*; Lehigh's *Rules and Procedures;* applicable legal requirements; and recommendations from the Faculty Personnel Committee.

Clarity	**Consultation**
Consistency	**Confidentiality**
Candor	**Caring**

- In all deliberations and recommendations, evaluators at every level (department/ program faculty, P&T committee, dean, and provost) must use and adhere to all applicable University policies and procedures, including *R&P* and the college guidelines on criteria for tenure and promotion. If the college guidelines contradict *R&P* in any way, the university-wide *R&P* prevails.
- When a question or a "gray area" arises regarding the criteria or procedures (and interpretation questions are not unusual in such matters), the committee chair should consult first with the deputy provost for faculty affairs (Jean Soderlund). She will consult with others as needed.
- Committees must reach their own substantive and independent recommendation on whether or not a candidate merits tenure/ promotion.
- Committee members should check to make sure that the candidate's portfolio is complete so that the committee can evaluate the individual's candidacy with full information. The committee chair should contact the department chair or dean's office if materials are missing.
- The committee may consider new positive information that becomes available during their deliberations, such as publication of a book or article. The candidate is responsible for making the information known to the department chair, who forwards the information for addition to the candidate's portfolio.
- College P&T committees must ensure that their evaluations of candidates and their recommendations (i.e., votes) are consistent. Specifically, what they write in their letters should support what they are recommending.
- All voting members of a college P&T committee must make a clear, unambiguous recommendation. *R&P* requires that at least five members must vote without abstention. In practice this means that all committee members must vote yes or no.
- Confidentiality must be maintained throughout the process.
- Personal issues such as family, health, or other personal situations must not be considered or discussed when making decisions concerning the granting of tenure/ promotion. Committees must not request access to such information, even when the probationary period has been extended.
- The standards for tenure will remain the same for candidates who receive tenure clock extensions as for those who do not receive extensions.
- Personal characteristics such as race, ethnicity, gender, disability, etc. must not be considered or discussed when making decisions concerning the granting of tenure/ promotion. Discrimination is unacceptable and illegal. Committees should familiarize themselves with and adhere to the University's Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action/Non-Discrimination Policy available at http://www.lehigh.edu/~policy/university/eo.htm.
- Lack of a response from an external evaluator must not be judged as a negative evaluation.
- The committee chair must make sure that copies of appropriate documents (for example, written communications to the department regarding the committee's recommendation and any departmental response) are included in the candidate's portfolio.

8.29.07

**Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation: Advice for Tenured Faculty, Department Chairs, and Academic Administrators* (American Council on Education, American Association of University Professors, and United Educators: 2000), available on the Web at http://www.acenet.edu/resources/chairs/index.cfm.

DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES AS REVIEWED AND REVISED

(December 2003)

MINIMAL FACULTY RESOURCES

(as reviewed, Spring 2000)

In times of shrinking resources, there is pressure to eliminate resources or restrict their flow only to those persons or programs that are deemed most productive. Faculty are, therefore, often called upon to justify why they should receive the resources they request. It is important to note, however, that there are some resources so basic to accomplishing the mission of the College and department that every faculty member should receive them without having to present any justification.

Among these resources are included:

1. An adequate computer system

   Each faculty member should have in his or her office a microcomputer system capable of meeting everyday needs. Such a system should be equipped, at the very least, with:
   - ⇔ a recent version of its operating system,
   - ⇔ word processing software,
   - ⇔ communications software and hardware for connection to the university's system,
   - ⇔ sufficient memory to support the software being used,
   - ⇔ a hard disk large enough to store files created and used routinely by the faculty member,
   - ⇔ a reasonable size monitor capable of displaying the files produced and used,
   - ⇔ a computer mouse (if the software uses a mouse),
   - ⇔ a DVD and/or flash drive,
   - ⇔ access to a laser-quality printer.

   Clearly, different faculty members will have need for computer systems of differing complexity and sophistication; teaching, scholarship, and service may make differential demands on faculty members' systems. An adequate system for one faculty may not meet the more sophisticated needs of another. Thus, "meeting everyday needs" is a phrase that must be matched to the demands of the everyday activities of the faculty member.

2. Secretarial support

   All faculty should be provided with secretarial services including:
   - ⇔ phone support
   - ⇔ typing/word processing support
   - ⇔ duplication/collating services

3. Appropriate office space

   Faculty offices should also be appropriately equipped. They should:
   - ⇔ be private with a locking door,
   - ⇔ contain a desk, chair, and client chair,
   - ⇔ provide a telephone, file cabinets, and bookshelves.

4. Travel support

   Faculty should be supported in participating in their professional organizations and making presentations as much as possible. This is particularly important for pretenure faculty who are working towards tenure and promotion.

5. Materials

   Faculty should be provided with the normal sorts of office supplies necessary to do everyday business, including their teaching, scholarship, and service. These materials include:
   - ⇔ pads and paper,
   - ⇔ pencils and pens,
   - ⇔ computer disks,
   - ⇔ transparencies.

RESOURCE ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS

(as reviewed, Spring 2000)

Budget Lines

It appears that present departmental budget lines do not match well with actual allocation needs. That is, department chairs have, in the past, had to reallocate funds within budgets in order to move funds from one line item to support another less realistically funded line item.

We suggest that this approach is illogical and perpetuates a set of myths about departmental needs that may someday cause serious problems for the department. For this reason, we recommend that the new department should request that the university redistribute budget funds among line items to reflect more nearly the realistic demands of those lines.

Supplies

Our explorations have revealed that the two present departments use approaches to identifying faculty needs for supplies that are clearly very different. This means that faculty coming into the unified department will bring in very different previous experiences and expectations. For this reason, we recommend that:

1. The new chair inventory the faculty at the start of each semester to determine their anticipated needs for the semester and use this formal process as a way to gauge more effectively the demands on the departmental budget.
2. All faculty members should be made aware of the appropriate procedures for requesting supplies and materials. Perhaps a printed set of guidelines would help here, since word-of-mouth is an inefficient and sometimes unreliable way to learn procedures. New faculty need particularly to be made aware of the appropriate procedures as soon as they join the faculty.

Equipment

The new department has access to much equipment, both audiovisual and computer equipment. Much of this equipment has been supplied, however, by outside sources rather than by the university. In addition, some equipment supplied by the university is aging rapidly. Computer equipment becomes quickly outdated as new devices and programs demand greater processing speed, memory, or storage. Recognizing these facts, we recommend:

1. Members of the new department attempt to share equipment resources as much as possible, within the limitations of their external funders and the demands on that equipment of the projects on which they are presently working.
2. To facilitate this sharing, a listing of equipment and software be prepared and a copy distributed to each faculty member. This listing should include the nature of the equipment or software, its location, any restrictions on its use, and the appropriate contact person and procedures for borrowing or using it.
3. The new chair use periodic inventories of anticipated faculty needs to determine departmental needs regarding equipment (audiovisual and computer hardware and software).
4. The new chair be proactive in requesting that classrooms on the Mountaintop be appropriately equipped for teaching. This includes more overhead projectors and videotape players that are permanently affixed in classrooms.

Secretaries

Effective organizations recognize that people are both resources and participants; when people play an active role in shaping their work environments, they are more likely to be creative, satisfied, and effective. Discussions with the secretaries in the Department reveal that they sometimes learn of decisions affecting them directly only after those decisions have been made and with little or no input or consultation. In addition, in many cases, the secretaries appear to learn about decisions affecting secretarial duties and assignments indirectly, through the "grapevine," rather than by common announcement. This can lead to rumor, uncertainty, and unhappiness.

We suggest, therefore, that the Department Chair be proactive in keeping the secretaries informed. We recommend that the Department Chair convene meetings of the Departmental secretaries as needed or requested, and use these meetings to discuss upcoming issues or decisions that may affect secretaries and to discuss any concerns raised by the secretaries.

ALLOCATION OF VACANT FACULTY SLOTS

(as reviewed Spring 2000; revision Summer 2003)

Assumptions

Faculty positions in the College of Education are considered Departmental positions and are not permanently attached to specific programs. As such, vacated faculty slots are not automatically retained by a program. The rationale for this is twofold: (a) There are needs in the Department that may cross program lines, and (b) Future needs may not be met by the current distribution of faculty. Given that the Department is unlikely to obtain new faculty positions in the near future, current and future needs must be met through careful allocation of current faculty slots to best meet the needs of the Department.

Procedures

1. The Dean's Council will be notified as soon as possible of upcoming vacancies in faculty positions.

2. Members of the Dean's Council will be provided an opportunity to present proposals for discussion at the council meeting concerning how the slot will be filled. Proposals for filling vacant faculty slots should:

   - demonstrate consistency with the College of Education Mission Statement.

   - include a description of how the faculty position will impact each of the areas of teaching, research, and service.

   - include a description of how the faculty position will impact the program, accrediting agency, and College.

3. Based on these presentations, a vote by members of the Dean's Council may be conducted (advisory only). The final decision will be made by the Dean in consultation with the Department Chairperson.

4. A similar presentation will then be made to the university administration by the Dean.

ALLOCATION OF AVAILABLE UNIVERSITY-SUPPORTED LECTURESHIPS

(as reviewed Spring 2000; revised Summer 2003)

Assumptions

Any university lectureship positions made available to the College of Education should be allocated within or among programs with the greatest demonstrated need for additional teaching resources. It is anticipated that any such lectureship positions will be in addition to current regular faculty slots.

Lectureship positions are fixed-term contracts with individuals who are expected to devote virtually all of their time to teaching rather than research or university service. Thus, such resources should be primarily directed toward programs currently experiencing high demands on regular staff members in terms of course load and class size. Such lectureship positions would alleviate teaching overloads for regular staff allowing them to direct the proper proportion of their energies to research and service activities.

Procedures

1. On an annual basis, members of the Dean's Council would be provided with an opportunity to present a proposal for use of a lectureship position within their respective programs. Such proposals would then be forwarded to the Dean for submission to the Provost for consideration.
2. The Dean's Council would be notified immediately of lectureship positions awarded to the College of Education.
3. The Dean's Council would consider the priorities listed below in making recommendations to the Dean for the use of these positions. It is possible that the Dean's Council might recommend that one or more available position(s) be shared among programs.
4. The final decision on the allocation of such positions would be made by the Dean in consultation with the Department Chair.

Priorities

Lectureship positions within the College should be assigned to individual programs according to the following priority considerations:

1. Consistency with the College of Education Mission Statement.
2. Persuasive rationale for how the available lectureship position would be used to facilitate the teaching function within a program, as well as how such a position would enhance the ability of regular faculty to fulfill the full range of their responsibilities.
3. Degree to which the lectureship position would impact positively on the program, program accreditation, and the College.

ALLOCATION OF UNIVERSITY-SUPPORTED GRADUATE RESEARCH ASSISTANTSHIPS

(as revised Spring 2000; Summer 2003)

Assumptions

Currently, graduate/research assistantship positions within the College are a result of generation of funds from external sources. It is possible that in the future, the university will fund and support graduate assistants. In light of such support, it could be stipulated that each program in the College is assigned a graduate assistant to conduct various research or teaching related activities. However, it is possible that each program has differing needs (for example, APA accreditation) within a year requiring more than one graduate assistant or none at all. As such, graduate/research assistantship positions should be allocated within and among programs based both on demonstrated needs and a recognition of the source from which those funds are generated. In addition, it is important that the role of the graduate assistant be clearly defined. Because graduate assistants are usually, but not necessarily limited to, doctoral candidates, their skills must be optimally utilized. This would entail ensuring that tasks that can be effectively and efficiently completed by others (for example, work study students, secretaries) are carefully reviewed before being assigned to graduate assistants.

Procedures

1. Once each year, the Department Chair will solicit requests for graduate/research assistantships from each program in the College.

2. Graduate assistantship requests should be made in writing to the Department Chair. Each request should provide a description of the needs (research or teaching) of the faculty in the program and an estimate of how much of the graduate assistant's time will be utilized during the semester.

3. The Department Chair will scrutinize proposals and determine assignments using the criteria outlined below.

Criteria

1. How well the proposal meets the primary mission of research, teaching, or both.

2. Impact on the professional development of the faculty member (with primary emphasis on the needs of junior faculty).

3. Impact on the professional development of the student.

ALLOCATION OF AVAILABLE UNIVERSITY SCHOLARSHIPS

(as revised Spring 2000; Summer 2003)

Assumptions

University scholarships are available for graduate students. These scholarships will be made available to both full- and part-time students, and to doctoral and non-doctoral students. However, at the recommendation of the Program Coordinators and the acceptance of the faculty, preference in making such awards will be in the following order:

- doctoral over non-doctoral students
- full-time over part-time students.

Coordinators are required to provide clear justifications for recommendations when part-time students are being recommended over full-time students.

Currently, the College receives a specific number of scholarships determined by the Dean. These scholarships are not necessarily shared equally among programs.

Procedures

1. The availability of graduate tuition scholarships and the procedures for application is announced publicly to faculty and students early in the spring semester.
2. Before the deadline set by the Dean (usually mid-February), the Department Chair will solicit requests for graduate tuition scholarships from each of the programs in the Department.
3. Working with the program faculty, program coordinators will rank order the students by the criteria determined within the program and will supply this ordering to the Department Chair along with a one-paragraph rationale for each student's candidacy.
4. Using these submitted materials, the Department Chair will use his or her judgment to rank order the candidates on a master list that is then submitted to the Dean. The Dean assigns scholarships on the basis of these rankings.
5. Following the submission of the master list to the Dean, the Department Chair will share with the Coordinating Council the master list and the rationales behind the rank orderings assigned.

Criteria

1. Academic achievement (as indicated by GPA).
2. Program needs.
3. Degree sought (with preference given to doctoral students).
4. Multicultural diversity.
5. Special justification related to the individual.

ALLOCATION OF TRAVEL SUPPORT FOR PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS

(as reviewed Spring 2000; Summer 2003)

Assumptions

It is reasonable to assume there will be more requests for travel support to professional meetings than funds available for this purpose. As a result, it is important that priorities be articulated and used in making decisions concerning allocation of travel support. In addition, faculty should make every effort to find travel funds through external funding sources. The priorities for supporting faculty travel may change over time and should be reviewed on an annual basis. Although travel for purposes other than professional meetings is important for the welfare of the College (for example, recruitment activities), it is assumed that other forms of funding must be sought for these activities.

Procedures

1. As soon as possible after July 1 each year, the Department Chair will solicit requests for travel support from the College faculty.

2. Travel support requests must be made in writing to the Department Chair. Each request should include a description of the professional activity (for example, presentation, workshop, poster, etc.) and an itemized budget. Faculty will be asked to anticipate their travel support needs for the entire fiscal year (through June).

3. The Department Chair will act on each faculty request using the priorities outlined below.

Priorities

Every possible effort will be made to provide travel support to untenured faculty making presentations at national and international conferences. All other faculty travel will be considered a lower priority for receiving travel support. Specific priorities for allocation of travel support include the following:

1. Untenured faculty will be given priority over tenured faculty.

2. Travel to make professional presentations will be given priority over poster sessions; posters will be given priority over simply attending a meeting.

3. Travel to national and international conferences will be given priority over travel to regional conferences; regional conferences will be given priority over local conferences.

ALLOCATION OF SPACE

(as reviewed Spring 2000; Summer 2003)

Assumptions

In light of our history of how space needs emerge, it would be naive to suppose that all requests for such needs could be placed before some decision making body on an annual basis and subsequently put into priority order and addressed. Consequently, such needs will have to be addressed in serial fashion.

In addition, space usage changes over time as does the rationale for the original allocation. A periodic review of space utilization needs to be conducted.

Finally, the priorities list that appears below should be taken only as a set of guidelines, understanding that the timing and the merits of individual requests may justify a violation of the suggested order.

Procedures

1. Space related requests should be made in writing to the Department Chair through the requestor's Program Coordinator.
2. The Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean of the College and the Office of Physical Planning, will act on the request in light of the priorities listed below.
3. The Department Chair, as always, has the option to consult with the Dean's Council. Whether or not such consultation is sought, the Department Chair will inform the Dean's Council of the request and the subsequent action.
4. The Department Chair will conduct an annual review of space utilization within the Department with the objective of identifying potential reallocations.

Priorities

1. Private offices for full time faculty, secretary to the Dean, and secretary to the Department Chair
2. Office space for other secretarial staff
3. Research/laboratory space for funded projects
4. Non-registrar scheduled instructional space
5. Full time graduate student offices (potentially shared)
6. Research/laboratory space for unfunded projects
7. Retired faculty offices (potentially shared)
8. Adjunct faculty offices (potentially shared)
9. Social space

DEPARTMENTAL POLICY ON TEACHING LOAD

Approved April 2000; revised May 2002, revised February 2008

The Teaching Load in the Department of Education and Human Services is considered to be the equivalent of 18 credit hours (6 courses or equivalent) for the contracted academic year.* All members of the departmental faculty are normally released from three credit hours (1 course or equivalent) per academic year to fulfill the advising responsibilities appropriate to a graduate department, to engage in the normal committee assignments associated with managing the Department and the University, and to engage in the routine scholarship expected of a faculty member in such a department. A normal Teaching Load is, consequently, considered to be 15 credit hours per year (5 courses or equivalent). This policy also recognizes that, in special circumstances, a faculty member choosing not to engage in scholarship or significant departmental and university advising and service may be required to teach in excess of 15 credit hours per academic year in order that they may fulfill reasonable contractual obligations.

The normal teaching load of 15 credit hours (5 courses or equivalent) can be reduced under the following circumstances and is subject to the following conditions:

1. When a new, untenured faculty member joins the department, a **6 credit hour (2 course** or equivalent) course load reduction will be granted during his/her **first academic year and a 3 credit hour (1 course or equivalent) course load reduction will be granted during his/her second academic year** in order that he/she may develop his/her personal research program. **This will bring** the normal teaching load for his/her first **academic year to 9 credit hours (3 courses or equivalent) and the normal teaching load for his/her second academic year** to 12 credit hours (4 courses or equivalent).
2. A faculty member has time "bought off" by external contract or grant support. This "buy-off" time cannot exceed 6 credit hours (2 courses or equivalent) per academic year. The cost of a faculty member buying off an academic course is 1/6 or 16.67% of their academic year salary. In some exceptional circumstances where faculty are able to reduce their academic teaching loads through the acquisition of external support, reductions below a 9 credit hour (3 courses or equivalent) course load per year can only be granted after discussion and approval with the Chairperson and Dean. Programs must negotiate such reductions by demonstrating the capacity to maintain the excellence in teaching and training of students.
3. When a faculty member is actually and demonstrably engaged in significant research and scholarly activities, their teaching load may be reduced by up to 3 credit hours (1 course or equivalent) per academic year. The determination for such a reduction will be made in January by the Departmental Chair who may seek the advice of appropriate colleagues. The burden of demonstrating such significant involvement is upon the faculty member requesting the reduction. Such requests should be made during the annual evaluation period in January and should precede the formulation of the following fall semester teaching schedule. At the discretion of the Chairperson, a reduction of teaching load can be made for a period of up to two years for those faculty who have maintained evidence of significant research and scholarly activities.

Reductions in teaching load as described in 1-3 above will be made under the assumptions that (1) the teaching responsibilities of the Department with regard to its degree programs can be met by available adjunct faculty; (2) students' progress toward their degrees is not unduly impeded by such reduction, and (3) adequate resources are available to provide for adjunct coverage.

The total reduction in teaching load under ANY combination of the above conditions should never exceed more than 9 credits (3 courses or equivalent). That is, the minimum required teaching load that is expected of all faculty is 3 credits (1 course or equivalent) per academic semester. **Under exceptional circumstances, and only with the permission of the Chairperson and Dean, a faculty member would be permitted to reduce their teaching responsibilities to one course per academic year for no more than a 3 year period.**

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

2.4 Leave of absence

1. The university recognizes three types of leave that are available to faculty members of professorial rank: (a) academic leave for professional development activities; (b) unpaid leave for temporary service in other academic institutions, governmental organizations, business entities, fellowship programs, or for personal reasons; and (c) medical leave. Requests for leave are made by letter to the provost through the department chairperson and academic dean. The following paragraphs pertain to the first type of leave — academic leave.

2. Academic leave of absence from the university is a valuable means of providing faculty with an opportunity for study, research, travel, writing, professional reeducation, and other professional development activities — in short, for self–improvement that will be beneficial to the university.

3. A faculty member who desires a leave should request the leave with reasons in a letter to the department chairperson. The chairperson is expected to seek the advice of departmental faculty members in considering the request. Other administrative personnel normally involved in the decision-making process include (center director, if relevant), the academic dean, (vice provost for research, if relevant), provost, president, and the board of trustees.

4. Each application will be evaluated for potential improvement that will be beneficial to the university, as stated in paragraph 2; appropriateness of timing with respect to other leaves taken by the individual and with respect to leaves being requested by other faculty in the same department; and special needs of the department, college, and university. An academic leave will be granted only where satisfactory arrangements are made to carry on the essential work of the department. Sincere efforts will be made at each level involved in the decision-making process to work out such arrangements.

5. An academic leave for any full-time faculty member, whether supported fully on the teaching budget or partially on the teaching budget and partially on research, is normally for one semester at full salary, or one academic year at half salary, with fringe benefits being fully paid in either case. Adjustments in salary may be made depending on the amount of outside support available for the leave — the intent being that total financial support during the leave should be on a "no loss/no gain" basis to the faculty member.

   Under exceptional circumstances an academic leave may be extended for an additional year, usually without salary.

6. Each faculty member returning from academic leave will furnish, through the chairperson and academic dean, to the provost a written report of accomplishments while on leave.

PRE-TENURE ACADEMIC LEAVE

College of Education Pre-Tenure Academic Leave
Effective fall, 2004

The College of Education provides untenured faculty with an opportunity to apply for a one-semester pre-tenure academic leave to allow an individual to enhance his or her scholarship and teaching. Submitting an application does not automatically result in the granting of a pre-tenure leave.

Each application is evaluated for potential contributions to the individual's tenure portfolio, as well as benefits to both the college and university. In addition, the dean recommends such academic leave to the provost when satisfactory arrangements can also be made to carry on the essential work of the program and the college during that individual's absence.

The guidelines and procedures for pre-tenure academic leaves are as follows:
1. During the third year of service, an untenured COE faculty is eligible to apply for a pre-tenure academic leave.
2. Pre-tenure academic leave is granted to an individual for one semester at full pay and benefits.
3. The period of a pre-tenure academic leave is included in the faculty member's probationary period. The letter granting the academic leave must state that the time on leave is included in the probationary period.
4. No more than two junior faculty in the COE are granted pre-tenure academic leave during any given academic year.
5. A COE faculty member granted a pre-tenure academic leave would be unlikely to receive support for a professional leave of absence funded by the university fewer than seven years following that pre-tenure leave.
6. Applications for pre-tenure academic leave are due February 1st for the following fall semester and September 1st for the following spring semester.
7. Pre-tenure academic leave applications are made through submission of a proposal letter submitted to the Department Chair. Following discussion with the applicant's program coordinator about how courses and other responsibilities will be covered, the Chair makes a recommendation to the Dean, who then makes a formal recommendation to the Provost. The Provost will inform the candidate as to whether the application is approved or not.
8. No later than two months after the pre-tenure academic leave is completed, the faculty member must submit a post-leave report to the Provost that is included in his/her tenure review.

Note: These procedures operationalize what is described in detail in Section 2.4 Leave of Absence of the *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty* pertaining to academic leaves.

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
PROCEDURES FOR THE MATRICULATION OF STUDENTS IN THE ED.D. AND PH.D. PROGRAMS

(Approved March 1, 1985; Amended October 4, 1996, September 1, 2000, Summer 2003, January 2006)

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

PROCEDURES FOR THE MATRICULATION OF STUDENTS IN THE ED.D. AND PH.D. PROGRAMS

(Approved March 1, 1985, Amended October 4, 1996, September 1, 2000, Summer 2003, January 2006)

I. ADMISSIONS

A. Admission to Graduate Standing

1. Admission of a student to the College of Education must be executed through the College of Education Graduate Admission Office. To be admitted with regular graduate standing, all credentials must reach this office at least thirty days before classes commence for the semester in which the student wishes to register. Admission is offered only upon approval of the program faculty. Students admitted within 30 days prior to start of classes will be granted Associate admission.

2. A graduate student who is absent from the University for a semester or more must obtain the written approval of the coordinator of his or her major program in order to be readmitted to graduate standing. Any student who has not registered for five years must submit a petition for readmission.

B. Admission to the Doctoral Program

1. The College of Education has established minimum standards for admission to the Ed.D. and Ph.D. programs. They are as follows:

   a. a combined score of at least 1117 across verbal and quantitative subtests of the GRE aptitude test (75th percentile for education) (program can make decisions on the use of the writing sample subtest for purposes of admissions) or the 75th percentile of the MAT or

   b. an undergraduate grade point average of at least 3.00 or a graduate grade point average (minimum 30 credits) of at least 3.5 or

   c. an undergraduate grade point average of at least 3.00 in the last two semesters;

2. Students must successfully pass the qualifying process, which varies from program to program. Students should consult their program advisor for information on the qualifying process of their particular program. A student who successfully completes the qualifying process will be informed in writing by the Program Coordinator. At that point, the student will be considered having been formally admitted to the doctoral program.

C. Admission to Candidacy

In order to be admitted formally to candidacy for the doctorate, the student must submit an application, a proposed program of study, and a proposal for the dissertation (see Section III) to the Dean of Education for approval. Included in the application is verification of meeting the concentrated learning requirement. The form of the application is prescribed in an instruction sheet available from the Program Secretary's Office.

D. A doctoral student who wishes to transfer to another program within the College of Education must:

1. Petition the Dean of Education through the programs involved and the Department Chair to transfer into the new program, and

2. Meet the eligibility requirements for that new program.

II. ADVISEMENT, REGISTRATION, AND REGULATIONS

A. Advisement

1. The coordinator of the program through which the student is admitted to graduate standing appoints a member of the faculty in the student's major field to advise the student on program and register the student for courses.
2. The coordinator of the program which accepts a student for doctoral study establishes a file for the official credentials, records, and correspondence which relate to that student. The student file is a program file.
3. The value placed on prior professional experience and course work of each doctoral student is determined by the faculty of the program in which the student is enrolled.
4. The program of courses for each doctoral student is developed by the student in consultation with the faculty of the program in which the student is enrolled.

B. Registration

1. Registration full-time is limited to 15 credit hours. A student holding a half-time TA, RA, or GA appointment (20 hours per week) is limited to 10 credit hours; Graduate students who are employed elsewhere and can give only part of their time to graduate work must restrict the size of their rosters accordingly.
2. Registration is expected before the first day of classes. After the first day of classes, registration and course additions are permitted only by the Registrar and a late fee is charged. Generally, registration is refused after the 15th day (8th day in summer).
3. All students using Lehigh University resources must be registered. A student must be registered in the semester in which the degree is conferred. If the minimum degree registration requirement of 72 or 48 credits is attained prior to formal admission to doctoral candidacy, continued registration of at least three (3) credits per semester is necessary. After admission to doctoral candidacy, a student must maintain candidacy by registering at least two times each calendar year (in each academic semester or in one academic semester and one summer session). After completion of the minimal registration requirement plus any additional requirements of the student's department or program, registration is permitted for 'Maintenance of Candidacy.' The tuition charge is for one credit hour. Full-time status again must be certified on the graduate registration form.

C. Time Limits

1. All work beyond the baccalaureate submitted for the doctorate must be completed within a ten-year period after commencing graduate study. If the student interrupts his/her studies after the Master's degree, a period of seven years is granted for completion of the doctorate after re-commencing graduate study.
2. Extension of the time limit is granted only for good cause, such as serious illness or military service. Approval of such an extension is by the Registrar with the consent of the student's program faculty, the Chairperson, and the Dean. Additional registration is required to maintain continuity of candidacy.
3. Any doctoral student who feels it necessary to interrupt his/her study for more than two consecutive academic year semesters is required to petition in advance for a leave of absence.

D. Concentrated Learning

1. Each Ph.D. or Ed.D. candidate must satisfy Lehigh's concentrated learning requirement. This requirement is intended to ensure that doctoral students spend a period of concentrated study and intellectual association with other scholars. Either two semesters of full-time Lehigh graduate study or 18 credit hours of Lehigh graduate study, either on or off campus, within a fifteen-month period must be completed.
2. Variations in the concentrated learning requirement exist among programs. Students are advised to investigate specific concentrated learning requirements in their programs which exceed the basic requirements.

E. Withdrawals and Incompletes

1. Course withdrawals with a grade of W are permitted only during the first nine weeks of classes during the regular academic year. During a summer session, such withdrawals must occur before 1/2 of the session has elapsed. After that, an automatic grade of WF is indicated unless definite evidence to the contrary is available.
2. If the student withdraws from all courses, the withdrawal must be processed through the College of Education Graduate Admission Office to the Registrar.
3. Graduate students have one calendar year to remove an incomplete unless an earlier deadline is specified by the instructor. Incomplete grades that are not removed remain as incomplete (N) grades on the student's record. Thesis or research project N grades may remain beyond one year until the work is completed.

F. Disqualification

1. If the student accumulates more than four grades less than B- or lower on courses numbered 200 or above, he/she is disqualified from further study by the Dean of Education.
2. Dishonesty or plagiarism by the student may be cause for disqualification for further registration. The program faculty should confront the student with the facts of the case preparatory to submission to the Dean of Students. The University judicial process is explained in the University Student Handbook.
3. A student may be disqualified for further graduate study by a program if his/her performance or attitude indicates that he/she is not performing acceptable work.

III. DISSERTATION PROPOSAL

A. Soon after the course work begins, and no later than mid-way in the course program, the student and his/her advisor should begin consultations on a proposal for the student's research. The sooner these consultations begin the better since the remainder of the student's course work should be designed in part to prepare him/her to carry out the proposed research. It is the student's responsibility to become sufficiently immersed in his/her field so as to be able to propose research which is both timely and significant. The faculty member who plans to be chairing the student's dissertation committee files an intent to form dissertation committee through the admissions coordinator. This form is signed by the Department Chairperson.

B. Students are required to pass their general examination prior to formally proposing their dissertation. However, it is recognized that exceptional circumstances do arise in which a student may propose their dissertation prior to passing their general examination. Students need to petition through their dissertation chair and the program coordinator to the department chair for variance to this requirement.

C. When the proposal is sufficiently advanced to be examined by a special committee, the advisor, through the Department Chair, appoints a special committee to examine the proposal and, if it is found acceptable, act as the student's dissertation committee as he/she conducts the study. The minimum number of committee members is four. Of these, three, including the committee chair, are to be voting Lehigh faculty members. With the written approval of the dean of the college, one of the three aforementioned faculty members, each of whom must have a doctoral degree, may be drawn from categories that include departmentally approved adjuncts, professors of practice, university lecturers, and courtesy faculty appointees. The fourth required member must be from outside the student's department (or outside the student's program if there is only one department in the college). Committees may include additional members who possess the requisite expertise and experience. Committee membership must be approved by the University's Graduate and Research Committee; such approval may be delegated to the colleges. It is the student's responsibility to propose research that is of interest to and can be directed by the faculty of the program. It is also the student's responsibility, with the assistance of the advisor, to present his/her proposal to and acquire the commitment of prospective committee members.

D. No member of the faculty may serve as a chairperson of a special committee unless:

   1. The faculty member has served as a special committee member for at least one successfully completed dissertation at Lehigh's College of Education, and
   2. The faculty member has an earned doctorate and holds a full-time regular faculty appointment at the rank of assistant professor or above in the Department of Education and Human Services, and
   3. His/her training, expertise and/or prior research experience, including his/her own doctoral dissertation, is in alignment with the dissertation proposal of the student, and
   4. He/she is already chairing less than four doctoral special committees that are active at that time.

E. No member of the faculty may serve as a member of a special committee unless:

   1. The research proposal being investigated by the student is in alignment with the training, interest, and expertise of at least one faculty person other than the chairperson, and
   2. He/she has an earned doctorate and holds a faculty appointment (adjunct or non-adjunct) in the College of Education. Special committee membership may be granted to persons outside the College of Education or the University where the research proposal being investigated by the student is in alignment with the training, interest or expertise of the proposed member. Approval for all such memberships must be obtained by the program coordinator submitting in writing the proposed member's credentials to the Department Chair for transmittal to the Dean of Education for approval.

F. When the special committee approves the proposal, it then is prepared for submission to the Dean of Education. The proposal is submitted to the Dean as part of the student's application for candidacy for the doctoral degree (See I-C above).

G. The student may proceed with the dissertation after having been informed by the Dean of Education that candidacy for the doctoral degree is approved. Although the special committee reserves the right to examine the student's progress at any time, it is the student's responsibility to monitor his/her own progress and to seek advice from any or all of the special committee when necessary.

IV. THE DISSERTATION

The dissertation requirement for the doctorate shall be satisfied by the doctoral candidate according to one of the following modes of inquiry:

A. A Traditional Dissertation (Ph.D. or Ed.D.)

This requirement is the traditional research dissertation prevailing in other disciplines.

B. An Analytic Dissertation (Ed.D.)

1. The analytic dissertation is a critical examination of a substantive problem of educational practice. A problem of practice may be concerned with educational processes, outcomes, policies, and/or procedures but not necessarily limited to the above. The purpose of the analytic dissertation, other than satisfying a doctoral dissertation requirement, would be to provide a document that might be useful to other educational practitioners faced with the same or similar problems.
2. The analytic dissertation shall define a problem of educational practice, analyze the problem from a theoretical base, and draw a set of analytic specific recommendations for action. The particular kind of inquiry suggested here might be called a decision-oriented inquiry. The process being one of identifying and collecting relevant information for decision-making. The analytic dissertation is not designed to support or refute particular theoretical positions, as would be the case in traditional dissertation research, but rather to contribute to recommendations for action.
3. The traditional research investigation delimits the research analysis to a level which we might call variable-specific, and in many cases also discipline-specific, while the analytic dissertation mode of inquiry is problem-specific. The latter approach would logically require an eclectic approach which seeks to bring relevant theories and paradigms from related disciplines to bear upon the problem.
4. Methods of analysis appropriate for the analytic mode of inquiry would include, but not be limited to, policy analysis, evaluation research, operations research, or other action-oriented research methodologies.

V. GENERAL EXAMINATION

A. The general examination (comprehensive examination) for the doctorate is designated to test both the student's capacity and proficiency in his/her major and minor fields of study. The examination is not necessarily confined to the content of courses that have been taken at Lehigh University or elsewhere. The student's program faculty defines the format and evaluation process of the examination and may include sit down essays, portfolio presentation, oral presentation, formal presentation, or take-home examinations. The program coordinator notifies the candidate, Chairperson of the Department, and the Dean of Education of the decision of the program faculty.

B. The general examination is administered near the completion of formal course work. It must be passed no less than seven months prior to the date of graduation and upon completion of at least 30 semester hours of post-master's work. The student may be scheduled for the examination with the consent of the major advisor and program coordinator.

C. Should a candidate fail in any part of the general examination, he/she may be permitted by petition to the program faculty to undertake a second examination not earlier than five months after the first examination. If the results of the second examination are also unsatisfactory, no additional examination is scheduled and the program faculty must meet to inform the student of his/her status to continue in the program.

VI. DISSERTATION AND ORAL EXAMINATION

A. When the dissertation is completed in draft form and approved by and signed by each member of the special committee as being ready for examination, it is submitted to the Dean of Education. The draft should be completed to such an extent that any revisions suggested by the examination be editorial in nature and not constitute any substantial changes. It is the responsibility of the special committee to withhold approval of the draft until these conditions are met.

B. After the dissertation draft is approved by the Dean of Education, the Department Chair and the Dean approve the convening of the special committee to conduct the oral examination. The examination is public.

C. The Chair of the student's special committee, who is responsible for scheduling the oral examination, must notify the Dean of Education and the faculty of the Education and Human Services Department at least five working days prior to the examination. It is the student's responsibility to provide copies of the draft dissertation to examiners and extra copies of the abstract to the program faculty at the time of this announcement. It is the dissertation chairperson's responsibility to withhold scheduling until these documents are made available. In addition, no oral examinations may be scheduled between University Day and the first day of classes in the fall semester. Students wishing to defend during this period can petition their committee for approval. Successful petitions require the agreement of all members of the dissertation committee.

D. The chairperson of the special committee is responsible for coordinating the examination procedures with both the candidate and the examining committee. These procedures may be tailored to suit those involved but must be agreed upon prior to the examination.

E. The oral examination is primarily the candidate's defense of the work done in connection with the dissertation as opposed to the writing of the dissertation. It is the responsibility of the special committee to withhold approval of the dissertation draft until it is in such form that the examination can be conducted in this spirit.

F. The members of the examining committee vote either "Pass" or "Fail" on the oral defense of the written document. It is inappropriate to vote:

   1. "Abstain" in view of the responsibility of having agreed to serve as an examiner.
   2. "Recess" in view of the policy regarding all other types of examinations.

G. At the time of the oral examination, the members of the special committee also provide final approval to the written dissertation. Options for this approval are:

   1. "Approve – no revisions needed."
   2. "Approve – revisions needed."

H. In the event the oral examination is not passed, the student may be granted a second opportunity on the following conditions:

   1. Approval is obtained through petition to the Department Chairperson and the Dean of the College of Education, and
   2. The initial examining committee conducts the second examination, and
   3. Rules governing the first oral examination are applied to the second attempt.

I. A report of the decision on the oral examination is made on a special form provided by the Program Secretary's Office and sent to the Dean of Education.

J. Finished copies of the dissertation must be deposited with the Dean of Education in accordance with instructions issued by the Dean's Office, no later than the published date in the University catalog.

VII. PETITIONS

Students have the right to petition through the program coordinator, Chairperson, and the Dean of Education via the Registrar to the Graduate and Research Committee for appeals to the University rules.

VIII. GRADUATION ACTIVITIES

A. A student who is (1) approved for candidacy, (2) has met residence requirements, (3) passed his/her general examination, (4) passed his/her oral examination, and (5) has, in accordance with all regulations deposited his/her dissertation with the Dean of Education is, upon clearance from the Registrar, eligible to receive the degree.

B. Students who meet (or expect to meet) all of the above requirements must apply for the degree. The deadline dates for this application are found in the University Catalog.

GUIDELINES FOR THE PREPARATION OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
LEHIGH UNIVERSITY

Guidelines for the Preparation of Doctoral Dissertation **03/05**

Copies of every dissertation must be presented to the Dean's Office for approval. Two unbound copies must be submitted by the deadline stated in the University catalog and available from the Dean's Office. A receipt from the Bursar's Office for the microfilming fee must be presented with the dissertation.

Be sure you have applied to the Registrar's Office for conferring of the degree, before the deadline indicated in the catalog and are registered for the semester in which you are to receive your degree.

The dissertation must conform to the following:

1. The paper shall be of a good grade of 20 lb. Bond or Xerox, 8-1/2 inches x 11 inches, uniform throughout the document. The second copy is to be on the same grade of paper.

2. The copies shall be clearly and neatly typed in black ink. Pages should be clean copies. Word processing or Xerox copy is acceptable. If reduction of text is necessary, a maximum of 15% may be used. Legends or figures must not become smaller than elite type size (10 point - 12 point is acceptable). The dissertation may be duplicated by any process which gives a clear, high contrast copy. In case the dissertation is duplicated by an acceptable process, two copies may be submitted in lieu of the typed original.

3. All straight text is to be double spaced and single sided (do not double side). Quotations, if more than a few lines in length, should be set in from margins and single spaced. Footnotes, tabulations, formulas, etc. should likewise be single spaced. Do not use page headers.

4. A left-hand margin of at least 1 1/2 inches shall be allowed for binding. Do not right justify. The other margins shall be at least 1 inch wide. Margins on illustrations, tables, graphs, etc., shall conform to the above. Page numbers should be at the center bottom without violating the 1 inch margin in typed form, not hand written. Figure numbers and titles should be placed at the bottom of the page.

5. Illustrations, tables, graphs, etc., shall wherever possible, be on paper of the same size as prescribed for the text. In no event is a smaller paper size to be used. If larger sheets are necessary, they shall be folded to substantially the same size as the text, care being taken that they will not be cut at the folds by the binder and that they may be readily unfolded when the dissertation is bound.

6. Illustrations, tables, graphs, etc., shall be consecutively numbered, so that they may be readily referred to in the context. Figures and tables placed sidewise on the page must be outward (facing to the right). The lettering and numbering on graphs and other illustrations shall be typed. Only the major coordinate rulings should appear on graphs.

7. A Table of Contents, giving at least the chapter headings, with page numbers, must be prefixed to the dissertation.

8. An abstract of 350 words maximum is to be prepared which will summarize the main findings and conclusions of the dissertation. As much as possible, the abstract should contain information, not merely an outline of the work done. *You will furnish ten copies of the abstract to the program secretary at least two weeks before the oral defense so that it can be made available for review by the faculty.*

9. Each copy of the dissertation must have a "vita" or appendix, giving a short biography of the candidate. This shall include the place and date of birth, names of parents, institutions attended, degrees (with dates) and honors, titles, or publications, teaching or professional experience, and other pertinent information.

10. Samples of the title page and signature sheet for the dissertation are attached for your information.

11. THE MATERIAL OF THE COMPLETE DISSERTATION SHALL BE ARRANGED, NUMBERED, AND **LISTED IN THE TABLE OF CONTENTS** AS FOLLOWS:
    a. the Title Page (which is page i but is not numbered)
    b. the Certificate of Approval or Signature Sheet (which is page ii)
    c. Acknowledgments (if any) (*continue with Roman numerals)*
    d. the Table of Contents (*continue with Roman numerals)*
    e. List of Tables (if any) (*continue with Roman numerals)*
    f. List of Figures (if any) (*continue with Roman numerals)*
    g. List of Illustrations (if any) (*continue with Roman numerals)*
       NOTE: Roman numeral pagination ends here.
    h. An Abstract of 350 words maximum (**Arabic numeral 1**)
       NOTE: Arabic numeral pagination starts with the abstract at page 1 and is continued in consecutive order to the last page of the dissertation.
    I. The main text of the dissertation including footnotes, tables and figures
    j. Bibliography or List of References
    k. any Appendices
    l. The "Vita" or brief Biography (last page)

12. Doctoral dissertations are limited to 400 pages. Manuscripts exceeding these limits may be returned for abridgment or an additional microfilming fee charged.

13. No source or object computer program is to be incorporated into the dissertation. Instead, arrangement should be made for such programs to be filed in the department and reference to their location included in the text of the dissertation. Proper credit should be given for use made of other programs. Appendices to the text containing tables, charts, etc., are generally limited to 25 pages.

14. The student should consult his advisor concerning University rules on the copyrighting of computer programs.

15. The pages of the entire dissertation, including illustrations, tables, graphs, appendices, bibliography, shall be numbered. It is important that every page (except the title page, as noted above) be numbered. There is no other way for the bookbinder or microfilm operator to restore the proper sequence if the pages become separated.

16. Both copies of the dissertation are submitted unbound. Copies must not be submitted with holes, stapled or otherwise fastened together.

17. Several referencing styles can be used in listing books, articles, reports, unpublished materials, and public documents, etc., in your bibliography. **Please consult with your advisor on the appropriate style used.** It is important that you maintain consistency with one style throughout your dissertation.

A Checklist of Procedures and Deadlines

1. Each Ph.D. or Ed.D. candidate must satisfy Lehigh's residency requirement. The residency requirement is intended to ensure that doctoral students spend a period of concentrated study. Either two semesters of full-time graduate study or 18 credit hours of graduate study within a twelve-month period must be completed. Variations in the residency requirement exist among programs. Students are advised to investigate specific residency requirements in their programs which exceed the basic requirements. When residency has been completed, the program coordinator notifies the student by written correspondence.

2. Language requirements as specified by the program.

3. General Examinations must be passed at least 7 months before graduation.

4. Payment of minimum tuition fee equivalent to 72 credit hours beyond the baccalaureate or 48 hours beyond the master's degree (obtained from another university or in a different field at Lehigh).

5. Application for degree. Apply by the date specified in the catalog. (Application is made at the Registrar's Office.) Reapplication is required if a student misses the expected graduation date.

6. Approval of the dissertation rough draft has to be signed by your committee. Submit to the Dean's Office by the date specified in the catalog.

7. Furnish ten copies of the abstract to the program secretary at least two weeks before the oral defense so that it can be made available for review by the faculty.

8. Final dissertation defense examination. Notify the Dean's Office of the date in advance. You may do this by submitting a copy of your defense announcement.

9. Submission of the final dissertation (two. copies, one copy requires an original signature sheet) to the Dean's Office along with the Bursar's receipt for the microfilming fee. Check final submission date in the university catalog or with the Dean's Office.

10. Clearance form (secured through the Registrar's office) and returned to the Registrar's office after obtaining appropriate signatures.

SAMPLE TITLE PAGE FOR DISSERTATION

(Title of Dissertation)

by

(Your Name)

Presented to the Graduate and Research Committee

of Lehigh University

in Candidacy for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

(Doctor of Education)

in

(Name of Program)

Lehigh University

(Date)

SAMPLE

(Guidelines - Page 5)

SAMPLE DISSERTATION SIGNATURE SHEET

Approved and recommended for acceptance as a dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy/Education.

____
Date

____
Dissertation Director

____
Accepted Date

Committee Members:

____
Name of Committee Member

____
Name of Committee Member

____
Name of Committee Member

____
Name of Committee Member

S A M P L E

ii
(Guidelines - Page 6)

DEPARTMENTAL POLICY ON STAFFING CPSY/EDUC 471, MULTICULTURAL ISSUES & EDUC 403, RESEARCH

Passed at faculty meeting, September 1998

September 2, 1998

To: Faculty in Education & Human Services

From: Ed Shapiro

Re: Proposal to Cap Enrollment

Motion:

Effective with the spring 1999 semester, enrollment in a single section of Educ 403 (Research) and CPsy/Educ 471 (Multicultural Issues) will be limited to a total of 28 students. Enrollment beyond that level will require the signature of the course instructor and/or the Department Chairperson.

Rationale:

One of the problems that the increased enrollment in our college has brought is high demands for certain courses. When the demands of these courses exceed reasonable levels, providing a high quality experience for students can be difficult. Further, courses that repeat frequently across the academic year provide multiple opportunities for students who cannot get into courses in a single semester to take the course in a subsequent semester. Certainly, students who must take the course to complete their degree in that semester would be accommodated.

cc: Dean Yoshida

SEE REVISION 12/16/05

DEPARTMENTAL POLICY (REVISED) ON ENROLLMENT OF CPSY/EDUC 471, DIVERSITY AND MULTICULTURAL PERSPECTIVES

Passed at faculty meeting, December 16, 2005

December 16, 2005

To: Faculty in Education & Human Services

From: George DuPaul, Chair, Diversity Task Force

Re: Proposed Enrollment Cap for CPsy/Educ 471

The goal of controlling section size for CPsy/Educ 471 (Diversity and Multicultural Perspectives) is to ensure course quality and assure that students have the proper environment in which to develop the intended awareness. There is much evidence that large sections inhibit such development and have a negative impact on both instructor and student learning and satisfaction.

For these reasons, the following motion is made:

Motion:

Based on recommendations made by the Diversity Task Force and the Chair's Council, effective with the Spring 2006 semester, enrollment in a single section of CPsy/Educ 471 (Diversity and Multicultural Perspectives) will be capped as follows:

On-campus: For courses that take place on Lehigh's campus, there will be a soft cap of 16. Once the soft cap is reached, with overrides additional students may be added up to a hard cap of 20. Section size may not exceed 20, however. Overrides will be coordinated by the course instructor and the Associate Chair for Students who will work together to determine which students should be added.

Off-campus: For courses that offered off-campus through the international program, the soft cap will also be 16, but the hard cap is 25.

[The higher hard cap reflects differences in international enrollment timelines that make it difficult to determine sections size until at or near the beginning of the course. In addition, when the course is taught synchronously (using live online sessions), the distribution of students across time zones usually produces smaller groups for discussion since synchronous online courses normally are offered in two sessions per week in order to address these time differences.]

PROGRAM COORDINATOR – JOB DESCRIPTION

General Position Outline

The program coordinator

- reports to the Chair of the Department of Education and Human Services.
- will be elected by the program faculty after consultation with the Chair.
- will serve for three years and may be re-appointed.
- will be ex-officio voting member of the Departmental Coordinating Council.
- will be evaluated annually as part of the performance review process for salary administration.
- shall be responsible for the effective coordination and leadership for all aspects of the academic program. All pertinent Rules and Procedures of the Faculty, as well as operating policies of the department, shall be applied as necessary and as appropriate in the exercise of these duties.

Principal Duties and Responsibilities

a. Prepare, in consultation with program faculty, teaching schedules appropriate to the students' programmatic needs.
b. Coordinate, in consultation with program faculty, the recruitment and admissions of students to the program.
c. Coordinate, in consultation with the program faculty, program and course changes, presenting any proposals to the Departmental Faculty for approval.
d. Coordinate the use and allocation of program-specific instructional and research resources, equipment and space including both those of the University and those that may be provided by external agencies.
e. Make recommendations, when necessary, regarding the appointment of adjunct faculty.
f. Maintain accurate and up-to-date records of students enrolled in the program.
g. Monitor the progress of all students, especially doctoral students, within the program.
h. Attend meetings of the Coordinating Council and represent the views and interests of the program students and faculty when necessary and/or appropriate.
i. Coordinate and prepare program-specific material for use by external accrediting or evaluating bodies and for the purposes of long-range planning.
j. Make recommendations, after consultation with the program faculty, to the Chair regarding the appointments of GA/RA/TAs and the awarding of scholarships and fellowships.
k. Mentor and support the professional development of junior faculty.
l. Hold meetings of the program faculty at regular intervals during the course of the academic year.
m. Serve as the initial point of contact for faculty and student concerns and complaints.

Compensation

Program Coordinators will receive a stipend of $4,000 per academic year as compensation for their service. The stipend can be used as academic year buyout of one course, or for other purposes in support of the professional development of the Program Coordinator such as travel, GA support, equipment purchase, etc.

This policy of compensation is reviewed annually and continued at the discretion of the Dean.

DEPARTMENTAL POLICY ON ADMISSION OF STUDENTS WHOSE FIRST LANGUAGE IS NOT ENGLISH

Passed by the faculty in November 2000

November 3, 2000

Colleagues,

At our faculty meeting this morning, we passed the following policy applicable to the entire college:

> Students whose first language is not English will be required to take the TOEFL and attain the following scores (on computer version/ paper version equivalent to be added):
>
> TOEFL:
>
> Total Score = 250 (600)
> Reading, listening, & structure/writing = 22 (56 for Reading and Listening; 55 for S/W)
> Written essay = 50
>
> Admitted students must attain a score of at least 50 on the TSE /SPEAK within one calendar year of the start of their academic program. Students not attaining this score will be prohibited from continuing their program until such scores are attained.
>
> These are college minimums, individual programs may set higher levels for admission.
>
> This policy will be monitored for a 3-year period to assess if its impact on enrollment.

POLICY ON TRANSFER OF CREDITS TO MASTER'S DEGREE

Passed by the faculty in May 2003

The College of Education has adopted a more restrictive policy on transfer of credits than has been approved by the University. Such policy is permitted by R & P 3.22.2.

With the approval of the department chair offering commensurate courses and the student's department chair (if different), a maximum of six credits may be transferred to a Lehigh Master's program. A petition is submitted to the Registrar with course descriptions and an official transcript, as well as a departmental recommendation(s). Students may also be asked for a statement from their former institution that the course has not been used toward a prior degree.

To be eligible for credit towards a Lehigh Master's program, all transferred courses must:

1. Have been taken at the graduate level
2. Have a grade of B or better
3. Not have been used toward any prior degree
4. Have been completed within four years of first enrollment into a Lehigh graduate program
5. Be transferred from an institution that is accredited by one of the six regional accrediting associations.

Additional Graduate Degree Transfer Credit Policies/Limitations

Student petitions meeting the standards listed on the front are also bound by the following five limitations on course transfers into a Lehigh Master's degree program. Any request for more than six credits must be submitted with a filled out Masters Degree Program form with all appropriate approvals.

1. The maximum number of credits that may transfer in is determined by the total number of credits in the master's program:
    - Up to nine credits for programs of 36 credits or less
    - Up to twelve credits for programs of 37 to 48 credits
    - Up to fifteen credits for programs of 49 to 60 credits
2. To be eligible for credit towards a Lehigh master's program all transferred courses must:
    - Have been taken at the graduate level
    - Have been completed within four years of first enrollment into a Lehigh graduate program
    - If taken in the U.S, be offered by a U.S. institution and that institution must be accredited by one of the six regional accrediting associations: Middle States Association of College and Schools, North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, New England Association of Colleges and Schools, Northwest Association of Colleges and Schools, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and Western Association of Colleges and Schools.
3. To be eligible for transfer, courses from by an international institution must be offered by a post-baccalaureate degree-granting institution. Credit will be evaluated on an individual basis.
4. Certain colleges or degree programs may have more restrictive policies with regard to the number of transferable credits or eligibility of courses.
5. Students must submit to the Registrar (a) the completed *Graduate Course Credit Transfer Petition* form, (b) an official course description from the institution at which the course to be transferred is offered, and (c) an official transcript. Students may also be asked to provide a statement from the institution offering the course confirming that the course has not been used toward a prior degree.

NOTE: Only those courses listed and approved on this form will transfer. Any student taking a course different from the one listed, risks having the course not be eligible for transfer credit.

Procedures

1. Complete one form for each course that you wish to transfer into your master's degree program.
2. Complete **all parts** of the front of this form and secure the necessary signatures.(Please note: Departmental recommendations are used to inform the Registrar's decision, but the Registrar is the final authority for the university.)
3. Submit the completed petition form to the Office of the Registrar, along with all attachments.
4. Once a course has been completed, you must request that an OFFICIAL transcript be sent to:
   Office of the Registrar, Lehigh University, 27 Memorial Drive West, Bethlehem, PA 18015

Information for Current Graduate Students Considering Leaves of Absence

Graduate students are eligible to petition for up to a two-year leave of absence from Lehigh for circumstances beyond their control. The assumption is that graduate students who take a leave of absence from Lehigh will not be taking coursework toward their degree at another institution of higher education during that leave. This assumption is reflected in the fact that the time-to-completion-of-degree is extended by the length of the leave of absence. Thus, if you plan to take coursework at another institution while on a leave of absence, please discuss your situation with your advisor and recognize that you would need to:

1. Secure approval to take coursework toward your degree while on leave.
2. Receive advance approval (using this form) before taking any such coursework.
3. Follow all procedures listed above.

Direct questions about leaves of absence to Kathleen Hutnik, Director of Graduate Student Life (kaha@lehigh.edu).

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR
27 MEMORIAL DRIVE WEST
BETHLEHEM, PA 18015

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE COURSE CREDIT TRANSFER PETITION

Student Name: ______________________ LIN # ____________

Department: ______________________ College: ____________

Degree sought: ______________________ Advisor: ____________

I wish to attend/have attended ______________________ during ____________

name of other college/university — semester (e.g, Summer 2010)

I request credit for the following course in place of the approved course at Lehigh University:

Course number and title at other college or university: ______________________ # of credits: ________

Lehigh course number/title to be replaced by requested course: ______________________ Registrar's decision on # of Lehigh credits: ________

Lehigh University Faculty policy for transfer credit towards a graduate degree:

Transfer of credit from other institutions is the responsibility of the registrar. Graduate students planning to take work at other institutions in the United States or elsewhere should initially check with the registrar on policies and procedures. Current graduate students may not be concurrently enrolled at any other institution without prior permission from the Standing of Graduate Students (SOGS) Committee. Transfer of final course marks from other institutions is not possible; only the approved credits transfer.

- Pass/Fail courses are not acceptable for transfer.
- Credits may not be transferred toward a Lehigh doctoral degree.
- Courses must be taken with graduate student status; courses taken under a limited/non degree seeking, continuing education, or simply post-baccalaureate status are not eligible.
- Courses must be designated at the graduate level and not have been used toward any prior degree.
- Advanced undergraduate courses are not eligible for graduate degree credit.
- Only courses for which the student received a final mark of "B" or higher will transfer. Courses for which the student received a final mark of "B-"or below will not transfer.
- Students may receive credit at Lehigh equivalent to that which was granted as indicated on the transcript of the other college/university, but only up to the number of credits for the equivalent course at Lehigh. Courses taken on the quarter system have credit granted on a 3-to-2 ratio, producing a whole number for the transfer credits (for example, 10 quarter credits of approved coursework become 6 credits at Lehigh, not 6.67).
- Please see the back of this form for additional policies that limit how many credits may be transferred.
- The Registrar determines the number of credit hours awarded upon receipt of the official transcript.

If you have any questions about these policies, please contact the Registrar's Office.

I confirm that I have read the policies above and on the back and understand that they govern my requested course credit transfer: ______________________

Student Signature (above)

____

Date signed:

	Name	Date	Recommendation & signature
Grad Program Coordinator/Adviser:			
Department Chair:			
Associate Dean:			

		Date	Action
Registrar:			Approve ☐ Disapprove ☐

Comments:

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY

Providing Support for Graduate Student Petitions: Increasing the Odds of Achieving Desired Outcomes

At Lehigh, one often hears, "A student can petition anything." While this may be true, it is also true that not all petitions are successful. The Committee on the Standing of Graduate Students (SOGS) meets every other week, including some meetings in the summer, and we typically hear between four and 12 petitions at each meeting.

Our desire is to see that petitions that should be approved are approved and ones that should be denied are denied. The best situation would be for every petition to provide the information needed to make an informed decision and for petitions to be treated equitably. In order for this to happen, it is important that faculty members make sure they provide enough information to make clear why they support or oppose a petition.

This brief guide outlines the petition process at Lehigh and offers some ways to enhance the likelihood that a petition is judged appropriately. Many of these suggestions may seem obvious to you, but members of SOGS can tell you that we view petitions at every meeting that do not follow them. Further, associate deans often send back proposals that fail to provide the necessary information and this slows the process.

A brief description of the petition process at Lehigh, arranged chronologically:

1. A student obtains a petition form and writes (1) What action he/she wants taken ["I respectfully request: …] **and** (2) Why that action is more appropriate than the action already taken ["Reasons: …"]. The student fills out the top of the petition, providing contact information, and then signs and dates the form.
2. The signed form then goes to the student's academic adviser. That adviser reviews the petition, makes a recommendation ["Approve" or "Deny"], provides any justification for his/her recommendation and then signs and dates the form.
3. The doubly signed form goes next to the graduate coordinator who reviews the petition and any attachments, makes a recommendation ["Approve" or "Deny"], provides any justification for his/her recommendation and then signs and dates the form.
4. The triply signed form next goes to the department chair who reviews the petition and any attachments, makes a recommendation ["Approve" or "Deny"], provides any justification for his/her recommendation and then signs and dates the form.
5. Now carrying four signatures, the petition form goes to the dean's office where the associate dean reviews the petition and any attachments, makes a recommendation ["Approve," "Deny" or "Defer to SOGS"], provides any justification for his/her recommendation and then signs and dates the form. [Associate deans recommend "Defer to SOGS" when they feel there may be cross-college issues that should be discussed before making a recommendation.]
6. The petition leaves the college at this point and goes down to the registrar's office. The registrar reviews the petition and any attachments, checks the student's record for any additional relevant information, and determines if the petition is covered by a recent precedent by the SOGS committee. If so, the registrar acts on the petition based on that precedent. If not, the registrar distributes the petition electronically to all members of SOGS and schedules it for discussion at the next SOGS meeting.
7. The SOGS committee meets to discuss the petition and then makes a decision on whether to approve or deny it. The registrar's office then notifies the petitioner of the decision of the committee.
8. If a petitioner is not satisfied with this decision, he or she may appeal to the Graduate and Research Committee (GRC). This appeal should be in the form of a letter to the GRC that the student delivers to the chair of the GRC. In this letter, the student should make clear (1) what action he or she wishes taken instead of the action taken by SOGS, (2) why the action taken by SOGS was inappropriate, and (3) why the requested action is the more appropriate action. [http://www.lehigh.edu/~indost/conduct/handbook/sect4.shtml]
9. The GRC as a whole considers the student's appeal and issues its decision.

Updated 11/11/09

Now some suggestions for faculty in supporting or denying a graduate student petition:

Suggestion	Explanation
Make sure the requested action is clearly indicated:	If student does not make clear in his/her statement on the petition what he or she is requesting, don't sign the petition. Instead, send it back to the student for clarification. A petition that is unclear about what it is requesting should never move forward and you cannot make a recommendation on such a petition.
Always make a recommendation:	Before you sign your name, write “Approve” or “Deny.” It is not enough to simply sign your name. Don’t make your colleagues later in the petition process guess what you intended. If they are uncertain, they will likely send the petition back to you and that slows the process down.
Always include an approved plan with requests for doctoral extensions:	When a graduate student is requesting an extension to the 7-year period (post-master’s) or the 10-year period (post-bachelor’s), the petition must have attached to it a timeline for completion that includes key milestones (like qualifying examination, comprehensive exams, proposal presentation, research/data collection, dissertation write-up, and dissertation defense). The doctoral adviser needs to state in writing that he or she believes this new schedule is reasonable and that the student is capable of meeting it. While this does not bind the adviser, advisers should be candid about the likelihood of students finishing. It is not a kindness to prolong the timeline of a student who is not likely to finish.
Provide documentation for petitions to drop a class after 10 days with a refund:	Any time a student petitions to drop a class and receive a refund, a statement from the instructor confirming the last day attended **must** be attached to the petition. This determines how much the student gets back in refund. If this statement is not included, SOGS will not act on the petition until it is provided.
Recognize that dropping a class and getting a full refund is rare:	Students very seldom receive a full refund. They have almost always used university resources such as email, the library and the time of professors and staff. What students receive is a prorated refund, based on how long they were enrolled in a course. Fortunately, there is a more generous medical refund for emergencies.
For extended absence, request a leave of absence, not an extension:	If a student has been (or expects to be) away from graduate study for one or two years for professional, personal or health reasons, consider requesting a leave of absence rather than an extension. Leave of absences for changing jobs, family events, and medical reasons are almost always granted and they extend the doctoral clock automatically.
For anything unusual, give a justification:	While many requests are straightforward, other requests are not. If there is anything unusual about what a student requests in a petition, attach a statement telling why you support or don’t support it. This need not be a long statement, but such a statement makes a big difference to your colleagues later in the petition process. You are usually closer to the situation and will know persuasive information that you can share.
Only approve deserving petitions:	If a petition is worthy of support, approve it. If, however, you do not think it should be approved, deny it. It is not fair to the signers that follow you in the process for you to pass the task of denying to them.

CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERATION FOR ADMISSION AS REGULAR GRADUATE STUDENT

Passed by the faculty in November 2007

1) An undergraduate GPA of 3.00 (on a 4.0 scale) or;

2) An undergraduate GPA of 3.00 (on a 4.00 scale) on the last 48 credits of undergraduate study or;

3) A graduate GPA of 3.00 or;

4) Scores on the GRE (V+Q+A) at the 75th percentile for education (a combined score of at least 1740 across verbal, quantitative, and analytic subtests of the GRE aptitude test) or the 75th percentile on the MAT or;

5) Successfully fulfilling the requirements of Associate Admission status (i.e., the completion of at least 9 credits and no more than 12 credits with a GPA of 3.00 or better and no grades lower than B-)

Individual programs may impose more rigorous admission standards so candidates should check with the program coordinator from the program they plan to apply to.

NON-DEGREE OPTIONS

Non-degree for external certification passed at EHS Meeting February 9, 2007

In addition to degree programs, there are two non-degree options as well: (1) Regular non-degree and (2) Non-degree for external certification

Regular non-degree admission is for students who wish to take up to 12 credits of graduate coursework at Lehigh without seeking a degree. Any transcript or other record from the University will clearly indicate the student status as non-degree. Non-degree students are not permitted to audit courses. University admissions criteria for non-degree graduate students are (a) a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution with an overall grade point average of at least 3.0 on a four-point scale (Applicants with undergraduate GPAs slightly below 3.0 may be admitted with approval from the department of Education and Human Services) or (b) to have achieved a GPA of 3.0 or higher on a four-point scale for a minimum of 12 graduate credits at another accredited institution.

Non-degree for external certification students are admitted to pursue coursework for the purpose of obtaining certification through an external accrediting agency. Applicants are expected to have an undergraduate GPA of 3.0 or higher on a four-point scale or to have achieved a GPA of 3.0 or higher on a four-point scale for a minimum of 12 graduate credits at another accredited institution. Applicants are assigned certification advisors on admissions and must work with the advisor to assure that they complete all requirements for certification satisfactorily. Non-degree for external certification students complete the coursework and any other required field experiences for the appropriate certification, with the number of credits and field experiences being dictated by the external accrediting agency. Given this external control of credit requirements, the number of credits will vary and will typically exceed the 12-credit limit for regular non-degree students. Certification involves qualitative components as well as credits; a non-degree student seeking such certification must meet the quality standards of the certification program, as well as completing the necessary coursework and field experiences.

Changing from Non-Degree to Degree Status

Non-degree students of either type may seek admission to a degree program. Non-degree students who seek admission to a degree program must meet all regular admissions criteria, complete all regular procedures, and present all documents normally required of degree-seeking applicants to that program. Courses taken by a non-degree student who later enters a degree program will count towards the completion of the program to the extent that those courses fall within the normal requirements of the program and to the extent that the student's performance in the course(s) is acceptable for degree program purposes. Any course which is counted towards the completion of a degree must be completed within the established time limits for that degree, whether taken initially as a degree or non-degree course.

OPERATING PRINCIPLES FOR THE CENTER FOR PROMOTING RESEARCH TO PRACTICE – SCHOOLS, FAMILIES, COMMUNITIES

Passed by the faculty in May 2002

Mission:

The change in title requires a slight change in the mission of the center. I believe this captures the Center's mission effectively.

The mission of Lehigh University's Center for Promoting Research to Practice i**s to generate new knowledge that will truly impact the lives of individuals with disabilities or those at-risk for disabilities. The primary objective of Center is to create a living laboratory that establishes partnerships with schools, parents and families, and community service providers to enhance the use of best practices for individuals with disabilities.**

Building the Infrastructure:

The CPRP needs to build an infrastructure that will allow it to offer the resources needed by faculty to develop a research rich environment. Although the CPRP has initial funding for an Executive Director, an individual responsible for web development, and a part of a secretary, these funds are not sufficient to sustain more than an 18-month period of development. The key needs for the CPRP are for a permanent Executive Director that represents a tenured or tenure-track faculty member, a business manager who can oversee budgets of several projects embedded in the CPRP, a web development person who can support projects brought into the CPRP, and the possible hiring of a staff of data collectors who can support various projects.

The infrastructure can be built in several ways. First, when grants are submitted through the auspices of the CPRP, the budget will be constructed to contain a small portion of the personnel costs for these types of positions. The exact amount will be negotiated between the Executive Director and the prospective Principal Investigator.

Second, when grants are submitted through the CPRP, the University portion of Research Incentive Funds (RIF) are returned to the CPRP and not the Department. Dollars are returned on the indirect costs at a rate of approximately 4% per year of total ICR, as defined in the RIF formula implemented by the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at Lehigh.

Third, when grants are submitted through the CPRP, faculty will often write in their time dedicated to the project. For many grants, the amount of time may be as high as 50% of calendar year. The cost of faculty buyout as per departmental policy is 16.67% of academic year salary per course. The cost of teaching replacements for the department is $4,000, the cost of an adjunct hired to teach the course. Thus, there is a portion of dollars that is available above the cost of teaching replacement for each course bought out by a faculty member. Current policy is for those dollars to remain within the departmental budget to provide additional discretionary dollars that the

Chairperson can use to support departmental needs. The proposal here is that most of these discretionary dollars will remain with the CPRP, rather than the department. Specifically, it is proposed that the CPRP retain 80% of the dollars beyond teaching replacement costs and the department retain 20%.

Here is an illustration. Faculty A receives a grant that allows a buyout of 1 course. The total dollars available for the academic year buyout in the project is $10,000. The department first claims $4,000 for adjunct replacement. The remaining $6,000 is divided with $4,800 going to the CPRP and $1200 going to the department.

Fourth, over the past two years, COE has adopted a policy of returning to PIs a portion of the return through revenue streams to the College on Indirect Cost Return. The dollars returned to PIs is based on a formula that calculates the proportion of which the projects held by the PI contribute to the total ICR return to the college. The percentage of contribution is multiplied by the amount of dollars returned under the revenue streams formula. There are two important issues that need to be considered in formulating a future policy for the distribution of COE funds. (1) The COE distribution to PIs must be equivalent (or greater in the CPRP) whether the project is in the CPRP or the department. (2) The CPRP needs to benefit from the COE RIF return policy as well.

Because the CPRP will be taking a percentage of the overall return (as will the Dean), the following formula is proposed:

Dean takes 25% of the total ICR return to the college. Calculation of the proportion of ICR contributed to the total is done in the same way as described above. The remaining dollars are distributed such that the PI receives 80% of the remaining dollars and the CPRP OR DEPARTMENT receive 20%. Thus, PIs would receive the same levels of support whether the project is in the CPRP or the Department. Here is an illustration:

Total ICR generated by COE in a single year is $1,000,000. Faculty B contributes $100,000 in that year to the ICR of the COE which represents 10% of the ICR return to COE for that year. Total return to COE after the revenue stream division is $800,000.

- Dean would take 25% of $800,000 = $200,000.
- Remaining dollars, $600,000, are divided such that 10% of the amount returned related to this project ($60,000) is divided such that the PI gets 80% ($48,000) and the Dept/CPRP would get $12,000.

This policy will apply only to newly submitted projects (both in the Department as well as through the CPRP). Existing projects will be subject to the existing policy, as modified by the Dean (i.e., Dean takes 25% of ICR return, remainder is distributed to PIs proportional to contribution to total COE ICR generation).

It is also noted that the policy of COE RIF return is in effect only if COE exceeds its specified target. Should COE fall below its target, dollars owed by COE to the University will be shared equally between the Center, Department, and Dean's office.

Types of Projects Remaining in Department versus Center

The CPRP will be open to all types of projects that are consistent with its mission on Promoting Research to Practice. It is anticipated, however, that those projects whose primary mission is the training of students leading to degree or certification outcomes would be most appropriate to remain within the Department rather than the CPRP. It is still unclear whether contractual types of projects (i.e., Transition & Assessment Services, Lehigh Support Community Choices, state funded contracts) should belong to the CPRP. I am recommended that the option be available for these projects to come to the CPRP if it is the desire of the PI to do so.

Types of Resources to be Developed and Offered by the CPRP

Once the CPRP is in full operation, it is planned to hire a business manager, a individual responsible for web and internet development, and a set of data collectors. The CPRP will provide budget development support along with templates for boilerplate sections of grants. It is also hoped that the CPRP will be able to offer support for all projects in information technology needs as well. The CPRP will also actively seek and disseminate information to all faculty on available grant opportunities, as well as facilitate collaboration across discipline areas when projects require such efforts.

EXCUSING STUDENTS WHEN BUSES DO NOT RUN

COE

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

bold, connected, innovative

M E M O R A N D U M

Date: January 8, 2006

To: Faculty, Staff and Students in EHS

From: Sally White, COE Dean

cc: Mohamed S. El-Aasser, Provost
Nicholas Ladany, EHS Chair
George DuPaul, Associate Chair for Students

Re: Excusing students when buses do not run

The Provost issues decisions on whether or not the university will remain open during inclement weather. On the rare occasions the university does remain open in less than favorable weather, yet the buses do not run which means some students may not be able to attend class. Under these conditions, students are to be excused from class that day and given extensions for assignments and exams if necessary.

The most up-to-date information on bus stoppages can be heard by calling 610-758-1700. After 4:30, the transportation services website is not updated until the next day.

ADJUNCT EVALUATIONS

Approved EHS Meeting March 14, 2008

Process:

- Department coordinator summarizes all adjunct course evaluations.
- Course evaluations are sent to adjuncts with a cover letter from the chair directing them to see the program coordinator for advice about improving coursework, if interested.
- Summary of course evaluations is sent to program coordinators.
  - Overall scores below 4.0 for course quality and effectiveness are "red flagged" by the chair.
  - Program coordinators provide feedback to adjunct faculty with low evaluations.
- Course syllabi of adjuncts are reviewed by the program; feedback provided by the program.
  - This activity can be independent of or done in conjunction with "red flagged" adjuncts.
- Chair will monitor course evaluation scores of adjuncts over time. Repeated low scores will result in adjuncts not being approved.
  - Feedback loop (e.g., program coordinators report back to chairs regarding feedback given to adjuncts).

COE REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW FOR PROFESSORS OF PRACTICE AND LECTURERS

Approved EHS Meeting January 30, 2009

Considerations Prior to the Reappointment Review

The dean's office will establish a reappointment schedule for lecturers and professors of practice following the schedule and guidelines for reappointment review established by the provost's office. The dean's office will establish a schedule that works well for the college.

The process of considering a reappointment review should occur at least 4 months prior to the end of the candidate's contract so that the candidate can be given sufficient notice of either reappointment or appointment. If it is not possible to meet the four month notice deadline (e.g., because of funding issues), notice of reappointment and non-reappointment should be made as soon as possible. The department chair will inform the professor of practice/lecturer about any problems with providing four months notice.

The process prior to the reappointment review is as follows:

By mid June each year, the provost's office will send a list of professors of practice and lecturers whose appointments end by August of the following year.

By the end of September, the dean's office will confirm the list of candidates for reappointment with the provost's office. If it is clear at this point that an appointment will not be continued past the current contract, the department chair will inform the professor of practice or the lecturer in writing.

Steps in the Reappointment Process

1. If the decision is to go forward with a reappointment review, the chair will appoint an evaluation committee consisting of (a) the program faculty of the POP/lecturer and b) one faculty member outside of the of the POP/lecturer's program.
2. The candidate for reappointment will compile his or her portfolio (See Provost Guidelines and Checklist) for review by committee.
3. The faculty committee will review the candidate's portfolio in relation to the candidate's contracted responsibilities. The department chair convenes a meeting of the committee to discuss the candidate's portfolio. The committee members will vote formally at a meeting as to whether or not they support reappointment. If the committee supports reappointment, the review process continues. If the committee does not support reappointment, the department chair will send a letter of non-reappointment to the candidate, with copies sent to the dean and provost. The department chair meets with the candidate to discuss the content of the letter.
4. If the committee supports reappointment, the department chair will write the department summary letter. If the reappointment is for 3 years or more, the department chair solicits individual letters of evaluation from each faculty evaluator and also writes an individual department summary letter. (Individual faculty letters are only needed for reappointments of three years or more). The department chair's summary letter is circulated to the program faculty/committee members. The chair meets with the candidate to discuss the content of the letter.
5. The chair forwards to the dean the candidate's portfolio, chair summary, and individual faculty letters from the committee (if required).
6. If the dean approves the appointment, he/she makes the recommendation to the provost. The official portfolio, including all original letters, is sent to the provost's office. See provost checklist for organization of materials for the provost.
7. If the dean does not approve reappointment, he/she will discuss the decision with the department chair.
8. The provost reviews the reappointment portfolio and sends a letter of reappointment or non-reappointment to the candidate, with copies to the dean and the department chair.

DEPARTMENT POLICY ON STUDENT CLEARANCE CHECKS

Approved at EHS Meeting May 9, 2008

This policy represents the minimum requirements for programs and students with respect to criminal and abuse records checks. Individual programs and/or school districts can set more stringent requirements.

1. All students who come into contact with children either through field-based or research experience in school settings in the U.S. must obtain and present to their program coordinator the following up-to-date (not more than one year old) clearance documents upon matriculation into their program:
    a. FBI Federal Criminal History Record (Act 114)
    b. Pennsylvania State Police Criminal Records Check (Act 34)
    c. Pennsylvania Child Abuse History Clearance (Act 151)
    d. Mantoux Tuberculosis Screening
2. It is the program's responsibility to provide matriculating students with contact information (e.g., relevant websites) needed to complete all four clearance checks.
3. All original clearance documents must be viewed and photocopied by the program coordinator. Before any student will be permitted to register for any course with a field experience component or initiate a research activity that involves school-based contact with children, the following conditions must be met:
    a. Either the Mantoux must be negative or the student must have a clear chest X-ray that is less than 5 years old.
    b. The other three documents must show that "no record exists."

    Students will be placed in field or research experiences when all documentation is clear; meaning that Mantoux or chest X-ray is negative and criminal background checks indicate that "no record exists."
4. Photocopies of clearance documents will be kept in an individual student file (separate from the student's academic file to protect confidentiality) and stored in a locked file cabinet in the program secretary's office.
5. It is each student's responsibility to obtain all four clearance documents and the application for these should be submitted upon matriculation into the program.
6. If any action is needed in response to any clearance check, that action is solely the responsibility of the student, not program faculty or staff.
7. It is the student's responsibility to keep clearance documents current by obtaining annual updates throughout their academic program. Updated, current documents must be provided to the program coordinator. Students must have up-to-date (not more than one year old), original documents available for school administrators upon request during all field assignments. Failure to produce documentation upon request will result in removal from the schools.
8. Decisions to admit students into public school practicum or internship placements are solely the purview of school districts. The department and/or program does not debate the merits of any school district decision in relation to clearance check results.
9. If a student is arrested during the student's field or research experience, then the program can remove the student from the field placement or research experience pending dispensation of the arrest incident.
10. All prospective students shall be informed of these requirements in writing and on the college application website prior to consideration of their application for admission into any academic program that requires school-based field and/or research experiences.

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY NON-DISCRIMINATION STATEMENT

Lehigh University seeks talented faculty, staff, and students from diverse backgrounds. Lehigh University does not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, gender, gender identity, marital status, national or ethnic origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran status in any area, including: student admissions; scholarship or loan awards; athletic, co-curricular, recreational, or social programs; academic programs, policies, or activities; and employment and employment development. Questions and complaints about this policy should be directed to: The Provost or The Vice President for Finance and Administration, Alumni Memorial Building, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA 18015.