2.1 Introduction

Lehigh University, under the leadership of Alice P. Gast, who became president in August 2006, has renewed its commitment to its Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) Decennial Accreditation Review. Campus leaders view the internal review process as an exciting catalyst for improvement, as well as a way to consolidate past achievements.

Since August 2006, the University has begun significant cross-campus conversations about where it wishes to be as an institution. At the same time, in preparation for the work ahead, President Gast has launched the Board of Trustees on a process of strategic thinking with the aim of strengthening the bridge between the Trustees’ experience and perspective, and on-campus planning.

The nine months of campus-wide review that resulted in this report, and the recommendations resulting from this process, provide a strong foundation for work over the next 5-10 years. In recognition of the powerful call for increased accountability, accessibility, and transparency in higher education from the Department of Education, the Higher Education Reauthorization Act process, and other executive and congressional actors, Lehigh intends to take this opportunity to rise to the challenge and position itself for the coming decade.

The following report captures the campus evaluation of the University’s compliance with MSCHE’s seven “institutional” standards, as well as Standard 10 on “Faculty.” Each section speaks to one or two of the standards, providing information on how Lehigh’s current policies, practices, and procedures demonstrate compliance with fundamental (and in some cases optional) elements of the standard. In each section, this report captures areas of real achievement and institutional strength, as well as identifies opportunities for further improvement. Each section concludes with recommendations that represent the University’s perspective on ways to create or enhance processes to better meet the standards. These recommendations were generated by the Compliance Subcommittee, discussed and endorsed by the Accreditation Steering Committee, and discussed and embraced by the University senior officers. The recommendations represent substantive areas for campus improvement in the next 5-10 years.

The Appendices serve as the “document roadmap” for this report, including copies of all the documentation referred to in the text below, as well as other relevant policies and background on the current environment at Lehigh.

The Lehigh University community, the ASC, and compliance subcommittee look forward to the visit of the Middle States team chair and generalist evaluator in the fall of 2007.
2.II. Review of Standards

2.II.A Standard 1: Mission, Goals, and Objectives

2.II.A.1 Lehigh University Mission Statement

The University Mission Statement was drafted in 1991 by then-President Peter Likins, working in consultation with the University Council, a University-wide planning group that included a wide range of representatives from across the University, as well as appointed faculty. The Mission Statement was approved by the Board of Trustees in 1992 (Appendix 2.1 for the complete Mission Statement).

Although the Mission Statement currently appears in the University catalog, it is not widely regarded as providing the central vision of the University and does not provide specific strategic goals. Instead, the “Seven Goals for Lehigh,” which were established by President Gregory Farrington (who followed Peter Likins), served as the organizational principles that guided planning from 1998-2006. These goals are discussed in detail below.

In 2006, Lehigh welcomed its 13th president, Dr. Alice P. Gast. At the date of this writing, no new guiding principles or strategic goals have been established; however, President Gast has announced that her administration will begin constructing new processes in 2007-2008 for better integrating resource planning with the University’s priorities, and working on an institution-wide “strategic thinking” process.

For the purposes of this document, the 1992 Mission Statement is partly responsible for – and is consistent with – a number of accomplishments in key areas: Diversity, global awareness and education, service, and research. Brief descriptions of campus progress in these areas are below.

Additional accomplishments in the areas of academic excellence, faculty integration of teaching, research and service, and the education of future leaders are subsumed below under descriptions of College and other major University unit planning.

2.II.A.1.i Diversity

Lehigh University has attempted to make strategic progress on the broad topic of “diversity” at various points in time over the last 15-20 years. At the end of the 1989-90 academic year, a “Final Report” was prepared by the Commission on Minorities and the Commission on Women, as the culminating document for its 18 months of work. This document included the results of campus-wide surveys, analysis of many areas of concern for the University, and recommendations for next steps. Although the commissions were not continued, some of the recommendations were implemented.

A later group, the University-wide President’s Commission on Diversity, then prepared a report for the period 1996-98, which was submitted to President Farrington when he arrived. This report detailed the Commission’s assessment of the University’s accomplishments, weaknesses or problem areas, made recommendations, and called for ongoing attention to this important issue.

With the turnover in many senior leadership positions, institutional efforts were not sustained as a priority until the fall of 2002, when President Farrington issued “Toward a More Diverse Lehigh.” Following this philosophical statement, several units focused their attention on diversity or used the report’s call for annual updates as a structure for reporting
work already in progress. Those annual updates were generated for two years, but the process did not include any method for refreshing/updating the articulated goals.

In the fall of 2005, the new Provost, Mohamed El-Aasser introduced a new institutional structure, the University Diversity Leadership Committee (UDLC), and three task forces. These task forces focused on students, faculty, and staff, respectively, with all student, faculty, and UDLC members chosen by the Provost’s Office, and the Staff Task Force chosen by Human Resources, in consultation with the leaders of each of the stems and various campus individuals and groups, such as the Employee Relations Advisory Committee (ERAC). Each task force and the UDLC articulated the goals they would be working toward; these goals were shared with the campus via a newly created website. In addition to a variety of diversity-related initiatives, which have been undertaken in recent years, one of the major accomplishments of the UDLC thus far is a project to assess the campus climate as it relates to diversity. An external consultant was retained to construct and implement a campus climate survey tool. The survey was completed by 41% of the campus community of undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty, and staff, and the results are being shared broadly with the University community.

The future organizational structure related to diversity initiatives is likely to change given the arrival of President Gast, who has embraced diversity as an institutional priority, with a focus on “sustainable” efforts as the University moves forward.

2.II.A.1.ii Global Awareness

Consistent with the emphasis on global awareness in the Mission Statement, various task forces have been appointed since the early 1990s to study how Lehigh should “internationalize” its curriculum and educational mission, provide greater study abroad opportunities for students, respond educationally to the rapidly changing forces of globalization, and/or more fully integrate Lehigh’s international students into campus life. (See, for example, the International Plan 2000, Mark Erikson’s International View, the International Task Force Report, Internationalizing the CAS Undergraduate Experience White Paper, the Globalization and Social Change White Paper and proposal, and the First Year Experience and International Experience White Paper, included in Appendices 2.2-2.6.) Lehigh has a number of longstanding international programs – including the Martindale Center, faculty-led and third-party-provided study abroad programs, a wide variety of international research collaborations and initiatives, and various research centers with clear international value.

In recent years, quite a bit of groundwork has been laid toward an overarching vision of global awareness, which has led to real achievements across campus. For example, with the advent of President Farrington’s administration, the Global Council, created by President Likins and comprised of international alumni leaders, was reorganized into an advisory group of thought leaders to help Lehigh position its international programs and efforts. The Global Council has met regularly in recent years, providing high-level advice to the President and Provost. In 2006, President Farrington presented a report to the Board of Trustees on the creation of Global Lehigh. In addition, a Global Initiative Fund was established to facilitate new initiatives in collaboration with the newly formed Global Affairs subcommittee of the Board of Trustees.

In addition, important organizational changes have taken place on campus that affect the University’s ability to more effectively coordinate its global awareness efforts. For example, in response to a 2001 Audit of the Office of International Education, the University divided its Office of Study Abroad and Office for International Students and Scholars (OISS), and
increased funding and staffing to the Office of Study Abroad. In addition, in 2004, Coxe Hall was renovated to house various offices pertaining to international education (Study Abroad, OISS, Global Union, English as a Second Language), with all three offices reporting directly to the Provost. In 2005, these offices were reorganized and reassigned to report to the Director of the Iacocca Institute, who was promoted to Director of Global Lehigh to reflect greater responsibility. Currently, a new Global Lehigh Advisory Council, which is comprised of Provost-appointed faculty from across campus, is studying the issues involved in implementing a Global Lehigh plan, with its report due in the summer of 2007.

At the College and program level, major new initiatives related to Lehigh’s commitment to educating students for an increasingly global world include:

- Creation of the Global Union (1997), which serves as an umbrella group for a wide range of clubs and student associations and which boasts of the largest student affiliation on campus.
- Creation of the Global Village (1997), which brings young entrepreneurs from across the globe to campus for intensive summer training and international networking.
- Creation of the Pennsylvania Governor’s School for Global Entrepreneurship (2001), which is housed at Lehigh.
- Creation of the Global Citizenship Program (2004), which was supported by Mellon Foundation funding for the past three years.
- Awarding of Lehigh’s Non-Governmental Organization status with the United Nations (2004), which allows students access to high-level briefings and puts Lehigh in a very select number of institutions.
- Passage of a new Global Studies major (2006).

Another indicator of greater emphasis on global success was the substantial increase in the number of Lehigh undergraduates studying abroad, reflecting both greater effectiveness in the Office of Study Abroad and the passage of new programs requiring study abroad.

2.II.A.1.iii Service

The Lehigh University Community Service Office was established in the fall of 1996 to provide a coordinated effort for students, faculty, and staff to engage in service to the greater Lehigh Valley area. The Community Service Office focuses on direct service initiatives and is grounded in the action-reflection service model, which espouses an emphasis on social justice. The office strives to educate change agents for social justice and encourage increased volunteerism among the Lehigh community. Currently the office has contact with more than 100 local agencies that are always looking for volunteers. In addition to contact with these agencies, the University runs major community service programs, such as Spring SERVE, the spring service break program; Volunteer Experience, the new student pre-orientation program; and America Reads and Counts, a tutoring program for local elementary and middle school children.

Although there are a number of examples of individual faculty members incorporating service and service learning into their courses (see below), the four Colleges do not make a commitment to service a priority in their education of undergraduates or graduate students. The Associate Deans from the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), the College of Business
and Economics (CBE), and the Rossin College of Engineering and Applied Science (RCEAS), in consultation with the Deputy Provost for Academic Programs, have begun preliminary discussions about how to create a bridge between the Office of Community Service in Student Life and the Lehigh undergraduate curricular experience. The goal is to expand service learning opportunities.

CAS has the greatest number of undergraduate courses that incorporate a service component linking theory to practice. In addition to longstanding courses that include an active civic engagement or service component, many CAS departments offer (or require) internship courses. In the CBE, students routinely provide assistance to small businesses, free tax service, or some form of community service. In the RCEAS, the most notable example of service learning can be found in the newly created chapter of Engineers Without Borders (EWB-USA). In addition, the Integrated Product Development program in RCEAS sometimes develops projects of community relevance. For example, it partnered with Good Shepherd Rehabilitation Hospital in Allentown, Pa., to develop an electro-mechanical swing pack that enables wheelchair users to store books or groceries, and a wheelchair tie-down system with a quick release in case of accidents and/or vehicular fires. Although not explicitly mentioned in the College plan, service to the community is at the heart of graduate training in the College of Education (COE). Graduate curricula across all six COE major programs require practicum/internship courses for successful completion of the degree, and there is a particular focus on serving the special needs population.

2.II.A.1.iv Research

In the early 1990s, Lehigh eliminated its formal graduate school, thus eliminating the offices of both the Vice President of Research and Dean of the Graduate School, along with their associated staff. This school was an administrative unit that coordinated research centers and institutes, processed graduate applications, participated in recruiting, acquired scholarships and financial aid for graduate students, handled orientation and student life issues, and worked with the Development Office to secure research funding. It also served as the “gatekeeper” for all Ph.D. dissertations and M.S. theses, setting University standards for graduation.

Subsequently, these responsibilities, including the reporting of research centers and institutes, were reassigned to the deans of the four Colleges. In each College, new structures have evolved to oversee the graduate endeavor, and an Associate Dean and at least one staff member are responsible for administering graduate programs, admission, program review, and resource review.

Under President Farrington, the research responsibilities not assigned to the Colleges were placed under a new position – the Vice Provost of Research – located within Academic Affairs and reporting to the Provost. The rationale for this position was that a Vice President of Research, at a similar level to the Provost and above the deans, led to conflicts in setting priorities. The new Vice Provost, consistent with the University’s decentralized environment, complements the deans of the Colleges in planning and financing major research programs.

The mission for the office of the Vice Provost for Research is to facilitate research opportunities for faculty and students and to develop, expand, and enhance the research capability, culture, and environment at the University. This Vice Provost:

- Works with deans to develop new interdisciplinary research initiatives, providing oversight for externally funded research, allocating matching funds, and fostering and supporting all manner of the University’s extant research ventures.
• Collaborates with the faculty, deans, department chairs, and directors of research centers and institutes to create and support multi-investigator research partnerships, including multi-university and industrial teaming relationships.

• Serves as the University’s principal spokesperson with respect to research matters; as head of the Office of Sponsored Research, the Vice Provost is the primary representative between the University and federal and state funding agencies, as well as with industrial and corporate partners.

• Works with the University’s Advancement and Government/Community Affairs offices to identify, cultivate, and solicit potential funding sources in both public and private sectors, and provides leadership in the University’s quest to continuously elevate the research profile of the University.

• Oversees the University’s intellectual property policies, policies related to technology transfer, and the University’s Conflict of Interest policies relating to research.

The University has 17 centers and 11 institutes. These centers and institutes, which report to the deans, are interdisciplinary and provide research and academic opportunities primarily for graduate students and faculty. They complement the scholarly activities of academic departments, and represent scholarship and research based on the expertise and capabilities of a group of faculty members. The Graduate and Research Committee of the faculty endorses the creation of, and regularly review, all centers and institutes.

2.II.A.2 Seven Goals for Lehigh
The Seven Goals for Lehigh (Appendix 2.7) were originally crafted in 2000-2001, put forth by the President’s staff, and reviewed with the President’s Leadership Group. (The earlier University Council was eliminated under President Farrington’s administration.) The original presentation of the Seven Goals included underlying “planning assumptions” and a brief description of each goal. Each member of the Leadership Group then was asked to take the Goals back to his/her respective units and “flesh out” the specific areas relevant to that unit. From this work a longer version of each of the Goals was articulated and then promulgated to the campus. The underlying planning assumptions were not circulated explicitly as part of the Goals, but often were included in discussions, as they helped to clarify some of the boundary conditions for each Goal.

Starting in the summer of 2002, the Goals were used for context in budget discussions and as a structure for long-range planning for specific units.

2.II.A.3 Decentralized Planning Environment
Each of the four Colleges and each of the major units on the Lehigh campus has a mission statement specific to its role on campus. In fact, most subunits across campus have individualized mission statements and subunit plans, as well. (Appendices 2.8-2.14 for the Mission Statements of the four Colleges and Finance and Administration, as examples.) The routine re-examination of mission statements varies, with some statements redrafted more recently than others. However, the University’s decentralized planning environment has fostered significant planning across campus, particularly in each of the four Colleges and many other major areas of the University.

Below is a brief description of the recent and current processes for planning and the articulation of goals and objectives in some of the major University units. These processes are included here to give a sense of the activities taking place in various units across campus.
Described further below are Academic Affairs, Finance and Administration, Library & Technology Services, Student Affairs, and Athletics.

2.II.A.3.i  Academic Affairs

All four Colleges have engaged in individual planning processes in the past several years (Appendices 2.15-2.18), and the COE has just completed a new round of planning after the completion of its previous five-year plan. The plans for each College are integrated into the University mission and goals via a multi-step process. In each College, faculty from other Colleges either participated or observed the planning processes at various points. In July 2005, the deans and the Provost held a strategic planning retreat for the academic stem to determine how the College plans could be crafted to integrate and support University missions, goals, and objectives, and to complement one another, especially in various academic areas where they collaborate. In August 2005, the entire Lehigh leadership was brought into the planning process via the President’s Leadership Retreat at which each College plan was presented.

- CAS: The CAS developed its current five-year strategic plan, “Arts and Sciences Strategic Plan: 2006-2011 – A Keystone in the Transformation of the University,” over a nine-month period. The process began in the spring of 2005 with data gathering and an assessment of the previous five-year plan begun in 2000. Most of the goals outlined in the earlier plan either had been met or were in process of completion.

  A College-wide retreat on May 17, 2005, initiated the new round of planning with a discussion of strategic goals for the College and embryonic ideas about how to achieve those goals. As an outcome of the retreat, several faculty working groups were charged with developing particular goals and initiatives, and the Dean assembled the various ideas in a draft outline of the plan that was posted on the web for CAS faculty comment. It also was presented to various groups of faculty and administrators outside the College and at the Provost’s Mini-Retreat in July and the President’s Leadership Retreat in August 2005.

  Based on feedback received from these consultations, the Dean prepared a draft plan that was presented to a College faculty meeting and University leadership, and discussed in individual CAS departments with feedback channeled through department chairs. The draft plan also was discussed by the CAS Advisory Board and modified as comments and advice came in from those consulted. The plan was finalized and adopted in January 2006.

  Implementation of the CAS plan began in earnest in the 2006-07 academic year. In meeting the various goals identified, initiatives led by various committees and task forces include: a second retreat in spring of 2006 to discuss how to improve diversity in the College and the formation of a College Diversity task force composed of faculty, staff, and students; a proposal for South Mountain College, where a selected group of students and faculty will live together and share a common core curriculum, which has since passed both the CAS and University faculties and will be in operation in the fall of 2007; a third CAS retreat in the spring of 2007, focused on College research; and the development of new graduate programs in several CAS social science and humanities departments.

  Many of these initiatives are interdisciplinary, several involve cooperation with one or more of the other Colleges, and all, as they take shape, are subject to discussion by – and eventual approval or disapproval – of the CAS and University faculties. Initiatives
also are reviewed by University administrators who must approve and assist with implementation.

- **CBE:** The CBE Strategic Plan was developed as input into the University’s academic planning process and as a key component in the 2007 accreditation review by the Association for the Accreditation of Colleges and Schools of Business. The plan presents a vision that builds upon successes and identifies new areas of focus. It also identifies the resources required to achieve the CBE Strategic Vision – most importantly, the expansion of tenured and tenure-track faculty to 65 faculty members from the recent base of about 50. Finally, it emphasizes the importance of the resources and visibility that would be possible with the endowment of the College.

  Strategic planning for the CBE during the past five years proceeded in two distinct phases. During the period from 2001-2003, documents outlining the strategic goals for the College were developed by the Dean on an annual basis as part of his reporting to the Provost. While the CBE Executive Committee, which included the Senior Associate Dean, the two associate deans, and the department chairs, provided feedback to the Dean on these planning documents, they were nonetheless “top down” plans with a very short-term focus.

  Beginning in the fall of 2004, the CBE began to develop a longer term strategic plan built up from planning documents developed by departments, programs, and centers. This was the first comprehensive planning exercise with wide-scale faculty involvement since 1999.

  The CBE Strategic Plan for 2005-2010 was the result of a lengthy and inclusive process of deliberation that began in the fall of 2004 with the preparation of three key documents. During the spring of 2005, the Dean used these documents to establish the major themes and parameters for CBE units to use when developing planning reports. In addition, a CBE Strategic Planning Committee, representing major internal and external constituencies, was established to work with the Dean in this effort.

  During the summer of 2005, the CBE Strategic Planning Committee used the planning reports from all CBE departments, programs, centers, and institutes to evaluate all aspects of the College and examine the goals and aspirations for the next five years. Background documents and all drafts and notes resulting from the weekly committee meetings were made available to the faculty and staff on the CBE Information Blackboard website. Faculty and staff thus were able to examine the planning record and make comments on sections of the planning document as they were drafted.

  In addition, input was solicited from the CBE Board of Advisors, CBE faculty members, and students prior to the formal consideration and adoption of the plan at the faculty meeting of October 26, 2005.

- **COE:** The COE is configured organizationally into a Department of Education and Human Services (EHS) that encompasses six programs: Counseling Psychology; Educational Leadership; Teaching, Learning, and Technology; School Psychology, Special Education; and Transcultural, International Education. There are five additional units within COE: the Office of International Programs, the Center for Promoting Research to Practice, Centennial School, the Office of Special Programs, and the Office of Admissions. Each of the COE programs and units plays a vital role in achieving the College’s strategic plan.

  The COE faculty adopted its vision statement and goals in the fall of 2001. In the spring of 2002, each program and unit developed specific objectives for reaching these
goals. In turn, each then developed a plan that specified action steps for reaching the goals, identified individual responsibilities, and outlined a time frame. These plans act as templates for how each program and unit will move forward and detail the specific contributions each will make toward helping COE achieve its goals.

During the spring of 2003, the COE Dean’s Council (consisting of the COE Dean, EHS Chair, program coordinators, and COE unit heads) synthesized the individual plans into a single integrated strategic plan that is used to communicate the College’s intentions to the wider community. The Dean’s Council worked interactively and iteratively with the faculty to produce a consensus plan. In November 2006, the COE faculty held an all-day strategic planning retreat at which their strategic goals and mission were discussed in work groups. The work begun at the retreat was furthered in January 2007 by a series of committees that produced draft versions of the consolidated mission and strategic goals statements. These drafts were brought to the entire COE faculty, and following discussion and slight modification, were approved. Individual programs then worked to created program plans to address each of the newly approved strategic goals.

- RCEAS: The RCEAS began to draft a strategic plan early in 2005. It engaged various faculty groups (in RCEAS, CAS, and CBE) and the College Advisory Board via 10 brainstorming sessions and more than 30 one-on-one discussion sessions. These sessions occurred between February and June of 2005.

  The plan also was developed in close collaboration with the RCEAS Engineering Advisory Board, a group of successful Lehigh alumni and community members engaged to provide an external, industry-oriented perspective on the College strategy and related topics. The Advisory Board meets twice a year, and conducts two conference calls in between meetings. Additionally, three cross-college Research Advisory Councils, made up primarily of CAS and RCEAS faculty whose research interests generally overlap, were formed early in 2005. These councils were formed to foster strategic, organic growth of research collaboration across traditional disciplinary boundaries, thereby expanding the scope and impact of research, and creating a forum for dialogue among faculty concerning future research directions and infrastructure investment. These councils also provided recommendations for the College strategic planning process, and act as yet another way that faculty members provide input to the overall process.

  In October, the College hosted a full-day retreat for all its faculty members to learn about the strategic plan and provide feedback through focused “breakout sessions,” in which various sections of the plan were discussed in detail. In addition, a College-wide survey solicited input from faculty and staff. Based on input provided through the retreat and survey, the plan was revised and finalized in December 2005.

  During the 2005 retreat, the departments also were asked to begin the development of specific departmental plans that would link directly to the objectives and goals established in the College-level strategic plan. The Dean provided a template to help ensure that department plans were consistent and focused. Each department chair made a “state of the department” report during the retreat.

  Since that time, departments have been holding retreats and meetings among their faculty to build from the template and develop appropriate department-level strategic plans. The departments formalized departmental advisory boards in May and started cross-departmental discussions for preparation of their plans.

  Beginning with the October 2006 RCEAS faculty retreat, these meetings will serve as an annual opportunity to provide feedback on progress made toward the objectives of
the RCEAS strategic plan, and a forum for recalibration of College-level and department-level plans. The departments presented their strategic plans to the entire RCEAS faculty at this retreat, and a written document with these plans was completed in December 2006.

2.II.A.3.ii Finance and Administration
The Finance and Administration senior staff discussed, drafted, and finalized a mission statement in 2005-06. This statement focused on their responsibility to support the rest of the campus in all of the Seven Goals for Lehigh. The focus on infrastructure support is a longstanding part of the culture of Finance and Administration.

Finance and Administration units prepare unit plans annually as part of the University’s overall budget process, so that any important incremental funding needs can be identified and integrated within the larger context of the Seven Goals. These plans also inform the goals for individual members of each unit and are integrated into the annual performance review process. Given Finance and Administration’s primary responsibility for providing the infrastructure that makes the achievement of the Seven Goals possible, all unit and area working plans are framed within those parameters.

The unit plans are reviewed by the Vice President’s entire staff twice a year: in the spring/early summer in order to integrate Finance and Administration objectives with the appropriate Seven Goals for the coming year (or Goal #8—“provide infrastructure for the other 7”), and again in the winter to assess progress, adjust expectations accordingly, or update individual plans. Individual unit plans are reviewed as is appropriate for the cycle of that area’s work.

2.II.A.3.iii Library & Technology Services
In support of the Seven Goals, Library & Technology Services (LTS) adopted “A Strategic Plan for Library and Technology Services” in 2002 (Appendix 2.19) and is updating it for 2006-2010 (Appendix 2.20). In both processes, there was no campus-wide review or approval process; however, a planning committee included representatives from each College and other major areas of the University, such as Student Affairs.

The goals and objectives of these plans flow from the LTS Vision Statement, intended to be a philosophical statement of the mission of LTS. The Vision Statement was adopted as part of the 2002 planning process and reaffirmed in 2006. The plans are used to guide future LTS program development and projects. Given the nature of Lehigh’s selected topics approach to its MSCHE self-study, a full description of the LTS planning process can be found in the selected topics portion of this report.

2.II.A.3.iv Student Affairs
The fundamental objective in Student Affairs is to support and enhance the University’s educational mission. Student Affairs seeks to create and sustain a healthy, safe living and learning environment that promotes learning; supports a residential community in which students are involved and have a sense of belonging; provides support for students in need; encourages students to become leaders; offers a wide range of social options; and fosters respect for the dignity and worth of all persons. In short, Student Affairs seeks to challenge and support University students to become responsible, engaged citizens of the campus community.

Student Affairs’ mission (Appendix 2.21 for the Student Affairs Mission Statement) is grounded in the Seven Goals, especially Goal #1:
“The people of Lehigh should work together to achieve a strong sense of community among Lehigh’s students, staff, faculty and alumni. The goal should be a campus and surrounding community in which living and learning are not constrained by traditional boundaries but integrate formal studies with residential life, student organizations, activities and athletics. The Lehigh community should be inclusive and both welcoming and supportive of those of differing races, cultures and backgrounds.”

A planning group comprised of the senior leaders in each of the Student Affairs departments meets in June and January of each academic year to review and revise the Student Affairs plan (Appendices 2.22-2.24 for the Student Affairs Strategic Plan, 2005-06, Dean of Students 2006-07 Strategic Plan, and Dean of Students Core Values Statement). This group discusses current issues, anticipated needs and opportunities, and affirms or amends the core strategic goals. In addition, the strategic plans of the Colleges also are reviewed to identify opportunities to collaborate and support the strategic initiatives in the academic areas. Each Student Affairs department then identifies intended learning outcomes and actions steps in support of the goals. Results are compiled at the end of each semester and inform subsequent planning discussions.

2.II.A.3.v Athletics
The Athletics Department’s Mission Statement – to advance learning, develop leadership skills, and foster personal growth through comprehensive athletics programming – was first drafted in 1998 and reaffirmed for 2006-07 (Appendices 2.25-2.27 for the full mission statement, the department’s Values document, and its Vision document).

In 2005, the Athletics Department developed a strategic plan that included a detailed assessment of the strengths and challenges facing athletics at Lehigh, in general and in each sport specifically (Appendix 2.28 for “Strategic, Financial and Outcomes Plan for Lehigh Athletics”). This plan addressed short and longer term goals, financial opportunities and constraints, and possible funding sources for advancing Athletics at Lehigh. This plan was updated and reaffirmed in 2007.

Each year, the Dean of Athletics solicits written unit plans from each program director. The expectation is that these plans will include input from the staff in each unit. The Dean of Athletics adjusts and incorporates each program director’s plans into divisional goals, and these goals are communicated annually with all staff through the annual performance appraisal process. The Dean of Athletics works continually with Admissions/Financial Aid on recruiting students, and with Student Affairs on academic support programs for student athletes. The Faculty Athletics Council meets regularly to discuss issues relating to student athletes’ academic course work.

2.II.A.4 Summary and Recommendations
Excellent progress related to the University’s mission, goals, and objectives has been made all across campus. CBE, COE and RCEAS are all accredited by the appropriate accrediting bodies, and specific departments and programs across all four Colleges have received accreditation. Driven by unit-specific missions and goals, all University units can show progress toward key aspirations. Many units also have demonstrable processes for revisiting their missions and goals, and in recent years most are tied to The Seven Goals for Lehigh. These institutional strengths and accomplishments could be further enhanced by a campus-
wide process of strategic planning that develops University-wide strategic goals linked explicitly to an overarching University mission. In order to build a successful strategic planning process at Lehigh, and to build a more effective culture of campus-wide communication regarding the mission and goals, we identify the following recommendations:

1. The University’s Mission Statement has not been reviewed regularly in order to ensure currency with the University’s aspirations, and there is no process in place for doing such a review. Moreover, the 1992 Mission Statement, while perhaps appropriate at the time, does not serve as the kind of focused vision for driving University planning and resource allocation that the current accreditation climate expects and requires.

   **Recommendation:** A University-wide review of the Mission Statement that engages the entire Lehigh community, with the aim of clarifying Lehigh’s current reality and future aspirations.

2. In the University’s decentralized planning environment, there is no structural mechanism or routine process for integrating plans programmatically across Colleges – or among Colleges and the various support units – that would provide the necessary infrastructure for achieving institutional goals. The absence of an overarching planning process can create inadvertent inequities, inconsistencies, and redundancies within units and across units.

   **Recommendation:** An overarching institutional planning process that insures ongoing integration of unit plans, and that includes stakeholders from the relevant constituencies on campus.

3. Currently, the University does not have an integrated process for assessing its progress toward institutional goals.

   **Recommendation:** Integrated planning that includes ongoing assessment measures for gauging progress toward goals.

   **Recommendation:** Assessment measures built into the planning process in collaboration with faculty and staff stakeholders so they are widely understood.

   **Recommendation:** Data generated by assessment processes should be made available so that their relevance to resource allocation decisions is widely understood.
2.II.B Standards 2 & 3: Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal, and Institutional Resources

2.II.B.1 Decentralized Planning Environment
As described in Standard 1, the University has decentralized planning processes. To implement components of the different plans, resources are found most frequently by reallocating existing resources within each unit; however, the University’s budget process, faculty and staff allocation processes, and space planning process also include an opportunity for high-priority requests to be submitted for additional institutional support. To show the ways in which the necessary resources are provided, the following sections describe the University-wide resource allocation processes, as well as the processes for the Colleges and other key departments.

Of course, a critical component of any such analysis examines whether the resources available today, and projected into the future, will be adequate for the institution’s needs. The final section of this chapter describes the assessment methods that are used in each of these resource areas, and includes information on other sources of support for institutional, department, and College activities.

2.II.B.2 Resource Allocation Processes

2.II.B.2.i Budget Processes – The University
The primary objective of the University budget process is to optimize the allocation of financial resources to achieve the University’s mission. During the budget process, a University budget model is developed that contains tentative budget parameters based on key strategic budget drivers (e.g., enrollment management; Section 2.II.F, Standard 7), institutional priorities, and new initiatives (e.g., 2020 initiatives; see below), while also taking into account the five-year budget projections.

Early in the budget process, the President requests that each of her direct reports submit requests for additional institutional resources. These requests are made in the context of individual unit plans and goals. These requests come out of different planning processes within each area.

In collaboration with the Provost, the Vice President for Finance and Administration and Budget Director solicit additional information for budget construction, including market salary information for staff from Human Resources, market salary information for faculty from Institutional Research, enrollment information from the Registrar, financial aid information and first-year class parameters from the Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid, and other key departments. Information also is solicited from the appropriate faculty committees, such as the Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee (FFPOC) and Faculty Compensation Committee (FCC), as appropriate. Performance of major resource areas such as Advancement (fund raising) is continuously reviewed for major shifts that affect multi-year budgeting.

The University’s budget process reinforces the level of control that has been delegated to the academic and administrative units, thereby empowering the leadership of these areas – vice presidents, deans, department heads – to take principal responsibility for choices and to integrate strategic plans with financial management. Throughout the academic year, the Budget Office monitors budget performance, with an assumption that each unit will end the
year with a balanced budget. In addition, a more detailed assessment of various major University activities (graduate tuition, summer sessions, etc.) is performed through University initiatives/incentive programs, such as the Revenue Streams Program (Section 2.11.B.3.vi, Research Resource Assessment). Periodic reports identifying institutional resources and budget variances are communicated to the appropriate University officers and the Finance Committee of the Board.

2.11.B.2.ii Budget Processes – The Colleges

Given the decentralized process described above, each of the Colleges uses its plan to establish priorities by which College and, if available, University resources are allocated. Available resources for each College include the annual operating budget, gift and endowment funds, funds from external grants, research incentive funds, and income returned to the College from various “revenue streams” (i.e., summer sessions and special off-campus or study abroad opportunities, graduate tuition, indirect cost recovery, and distance education income). Below is a brief description of the budget construction and monitoring process for each College.

- **CAS**: The CAS’s financial planning and budgeting are done on an annual basis but in the context of the five-year hiring plan and long-term development goals. The Dean and Director of Administration meet weekly to review expenditures and commitments within the framework of the annual financial plan, which includes current account balances, anticipated revenues, endowment earnings, expenditures, anticipated retirements, new hires, projected renovations, projected startup packages, revenue returns to the departments, cost share commitments, program support, student support, support for faculty development, and support for College-wide initiatives.

  Expenditures are tracked on an annual basis in the following categories: undergraduate student support, graduate student support, new faculty costs, faculty development, staff development, faculty research support, renovations, infrastructure development, department operations, interdisciplinary program operations, College operations, and communication and marketing. Resource allocation is tied to assessment of needs and review of program performance across a range of metrics and assessed against the strategic plan for the College. Resource allocation is reviewed and adjusted on an annual basis within the context of the College’s five-year plan.

- **CBE**: Using the CBE Strategic Plan for 2005-2010, the Dean in the spring of 2005 established the major themes and parameters for the development of planning reports by each CBE unit. These planning reports, and the resulting department hiring plans, are then incorporated into a five-year financial projection for the College, which then is reviewed and adjusted periodically throughout the year. The plan includes costs of new faculty salaries and start-up/summer support; expenditures related to current faculty and staff salaries, adjunct instructors, and teaching and graduate assistants; and undergraduate and graduate operations as they relate to the University unrestricted budget.

  The Dean and the Business Manager also regularly review expenditures related to the College’s restricted funds from endowment income for program support in areas such as faculty research, curriculum initiatives, program development, and facility improvement. In addition, the resource needs that were identified in the strategic plan were the basis for a major revision in the summer of 2006 of the “Case for the CBE,” which is used by advancement officers in their fundraising efforts.

- **COE**: Separate operating budgets are developed for and by each COE unit – the Department of Education and Human Services, Centennial School, Center for
Promoting Research to Practice, and the Office of International Programs. While efforts are made to operate these units somewhat independently, there is a necessary amount of overlap, given the integrated structure and small size of the College. Requests for any new funds are submitted to the Dean by each unit at the start of each annual budget process, while reallocation of existing funds is managed within each unit. This budget process culminates in a submission to the Provost for final submittal through the institutional budget process (as described above). Throughout the year, the business manager for the College works with the Dean to review ongoing expenditures against budget, and make whatever adjustments are necessary.

- **RCEAS:** The RCEAS’s financial planning and budgeting is done through rolling five-year hiring and spending plans. The Dean, Executive Assistant to the Dean, and Senior Budget Analyst work together throughout the year to keep track of the current spending and hiring plans and update them with changes for the current and subsequent years. Before the start of each fiscal year, the plan for the next year is finalized for presentation to the Provost. The plans include an overall summary of the actual and projected revenues and expenditures (with appropriate levels of detail), broken down into categories such as undergraduate activities, graduate/research activities, and new faculty costs, as well as any permanent faculty salary funding available.

  In conjunction with the College’s initiatives and the hiring and spending plans, the Dean provides support to the departments, centers, and institutes, as well. The Dean, in consultation with the Chairs, sets budget allocations formulas as needed. During the October 2006 RCEAS Faculty Retreat, the Dean reported to the faculty on the progress made toward the strategic goals set in 2005. This report is expected to occur annual at the retreat.

**2.II.B.2.iii Faculty Allocation and Compensation Process**

While the allocation of financial resources is obviously a crucial part of the University’s overall planning process, there are other major “resources” that need to be effectively distributed to support the University’s mission. Key among these are the human resources, both faculty and staff, who carry out the University’s mission on a day-to-day basis. The next two sections describe the processes in place for the allocation of faculty and staff resources across the University, and the way that the compensation program is managed for each group.

Like the financial planning process, the University’s overall staffing strategy for faculty is decentralized. While the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs has overall responsibility for supervising the University’s academic programs, including strategic planning and faculty hiring, the Dean of each College has responsibility for developing the academic plan for his/her College. These plans are developed in consultation with the College faculty and/or department chairs, and include plans for faculty hiring. The Dean of each College discusses the hiring plan with the Provost, who ultimately must approve a hiring plan for the Colleges on an annual basis. This approval takes into consideration the overall University academic needs and budgetary considerations.

In each College, the Dean – with the Provost’s endorsement – approves the creation of all new faculty, Professor of Practice, and adjunct positions, and requests to fill vacant positions. Deans also are responsible for the allocation of graduate Teaching Assistants in their colleges. Criteria for the allocation of TAs vary across colleges. When a faculty search is complete and the top candidate identified, the Dean makes the recommendation to the
Provost, who is responsible for approving the applicant pool with respect to the University’s Affirmative Action Plan (Appendix 2.29), the identified finalist, proposed salary level, and funding source of salary.

The deans conduct the annual salary reviews of faculty in collaboration with department chairs and send recommendations to the Provost for approval. Human Resources designs, creates, recommends and implements benefits policies for faculty, as well as for exempt and nonexempt staff.

2.II.B.2.iv Staff Allocation and Compensation Process

The University’s staffing allocation process is decentralized for classified exempt and nonexempt staff. Each vice president, dean or other direct report to the President is responsible for managing staffing levels for departments under his/her direction. He/she must approve the creation and classification of all new positions, as well as requests to fill vacant positions. He/she also is responsible for approving candidates, proposed salaries, funding sources of salary, and applicant pools with respect to the University’s Affirmative Action Plan. In addition, all exempt hiring is managed within individual departments, with guidance from Human Resources. The hiring of non-exempt staff is coordinated within Human Resources, which then works closely with the hiring department throughout the process.

Human Resources is responsible for the development, maintenance, and revision of policies related to classified exempt and nonexempt staff compensation, and works with employment coordinators in each unit on all aspects of the employment process (Appendices 2.30-2.31 for the LASER Project and Employment Coordinators Handbook). Human Resources staff manages the nonexempt employment processes, and is available to advise and assist with the employment process throughout the University.

Staff members who work in areas with particular funding considerations (such as those who are paid through research funds), and those who work for outsourced providers (such as in custodial services, grounds keeping, dining services, the bookstore, and contractors for large maintenance jobs) are managed in a decentralized process through the relevant on-campus operation. Although for these more decentralized areas, consistent policies are applied whenever appropriate. For example, the contracts with these vendors stipulate adherence to EEO/AA policies.

The research scientists and engineers, who are primarily supported by external funds secured either solely by one individual faculty member or through collaboration with the research personnel in a center/institution and/or academic department, are hired in order to supplement the specialized research needs of the University faculty and/or the department, in order to sustain a vibrant research program. Hiring decisions for research scientist and engineer positions are made in one of two ways: (1) an individual faculty member has a funded research program that requires additional expertise, or (2) research centers, institutes, or academic departments (with approval from the appropriate college dean) will ascertain that their organization needs a specific expertise. Individuals who have been certified as a PE (Professional Engineer) are appointed with the title of Research Engineer; all other individuals are appointed as a Research Scientist. There are six position levels for long-term appointments of research scientists and engineers, as well as four position levels for short-term appointments.

Allocations of merit pool resources for staff, including research scientists and engineers, are determined through the budget process. Market equity issues are addressed separately, with the final implementation of the most recent staff compensation and market
competitiveness study completed in FY07. To determine market competitiveness, faculty and staff salaries are reviewed on a regularly scheduled basis. These competitiveness reviews use CUPA data by discipline for the faculty comparison, and market-comparison data from a variety of sources, by job family, for the staff comparison.

The College Deans have the principal responsibility for determining the distribution of raises in the academic areas. This distribution process involves the department chairs and is subject to the overall approval of the Provost. In non-academic areas, this responsibility is assigned to the vice presidents.

2.II.B.2.v Space Planning/Allocation Process

The primary purpose of the Facilities Services and Campus Planning office is to create and sustain physical environments that support Lehigh’s mission. This is accomplished through academic planning support, efficient use of physical and financial resources, attention to long-term maintenance and operational costs (including management of any deferred maintenance challenges), appropriate consideration for quality of space and materials (particularly within the context of historic architectural preservation when appropriate), and adherence to established codes, standards, and guidelines. To get consistent and balanced results across the University, these activities must be undertaken in a more centralized way than is customary for other University planning processes, and a number of steps have been taken over the past years to make the space planning process an integrated one.

The University’s most recent master plan for facilities development – the “Sasaki plan” – was begun in 1999 and served to identify potential new building sites on all three campuses for “hypothetical” new initiatives, develop concepts for creating more inviting outdoor spaces and blurring the lines between the University and the adjacent community, and suggest possible properties for acquisition and/or deaccession. (Appendix 2.32).

To respond to the on-going academic planning process, and to assist in prioritizing projects for the capital campaign, a Space and Capital Needs Committee was formed in January 2002. The Committee’s charge is:

- Recommend the use and reuse of existing facilities including academic, administrative, athletics, student life, and grounds.
- Focus the campus on renovating existing high-quality space and reallocating space to high producing areas.
- Identify high-impact project priorities for core academic programs and quality of student life, including the identification of possible funding sources.

The Space Committee is comprised of the several direct reports to the President and is supported by the Facilities planning leadership. It meets regularly throughout the year, reviewing space needs, which have been gathered from submitted requests, meetings with academic and administrative leadership across campus, and other sources. The needs are compiled in a working document (Appendix 2.33 for a sample) that outlines the known needs, the possible solutions (temporary and permanent), related space reallocations, preliminary cost figures, possible funding sources, and a projected timeline for completion. The document also is reviewed regularly by the President and the Physical Planning & Plant Committee of the Board of Trustees, and has been presented to the Council of Deans, the Provost’s Council, and direct reports to the President, as appropriate. This space planning process creates a rationale for the more institution-wide or cross-disciplinary projects that are considered during the annual budget process, and was a major factor in the successful
identification of the space and capital needed to support the 2020 academic initiative (See below), for example.

The decentralized planning method is used at the department or College level, and department heads are encouraged to solve their space issues through reallocation of existing space assigned to them, with assistance from the Facilities office. Guidelines for assigning space were developed in the late 1980s when the University acquired a significant amount of additional space on the Mountaintop campus, and are continually tested and refined (Appendix 2.34). Any request for additional space automatically invokes a space audit by Facilities to ensure that the guidelines have been followed wherever practical (see Space Assessment below). If no further reallocation is possible, the request is forwarded to the Space Committee with suggested solutions.

The Facilities Services office deals with the condition of spaces on campus in two ways. It uses annual maintenance budgets for utilities and the repair and operation of each facility, including instructional spaces, residences, athletics fields, roadways and parking lots; and it uses separate plant preservation allocations for larger, more life-cycle-type renewals and replacements. The office compiles and continuously updates known needs and plugs them into a two-to-three-year planning horizon, which is then reviewed annually by the Vice President for Finance and Administration, the Budget Office, and the Physical Planning & Plant Committee of the Board of Trustees on an annual basis. Funding for these needs comes through the annual operating budget process, and also can be supported through year-end surplus funds, when available.

2.II.B.3 Resource Assessment

The approach to assessing the adequacy of University resources varies, both by type of resource and across the campus. The decentralized nature of the planning environment results in such assessments being made effectively within a unit, but makes it more difficult to make comparisons across the campus and reallocate resources from one area to another. A general description of each unit’s approach and some of the pressures experienced during this process are described below.

2.II.B.3.i Budget Assessment

The University has not used a zero-based budget model for several years, so the annual budget process by itself is an opportunity to review whether areas are receiving adequate funding to achieve their core goals. Incremental non-salary support is allocated at the vice-presidential level, so that individual areas do not receive “automatic” expense budget increases; rather, they need to propose specific additional projects, programs, or activities which will advance the unit’s or University’s strategic objectives.

Salary increases are allocated 100% by merit for both faculty and staff, with overall pool amounts assigned to the vice president level, which are then further distributed to deans, associate vice presidents, etc. A portion of the overall pool is reserved at the vice president level for recognition of special merit. Each vice president is responsible for increases within his/her area, and the increases for the President and her direct reports are reviewed with the Compensation Subcommittee of the Board of Trustees. To ensure compliance with intermediate sanctions best practices, an outside consultant works directly with the Compensation Subcommittee to provide comparable data from a selected group of peer institutions.
2.II.B.3.ii Faculty Allocation Assessment
Assessment of faculty staffing levels is ongoing, with decisions based on faculty workload by credit hours for undergraduate and graduate instruction, balance of teaching with research and service, and creation/elimination of programs. Benchmarking of faculty staffing levels is conducted for comparison with departments at peer institutions and for accreditation reviews by such organizations as ABET and American Association of Colleges and Schools of Business (AACSB).

2.II.B.3.iii Staffing Assessment
As noted above, there is no University-wide measure of the appropriateness of staffing levels; rather, these analyses are performed at the unit/department/College level. The most recent such assessment was performed by the RCEAS, using a benchmark group of the top 25 engineering schools as ranked by *U.S. News & World Report*, and comparing enrollment levels, graduation rates, and research expenditures in order to ensure that staff support is distributed equitably across the College.

2.II.B.3.iv Space Assessment
As mentioned above, the appropriateness of space on campus is reviewed automatically whenever a request is made for additional or changed space. In addition, special projects or needs – such as the hiring of new faculty as the result of the 2020 initiative (see below), or the recent Greek Life Task Force work relating to the fraternities and sororities – result in a full assessment of the relevant spaces, both for adequacy and condition. In the future, it would be ideal to have a regular schedule for space assessment, so that this ad hoc approach could be replaced with a more systematic review.

2.II.B.3.v Graduate Student Resource Assessment
One of the areas to which the University has given an increased focus in recent years is the “outside-of-class” experience of graduate students. Lehigh’s traditionally strong focus on the undergraduate academic and student life programs has resulted in a sense of “second class citizenship” for graduate students. This perception is particularly problematic for the graduate students who are full-time. In 2002, a new position, Director of Graduate Life, was created within the Student Affairs area. The assignment for this position was to focus on any areas of concern for graduate students – level of stipends and tuition remissions, housing concerns, health insurance access, activities for graduate students outside of their academic departments, transportation issues, hours of library and dining facilities in summer and holiday seasons, etc. An assessment of the resource issues for these students is discussed below:

- **Support for International Graduate Students:** This year, the University will provide, through Residential Services, some limited temporary housing for newly arrived international graduate students. In addition, a new program will be introduced through which faculty, staff, and graduate students will host new students upon their arrival in August, as they find permanent housing. Student Affairs has provided some financial support for this program. For example, graduate student hosts can get expenses reimbursed up to a certain amount.

- **Graduate Student Space:** Although there are pockets of space designated for graduate students around campus (the Catacombs and the Graduate Student Lounge on the 2nd floor of Linderman Library), the Graduate Student Senate and Graduate Life Office will begin looking into the possibility of creating a Graduate Student Center proper.
Technology Fee: The technology fee charged to all full-time undergraduate and graduate students has been a point of concern for graduate students, since it is not currently included within “tuition,” and therefore is not covered by graduate student tuition packages. The Provost has decided that full-time graduate students on support packages will need to pay only 50% of the fee for the 2007-08 school year, and it is possible that this fee will be rolled into tuition and, therefore, into support packages in the future.

In the coming year, the Enrollment Management group will be working with our external consultants on a substantial benchmarking and best practice review of stipends and other topics related to the graduate student experience. In addition, the possibility of re-centralizing the graduate application processing activities is being explored.

2.II.B.3.vi Research Resources Assessment
Lehigh is a research-intensive institution, so support for research is a critical component of the University’s ability to accomplish its mission. Lehigh uses a Revenue Streams program for research and graduate and distance learning programs, in which the individual Colleges have fiscal responsibility for, and individually recruit and matriculate, graduate students. This program, which was created for each College, provides the financial resources necessary to support graduate programs and research.

- CAS: The CAS allocates and funds teaching assistants, graduate assistants and graduate fellowships. In addition, the Dean provides modest pools of funds to support graduate students for conference travel, for travel necessary to support research, and for the recruitment of promising applicants (department funds are used to match College funding). Similarly, in a cost-sharing arrangement with departments, the College provides funds for faculty travel to present conference papers. Junior faculty members have access to an additional funding pool to support their research programs. They also are encouraged to apply to the Provost to fund international travel to conferences and to the Faculty Research Grant program for small grants that support research projects.

- CBE: The CBE also allocates resources to support faculty research. The College, in conjunction with the Martindale Center, supports the CBE Research Committee’s faculty grant program, pays for a variety of major databases containing financial and other data on firms, and provides limited support to departments or centers that are funding a research assistant. The College does not formally assess the productivity of these resource allocations; however, grant recipients are required to give seminars to report on the outcomes of their research. Also, because research assistant positions are funded primarily at the department level, departments track productivity closely. These research assistants are most likely to be allocated to recently hired, research-active faculty members.

- COE: Research resources within the COE include, but are not limited to, equipment, space, graduate assistants, research assistants, release time for faculty, travel support, and the distribution of ICR funds as part of the Revenue Streams program. As a general rule, these resources are appropriated through the Office of the Dean (i.e., determinations are made by the Dean regarding the resources to be made available) and allocated through the Office of the Chair (i.e., determinations are made by the Chair regarding where the resources should go). These processes are guided by the policies outlined in Departmental Policies and Procedures (Appendix 2.35).

Typically, whenever a new department chair takes office, these policies are reviewed. Minor adjustments perceived as necessary to meet current needs are made in
collaboration with the associate chairs, while proposals for major changes are brought before the full departmental faculty. Such proposals always can be – and occasionally are – brought forward by the faculty members themselves on an as-needed basis. Beyond this, no systematic review of policy or procedure is in place.

- RCEAS: In the RCEAS, the Revenue Streams program provides the financial resources necessary to grow the graduate programs. This program provides funds for purposes such as teaching assistants, fellowships, research assistant supplements, and reinvestment into hiring and replacement of faculty – and the attendant upgrades to the physical infrastructure of the College. Annually, each research center/institute provides a report, which the Dean reviews to assess the performance and the on-going viability of each entity. Through this assessment, the Dean and his Research Advisory Council can establish strategic goals and objectives for future years. In addition, the Dean provides an assessment of the various research and education programs through a process of “benchmarking,” which involves the use of data from both internal and external sources, such as the Office of Institutional Research and the American Society of Engineering Education.

In addition to the hiring of new faculty through the support of the 2020 initiative (see below) and the usual faculty turnover in the College, a key focus in recent years has been the development of new laboratories for both undergraduate and graduate research. These include laboratories for the newly formed undergraduate Bioengineering program, where approximately 50% of the undergraduates are women, and the development of graduate research facilities, such as the construction of the new Center for Optical Technologies and the renovation of the Sherman Fairchild Center for Nanoscience and Engineering.

Finally, in support of the institution-wide research endeavor, the University Research Council was formed in 2004. It is comprised of research center and institute directors, representatives from each of the University’s four Colleges, and one representative from the Graduate and Research Committee. This Council addresses issues and challenges relevant to enhancing the overall effectiveness of the research centers and institutes.

2.II.B.4 Sources of Resources
When considering the adequacy of current resources, the availability of additional resources clearly is an immediate concern. Although the University’s revenue sources are relatively well distributed – 50% comes from tuition and fees and 50% comes from endowment earnings, contract and grant support for research, auxiliary enterprise revenues and annual giving – each of these sources needs to be attended to carefully. In addition, the identification of “one-time” funds for particular priorities (the 2020 initiative; see below), and the reallocation of current resources from a lower priority area to a higher priority, also are important components of the resource planning process. Each of these is described further here (Appendices 2.36-2.37 for Financial Statements for FY05-06 and Budget Book for FY 07-08).

2.II.B.4.i Shine Forever Campaign
Compared to many of its peer institutions, the University is “under-endowed,” and thus the major focus of the current comprehensive Shine Forever Campaign is on raising the endowment (Appendices 2.38-2.39 for the Shine Forever Campaign Case Statement and 12/31/06 Report on Campaign Progress). The $500 million campaign has a goal of $125
million for annual support, $75 million for major facilities projects, and $300 million for endowment of financial aid, professorships, and academic programs. Although the Presidential transition year created a slight dip in the upward trajectory of fundraising success, the campaign is more than halfway complete and on track.

2.II.B.4.ii 2020 Initiative
The “2020 Initiative” is another resource that the University has had available for support of key academic initiatives in recent years. This initiative, put in place in 2000 by then President Greg Farrington, functioned as an “academic venture capital fund,” providing non-recurring support for key investments. If successful, these investments were then moved onto permanent funding, either through reallocation of existing resources or creation of new resources (e.g., by increasing graduate tuition income or fundraising).

The $75 million in total funding for 2020 came from the reassignment of existing operating funds ($5 million per year over 7 years, for a total of $35 million); decapitalization of quasi-endowment ($30 million to be drawn down as needed); and reallocation of existing resources ($10 million). Initiatives such as the Optics Center, or the Bioengineering program, started with “seed” funding from 2020, and have since received major gifts from donors, support from federal and state research funding, and reallocation of departmental resources (as faculty members have retired).

2.II.B.4.iii Annual Reallocations
Since the annual budget process does not provide any automatic increases in non-salary support, reallocating resources into higher priority areas is a constant practice throughout the University. In addition, as mentioned above, initiatives such as 2020 have provided departments and Colleges the opportunity to “try out” new initiatives, and if deemed successful, to then reallocate current resources toward these new endeavors. As deans have reassigned faculty positions, and/or directed their Revenue Streams support into new areas, the total support from College and departmental funds put toward 2020 initiatives of approximately $75 million outpaced the $45 million of institutional funds that have been expended to date.

2.II.B.5 Summary and Recommendations
The decentralized approach that Lehigh uses in so much of its institutional activities provides great opportunities for innovation at the local level, and puts much of the resource allocation decision-making in the hands of units and departments, which are best able to identify high priority needs and then meet them. The flexibility that this approach offers has resulted in a great deal of innovation, and the accomplishments of the various units are evidence of the strength of current practices.

The challenge to this approach arises when there are needs that outpace the ability of an individual unit to reallocate within current resources. The University recognizes that the opportunity to create structures for making cross-unit choices, enabling the redirection of institutional resources to new priorities, can further strengthen the effectiveness of the current approach. The University identifies the need for creating structures for tying University-wide priorities to resource allocation, integrating these priorities more explicitly to fundraising processes, and communicating these processes more effectively on campus, below.

1. The University’s decentralized planning context makes institution-wide resource allocation decisions difficult to justify. The current incremental approach to the
annual budget process works well within this setting, but the absence of a widely supported University mission and integrated planning process makes it difficult to have campus-wide engagement in the redirection of budgetary resources into new areas. As a result, strategic redirection is infrequent, as well as insufficiently supported across campus. Similarly, the space planning process and faculty and staff staffing processes are driven by stem or unit priorities, and therefore, are not easily integrated across the institution.

Recommendation: A consistent and transparent approach to resource allocation that is explicitly tied to the integrated planning process recommended above, in order to insure the most effective use of limited University resources.

2. In addition to the careful stewardship and allocation of existing resources, the University must depend on developing new sources of revenues through fundraising. The lack of an integrated process for setting University priorities makes it difficult to develop coherent fundraising strategies that match potential donors with University priorities.

Recommendation: A consistent and transparent approach to tying fundraising strategies to University priorities.

3. There is limited engagement of the University community in the budget, staffing, and space planning processes. Currently, these processes include few routine communication mechanisms, resulting in poor understanding across the broader campus community. Faculty, staff, and students often do not feel as though they know how priorities are chosen or where resources are directed. Departmental/unit decisions are relatively transparent, but the larger institutional context is not well understood.

Recommendation: A regular and timely communication strategy about the planning process and the results of the process and allocation of resources.

2.II.C   Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

2.II.C.1   Introduction
The core objective of Lehigh University is superb teaching and research. A university succeeds in its mission to the extent to which it can take full advantage of the free interchange of knowledge and ideas inherent in a community of scholars. This requires collegiality and a strong sense of joint purpose and responsibility among all the members of the community. It also depends on the free flow of information and ideas, and the implementation of a governance system that empowers individuals to voice their concerns, analyses, and recommendations, and to participate meaningfully in decisions that affect the teaching and research of the university.

The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence between the Board of Trustees, administration, faculty, staff, and students. The governance structure must reflect this interdependence.
Although each component has responsibility and authority over different aspects of institutional life and function, the interests of all components are related and entwined.

At Lehigh, the Board of Trustees is the final institutional authority with all the powers provided to Trustees by law, with a special responsibility to insure the long-term health and viability of the institution. The Board has the authority to do all things deemed necessary and expedient in the governance, management, and control of the business and affairs of the University, including the establishment of the University’s general, educational, and financial policies. The Board delegates responsibility for the daily administrative and educational functions of the University as described below.

1. The President is the chief executive officer of the University and the official advisor to and executive agent of the Board of Trustees and its Executive Committee. The President has general superintendence over all institutional affairs, insuring that the Board remains fully informed.

2. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs is the chief academic officer of the University. The Provost supervises the academic programs of the University and directs the deans, the faculty, and other academic personnel. In addition, the Provost supervises non-curricular areas of the University such as Student Life, Library & Technology Services, and Admissions/Financial Aid.

3. The deans are responsible for the curricular, research, and financial leadership of their respective Colleges.

4. The Faculty, together with the University administration, is responsible for formulating policies and procedures that promote the academic and research missions of the University. In particular, these responsibilities apply to policies that pertain to the admission, registration, curriculum, instruction, and discipline of students; the appointment, promotion, tenure and dismissal of faculty; the assurance of academic freedom; and the furtherance of scholarship and research.

2.II.C.2 Board Governance

The Board of Trustees is comprised of four categories of active trustees: Corporate Trustees, Appointed Trustees, Alumni Trustees, and an Ex-officio Trustee – the President of the University.

There are 10 Corporate Trustees, whose successors are elected by the Corporate Trustees then in office whenever vacancies occur by resignation, death, or otherwise in accordance with charter provisions. Corporate Trustees hold office for a term of five years and may serve for two successive terms. After vacating the Office of Corporate Trustee for a period of at least one year, a former Corporate Trustee may be re-elected to such office.

There are 25 Appointed Trustees who are elected for terms of three years, each upon recommendation of the corporate trustees. Appointed Trustees may serve two three-year terms.

There are up to six Alumni Trustees elected by the members of the University’s Alumni Association as prescribed by its by-laws. The Alumni Trustees are elected for terms of three years with two of them graduating not less than two years and not more than 15 years prior to their election.

The Board of Trustees also includes Trustee Emeriti and Honorary Trustees. Upon the resignation or retirement of a Trustee, the Trustee may be given emeritus status and retain such distinction for life.

The Board of Trustees meets three times a year to review the general direction of the University and act upon significant matters affecting it. There are 10 standing committees of
the Board responsible for specific administrative functions: Academic Affairs, Audit, Cultural Affairs, Development, Executive, Finance, Nominating, Physical Planning and Plant, Public Affairs, and Student Affairs Committees. The Board of Trustees elects its officers according to the By-laws of the University.

The University has a conflict of interest policy (Appendix 2.40) designed to identify and review conflicts of interest, including apparent conflicts of interest, between the University, its Board of Trustees, its Officers, its faculty, its staff, or any member of such person’s immediate family. If a conflict of interest exists, the Policy requires that “Trustees shall not vote or participate in the deliberation of the matter, use their personal influence, directly or indirectly in the matter, or be counted in determining the existence of a quorum for the purposes of any action of the Board of Trustees.”

The Policy states that Officers of the University “shall not use their personal influence, directly or indirectly in the matter.” It also sets forth that faculty and staff members of the University shall “not participate in the decision making and related deliberations on the respective matter or use their personal influence, directly or indirectly in the matter. In addition, they will not be involved in the subsequent approval/authorization for payment of such supplies, goods or services.”

Each year the Secretary of the Board and/or the Director of Internal Audit of the University forwards the Policy to all members of the Board of Trustees, all Officers of the University and all members of the University’s faculty and exempt staff, and requires disclosure of any potential or real conflicts of interest. Responses are reviewed and resolved in accordance with the terms of the Policy.

In 2006, the Board of Trustees conducted a self-evaluation overseen by the Trustee Audit Committee. With a nearly 80% response rate, the survey provided a number of valuable insights for consideration by the Trustees. Four common themes were identified for further review and consideration:

1. Communication and Transparency: Strengthening communication between the Executive Committee and the full board about Executive Committee meeting discussions, and making the Evaluation Committee’s review process for evaluating the President and her direct reports more transparent.
2. Board Member Orientation and Performance Measurement: Including participation of committee chairs and Board officers in orientation activities, and feedback from committee chairs to the Nomination Committee regarding individual board member performance.
3. Strategic Planning: A commitment to spend time at each board meeting on strategic planning and higher education issues affecting the University.
4. Public Image: Including strong sustained support for the efforts of University administration and the Public Affairs Committee.

The University and the Trustees have begun to address the recommendations highlighted in the survey. The fall of 2006 Board Member Orientation was restructured to include active participation by committee chairs and board officers. The February 2007 Board meeting agenda was revised to focus on strategic thinking and the May 2007 meeting will continue this broad-based focus as the University begins its strategic planning process. The remaining items are being addressed by the appropriate committees and University staff. The Audit Committee agreed to oversee and report on the progress of these recommendations to the full Board on a periodic basis.
2.II.C.3 Faculty Governance
In 1997, there was widespread faculty perception that a variety of factors had led to a decline in the effectiveness of shared governance at Lehigh. As a result, then-President Likins appointed a special Constitutional Task Force to draft a constitution for a new Faculty Senate, which would be brought before the faculty for review. By a majority vote at the University faculty meeting, the faculty approved the creation of this Task Force to draft a constitution, as well as to develop a process for bringing the draft through a defined amendment procedure.

The Task Force drafted a constitution in the summer of 1997, and the amendment process – including responses from each of the University committees, as well as a range of individuals and administrators across campus – took place during the fall 1997 semester. In December 1997, the faculty approved by majority vote a process for a “constitutional convention” on January 8, 1998, in which each proposed amendment was debated and voted on. The same vote also created a new process for electronic voting on the final draft. These procedures for amendment and electronic voting have become standard procedure for significant pieces of faculty legislation and are still used today. The vote in the spring of 1998 by the full faculty to accept or reject the constitution of a new Faculty Senate was split virtually 50-50, falling short of the two-thirds majority required for successful passage.

In the fall of 2002, then-President Farrington created another task force, the Faculty Governance Review Committee (FGRC), to assess the state of faculty governance at Lehigh and to make recommendations about its improvement. In November 2003, the FGRC issued its report, recommending that the faculty and administration reaffirm the principle of shared governance, that a new governance structure based on governance by a representative faculty body elected by the faculty be created, and that a number of changes be made in the University Committee structure. (Appendix 2.41) This report was endorsed by a sizable majority vote of the faculty and sent on to the President and Provost.

In the fall of 2004, the Faculty Steering Committee appointed a committee to examine the recommendations of the FGRC and to write a new governance document for the faculty. After a series of open meetings and consultations with the many constituencies of the University, that committee produced a governance document that established a Faculty Senate and restructured major University committees so that faculty, administrators, and students shared governance responsibilities (Appendix 2.42).

In 2005, the faculty voted electronically on this new governance system. By a very narrow margin it fell short of the two-thirds majority required for successful passage. Since then and with the advent of another new President, faculty governance remains by the faculty acting as a committee of the whole.

2.II.C.4 Student Governance
2.II.C.4.i Undergraduate Student Senate
Established in the spring of 1988, the Student Senate (Appendices 2.43a and 2.43b) provides an opportunity for students to discuss and express their views on student issues, and to make recommendations or pass resolutions on these matters. The Senate has responsibility for allocating funds to student organizations, as well as for recognizing student organizations. The undergraduate student body elects 45 senators based upon living group. Elections are held in the late spring for upperclassmen and in September for first-year students. Responsibilities such as selecting student representatives to the Board of Trustees...
and to certain faculty committees are the province of the Student Senate or the Graduate Student Senate.

The Student Senate is the governing body for undergraduate students and has jurisdiction over all recognized undergraduate student organizations at Lehigh. The Associate Vice Provost and Dean of Students is the advisor to Student Senate and closely collaborates with it on strategic planning. The Senate began an annual administrative forum in 2005 to present its strategic priorities to the senior University leadership each fall. During this session, the Senate solicits feedback from administrators and seeks opportunities to collaborate on institutional goals.

2.II.C.4.ii Graduate Student Senate

The Graduate Student Senate (Appendices 2.44a and 2.44b) serves as the representing body of the graduate student community in all matters pertinent to the graduate programs and graduate student life. Its mission is to act as a liaison between graduate students and administrative bodies, as well as to encourage social interaction and communication among graduate students. The council is run entirely by students.

The objectives of the Graduate Student Senate are:

1. To serve as the representing body of the graduate student community in all matters pertinent to the graduate programs and graduate student life at Lehigh.
2. To encourage communication among graduate students.
3. To provide graduate students with a forum to discuss issues pertinent to the graduate programs and graduate student life at the University.
4. To acquire information from and disseminate information to the graduate student community.
5. To appoint graduate students as representatives of the Graduate Student Senate to serve as Graduate Members of the Graduate and Research Committee, Educational Policy Committee, and other University bodies as the need arises.
6. To approve and present resolutions to the Graduate and Research Committee, Educational Policy Committee, other University bodies, the Provost, President of the University, or the Board of Trustees.
7. To provide the Graduate and Research Committee, Educational Policy Committee, other University bodies, Provost, President of the University, and the Board of Trustees with a forum to discuss issues with graduate students, and to prepare position papers when they so request.
8. To maintain a Graduate Student Center.

2.II.C.4.iii Interfraternity Council

The Interfraternity Council (Appendices 2.45a and 2.45b) is comprised of the 23 fraternity chapter presidents and has an executive board that serves as its executing body and the supporting body of the member fraternities at Lehigh. The role of the Interfraternity Council (IFC) is to help carry out a wide range of duties pertaining to inter-fraternal relations, working with the administration on issues related to fraternal living and learning, communication and liaison responsibilities across campus, educating campus and external audiences about Lehigh’s fraternities, maintaining appropriate recruitment policies for new student members, collaborating with the administration on judicial matters, and working with the Panhellenic Council. The focus of the council each year within these general parameters is dictated by the needs and desires of each year’s IFC.
2.II.C.4.iv Panhellenic Council
The Panhellenic Council (Appendix 2.46) is comprised of the sorority chapter presidents and one delegate from each chapter. Its executive board serves as the supporting body of the sorority chapters at Lehigh. The role of the Panhellenic Council is to help carry out duties pertaining to inter-sorority relations, working with the administration on issues related to sorority living and learning, communication and liaison responsibilities across campus, educating campus and external audiences about Lehigh’s sororities, maintaining appropriate recruitment policies for new student members, collaborating with the administration on judicial matters, and working with the IFC.

2.II.C.5 Staff Governance
Beginning in the mid-1970s and until the early 1990s, the Forum – a venue for staff as well as faculty and students – served as the primary mechanism for discussion of campus-wide issues. With its dissolution and the establishment of other advisory bodies such as the Employee Relations Advisory Committee (ERAC), there is currently no standing body where issues of common concern among staff, faculty, and students can be debated in an open setting. ERAC is the mechanism for addressing staff issues across Colleges and stems (Appendix 2.47).

As described on its website (www.lehigh.edu/~iner/c/), ERAC is strongly committed to a proactive stance in advising the President, through the Vice President for Finance and Administration, on matters of policy and programs pertaining to employee relations. Areas of primary concern include the following: communication, problem-solving mechanisms (resources), compensation (salary and benefits), working conditions, staff recognition, and development. The Committee consists of 17 voting members: nine members elected from the nonexempt staff, and eight members elected from the exempt staff. The Associate Vice President for Human Resources serves as the ex-officio member. In addition, for the purpose of providing continuity, the outgoing Chairperson also serves as a non-voting, ex-officio member for one year following his/her term as Chairperson.

2.II.C.6 Summary and Recommendations
Lehigh has a strong tradition of student governance – particularly for undergraduate students, whose governance structures are well-established, vibrant, and supported by Student Life. The creation of a Graduate Student Senate also has led to real improvements in addressing academic and non-academic graduate issues, and the new leadership in this area promises to strengthen and consolidate progress in these areas.

Lehigh faces more significant challenges in consolidating similarly effective structures in board and faculty governance. However, there has been some progress. For example, the Board of Trustees recently began to address its governance processes in a serious review of board procedures and governance, such as by instituting a board member self-evaluation process. Various attempts to strengthen faculty governance in the past couple of decades have heightened faculty voice in concrete areas. Yet both faculty and administrators widely consider shared governance to be “broken.” And, while staff issues are ably brought forward by ERAC, many members of the campus community regard the absence of a University-wide forum for discussion of issues shared by faculty, staff, and students as an impediment to the overall effectiveness of faculty and staff communication, in particular. The University identifies the opportunity to support improvements in Board governance
1. A particular challenge in designing and implementing a new integrated planning and assessment process is the lack of a stable, shared governance structure. Such a structure would enable the administration to work effectively and collaboratively with the campus community to set priorities, make strategic choices and achieve University goals and objectives.

Recommendation: University leadership works collaboratively with faculty leadership and appropriate staff to implement a shared structure that is widely endorsed by faculty, staff, and administration.

2. Similarly, the lack of regular communication between staff, and between faculty and staff, particularly regarding shared interests in the mission and goals of the University, undermines the effectiveness of community engagement in University planning.

Recommendation: Establishment of a mechanism for staff and faculty discussion of shared mission and goals that can support greater integration across University units and responsibilities.

3. The Board of Trustees’ recently instituted self-assessment process, through which a variety of changes have been recommended, represents a significant accomplishment. As with any new initiative, it will require continued attention.

Recommendation: Incorporation of the self-evaluation results into the Board’s future actions and regularization of the evaluation process as a routine practice.

Recommendation: The Board formalizes the “succession planning” process for leadership changes for Committees and the Board, itself.

2.II.D Standard 5: Administration

2.II.D.1 Introduction
The University’s administrative structure is consistent with many research universities: It has a central administrative structure with vice presidents, directors, etc., and deans in each of the four Colleges, each with administrative structures appropriate to the size and scope of the College. The structure has evolved over time and will likely continue evolving as President Alice Gast, who joined the University at the beginning of FY07, may wish to adjust the structure to better meet her goals for Lehigh.

The information below describes the current administrative structure and the qualifications of those in key positions. The information also describes the ways in which the administrative structure has been reviewed over time, and briefly details the information systems that are used by many for decision-making throughout the University’s administrative and instructional areas.
2.II.D.2 Current Structure and Qualifications

The University’s administrative structure, as reflected in the current organizational chart (Appendix 2.48), has evolved over time as the needs of the organization have changed. The current structure reflects the important leadership role of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in academics. Reporting directly to him are the deans of the four Colleges, the Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid, two deputy provosts, the vice provosts for Research, Library & Technology Services and Institutional Research, the Director of the Iacocca Institute and Global Lehigh, and the Registrar. Also reporting to him is the Vice Provost for Student Affairs, which provides his position with responsibility for the out-of-classroom lives of the students.

Other vice presidents and direct reports to the President include those with responsibility for Finance and Administration, Advancement, and University Relations, as well as the General Counsel, Executive Director of the Alumni Association, and Dean of Athletics, for example. Biographies and CVs for the senior administrators of the University are included in Appendices 2.49a-2.49r and demonstrate clear expertise in their positions.

In 2003, the University began a project to replace an 18-year-old, inflexible staff compensation structure. This project resulted in the articulation of a total compensation philosophy and the design of a staff compensation program, which included the development of a market-based position classification program. As part of this project, up-to-date position descriptions, a clearly defined market for salary comparison, and current survey data for benchmark positions were articulated for all classified staff positions on campus (including some of the senior administrative positions). Research staff positions were not included in this program.

2.II.D.2.i Process for Reviewing Administrative Structure

Since 1998, there have been various changes within the administrative structure. These include the addition of a General Counsel, Lehigh’s first full-time in-house attorney, and the re-creation of the Vice Provost for Research position, which had been abolished in the early 1990s. In 2004-2005, two Deputy Provost positions were added to the Provost’s office – the Deputy Provost for Faculty Affairs and the Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs.

The process by which these positions were created is representative of the process used whenever the University considers its senior administrative needs: The President had a series of discussions with various members of the senior leadership team, Human Resources drafted possible job descriptions – with review by the President and Provost – and the Faculty Personnel Committee reviewed the positions. There also was an analysis of the impact of these additional administrative salaries on the University’s unrestricted budget, with the implementation integrated into the budget planning for the subsequent year.

2.II.D.2.ii Information Systems Used for Administrative Decision-making

In the summer of 2001, the University completed the implementation of the final module of the Banner system, an enterprise-wide system for managing transactions and providing information on all aspects of the University’s administrative function. In the years since that “plain vanilla” implementation, the system upgrades have been kept current with the vendor’s requirements, both for the operating system, as well as for the applications. As a result, the underlying infrastructure remains current for institutional needs.

In addition, since the Banner system is a strong transaction-processing system but not as robust a reporting environment, the University has implemented a variety of Microsoft Access database reporting solutions. These solutions are focused in a variety of key areas. For example, the “desktop finance” tool provides easy access for hundreds of users across
Various other reporting environments were created within Advancement to track fundraising success, within University Relations to track media exposures, and within the Alumni Association for alumni engagement profiles, etc. Within the Office of Institutional Research, a variety of reporting tools are used in order to provide timely information for the President, Provost, Trustees, and Senior Officers.

In addition, the Blackboard course management system is used widely throughout campus. While the primary focus is on its academic applications, Blackboard also is used for various administrative functions, such as sharing information regarding candidates who are finalists for key positions, and the effective management of the MSCHEN process for sharing work plans and draft reports with the community. In addition, the Sunguard Luminis Portal, a technology solution that enables secure data access by a given set of community members, also has been implemented extensively throughout the campus, with many administrative and educational uses.

### 2.II.D.3 Summary and Recommendations

The University’s administrative structure is appropriate to the institution’s needs. Individuals in key positions are well qualified and well supported through infrastructures such as an information system that provides key decision-making data. The administrative structure is communicated to the campus through the information provided on the Provost’s office website (www.lehigh.edu/~policy/), and is changeable as the University’s needs evolve and change. The University identifies the opportunity to further strengthen campus-wide understanding of administrative evaluation and accountability. As mentioned above, in recent years positions have been added or returned to the administrative structure. Now that it has been several years since the research/graduate oversight has been reintroduced in a revised format, performing a review of these structures would be timely.

**Recommendation:** Transparent evaluation procedures for administrative performance so administrative accountability – within appropriate guidelines – is clear and tied to the University’s mission and goals.

**Recommendation:** Review of the current decentralized structure for graduate admission and education.

**Recommendation:** Review of the current decentralized oversight of University research centers and institutes.

### 2.II.E Standard 6: Integrity

#### 2.II.E.1 Introduction

Lehigh has a full range of policies that help insure integrity throughout the University. All of these policies, which are described below, are available on the University website (www.lehigh.edu/~inlpd/index.html) The University policies are listed first, and then the
administrative policies that are managed by individual areas. These areas are: Dean of Students, Human Resources, and Vice Provosts for Research, Library & Technology Services, Vice President for Finance and Administration, and Dean of Athletics.

The last major review of the University policy structure began in 2002 under the leadership of the Provost’s Office and General Counsel. This review resulted in the updating and, in some cases, creation of policies appropriate for compliance with external regulations. In addition, a new University Policy Structure was created to govern review, communication and assessment practices for three categories of policies: Academic, University and Administrative. This structure was approved by the Board of Trustees in June 2002 and is reflected in the Policy Statements link on the Provost’s webpage (www.lehigh.edu/~inprv/). When relevant, information regarding the offices responsible for oversight is found in each policy.

In addition to the policies below, the revision of the Harassment Policy that was completed in 2002 resulted in the creation of the offices of the Ombudsman and the Harassment Officer. These offices serve as University-wide resources for individuals on campus. In both offices, the initial faculty appointee has been reappointed. To date, no procedures for assessing the effectiveness of these offices are in place, although the Ombudsman does report annually to the President, and there is a broad sense that these offices are welcome additions.]

The sections below are divided to reflect major areas on campus: Academic, Financial/Business Relations, Employee Relations, and Self-Reporting External Relations.

2.II.E.2 Academic

2.II.E.2.i Academic Integrity

The University convened a campus-wide dialogue related to academic integrity in 2004-05. Students, faculty, and staff participated in numerous focus groups, video conferences, and revisions of the Code of Conduct related to academic integrity. In addition, a website (www.lehigh.edu/~inprv/academicintegrity.html) was constructed in collaboration with some of the major constituencies, including the Dean of Students Office, the Provost’s Office, Undergraduate and Graduate Student Senates, Library & Technology Services, and the Educational Policy Committee. This website provides information and resources for faculty and students related to academic integrity. It also highlights supporting statements from the Undergraduate and Graduate Student Senates.

In addition, beginning with the first-year class of 2005, each first-year student signs a statement agreeing to abide by the University’s statement on academic integrity. At the beginning of each semester, faculty also receive a letter from the Dean of Students and Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs including the following excerpt:

As the new semester begins, we would like to encourage you to take an active role in fostering academic integrity on our campus…Many faculty include a statement in their course syllabi that outlines their expectations regarding academic integrity and explaining course policies relating to academic dishonesty.

During orientation, our incoming first-year students attend sessions that begin the process of building an appreciation of the value of academic integrity. Each first-year student then signs a pledge to abide by the Undergraduate Student Senate’s affirmation of the Code of Conduct. At the
first-year convocation Sunday evening, a representative of the Senate presents a binder containing those signatures to the President. This is a symbolic ritual that highlights the core values of honesty and integrity in Lehigh’s culture. We are also pleased to announce a new suite of web resources to support academic integrity… The best cure for academic dishonesty is prevention, and you'll find information about preventing academic dishonesty for faculty and avoiding academic dishonesty for students. Of special importance are the resources for developing information literacy. You'll also find information about turnitin.com's plagiarism detection service for both faculty and students.

2.II.E.2.ii Academic Freedom
In 2002, a review of the University policy structure resulted in an awareness that Lehigh needed to develop policies in key areas. (Appendix 2.50 for the list of University policies that were identified.) During the campus discussions of a proposed harassment policy, both faculty and the administration highlighted the need for a formal University academic freedom policy. In 2004, a proposed academic freedom policy was brought to faculty review at a University faculty meeting, where it was amended substantially and passed. The amended policy was rejected by the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. After a period of inattention, senior faculty members on the board of the Lehigh chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) collaborated with the General Counsel to draft a new proposal, which was brought to successful faculty passage in 2007. The new policy is awaiting Board review and endorsement (Appendix 2.51 for the draft of the Academic Freedom Policy)

2.II.E.2.iii Student Handbook
The Dean of Students Office issues the Student Handbook as the University’s official notification of opportunities, services, and regulations that concern student life at Lehigh (Appendix 2.52). The University makes every effort to provide accurate, current, and comprehensive information in this handbook, which has been revised through June 2009. Students are subject to the rules and regulations contained in it, but the University reserves the right to change at any time the rules governing admission, tuition, fees, courses, the granting of degrees, or any other regulations affecting its students.

The Student Handbook website contains the most recent information in the following sections:

- Policy on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action/Non-Discrimination
- University Governance
- Academic Resource Guide
- Services for Students
- University Student Judicial System
- University Policies and Guidelines
- University Regulations
- Living at Lehigh
- Student Involvement in Activities
- Athletics and Recreational Opportunities
Included in the Student Handbook is the Student Code of Conduct. (Appendix 2.53) The Student Code of Conduct has been developed to promote student growth, to provide accused students with fundamental fairness (and educate the University community about the meaning of “fundamental fairness”), to protect the rights of individuals, and to uphold the educational mission of the University. The Code was last reviewed comprehensively over an 18-month process that included consultation with the University Committee on Discipline, the Educational Policy Committee, every undergraduate College, and all of the student governance bodies. The University Faculty passed the newly revised Student Code of Conduct in 2006 and the Board of Trustees passed it in June 2006. The new Code dictates a substantial review process every four years, and the Assistant Dean of Students for Student Conduct maintains and administers the Code’s review, revision, and implementation.

The Student Handbook includes policies and information relevant to graduate students as well as undergraduate students. In addition, each of the Colleges maintains its own Graduate Handbook (the College of Education maintains program manuals for each of its six programs), which include College-specific information. College handbooks and manuals can be found on the appropriate College websites and are easily accessible to graduate students through their College Deans’ offices. These handbooks and manuals do not replace or supersede policies, regulations, or information found in the University Rules and Procedures or the Student Handbook.

2.II.E.2.iv Policy on Intellectual Property
University faculty, staff, and student personnel are regularly involved in a wide range of scholarly activities that stem from their core teaching, learning, research, and service missions. While the primary focus of such efforts is the advancement of the central purposes of the University, the products of scholarship often have implications for wider and differing applications. These products or intellectual properties thus may be of benefit to the individuals involved, to the University, and to the larger society in which we live. By establishing a policy on Intellectual Property, Lehigh seeks to support faculty, staff, and students in identifying, protecting, and administering Intellectual Property matters and defining the rights and responsibilities of all involved. This policy was approved by the Board of Trustees in 2001 (Appendix 2.54)

2.II.E.2.v Ethical Conduct in Academic Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities
The University prides itself as a research university and holds the integrity of the research enterprise as an essential aspect of its culture and intellectual structure. This integrity is dependent largely on a climate of self-regulation that promotes academic practices to prevent misconduct, and develops policies and procedures to address allegations of fraud and misconduct.

In 1993-94, a task force was formed by the Faculty Personnel Committee to develop a policy on, and procedures for, dealing with issues involving ethical misconduct in academic research, scholarship, and creative activities. The intent was to develop a document that was fair and responsible and would bring the University into compliance with Federal law. In May 1995, the faculty adopted the policy on Ethical Conduct in Academic Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (Appendix 2.55).
2.II.E.2.vi Additional Policies Related to Research
Sample forms and policies related to a variety of issues can be found at http://www.lehigh.edu/~inors/inorsub.htm, including:

- Cost Reallocation Policy and Forms
- Consulting Policy and Forms
- Disclosure of Investigator Significant Financial Interests Related to Sponsored Projects
- Institutional Review Board For the Use of Human Subjects
- Institutional Animal Care and Use
- Ethical Conduct in Academic Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities
- Major Instrumentation Policy

2.II.E.2.vii Additional Policies Related to Library & Technology Services
In Library & Technology Services (LTS), a range of policies can be found linked to the Provost’s page at www.lehigh.edu/lts/admin/policies/policies. These policies include:

- Computer Use Policy
- Software Support Policy (ACIS Policy #1)
- Service Standards Policy (ACIS Policy #2)
- Service Standards
- Network Policy Standards Wired & Wireless (ACIS Policy #3)
- Campus Server Standards (ACIS Policy #4)
- External Lehigh E-Access (ACIS Policy #5)
- E-only Journal Conversion (ACIS Policy #6)
- Data Administration (ACIS Policy #7)
- Web Services (ACIS Policy #8)
- Campus Electronic Security (ACIS Policy #9)

2.II.E.3 Financial/Business Relations
2.II.E.3.i Policy on Conflict of Interest
The Board of Trustees adopted a Policy on Conflict of Interest in 2002, as described in section 4.1.C.2, above.

2.II.E.3.ii Environmental Health and Safety
The University has instituted a variety of safety policies and programs, which are intended to provide a safe and healthy environment that surpasses the minimum standards established by Federal, State, and Local governments. These can be found at: http://www.lehigh.edu/~inehs/policy.htm

2.II.E.3.iii Internal Audit Office
The mission of the Internal Audit Office is to provide independent, objective assurance and consulting services designed to add value and improve the University’s operations, and to meet the needs of the Board of Trustees and the University’s executive management by bringing a systematic, disciplined approach to the evaluation and improvement of the effectiveness of risk management, control, and governance processes. To provide for the independence of the Internal Audit Office, the Director reports functionally to the Trustee Audit Committee (TAC) and the President, and administratively to the Vice President for
Finance and Administration. This reporting function is outlined below in the section on Accountability. The Internal Audit Office is governed by the University’s Internal Audit Charter (effective October 2005).

2.II.E.3.iv Travel and Business Expense Reimbursement Procedures and Policy
This policy, which is effective as of July 2005, is intended to provide a clear and consistent understanding of the University’s reimbursement policies for all faculty, staff, students, and others who incur expenses while engaged in University business or related travel, and who intend to receive reimbursement. It establishes responsibilities and guidelines for ensuring the travel and business expenses are valid, necessary, and within compliance of Internal Revenue Service and other government agency guidelines (Appendix 2.56).

2.II.E.3.v Finance and Administration Code of Ethics
In addition to the various policies relevant to the financial and business functions of the University, the Finance and Administration stem adopted a Code of Ethics in 2006 that department heads will review with their staff annually, and individual staff members will sign annually (Appendix 2.57).

2.II.E.4 Employee Relations
2.II.E.4.i Disability Accommodation Policy
Most recently reviewed in 2003, this policy states that Lehigh is committed to diversity and nondiscrimination, and supports the full employment of qualified individuals with disabilities in its workforce in accordance with state and federal laws and regulations, including Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1992 (ADA).

This disability accommodation process relates to staff employees, and is administered through the Human Resources Office. Faculty requests for accommodations should be directed to Debra Nyby, Administrative Director to the Provost. Student requests should be directed to Cheryl Ashcroft, Assistant Dean of Students, Academic Support.

2.II.E.4.ii Drug and Alcohol Policy
Lehigh’s Drug and Alcohol Policy was approved in 1990. It is based on the University’s intention to give the same consideration to employees with chemical (alcohol and other drugs) dependencies as it does to employees having other diseases. It is concerned only with those situations where the use of alcohol and/or drugs seriously interfere with an employee's health and job performance, adversely affects the job performance of other employees, or is considered so serious as to be detrimental to the University’s functions. There is no intent to intrude on the private lives of employees.

Early recognition and treatment of chemical dependency problems are important for successful rehabilitation because they reduce personal, family, and social disruption, and benefit the University community as a whole. The University supports sound treatment efforts, and an employee will not place his/her job in jeopardy if help is sought conscientiously. In this context, constructive disciplinary measures may be used to motivate employees to seek help. University benefits, such as the Employee Assistance Program (see below), sick leave, and the group medical plan, are available to help in the treatment and rehabilitation process.
2.II.E.4.iii Policy on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action/Non-Discrimination
The purpose of the Policy on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action/Non-Discrimination, which was adopted on June 6, 2003 by the Board of Trustees, is to define a philosophy for the institution and articulate mechanisms for the oversight of the policy.

The University strives to be an educational institution that welcomes faculty, staff, and students from diverse backgrounds and situations. The University is committed to provide all members of its community with equal access to relevant academic programs, social and recreational programs, services, and opportunities for participation, growth and promotion, and to promote and enhance the diversity of the University community (Appendix 2.58).

2.II.E.4.iv Policy on Harassment
The most recent Policy on Harassment was adopted by the Board of Trustees in June 2002, and defines prohibited conduct and sets procedures for addressing and resolving harassment complaints. The University strives to provide an educational, working, co-curricular, social, or living environment for all students, staff, faculty, trustees, contract workers, and guests that is free from harassment on the basis of age, color, disability, gender, gender identity, national or ethnic origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran status. Such harassment is unacceptable behavior and will not be tolerated (Appendix 2.59).

2.II.E.4.v Employee Privacy and Inspection of Personnel Files
Under an act of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, an employee has the right to inspect certain personnel files. This act protects employees from the placement of inappropriate information in their personnel files. Lehigh’s policy was adopted in 1982.

2.II.E.4.vi Employee Assistance Policy
The University believes that the vast majority of personal problems can be resolved successfully. Further, while there is no intent to intrude upon employees’ private lives, the University believes it is in the best interests of the employee, the employees’ family, the University, and the community at large to provide an employee with service that deals with such problems.

Therefore, the University implemented an Employee Assistance Program (EAP) in 2003, via a private company, Integrated Behavioral Health (IBH). This program assists employees in a confidential, constructive, and effective manner consistent with good therapeutic and business practices.

2.II.E.4.vii Employment and Placement of Relatives Policy and Annual Nepotism Policy Compliance Review
The University’s Employment and Placement of Relatives Policy (approved in 2004 and revised it in 2006) and Annual Nepotism Policy Compliance Review demonstrate the University’s commitment to employment and advancement based on qualifications and merit (Appendix 2.60).

Under some circumstances, the employment and placement of close relatives in certain positions or work groups may create potential conflict with this policy. In order to comply with the University policy, Human Resources annually obtains a listing of employees who have the same home address, and identifies their relationship and University department. The annual compliance procedure details steps to rectify situations in which violations of the nepotism policy are found – both in routine cases, as well as in cases involving top managers of the University.
2.II.E.5  Self Reporting External Relations

2.II.E.5.i  The Clery Act
The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act, codified at 20 USC 1092 (f) as a part of the Higher Education Act of 1965, is a federal law that requires colleges and universities to disclose certain timely and annual information about campus crime and security policies. All public and private institutions of postsecondary education participating in federal student aid programs are subject to this law.

The Clery Act, originally enacted by the Congress and signed into law by President George Bush in 1990 as the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990, was championed by Howard & Connie Clery after their daughter Jeanne was murdered at Lehigh University in 1986. They also founded the non-profit Security On Campus, Inc., in 1987. Amendments to the Act in 1998 renamed it in memory of Jeanne Clery.

The University fully complies with this legislation. The annual “Playing it Safe” brochure is sent to the campus community via email every August (Appendix 2.61). In addition, a link to this document is provided on the University police web page. This document contains the Clery Crime Statistics and also a complete description of all the parts of compliance of the Clery Act.

2.II.E.5.ii  NCAA Regulations and Reporting
The University, as a Division I institution, must compile information regularly regarding NCAA regulations concerning student athlete participation and access to athletics. This information is compiled by the Dean of Athletics and other offices, as appropriate (i.e., Financial Aid), and reported to the President’s Office and the NCAA.

2.II.E.6  Summary and Recommendations
Since 2002, the University has engaged in a comprehensive review of a broad range of policies, in order to insure that the University is in compliance with all external regulations and that there are mechanisms in place for regular review of policies by appropriate areas. The University also has identified specific offices that are accountable for the implementation and review of specific policies, and grouped similar kinds of policies into appropriate websites. The General Counsel's office (created in 2000) has been a major resource for this endeavor, and that office also is responsible for implementing the Board-approved structure for campus-wide review of all new policies. This structure provides an excellent foundation for ongoing policy review at Lehigh. Further consolidation of routine procedures for policy review and identification of new policy needs can strengthen the University’s success in this area.


Recommendation: An explicit process for identifying new policy needs that includes representation from relevant faculty, staff, and administrative stakeholders

2.II.F.  Standard 7: Institutional Assessment Processes

2.II.F.1  Introduction
The University operates in a decentralized planning and resource allocation environment, so University-wide assessment is not a frequent practice. However, there are some activities
that involve the assessment of specific University components from all Colleges or departments involved (e.g., enrollment management or research), and these are described further below.

There is a significant amount of assessment being performed at the unit/department level. Included below are the assessment activities performed in each of the four Colleges, activities which have a central role in planning and resource allocation for the academic endeavor. In addition, Appendices 2.62a-2.62g include an updated compendium of the assessment activity in other major units on campus. This compendium incorporates all areas included in the University’s 2003 Periodic Review Report, reflecting updated information.

The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) provides leadership and support for all institution-wide research and outcomes assessment, as well as for many of the unit-by-unit activities. This leadership and support includes performing analyses (including comparative data from peer institutions); selecting, collecting, and analyzing metrics of accountability in support of the University’s strategic objectives; coordinating and responding to requests for institutional information from internal and external sources; and conducting special studies as designated by the President and Provost.

The OIR provides the entire infrastructure for the student course evaluation process on campus, coordinating approximately 35,000 course evaluations per semester. This process includes summer and distance courses, as well as traditional on-campus semester courses. OIR maintains a database of courses for department chairs and coordinators to use in managing the evaluation process, as well as summary reports that are prepared and distributed at the end of each evaluation season. Other forms of course and program assessment, where they exist, vary widely across departments and colleges.

In addition, the OIR is responsible for administering various annual and ad hoc surveys, such as the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA’s Cooperative Institutional Research Program Freshman Survey (CIRP) and the Admitted Student Questionnaire (ASQ), as well as the first-year experience survey and the Senior Survey. The office maintains a website (with the annual University profile and Common Data Set), and provides support to the Colleges, faculty committees, and the trustees, as needed. The OIR also maintains the University Fact Book on a secure website.

2.II.F.2 Research

Given the University’s role as a research-extensive university, the regular assessment of the research endeavor is a critical component of overall institutional planning. The Office of the Vice Provost for Research and the Office for Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) regularly generate reports indicating changes in research support, levels of proposal submission activity, and comparisons within and across academic fields. From these reports, the Provost, Vice Provost, and deans are able to examine and analyze important measures of research activity. It is the intention of the University to support all active scholars in the community, regardless of the availability of funding for individual projects. Of course the assessment of non-funded scholarship is a much more subjective activity.

In addition, the activity of the research accounting operation is reviewed regularly to be sure that required reporting and record-keeping, such as effort reporting and space surveys, etc., are current and complete. This work is performed by the University’s external auditor, supported by the Internal Audit Office.
2.II.F.3 Enrollment Management
In the fall of 2001, when the Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid resigned her position, the University did a full analysis of its needs in this area, and determined that Enrollment Management would be an important focus. Thus, an Enrollment Management Committee was created to work with the newly appointed Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid. At various points in the past six years, enrollment management has been administered by the Enrollment Management Committee, whose membership has evolved over time. The current group, and the mission as defined when it was revived, are included in Appendix 2.63. Currently, the committee is chaired by the Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs, and is continuing to evolve both in structure and mission.

The committee now takes as its mandate the planning for and assessment of all components of the undergraduate enrollment picture – admissions and financial aid for the entering class, financial support for continuing students, retention strategies in student life and the academic endeavor, and other specific topics as identified. It also intends to address key areas of concern for graduate enrollment management. Recent projects have included an assessment of the University’s Presidential Scholars program, a review of the retention statistics for the last six years, an analysis of the financial aid projections for the class entering in the fall of 2007 (as part of the University’s FY08 budget process), and a detailed analysis of early decision and merit aid as part of the University’s undergraduate recruitment strategy.

2.II.F.4 2020 Initiative
As mentioned in Standard 2, the 2020 initiative was introduced in the fall of 2000 as a way of providing “start-up” funds for important institutional academic initiatives. The proposals that were received, reviewed, and ultimately funded included those in support of major academic initiatives (such as the creation of two separate departments; Computer Science and Engineering and Electrical and Computer Engineering Department, and the enhancement of Industrial and Systems Engineering) as well as more targeted initiatives, such as the creation of a Humanities Center, or the support for a three-year pilot summer program in Choral Arts for high school teachers. Before the funds were awarded, each proposal was reviewed for completeness, consistent use of budget assumptions, and creation of metrics for measurement of “success.”

The program was originally designed as a seven-year program. However, after all current commitments are supported, there is still some additional funding available. As a result, the program will likely continue in some form. Unfortunately, although metrics were originally specified for each program, the annual review of those metrics was not continued, and thus measurement of the success of this program has, for the most part, been performed at the institutional level, rather than at the individual program level.

2.II.F.4 Surveys of Student Attitudes: Diversity, Global, Service
In addition to the assessment of student educational experiences described in the focused self-study section on this topic, the University currently participates in some national student surveys (CIRP Freshman survey, the College Board’s Admitted Student Questionnaire, and the Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) consortium senior survey) and also performs its own assessment of student attitudes, etc., in specific areas, as appropriate. Recent examples of such in-house surveys include the annual survey from LTS on the use of technology in teaching (discussed in the focused self-study section on this topic); various surveys performed on students’ service activity, interest in and knowledge of global initiatives; and
the recently completed campus-wide “climate survey” around diversity issues. Beginning in the spring of 2008, the University will be participating in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), as well.

The results of these surveys are then used to assess the relevant programs that are focused on enhancing student learning in these out-of-classroom activities.

2.II.F.5 Colleges

As mentioned above, the Colleges play a key role in the University’s advancement of critical academic endeavors, and thus the practices of “institutional assessment” within each College are relevant to mention here. Each of the Colleges has its own plan (as described in Standards 1, 2 and 3 above), and below are brief summary statements of the assessment activities related to those plans.

2.II.F.5.i CAS

The Dean of CAS maintains a matrix of all the initiatives listed in the College plan. Each September at the first College faculty meeting of the year, she reports on the status of the College in regard to each goal, has faculty discussions about where to go next, and arranges to have faculty volunteers work on the next initiative.

2.II.F.5.ii CBE

General oversight of the strategic management planning process falls to the Dean of CBE and the CBE Executive Committee. The AACSB requires an annual report that describes progress during the academic year on action items designed to achieve strategic goals and that sets out a new set of action items for the next academic year. These annual reports are part of the required documentation for AACSB maintenance of accreditation reviews every five years. The Dean and the Executive Committee prepare these reports. They are presented for discussion to the CBE faculty and Board of Advisors and feedback from the faculty and advisors is important information used by the Dean and the Executive Committee in this strategic management planning process.

2.II.F.5.iii COE

The COE has a process in place that evaluates its strategic goals and monitors progress toward them. Specifically, the Chair of Education and Human Services, Director of the Office of International Programs, Director of the Center for Promoting Research to Practice, and Director of Centennial School submit mid-year and end-of-year reports to the COE Dean. These reports identify both the quantitative and qualitative achievements of the unit’s contributions to the College’s strategic goals and objectives. In monthly staff meetings with the Dean’s Cabinet, Dean’s Directors – and as individuals – the COE Dean and unit head discuss progress toward that unit’s goals and objectives. The end-of-year report is shared with the faculty and staff of the COE, as well as submitted to the University Provost. The COE mid-term and end-of-year reports serve as part of the evaluation process for the Dean.

2.II.F.5.iv RCEAS

An assessment plan designed to track the progress of the RCEAS strategic plan is currently underway. Both quantitative and qualitative measures will be developed to track the College’s progress toward the established goals and tactical initiatives. An on-campus specialist will serve as a consultant and keep track of the progress on different fronts, with periodic reports made to faculty and administration concerning this progress.
2.II.F.6  Summary and Recommendations
Consistent with the University’s decentralized planning and resource allocation process, the assessment activities at Lehigh are undertaken more at the departmental/unit level than at the University level. Within individual areas, as shown in Appendices 2.62a-2.62g, there is a very high level of activity focused on setting measurable goals, and regularly reviewing progress toward achieving those goals. The University recognizes that although many units engage in their own assessment strategies, the opportunity for establishing appropriate, transparent, and widely understood assessment metrics will further strengthen planning, resource allocation, and campus-wide continuous improvement. As the University moves to create a new, overarching University-wide planning process, it is appropriate to create a related campus-wide process for integrating routine measurement, feedback, or appropriate program adjustment.

Recommendation: A University-wide process and expectation for establishing assessment metrics for unit initiatives.

Recommendation: A University-wide process for integrating routine assessment of unit effectiveness into the integrated planning process recommended above.

2.II.G  Standard 10: Faculty

2.II.G.1  Description of Lehigh Faculty
The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) regularly gathers and analyzes information regarding the faculty – tenured and tenure track, as well as other instructional employees such as adjuncts, professors of practice, visiting faculty, and part-time instructors. The 2007 report shows that out of the 443 full-time faculty members, only two do not have either a doctorate or a terminal degree in their field. Among the tenured and tenure track faculty, nearly 100% have doctorates or terminal degrees.

The OIR also measured Lehigh’s reliance on contingent faculty compared to national averages. This comparison is based on a July 2006 AAUP summary, which shows that 25.9% of Lehigh faculty members are either part-time adjuncts or full-time faculty who are not tenured or tenure track. This is lower than the United States average for private doctoral universities, for the top 50 universities as defined by *U.S. News & World Report*, and for the Patriot League average. The full AAUP report is available at http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issuesed/contingent/ (Appendices 2.64a and 2.64b for the Lehigh comparison).

Definitions of non-tenure track faculty include:

Lecturers: Full-time, non-tenure track faculty whose appointments focus on teaching. They may be appointed for up to five years. No more than 10 lecturers may hold appointments at the University at one time (R&P 2.9). See below for descriptions of Lehigh University Rules and Procedures (R&P).

Professors of Practice: Individuals with significant experience and expertise, whose appointments will add instructional value to University programs, enhance the research or applied missions of departments, and permit the University to expand its course offerings. Their contracts may be for one to five years (R&P 2.1.2).
Visiting Professors: Full-time temporary faculty who receive on-year appointments. They may be reappointed for a second year. Visiting appointments going beyond two consecutive years require review by the Faculty Personnel Committee (R&P 2.2.3).

Adjunct Lecturers and Professors: Part-time, temporary faculty who are hired to teach one or more courses on a semester basis (R&P 2.2.3).

2.II.G.2 Faculty Role in Curricular/Educational Mission
The University faculty is responsible for course and curriculum changes, the creation of new majors, minors, programs, certificates, and the overall responsibility for the University’s educational mission for undergraduate and graduate students.

Although structured somewhat differently in each College, the process for curricular changes involves several levels of faculty scrutiny and review before being implemented at the University level. In addition to departmental and program review, curricular changes must be reviewed and passed at a College-level review by the appropriate faculty committee (in which Deans’ offices are represented). Proposals passed at the College level are reviewed by the University Education Policy Committee (undergraduate curriculum) or by the Graduate and Research Committee (graduate curriculum), which are comprised of elected faculty from each College, as well as the of deans of each College, and various administrators, either as ex officio members or guests. These committees are charged with reviewing curricular changes in terms of their educational value, feasibility, resource implications for the overall educational mission of the University, and integration with the College and University priorities. Proposals passed by the Educational Policy Committee and Graduate and Research Committee are taken to the University Faculty meeting (a committee of the whole) where they also must pass by faculty vote. The description of these processes and the roles of the committees are articulated in the Lehigh University Rules and Procedures (R&P), the official governing document of the University (Appendix 2.65) that is accessible through the Provost’s webpage.

2.II.G.3 Standards and Support For Faculty Review, Tenure, And Promotion
Clear and concrete procedures for faculty reappointment, tenure, and promotion can be found on the Provost’s webpage, as well as in R&P. In addition, these procedures can be found in the Chairs Manual (updated in 2006 and also posted on the Provost’s webpage) along with procedures for appointment, a checklist for review, tenure, and promotion files, appropriate forms for all instances of faculty appointment and review, and other resources relevant to faculty contractual procedures and responsibilities.

The Provost’s webpage also includes links to Faculty Development, which offers regular training and resources related to teaching. In addition, this webpage links to a New Faculty Handbook, updated in 2006-2007, in which new faculty can find not only the procedures regarding faculty reappointment, tenure, and promotion, but also a host of information regarding how to get started in developing courses (including sample syllabi), a broad range of policies and forms related to course instruction and course management, procedures for such faculty support as travel grants, helpful information about the Lehigh community and the surrounding Lehigh Valley region, and information regarding other support services for faculty (Vice Provost for Research/Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, the Lehigh Faculty Development Office, Office of Technology Transfer, Entrepreneurial Research and Education, and Corporate and Foundation Giving).
The Faculty Development Office has primary responsibility for major support of faculty in all areas relating to teaching effectiveness, including the uses of technology, writing, and innovative pedagogies. The role of this office, which is housed in LTS, is described at great length in the focused self-study portion of this MSCHE report. Research support – including identifying government, corporate, and foundation funding, grant and proposal writing and submission, and the development and administration of research budgets – are shared responsibilities of the Office of the Vice Provost for Research, the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, and Corporate and Foundation Relations.

Central to Lehigh’s mission is an equal emphasis on faculty excellence in teaching and research, as well as an emphasis on appropriate levels of service and leadership as faculty move through their careers. Thus the University’s policy is that all salary increases are merit-based and judged according to standards of excellence in the areas of faculty research, teaching, and service. Each College articulates these standards and administers the annual faculty merit review for salary purposes. These standards can be found on each College webpage, and each was passed by faculty vote in each College after broad discussion. (Faculty voting procedures differ across Colleges; for example, CAS voted by department, whereas COE voted in a committee of the whole.)

Individual faculty members prepare annual reviews of their accomplishments in teaching, research, and service; these reviews are evaluated by deans and department chairs, which result in salary recommendations that then are reviewed by the Provost with each Dean. (CAS also has a process for evaluation of Lecturers and Professors of Practice, and Lecturers and Professors of Practice are required to submit annual Professional Activity Reports to the Dean’s Office for review.) In addition, particular faculty merit can be rewarded annually in a University-wide faculty and staff Awards process. Based on nominations solicited campus-wide, the President’s senior officers select winners to be announced at the annual faculty dinner and staff dinner.

Faculty teaching effectiveness is measured for each course on campus (for all tenure track and non-tenure track faculty in courses with at least 5 students enrolled) through the administration of standardized student evaluations, which are collected and analyzed by the OIR. Faculty is welcome to add additional questions to the standardized form in order to assist in teaching improvement. Hard copies of the student evaluations are sent back to the faculty after they have been processed by the OIR. Faculty members must report evidence of their teaching effectiveness based on student evaluations in each year’s merit review process.

To assist with faculty mentoring, the Provost directed the creation of a University mentoring program in 2004. A link to this program can be found on the Provost’s webpage. The University mentoring program is voluntary, including 20 faculty members across the campus. They can be contacted by other faculty members with questions or for advice. The mentoring program webpage contains a profile on each of the 20 University mentors, including a picture and contact information. Each College also has a mentoring program; the structures of these programs differ to reflect the specific needs, missions, and cultures of each College.

2.II.G.4 Diversity
The OIR’s 2007 Affirmative Action Report measures the University’s employment of female and minority faculty against a representative pool of female and minority faculty nationwide. This report indicates Colleges and divisions in which improvement could be made.
In years past, departments were required to demonstrate to their respective Deans’ offices their strategies for increasing the diversity of their pools for hiring new faculty. In some cases, hiring was frozen until the department could demonstrate a concrete strategy for increasing the diversity of their applicant pools.

Currently, the Faculty Task Force of the University Diversity Leadership Committee has made the University’s overall approach to increasing faculty diversity a primary focus. The Faculty Task Force is considering specific proposals based on benchmarking and review of best practices, and the work of this group will contribute to the University strategies that arise out of the spring of 2007 Campus Climate Survey.

The Deputy Provost for Faculty Affairs also serves as a point person to identify and implement specific policies designed to reinforce the University’s commitment to increasing diversity within the faculty. For example, this office administers Lehigh’s Sloan Program for Faculty Career Flexibility, which is a two-pronged approach to easing the tension between career and family life for tenure-track faculty members. The first component of the program aims to increase understanding, acceptance, and utilization of Lehigh’s current and planned career flexibility policies, including the Family and Medical Leave Policy for Faculty and the Tenure-Clock Extension for Parenthood (Appendices 2.66 and 2.67).

2.II.G.5 Standards and Support For Graduate Students/Teaching Assistants

The Graduate Life Office was created in 2001 to work with graduate students on the full range of professional and social issues. A number of new initiatives were launched successfully, including a proposed graduate teacher development program developed in collaboration with the faculty Graduate and Research Committee and the Faculty Development Office. The proposed program is funded and a pilot teacher development program will be offered in fall of 2007.

As in previous years, an orientation for Teaching Assistants will be offered at the beginning of each fall and spring semester. Orientation is comprised of two parts: A general “getting your bearings at Lehigh” session intended for all graduate students, and a specific orientation for new Teaching Assistants, which includes effective use of technology in the classroom, information on student support services, harassment training, and lab safety training.

Additional support for graduate students whose first language is not English is offered through the English as a Second Language (ESL) office.

2.II.G.6 Summary and Recommendations

Lehigh’s strong commitment to excellence in its faculty and other teaching personnel is obvious. Almost all tenure track positions are filled with faculty with a doctorate or an equivalent terminal degree in their fields. Although the number of non-tenure track instructors has risen in recent years, Lehigh depends less on non-tenure track instructors than its peers. Deans carefully evaluate appointments for adjuncts, visiting instructors, and professors of practice, and department chairs monitor their classroom effectiveness.

Resources are readily available to faculty, particularly new faculty, for help in improving their teaching, and these resources are available to both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty. In the area of research, the offices of the Vice Provost for Research and the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs offer support to faculty in locating, writing, and submitting research grants. And mentorship programs at the University and College levels offer new faculty informal support in establishing their research agendas and classroom
techniques. The tenure and promotion guidelines clearly emphasize excellence in teaching and research as standards for faculty success, and the guidelines can be found easily on the Provost’s webpage, as well as on College portals.

Lehigh has not been as successful as many in the University community would like in the area of increasing faculty diversity; however, some gains have been made and this issue is a major, ongoing focus of a faculty task force within a larger institutional drive to increase diversity. In addition, the University commitment to providing help to graduate student instructors has improved in recent years, there are ongoing plans to improve these resources, and new programs are soon to be implemented.

The University welcomes the opportunity to build on the strength of the improvements made in supporting faculty and other teaching personnel at Lehigh. Specifically, the University identifies the opportunities to further clarify and communicate assessment of non-tenure track faculty and enhance institutional support for post-tenure faculty.

1. Assessment of non-tenure track faculty is not well understood across the University.

   Recommendation: Clarifying assessment procedures for non-tenure track faculty and making them widely accessible, and building on the strength of recent improvements that make tenure and promotion standards easily accessible to faculty and department chairs.

   Recommendation: Where existing procedures are not clear, additional clarification should include collaboration with relevant faculty committees, department chairs, and other faculty stakeholders.

2. Currently, institution-wide support in teaching, research/scholarship, and service/leadership for post-tenure faculty is not addressed as coherently as support for new faculty.

   Recommendation: A process for reviewing institution-wide faculty development structures and resources, which meets the goal of supporting faculty across the whole of their careers.

   Recommendation: An institution-wide commitment to faculty development that integrates existing support under an overarching set of institutional goals, which is measured regularly by widely understood metrics for success and whose assessment data are used to continuously gauge the effectiveness of investment into faculty development.