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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Commission on Residential Environment (CORE) formed eight working groups to explore the following aspects of the residential environment: undergraduate residential life and housing; fraternity and sorority life and housing; off campus life and housing; affinity and special interest life and housing; international student life and housing; graduate student life and housing; social life, social policy, and student conduct; faculty role in the residential learning environment. The work of these groups led to numerous recommendations of limited scope and led to the following major recommendations.

Lehigh should:

1. Require all students live in university housing for their first three years.
2. Focus and strengthen special interest and affinity housing.
3. Fully develop a “living learning” model of residential housing.
4. Provide more housing for graduate students.
5. Rewrite the social policy.
6. Improve support for international undergraduate students.
BACKGROUND

The Commission on Residential Environment (CORE) was formed subsequent to an email to the Lehigh community on 26 March 2104. Quoting from that email:

"the President, Provost, and CEC announce the creation of a high-level commission to evaluate and recommend improvements to student living and how the residential environment relates to education and social life at Lehigh. The work of this group will include the evaluation of housing demand trends both undergraduate and graduate, current capacities, Greek life and "affinity housing", off campus housing, residence-based education, related social policies and practices, financial structures of our living groups, meal plans, housing costs, social alternatives and related issues the commission feels are relevant."

President Gast and Provost Farrell appointed trustee Sarat Sethi and professor emeritus Edwin Kay co-chairs of CORE. In turn, the above four recruited 12 additional members. The members of CORE are:

Co-Chairs
Sarat Sethi, Trustee
Edwin Kay, Professor Emeritus

Trustees:
Robert Brown
Michael Connor

Alumna:
Kathleen Trimble

Faculty:
Robert Flowers
Jacob Kazakia
Jesus Salas

Undergraduate Students:
Danielle Taitt
Ryan Newcomer
Madison McGahan

Graduate Student:
David Nguyen

Staff:
Allison Gulati
Greg Reihman

The complete charge for CORE is in Appendix I.

CORE decided to focus on eight areas. Some of these areas overlap and, collectively, cover the issues raised in the charge. CORE then formed eight working groups that correspond to the eight areas that we identified and recruited co-chairs for the working groups as well as members for the working groups. Each working group
has at least one member of CORE as a member (but not as a co-chair). The working
groups, their co-chairs, and their CORE representatives are as follows:

1. Undergraduate Residential Life and Housing (WG1)
   Leon Washington, co-chair
   Jess Manno, co-chair
   Allison Gulati, CORE
2. Fraternity and Sorority Life and Housing (WG2)
   Joe Sterrett, co-chair
   Sharon, Basso, co-chair
   Ryan Newcomer, CORE
   Mike Connor, CORE
   Robert Flowers, CORE
3. Off Campus Life and Housing (WG3)
   Kim Smith, co-chair
   Brooke DeSipio, co-chair
   Madison McGahan, CORE
4. Affinity and Special Interest Life and Housing (WG4)
   Heather Johnson, co-chair
   Taran Cardone, co-chair
   Jesus Salas, CORE
   Danielle Taitt, CORE
5. International Student Life and Housing (WG5)
   William Hunter, co-chair
   Rick Weisman, co-chair
   Jacob Kazakia, CORE
6. Graduate Student Life and Housing (WG6)
   Diane Hyland, co-chair
   Stacy Burger, co-chair
   David Nguyen, CORE
7. Social Life, Social Policy, and Student Conduct  (WG7)
   Lynn Columba, co-chair
   Katherine Lavinder, co-chair
   Kathy Trimble, CORE
   Robert Brown, CORE
8. Faculty Role in the Residential Learning Environment (WG8)
   Richard Aronson, co-chair
   Lori McClaind, co-chair
   Greg Reihman, CORE

CORE’s charge to the above working groups is in Appendix II.

The working groups made their reports to CORE on 15 April. Subsequently, the 16 co-
chairs met with the members of CORE to produce a rough outline of this report. The
executive summaries of the working groups’ reports are in Appendix III. The complete
reports are in Appendix IV.
This report is organized into four parts. In the first part we present a vision for the future of Lehigh’s residential campus. In the second part we provide a broad overview of the information that the working groups gathered in executing their charge, and we recommend processes for implementing our recommendations. In the third part we present a number of recommendations that would lead to substantial institutional changes and, in some cases, would require substantial financial resources and a number of years to implement. For each recommendation we first set its context and explain how its implementation is intended to improve the residential environment. In the fourth part, we present a fairly long list of more modest recommendations that can be quickly and readily implemented. We organize the latter recommendations according to the working group that was the source of the recommendation. Again, before making the given recommendation we set its context and intended result.
VISION OF THE ROLE OF RESIDENTIAL EDUCATION AT LEHIGH

Having students reside on campus has the primary purpose of complementing and enhancing Lehigh's academic goals. Lehigh's residential and social environment should promote health and safety, nurture growth of personal values, facilitate diversity and inclusion, integrate the residential and academic aspects of students' lives, and provide opportunities for rich experiential learning.

For our undergraduate students, the campus environment will offer an array of innovative living options including traditional residence halls; fraternities and sororities; exciting special interest communities; and faculty-led residential communities. Students will expect to live alongside and interact actively with others from diverse backgrounds. To serve the major goal of promoting the cross-pollination of thoughts and actions among these diverse living groups Lehigh will provide facilities, policies, and infrastructure that support vibrant and safe social opportunities for students and student affinity groups to interact on campus.

We aspire to offer our undergraduate students a residential environment that sparks curiosity, that enhances students' ability to explore and grow stronger in their individual identities, that assists students in gaining a deep appreciation for developing relationships and interacting in meaningful ways with others, that promotes both academic and experiential learning, that encourages inclusive leadership, and that builds a sense of community for all. Our facilities will be designed and constructed to strongly support the residential system’s educational offerings, living options, and supervisory structures.

For our graduate students, we aspire to offer a residential environment that complements their academic and professional pursuits, facilitates deeper relationships with faculty, creates opportunities for mentorship with undergraduate students, and strengthens a sense of community among the larger Lehigh and Bethlehem communities.
OVERVIEW

Over 60 people were involved in the labors of the eight working groups. In the process the working groups developed a large body of information relevant to CORE’s charge. The working groups’ reports necessarily condensed that information. This report, in turn, condensed the information in the working groups’ reports. In implementing any of our recommendations it is important to have the larger body of information available to avoid duplication of effort. We have developed an archive to save the working groups’ reports and to preserve the hard earned wealth of information that they gathered. The password-protected web page www.lehigh.edu/~incore/archive provides a link to that archive.

The co-chairs of the working groups and the members of CORE have had a yearlong education about the residential environment, an education that should not be wasted. They also have a detailed understanding of the information that they gathered, an understanding that should be taken advantage of. In general, the first five major recommendations will require further study and planning. On the other hand, many of the more modest recommendations represent “action items” that can be referred to the appropriate senior officer. With the exception of residential services, those relevant senior officers report to the provost. We recommend that a committee, drawn in part from the working group co-chairs and the members of CORE, be formed to advise the provost on the implementation of CORE’s recommendations, with special attention to the major recommendations.
MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

MAJOR RECOMMENDATION #1. A “THREE YEAR” REQUIREMENT

Over the past five years or so, the social scene for undergraduates has shifted from gatherings on campus, primarily in the fraternity houses, to rented houses and apartments on the edge of campus. For example, six years ago more than 80 parties were registered on campus, whereas in the fall 2014 semester only five were registered. Off-campus members of the same fraternity room together, members of the same sorority room together, and member of the same athletic team tend to room together. These groups hold the vast majority of the parties, using their rented houses and apartments as venues. These locations are ill suited for such gatherings, threatening the safety of the students. Often enough, the parties are held in the rented houses’ basements, in overcrowded conditions and in violation of fire laws that require multiple egresses.

In general, parties held off-campus are more exclusive than parties held on campus. The venues are smaller so that attendance tends to be limited to students affiliated with the people holding the party.

Currently Lehigh’s students must spend their first two years living on campus. Those sophomores who belong to fraternities or sororities are motivated to inherit the leases of their upper class fraternity brothers and sorority sisters living in the highly desirable housing close to campus and sign their own leases for this housing at the end of their first year, one year ahead of their occupancy. This precludes their exploring alternative options for housing in their upper class years.

The fraternities satisfy the pressures to keep their chapter houses at full occupancy by having their sophomore members live in the fraternity houses. Because of intense interest in membership, sororities have the problem of being over capacity and being unable to readily house juniors and seniors. Consequently some junior and most senior fraternity and sorority members live off-campus, which reduces their participation in chapter leadership. Indeed, in many chapters the officers are predominantly sophomores. The fraternities and sororities would be better served by having older, more mature leadership.

“Live Lehigh” is a program that provides both the incoming student and the upper class student the opportunity to live with a group of students with shared interests and provides programs that promote the shared interest. This past academic year there were eight different “affinity groups” for first year students and seven affinity groups for upper class students, with 489 students participating. Below we will recommend expanding the affinity programs. Here we note that for juniors the possibility of living off campus competes with participation in Live Lehigh programs.

The above synthesizes information gathered by five of the working groups, each of which independently came to the same conclusion: the residential environment would be greatly enhanced by expanding the current requirement that first and second year students live on
campus by requiring all third year students live on campus as well. We think this change will move much of the social life back onto campus, where the environment will be safer, better controlled, and where the social scene will be more inclusive. Also, we think it will make the Live Lehigh programs more attractive to more students. The Fraternity and Sorority working group made a more nuanced recommendation, which we second: sophomore fraternity and sorority members should live in the dormitories and not in their chapter houses. This would have three salubrious effects. It would reduce the exclusivity of the social lives of the sophomore fraternity and sorority members. Second, it would strengthen the fraternities and sororities by increasing the number of upper class residents in the chapter houses. Most important, Lehigh would ensure that the students living on campus would be exposed to curricular and co-curricular opportunities to a greater extent.

This recommendation of requiring all first, second, and third year students to live on campus, if accepted, would clearly play out over a number of years, and there are numerous details that would need to be worked out. Our best rough guess is that Lehigh would need about 500 additional beds on campus to effect this recommendation.

MAJOR RECOMMENDATION #2. FOCUS AND STRENGTHEN SPECIAL INTEREST AND AFFINITY HOUSING.

Lehigh faculty and staff have initiated some Live Lehigh programs, while students have initiated other Live Lehigh programs. The success of the latter has been quite variable, because student initiated programs often depend upon the leadership and strong motivations of individual students. When the given student leader of a highly successful program graduates, the program often loses steam. Lehigh should build on the Live Lehigh programs by reframing and strengthening a few (4-6) high-quality, structured, university-initiated communities. These would be university-supported programs, advised by committed faculty and staff, and available to all. Each community would be rooted in a theme that explicitly focuses on synthesizing and integrating personal growth and academic experiences. Examples may include (but are by no means limited to) UMOJA (a multicultural house), PRIDE (for trans-gender and gender non-conforming students), CHOICE (substance free housing), Service Learning, Entrepreneurship, and STEM. The advisors (faculty and staff) should be vetted carefully, and there should be significant and meaningful incentives for faculty and staff involvement (i.e. stipends, teaching time release, merit acknowledgement, dining privileges, etc.). The housing for these special interest and affinity options could be in current facilities. There should be staff in the Office of Residence Life fully dedicated to these programs.

MAJOR RECOMMENDATION #3. FULLY DEVELOP A “LIVING LEARNING” MODEL OF RESIDENTIAL LIFE

In an era of accountability and evidence-based education, students expect to benefit from dynamic learning environments that reinforce the value of a face-to-face, residential education as opposed to an online curriculum. A variety of surveys administered to
Lehigh students confirm that Lehigh students expect a world-class learning experience where professors are involved with them beyond the formal classroom and mentor them personally and professionally. Similarly, Lehigh faculty surveyed through the National Faculty Survey on Student Engagement share hopes for guiding students and deeply engaging them in the campus environment. Despite these shared expectations and hopes, internal and external assessment data confirm that that vision is not translating into reality at Lehigh, resulting in divisions among the faculty, the staff, and the students. Closing this divide is a pressing challenge, as data can now show the extent to which colleges and universities have graduated students who are successful in multiple aspects of their lives. In fact, Gallup is now comparing those data across institutions and revealing where institutions are falling short and where they can bolster their efforts via practices proven to enhance students’ experiences both during and beyond college -- many of which are at the core of this proposal.

Faculty-in-residence communities are among the best ways to contribute to student success as it relates to achieving higher education outcomes because they combine crucial components such as faculty mentorship and application of knowledge within a practical community. Three years ago, Lehigh piloted the Residential Fellow Program with Professor Heather Johnson and her family moving onto campus to live with the students in Sayre Park Village. Yearly evaluations of the community demonstrate the positive gains stemming from ongoing interactions with Professor Johnson and her family both on individual students and on the community at large. The Residential Fellow Program is a form of “living-learning” community, in which the residential and academic experiences are integrated to offer a comprehensive, holistic undergraduate living-learning community, providing students, faculty, and staff a transformative experience during their time at Lehigh. The most successful living-learning communities include university supported faculty and staff involvement, promoting rich interactions that foster students’ intellectual and leadership development.

We recommend that Lehigh aggressively expand its Living Learning programs to foster new opportunities for meaningful faculty-student interaction, and thus bring the residential experience of our students and the culture of our campus in-line with our core institutional mission and values: “To advance learning through the integration of teaching, research, and service to others” (see Lehigh University Mission Statement).

The implementation of this recommendation has three important components. First, there needs to be an appropriate physical infrastructure. This is broadly envisioned as a new physical space on Lehigh’s campus, constructed as a “campus within the campus.” This new campus would incorporate upper class student housing with structured and university supported faculty-in-residence programs, rooted in partnerships and collaborations across the university (connecting students, staff, and faculty), so that the student’s residential life and the student’s academic life are physically integrated. This new Living-Learning Community area would include residence halls; faculty residences; classrooms; meeting rooms; event space (for lectures, speakers, programs, etc.); dining facilities; office space for staff; social space indoors and green space outdoors conducive to community building; and common community space conducive for natural gathering
of students, faculty, and staff who are not living in the area (in particular, upper-class students who live off campus). This recommendation aligns with our first recommendation; the construction of housing space for 500 more students on campus should be designed to accommodate living-learning programs.

Second, there needs to be committed involvement by faculty. These new residential spaces would have specific pre-determined and set themes, that would change over time, as developed in each period by the various faculty-in-residence. The leadership positions (individual faculty members, or faculty families) would be chosen carefully through a selective vetting process. The faculty-in-residence program would be housed in the President’s Office (or, minimally, the Provost’s Office), and would work in conjunction with the Office of Residence Life and other stakeholders across the university to support the programs and individuals involved in the leadership and operation of them. Working Group 8 (Faculty Role in the Residential Learning Environment), whose work we describe in more detail below, surveyed faculty interest in being involved in campus activities outside the classroom. Their data indicate varying degrees of interest in such involvement, but there was a group of faculty interested in serving as faculty-in-residence.

Third, strong institutional support for the concept of living-learning communities is needed. Most important is the way in which Lehigh supports the faculty-in-residence. Lehigh’s professors are explicitly rewarded for their teaching, for their research and scholarship, and for their service. Traditionally, activities that involve interacting with students outside the classroom have been considered “service.” When it comes to activities such as the Residential Fellow Program (and many other forms of active faculty-student engagement), this conception is wrong. For the Residential Fellows, these activities are not simply university service, but are substantively part of their teaching. This sort of activity, when done well, is teaching; it is pedagogy, mentoring, advising, and providing role models -- across the campus and beyond -- well outside the confines of the traditional classroom’s walls. The very notion of a living-learning community depends upon viewing the Residential Fellow as a teacher. The Residential Fellows should be given credit for their teaching beyond the traditional academic course. There must be substantial and meaningful support for faculty-in-residence (i.e. stipends, course reductions, contracted sabbatical leaves upon completion of time lived-on, merit acknowledgement, on-campus dining privileges, etc.). In order for living-learning communities such as faculty-in-residence programs to be successful, explicit university support will be necessary to attract and sustain faculty in such efforts.

MAJOR RECOMMENDATION #4. PROVIDE MORE HOUSING FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

The housing needs of graduate students are much more diverse than the housing needs of undergraduates. Some graduate students are single, some have families, and many are international students. In contrast to the beginning undergraduate students, whose housing is assigned to them, the beginning graduate students are pretty much on their own. This can be especially daunting for international students, whose understanding of
what it means to lease an apartment is at best vague. This is compounded by the practice, noted above, of undergraduate students signing leases a year in advance, thus locking out newly arrived graduate students from the desirable housing closer to campus. Further, most housing options close to campus must be shared with other students, something that is very difficult for a newly arrived graduate student to negotiate.

Working group 6 (Graduate Student Life and Housing) found that the major challenge for graduate students was finding safe and affordable housing and that “the quality of their housing is related to their overall wellbeing and their ability to be successful in their academic programs.” There is anecdotal evidence that the lack of good housing for graduate students makes it more difficult to recruit and retain the best graduate students.

Currently, the university provides 3300 beds for its 5000 undergraduates and 200 beds for its 1200 full time graduate students. We recommend that Lehigh increase the number of beds for graduate students, by acquiring, refurbishing, and managing houses near the lower campus and by building new graduate housing on the lower campus.

MAJOR RECOMMENDATION #5. REWRITE LEHIGH’S SOCIAL POLICY

The main thrust of Lehigh’s social policy is the regulation of the serving of alcohol at student events on campus. In practice, the policy states quite detailed rules for the serving of alcohol at fraternity houses, because sororities are forbidden by their nationals to serve alcohol and because the barriers erected by the social policy are too high for other social groups to serve alcohol. It is likely that the current social policy, coupled with the students’ desires to engage in high-risk drinking, is responsible for the migration of the social scene off campus. Its stringent rules may have initiated a cycle where an increase in the number of parties off campus made living off campus more attractive, which in turn led to the holding of more parties off campus. Many of the working groups independently concluded that social life on campus would be greatly improved if the fraternities’ did not have a near monopoly on holding parties. To that end, CORE recommends that Lehigh rewrite its social policy so that it has broader application and facilitates social events by a wide variety of campus groups. We note that this is a major undertaking that requires careful study, which is why we refrained from taking on that task.

MAJOR RECOMMENDATION #6. IMPROVE SUPPORT FOR UNDERGRADUATE INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS.

Over the last five years undergraduate enrollment of international students has increased from 156 to 334. These international students have difficult challenges in adjusting both to Lehigh’s academic culture and to U.S. culture. WG5 (International Student Life and Housing), based on interviews with staff members in Residential Services and Residential Life, based on a survey of the undergraduate international students, and based on data from focus groups of international students and of leaders of international cultural clubs, concluded that there are numerous ways to better meet the needs of these students. We
hope that the new Vice President for International Affairs takes the lead in implementing the programs and action that we list below.

First, some, but not all, international students are picked up at the airport. More of that kind of transportation should be provided because of the difficulties a newcomer to America has in negotiating our public transportation. Second, there is currently a short orientation program for international students. They would be better served by a weeklong orientation that deals with the special challenges that international students face. Part of the orientation should include a pairing of international students with American students, who help the international students adjust to our culture. Third, for international students there is a tension between wanting the comfort of being with students from their own country and for wanting to achieve fluency in American English and to learn the nuances of American culture. We believe that Lehigh should more strongly serve the latter purpose. In particular, Lehigh should facilitate the rooming together of American and international students. To that purpose, we recommend that American students with international interests and international students live together. This would provide the right balance between the two competing desires cited above. Fourth, many international students are pretty much left to their own devices during school breaks. Lehigh should provide programs to fill this vacuum. Indeed, it is an ideal time for Lehigh to organize trips for these students to visit nearby cities and cultural institutions.
SHORT-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS

Most of the additional recommendations that follow emanated from a single working group, unless otherwise noted. To highlight each of the recommendations we have numbered each.

Undergraduate Residential Life and Housing (WG1)

1.1. In their work both WG1 and WG3 met with members of the South Bethlehem community and developed a friendly, useful dialog. From these interactions it became clear that Lehigh and South Bethlehem would be well served by an advisory committee composed of community and university members. As an interesting example, the students’ landlords expressed real interest in the broad education of the students, especially when it comes to being good tenants and good neighbors.

1.2. WG1 and WG3 both noted that the most of the residential programs serve students living on campus. We support their recommendation that programs for addressing the needs of students living off campus should be developed and that staff be hired to address the specific needs of these students.

1.3. The undergraduate student members of CORE stated their belief that students admitted to Lehigh “early decision (ED)” are financially better off and get earlier preferences for housing by making earlier housing deposits. (Offering earlier housing preferences for earlier deposits was part of Lehigh’s recruiting strategy). They further believed that this led to some socio-economic segregation between two specific dorms. We collected empirical data that corroborated the specific anecdotal evidence. Further, we found that this phenomenon seems to be occurring at other institutions. We recommend that the date of deposit no longer determine preference in the choice of housing and that Lehigh use a housing lottery after “deposit day” to place incoming students. We note that Leon Washington, Vice Provost of Admissions and Financial Aid and co-chair of WG1, believes that this change would not affect the attractiveness of Lehigh’s offers of admission. Making this change would further our goal of providing a campus environment that facilitates diversity and inclusion.

Fraternity and Sorority Life and Housing (WG2)

2.1 WG2 noted the asymmetry between the supervision that Lehigh has in its dormitories, e.g., by providing Gryphons, and the lack of supervision in the fraternity and sorority houses. They recommend, and we concur, that Lehigh explore an approach where the amount of supervision depends on the age and maturity of the students, rather than where they reside. This would mean less supervision of upper class students and more supervision of younger members of fraternities and sororities.
Off Campus Life and Housing (WG3)

3.1. When Lehigh students move off campus they encounter the various challenges of renting their own housing and in managing their own households. Lehigh can improve its support of the students living off campus. First, the website for off campus students should be upgraded and made more relevant to the students’ off campus experience.

3.2. Second, Lehigh should encourage better behavior on the part of the landlords by developing a registry for approved rental houses and apartments. To improve the general behavior of the students living off campus Lehigh should be selective in allowing students to live off campus by making living off campus a privilege, dependent, e.g., on GPA and on good disciplinary standing.

Affinity and Special Interest Life and Housing (WG4)

4.1. Currently the housing units offer a wide variety of environments: there are different levels of oversight (e.g., presence or absence of Gryphons), of amenities available (e.g., meals served in the housing facility), of the ability to host social events and to serve alcohol at those events, etc. Some attempts should be made to minimize those differences that do not promote student development and the development of community.

International Student Life and Housing (WG5)

5.1. The data that WG5 collected indicated that international students tend to be less involved in residence programming. They should be counseled to become more involved. Further, they should be encouraged to become Gryphons, which would have two effects. The international students who become Gryphons would be more involved, and they would act as role models for the greater involvement of other international students.

5.2. International students who live off campus are ill prepared for the dangers of living in urban America. Lehigh should take measures to improve the safety of those areas where international students live off campus.

5.3. The Lehigh valley has a wealth of ethnic grocery stores (Turkish, Chinese, Indian, Hispanic, Mediterranean, etc.), but they are out of reach of undergraduate international students, who typically lack cars. Lehigh should develop a system for transporting the international students to these grocery stores.

5.4. CISH, a community based organization of volunteers, aims to provide support for international students. CISH has the problem of finding ways to achieve its aim. Lehigh should reduce this frustration by developing ways to use CISH’s help. For example, this year some of the international students expressed strong interest in dining with a “typical” American family. CISH would be eager to satisfy this interest.
5.5. Currently, information of interest to international students is scattered among a number of Lehigh’s web pages. These students would be better served by a website that consolidates all such information.

5.6. For most international students the fraternity and sorority system is an alien concept that they have a great deal of trouble understanding. At the least, they should be educated about the system, say during orientation. Also, Lehigh should explore ways to develop a fraternity or sorority chapter whose membership is a mixture of American and international students.

Graduate Student Life and Housing (WG6)

6.1. As opposed to undergraduates, the lives of graduate students are more centered on their departments. Yet, they often feel isolated from the larger Lehigh community. Lehigh should increase the amount of resources and the number of programs devoted to the lives of graduate students outside the classroom and laboratory.

6.2. In their various discussions with graduate students WG6 heard a few loud complaints about excessive amounts of work required of research assistants (RAs) and teaching assistants (TAs). They also heard complaints that some RAs and TAs were being asked to perform personal favors for their advisors, activities that were clearly beyond the scope of RA and TA assignments. This problem should be addressed in two ways. First, Lehigh should clearly communicate to faculty and graduate students the work requirements of RAs and TAs. Second, Lehigh should find ways to monitor the RA and TA systems to avoid abuses.

Social Life, Social Policy, and Student Conduct (WG7)

7.1. WG7, in concert with a number of the other working groups, is concerned that the fraternities and sororities overly dominate social life at Lehigh. To moderate this dominance, Lehigh should develop ways to foster inclusive and broad social activities on campus. Further, Lehigh should construct indoor and outdoor facilities conducive to these activities.

Faculty Role in the Residential Learning Environment (WG8)

8.1. As noted above, there is a critical mass of faculty who have expressed interest in interacting with the students outside the classroom, ranging from leading occasional student discussions on subjects of personal (non-academic) interest to living in a faculty residence on campus. Lehigh should take maximum advantage of this faculty interest by fully developing a model of faculty-student interaction that has graded levels of engagement. Programs should be developed that reflect the various levels, and there should be meaningful rewards (beyond the intrinsic reward) for faculty participation. Below we sketch out a model with four levels of engagement.
Residential College Master: Faculty who live on campus in faculty apartments in student housing and provide significant leadership to the Faculty Associates and students; they would have a substantial role in designing the residential learning experience.

Residential Faculty Fellow: Faculty who do not live on campus yet provide significant leadership to the Faculty Associates and students; they would have a considerable role in designing the residential learning experience.

Faculty Associate: Faculty who do not live on campus yet affiliate with a residential hall or student community; involvement would include approximately 5-10 programs, meals, or events with students per semester.

Faculty Affiliate: Faculty who do not live on campus yet affiliate with a residential hall or student community; involvement would include 1-5 programs, meals, or events with students per semester.
APPENDIX I.

Charge to CORE

As a residential university, we greatly value the experiences our students gain by living in an educational community. Learning at Lehigh includes and extends into the living environment and our standards for the living environment must be as high as our standards for teaching and research. We charge this high-level commission of trustees, faculty, students and staff to consider how the residential and social lives of students can contribute to their Lehigh education and the Lehigh mission, and how the residential and social experience of Lehigh students could more closely approximate that ideal. The commission should develop recommendations on what we could do to move towards this goal. The commission should evaluate all aspects of Lehigh University’s student living environment that the commission deems appropriate. The university will provide the commission with resources for research and data gathering. The commission will seek input from across the campus community, alumni and neighbors. In terms of timing, the goals of the commission are to provide the Board of Trustees with an update and progress report during the June 2014 meeting of the Board. Thereafter, with respect to defining standards and ideals for the University’s living environment, the goal is to provide the administration and Board with concrete actionable recommendations to achieve these aspirations prior to the June 2015 meeting of the Board. We thank in advance Trustee Sarat Sethi and Professor Emeritus Edwin Kay for their leadership of the Commission and all members of the Commission and its working groups for their service.
APPENDIX II.

Charge to CORE working groups

Within the context of the charge to CORE and within the context of the given work group, answer the six questions below, keeping in mind:
(a) Health and safety, including the role of alcohol and other drugs;
(b) Diversity and inclusion;
(c) Enhancing Lehigh's academic environment; and
(d) Engagement with the South Bethlehem community.

(1) What Lehigh program and policies currently in effect have a positive effect on the campus environment?
(2) What are the top three changes you believe would have a positive effect on the students' environment?
(3) What three successful programs from Lehigh's peer and aspirational universities can we implement at Lehigh?
(4) What universities have reputations for having a positive campus environment? Which of their programs contribute to that environment? Could those programs be implemented at Lehigh?
(5) What are the biggest challenges that Lehigh students face?
(6) What current Lehigh policies would you change, and why?
APPENDIX III.

Executive Summaries

Executive Summary – Working Group 1
Leon Washington & Jessica Manno, co-chairs

The undergraduate residence life and housing working group having the same charge as the other working groups, critically examined the educational co-curricular residential living experience and physical housing facilities and processes at Lehigh. Related to the charge, WG1 was specifically seeking to answer how the co-curricular residential living experience and university provided housing could enhance the students’ personal growth and educational experience, while contributing positively to the overall university climate.

We have established the overall vision of “a cutting-edge residential research university that expects the integration of research and discovery everywhere on campus” as the guide for our major philosophical recommendation;

*Three years of diverse, vibrant, inclusive, and educational residential experiences are guaranteed and required for all undergraduate students to enhance and compliment the curricular mission of the university.*

This philosophical recommendation is teased apart into two primary components, which are used to give shape to two overarching recommendations;

1. By 2020 on campus residential housing will be available and required for all first, second and third year undergraduate students. Housing spaces and processes to be coordinated and overseen by the Office of Residential Services in close collaboration with the Office of Residence Life

2. By 2020, the on campus residential experience will be a seamless and synonymous synthesis of living and learning.
   i. Restructure the FY housing placement process to focus on the creative curiosity, intellectual exploration and personal growth and development of students first and foremost.
   ii. Examine the possibility of purchasing homes closest to the east side of campus and converting them into campus owned, off campus housing options for seniors, similar to the Warren Square model.
iii. Enhancement of the housing and dining offerings during non-traditional class times (fall, winter, spring breaks).

Within this report, key recommendations are provided that align with the 2012 and 2013 appreciative inquiry process by the Offices of Residence Life, Office of Fraternity & Sorority Affairs, and Residential Services at Lehigh University. The recommendations also take into account the best practices and policies of peer and aspirational institutions, and schools with which we remain competitive at the highest levels for admissions.

Executive Summary – Working Group 2
Fraternity & Sorority Life and Housing
Sharon Basso & Joe Sterrett, co-chairs

Basic Tenets and Overview
Working Group 2 (Greek Life) of the Committee on the Residential Experience conducted its activities through an extensive series of discussions with key constituency groups (including a broad spectrum of students as well as parents, faculty, staff, alumni and national organization officials) followed by highly interactive dialogue among committee members. Among the many perspectives on the role of Greek Life as a part of the residential experience at Lehigh, perhaps the most important to recognize is that the issues associated with Greek Life are deeply connected to many of the other recommendations that are under consideration for residential, social and community life. Accordingly, all of the ideas advanced by the CORE process should be evaluated in the context of the full set of recommendations.

Before presenting the most significant ideas or recommendations that emerged from our working group study and discussions, we want to summarize a set of reminders our Working Group adopted that also are likely to apply to any of the conclusions that emerge from the CORE report

1. All ideas are likely to have implications for areas beyond the scope of any specific working group. In this overall process, comparatively little time was devoted to cross working group dialogue. Therefore, it will be critical to plan and conduct additional discussion of all ideas and possible recommendations before they are adopted. The concept of recommending an implementation team that would conduct these integrated discussions has merit.
2. All conceptual ideas discussed by Working Group 2 may have a range of options including fairly extreme forms as well as comparatively modest changes to current practices. Where the CORE group might land on this continuum ought to be a function of the total number of changes that are proposed and projected impact of those changes. Like any multivariate analysis, the impact of change in one variable on all others is important to anticipate and consider.

3. A number of ideas and possible recommendations have potentially significant socioeconomic implications for students and their families. The implications of socioeconomic diversity on the Lehigh campus are among the most challenging cultural issues and merit careful thought.

4. Our working group recognized that even for recommendations around which there was strong consensus among those involved in the discussions, there may be individual circumstances that merit an exception to a proposed policy. Therefore, our working group encourages the CORE steering committee to advocate for consideration of a process for determining when and how exceptions to recommended changes in policy or practice ought to be made.

5. Finally, the proportion of our discussion and deliberation time that was linked to matters of “social policy” was significant. Perhaps this is characteristic of the Greek system, and our working group concluded that social dynamics and social policy considerations are important themes to any residential university, most especially those engaged in educating a cohort of students of traditional college age. Accordingly, any planning for social policy modifications deserves to have highly integrated contributions from a range of campus personnel. The social policy issues are complex and the risk of unintended consequences is significant.

Core Ideas
The full report contains six “core ideas” that the working group vetted and includes a discussion of each idea, along with a characterization of the level of support attributed to our working group. Some of the core ideas received
unanimous support from our group, while other core ideas received mixed support and/or no support. This group wanted to provide information even on the core ideas that were vetted and not supported so the community understands that we fully and comprehensively considered many approaches.

Summary of “Core Ideas” from Working Group:

**Core Idea 1 : Third Year Student On Campus Residential Requirement – sophomore aspect**
This working group discussed the core idea of requiring all juniors to reside in on-campus housing in the context of Greek Life. We believe this recommendation has the potential to be transformational for our university, and we discussed the implementation of such a policy within the context of Greek life. We discussed two approaches to the sophomore experience in the implementation of a junior housing requirement:

1. All sophomores live in residence halls and not in Greek facilities (many options on how to implement this to contribute to inclusion)
2. Some sophomores (based on criteria such as GPA, conduct record) reside in Greek chapter facilities which reduces the number of new beds to build and also contributes to multiple class years in chapter facilities for leadership mentoring of these younger students. In this instance, we would stipulate that sophomores may not hold significant chapter leadership roles, instead they would be residing in the chapter house to learn how to assume leadership roles in the future.

**Core Idea 2: Level of Residential Supervision**
The group discussed the concept of a continuum of supervision in all on-campus residences that can be conceptualized as moving from high supervision to very little or no supervision. The group recommends that there be a strategy and plan developed so that supervision of residence hall settings and Greek residential facilities be structured around the same continuum.

**Core Idea 3 : Spaces that Promote Community and Reduce Exclusivity**
The group discussed the transformational potential that physical spaces have on shaping behavior and supporting behaviors the campus values. There are three categories of spaces that we recommend be improved and enhanced at LU.

1. Community Dining Experience
The group recommends that a new framework of dining be examined and implemented that would incorporate Greek facility residents eating some of
their meals outside of their individual residential facilities and with other LU students.

2. Recreational/Social
The group recommends enhancements to outdoor spaces and existing facilities to create recreational and social spaces more prominent on campus and dedicated to student use. Some examples the group discussed include lighted basketball/tennis courts on Asa Packer campus, a satellite fitness center, and an outdoor amphitheater. Preliminary plans have existed for years for one such space, the “pergola” adjacent to M&M residence hall.

3. Community Hub –
The group supports the University Center Re-Imagined as an excellent illustration of existing space that could be transformed AND be transformative in promoting community, and providing much needed and significantly lacking square footage of open programmable space.

Core Idea 4: Affirmation of the presence of greek life in some form as one continued aspect of Lehigh University’s student life.
Given the national landscape of challenges universities are facing with greek life on campuses (hazing, alcohol risks, diversity and harassment issues, socio-economic considerations), the group fully discussed the continued value of greek life at Lehigh University and the potential impacts of abolishing the Greek system. This group affirms the continued presence of greek life at Lehigh University in some form and size, and reinforces the expectations articulated during the Strengthening Greek Life Task Force that Greek organizations must continue to demonstrate and uphold University policies and procedures, including the Student Code of Conduct and the more recent Principles of Our Equitable Community. Core Idea 5 : Size of the Greek System – this idea warrants significant further exploration
A. Overall size of the system
The group discussed the issues related to the current size of our Greek system – between 38 - 45% of LU students (and a bit higher currently for females). There is concern that this large of a percentage of any sub population in a culture has the potential to significantly influence a community. While we do not support the elimination of the system, there was some support for examining the overall size of the system in the context of perhaps identifying an “ideal percentage” of Greek affiliated students.
B. Size of Individual Sorority Chapters
Sororities face a different issue related to size. The current National Panhellenic Lehigh chapter can have membership as large as 135 students. The standard chapter member number, known as Chapter Total,
determined by the local Panhellenic council in conjunction with the National Panhellenic Council. Sororities at Lehigh are functioning well with these relatively large numbers with the exception of the residential experience. The large membership regularly results in an “over-occupancy” situation in their on campus residential facilities. Currently, in order to house their sophomore class, most of their junior class and their chapter leadership in the residence they need to triple and sometimes quad occupy rooms. This conversation links with many of the other ideas and conversations and should be continued in a comprehensive manner.

C. Size of Individual Multicultural Greek Chapters

One of the significant successes in the past decade of Lehigh Greek life is the expansion of the number of Multicultural Greek Chapters (traditionally members of the National Panhellenic Council and the North-American Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations). These chapters are values based and not traditionally as focused on the social aspects involving alcohol. Their presence has contributed to an inclusive campus environment. Some of the challenges the multicultural Greek chapters face on many campuses (and at LU) include lack of a strong alumni group, insufficient operating funds (related to limited regional and institutional alumni), and the size of each chapters’ membership is relatively small (3 – 10 members annually) which can cause them to have ebbs and flows in activity. Our working group believes that support of these chapters institutionally, warrants further campus discussion.

Core Idea 6: Examine possibilities to “right size” existing residential houses and other ways to re-design the configuration in the context of any broader residential recommendations.

This discussion really focused on the fact that it is difficult to emerge with some transformational ideas when the boundary of existing housing stock and assignments are in place. The present system of Greek chapters having sustainable access to desirable housing does provide a bit of gridlock and difficulty for others to have an opportunity at such attractive housing unless it is at the demise of a Greek chapter. We wonder if there are ways to change this for the better of the campus environment and support ongoing investigation of possibilities.

Executive Summary – Working Group 3
Off Campus Life and Housing
Kim Carrell-Smith and Brooke DeSipio, co-chairs
The off campus working group determined that there are several initiatives currently in place that address the needs of off campus students but they need to be further developed and publicized. These include LUPD safety initiatives, Dale Kochard’s orientation program and off campus representatives on student senate. After exploring Lehigh’s off campus residential experience through conversations with students, faculty and staff, landlords and community members, and other working groups, as well as investigating peer and aspirational institutions the off campus working group is prepared to make **five key recommendations:**

1. While our working group supports a third year residency requirement in theory, we are *strongly* urging the university to adequately plan for and address any potential consequences before the policy is changed. We are specifically concerned about the effect of such a policy change on the neighborhoods surrounding Lehigh, a concern for both our admissions and campus life, as well as for the local community. We have heard the problem addressed as “gutting the neighborhood,” and are concerned about the potential to concentrate poverty and create new challenges in “abandoned” student neighborhoods close to campus.

2. In order to successfully accomplish recommendations 1-3, Lehigh needs a full time staff person and office dedicated to off campus residence life which could work with both undergraduates and graduate students.

3. Lehigh should create and maintain an advisory board comprised of University administrators, students, city officials, landlords, and community members that can work together to address off campus issues and build community. A key task of this advisory board would be to plan a joint university and community welcome day event during the fall semester each year. The group would also work on problems identified by the group, or by people who may be affected by Lehigh students living off campus.

4. Lehigh should develop more useable, accessible resources for off campus students, including a new re-vamped off campus website.

5. Off campus houses should be registered with the university and the university should develop requirements for students who want to move off
Executive Summary – Working Group 4
Affinity and Special Interest Life and Housing
Heather Johnson & Taran Cardone, co-chairs

Working Group #4 proposes to create a new hybrid living-learning model of residential housing to bring Lehigh University (LU) into the next era of residential college experience with a broad array of housing options for a diverse student population. Our proposal focuses on university-driven special interest and affinity housing, and a major build-out of a new housing arena for LU that would foster new opportunities for meaningful student-faculty interaction. The goal is to offer a campus-wide, comprehensive, integrated, holistic undergraduate living-learning community, which will give students, faculty, and staff a transformative experience during their time at Lehigh, and will propel Lehigh into the next era and for generations to come. This mission is operationalized through: a) university supported faculty and staff involvement and leadership, of b) creative living-learning programs, that c) connect residence life with academic and co-curricular programs, in order to d) promote rich faculty-student interactions and enhance a sense of community on-campus, while e) fostering students’ intellectual and leadership development. The model we propose incorporates two major components, briefly outlined below.

1. **University-Driven Themed Special Interest and Affinity Housing.**
Focus on creating and/or reframing and strengthening a few (4-6) high-quality, structured, university-driven communities. These would be university-supported initiatives, advised by committed faculty and staff, and available to all students (including incoming first-year students). Each community would be rooted in a theme which explicitly focuses on synthesizing and integrating both identity issues and academic experiences (in other words, combining the personal and the intellectual). Examples may include (but are by no means limited to) Umoja, PRIDE, CHOICE, Service Learning, Entrepreneurship, International Student House, and STEM. The advisors (faculty and staff) should be vetted carefully, and there should be significant and meaningful incentives for faculty and staff involvement (i.e. stipends, merit acknowledgement, dining privileges). The housing for these special interest and affinity options
could be in current facilities. These programs would be overseen by a newly established exempt staff position, and be housed in the Office of Residence Life.

2. **A New Hybrid Model Living-Learning Community.** Create a new residential option as an integrated experience for students and faculty. This is broadly envisioned as a set of newly constructed, high-quality residential spaces (set up as a new physical space on Lehigh’s campus; a “residential college”/“park”/“campus”), incorporating upper class student housing with structured and university supported faculty-in-residence programs rooted in partnerships and collaborations across the university (connecting students, staff, and faculty). These new residential spaces would have specific pre-determined and set themes, that would change over time, as developed in each period by the various faculty-in-residence. This Living-Learning Community area would include residence halls; faculty-in-residence housing; classroom/seminar space; event space (for lectures, speakers, programs, etc.); a dining hall facility for communal dining; office space for staff; social space indoors and green space outdoors conducive to community building; common community space conducive for natural gathering of students, faculty, and staff who are not living in the area (in particular, upper-class students who live off campus), possibly in the form of a coffee cafe or food vendor; recreation/fitness/exercise space; study/library-esque space. The leadership positions (individual faculty members, or faculty families) would be chosen carefully through a selective vetting process, and there would be substantial and meaningful incentives for faculty-in-residence (i.e. contracted sabbatical leaves upon completion of time lived-on, course reductions, stipends, merit acknowledgement, dining privileges). The faculty-in-residence program would be housed in the President’s Office (or, minimally, the Provost’s Office), and would work in conjunction with the Office of Residence Life and other stakeholders across the university to support the programs and individuals involved in the leadership and operation of them. Note: this should be co-ed, multi-class year housing, capable of attracting transfers, sophomores, juniors and seniors “back to campus” (away from living off campus).

**Executive Summary – Working Group 5**
**Undergraduate International Student Life and Housing**
**William Hunter and Rick Weisman, co-chairs**
Our committee was initially known as the International Student Residence/Campus Life Committee. In consultation with other committee leaders, it was determined early on that our committee would focus exclusively on undergraduate international students. The Graduate Student Residence/Campus Life Committee agreed to focus on the graduate international student population.

We met weekly throughout the fall semester, after meeting periodically in late spring and summer of 2014. To gather information, we held interviews with key Residential Services and Residential Life staff on campus, focus groups with international students and leaders of international cultural organizations, and conducted a survey of international undergraduate students.

Through our research, we identified a number of short-term goals that are relatively cheap and easy to institute, likely bringing significant positive benefits to incoming international students. Some of the most desired aspects here include: airport pick-ups for all newly arriving international students; an extended, further customized orientation (similar to PreLUsion); expanded safety patrols and CCTV in high-density, off-campus housing areas; and a year-long peer-to-peer program, matching international students with domestic students.

Numerous mid-term goals identified include: the creation of a “one-stop” website for international undergraduate students; expansion of host family opportunities; a greater understanding of Greek life and giving international students the option to start their own fraternity/sorority; and establishment of an International House as a residential center featuring vibrant cross-cultural programming. A comprehensive list of short-term and mid-term goals can be found in Appendix A.

Executive Summary – Working Group 6
Graduate Student Live and Housing
Stacy Burger & Diane Hyland, co-chairs

Important Recurring Themes

There was widespread agreement that housing and graduate life issues contribute to or impede academic persistence and success. The feedback we received across respondents and groups was consistent in emphasizing that decent, affordable housing lowers graduate students’ stress levels which benefits not just the students but the faculty with whom they work.

Safety was a recurring and deeply felt concern. Many respondents shared the anxiety they experience on a continuing basis related to personal safety while walking from campus to their cars or apartments. Many reported that this impacted their ability to be in their offices or labs in the evening and had negative effects on their performance.
Some voiced concerns about the safety of their current housing and some shared anecdotal reports of themselves or their friends being victimized by crime.

Since the graduate student population is diverse, challenges in the areas of graduate life and housing are not uniform. Some graduate students are long-term Lehigh Valley residents and others were Lehigh undergraduates. They are better prepared to understand the local rental market, and they enter graduate school with local friends and support networks. The challenges for graduate students relocating to Bethlehem for the first time are much greater. This is particularly true for international students who are coming to Lehigh alone or with families. They have difficulties securing housing remotely and negotiating complex lease processes, particularly when English is not their native language. In Bethlehem, many do not have cars and experience frequent challenges with routine daily tasks such as grocery shopping and laundry.

There was a commonly shared hypothesis that improvements in the area of graduate life and housing might improve recruitment, retention, and loyalty. Good housing and strong graduate life may help us to attract better graduate students. The quality of the total graduate school experience may influence retention rates and could affect sense of loyalty to Lehigh after degree completion. Given current students’ less than optimal assessment of graduate life and housing, will these alumni be ambassadors for Lehigh after graduation? Will they steer people in their network toward or away from Lehigh?

Executive Summary – Working Group 7
Social Life, Social Policy & Student Conduct
Katherine Lavinder & Lynn Columba, co-chairs

For WG7 the biggest challenges students face are: (1) balancing the social and academic aspects of their lives; (2) improving the current situation for parties, most of which are held off-campus in subpar, overcrowded venues; (3) confronting what students perceive as inconsistent enforcement of policies e.g., treating on-campus parties differently than those held off-campus, lax enforcement of rules for tailgate parties versus parties held on the lower campus; and (4) misusing alcohol.

WG7, independent of the above working groups, favors requiring juniors to live on campus for many of the same reasons as cited above: to enhance student safety, to have older (more mature) students live in the Greek houses, and to make it more likely that a larger proportion of parties would be held on campus. WG7 believes that Lehigh’s Social Policy should be rewritten and work should begin on this as soon as possible. The aim of this
effort is to increase opportunities for the students to socialize and to drive those activities onto campus.

WG7 identified the top three changes that we would recommend for producing a positive effect on the students’ environment: (1) require juniors to live on campus; (2) re-draft/update the Social Policy; and (3) foster socializing on campus.

Working Group 8
Faculty Role in Residential Learning Environment
Richard Aronson & Lori McClain, co-chairs

Student success is linked to the connectedness that students feel to their institution to include their relationships with their faculty. That level of engagement naturally occurs in the classroom, but there is value in understanding and recognizing that learning takes place everywhere, especially outside of the boundaries of the classroom and within the residential experience of our students. There are a number of opportunities, both large and small, where faculty can engage students on our campus; examples include living in the residence halls to participating in events and discussions across campus. To that end, we recommend that a multi-tiered system be developed for faculty to actively seek opportunities to build and strengthen relationships with students in the residential setting. We also recommend that this level of faculty engagement be recognized in the promotion and tenure review process.
APPENDIX IV.

Working Groups’ Reports

CORE Working Group #1
Undergraduate Residence Life & Housing

Co-Chairs: Leon Washington & Jessica Manno

Executive Summary

The undergraduate residence life and housing working group, having the same charge as the other working groups, critically examined the educational co-curricular residential living experience and physical housing facilities and processes at Lehigh. Related to the charge, WG1 was specifically seeking to answer how the co-curricular residential living experience and university provided housing could enhance the students’ personal growth and educational experience, while contributing positively to the overall university climate.

We have established the overall vision of “a cutting-edge residential research university that expects the integration of research and discovery everywhere on campus” as the guide for our major philosophical recommendation:

_Three years of diverse, vibrant, inclusive, and educational residential experiences are guaranteed and required for all undergraduate students to enhance and compliment the curricular mission of the university._

This philosophical recommendation is teased apart into two primary components, which are used to give shape to two overarching recommendations:

- By 2020 on campus residential housing will be available and required for all first, second and third year undergraduate students. Housing spaces and processes to be coordinated and overseen by the Office of Residential Services in close collaboration with the Office of Residence Life.
- By 2020, the on campus residential experience will be a seamless and synonymous synthesis of living and learning.
  - Restructure the FY housing placement process to focus on the creative curiosity, intellectual exploration and personal growth and development of students first and foremost.
  - Examine the possibility of purchasing homes closest to the east side of campus and converting them into campus owned, off
campus housing options for seniors, similar to the Warren Square model.

iii. Enhancement of the housing and dining offerings during non-traditional class times (fall, winter, spring breaks).

Within this report, key recommendations are provided that align with the 2012 and 2013 appreciative inquiry process by the Offices of Residence Life, Office of Fraternity & Sorority Affairs, and Residential Services at Lehigh University. The recommendations also take into account the best practices and policies of peer and aspirational institutions, and schools with which we remain competitive at the highest levels for admissions.

Overview

The undergraduate residence life and housing (CORE Working Group #1, WG1) group having the same charge as the other working groups, critically examined the educational co-curricular residential living experience and physical housing facilities and processes at Lehigh. An appreciative inquiry approach was utilized, paying particular attention to the positive best practice experiences that residence life and housing have in place currently. Other positive best practice experiences were sought out with both peer and aspirational institutions as well as those schools with whom we most directly compete in the admissions process (win/loss schools). Related to the charge, WG1 was specifically seeking to answer how the co-curricular residential living experience and university provided housing could enhance the students’ personal growth and educational experience, while contributing positively to the overall university climate in the specified charge areas of; (a) health and safety including the role of alcohol and other drugs; (b) diversity and inclusion; (c) enhancing Lehigh’s academic environment; and (d) engagement with the South Bethlehem community.

Supporting Background Information

The appreciative inquiry process conducted in 2012 by the Office of Residence Life, Office of Fraternity & Sorority Affairs, and Residential Services and revisited in fall 2013 yielded the suggestion of a University-wide initiative, "Lehigh Living: Transforming our Residential Community." Four potential major focus areas were identified as a result of this appreciative inquiry process and each of those were further explored by WG1. Two of those focus areas; consider and evaluate a 3 year housing requirement, and investing in special interest housing options, became areas of intense exploration and idea generation. For more in depth information on the AI process and recommendations please see the WG1 folder in the Commission 2014 Dropbox, specifically the Res Life Appreciative Inquiry folder and within Power Point.

Within this report submitted by CORE WG1, key recommendations are provided that align with the 2012 and 2013 appreciative inquiry process by the Offices of
Residence Life, Office of Fraternity & Sorority Affairs, and Residential Services at Lehigh University. The recommendations also take into account the best practices and policies of peer and aspirational institutions, and schools with which we remain competitive at the highest levels for admissions. Finally these recommendations, which WG1 conceptualized as supports to a grander vision, will further help Lehigh University to “redefining what it means to lead”, not only at the broad institutional level, but also within the extremely critical and competitive residential & housing experience realm.

VISION: A cutting-edge residential research university that expects the integration of research and discovery everywhere on campus

2. Three years of diverse, vibrant, inclusive, and educational residential experiences are **guaranteed and required for all undergraduate students** to enhance and compliment the curricular mission of the university.

   a. By 2020 on campus residential housing will be available and required for all first, second and third year undergraduate students. Housing spaces and processes to be coordinated and overseen by the Office of Residential Services in close collaboration with the Office of Residence Life

Creation of an intentional “phasing plan” to meet the housing expansion is of the utmost importance for the successful transition to this level of on campus housing. Possible suggestions to add support for the increased number of on campus residents are as follows:

   i. In phase I all Greek sophomores and Greek juniors will be required to live in their on campus Greek chapter houses. This can be accomplished in the short term with some immediacy, requiring an additional projected and approximate 50 bed spaces to accommodate the remainder of the junior class, not already living on campus (See Appendix I).

   ii. Phase II will require all 2nd year students to live in on campus residential housing that is not a Greek Chapter house. This would require adding and additional projected and approximately 500 bed spaces to accommodate all sophomores in residence halls. This ripple effect (of all sophomores leaving Greek chapter housing) would fill the Greek chapter houses with a majority of juniors while simultaneously bringing some additional seniors back on campus into Greek chapter housing, to ensure the 90% occupancy requirement for Greek chapters by Residential Services.

   iii. Create a community relations group that might include representation from the following constituents; residents that live among Lehigh student housing/within South Bethlehem closest to Lehigh University, housing rental companies who rent to Lehigh
students on the South Side, Bethlehem Housing Authority, Bethlehem Police Department, Lehigh University Police Department, Office of Residential Services, Graduate Student Life, Office of Residence Life, Student Affairs staff and at least 2 undergraduate students, etc.

1. The charge of this group could include topics such as; proper turnover/buy out of rental stock from undergraduates moving back onto campus, a “memo of understanding (MOU)” formalized between the police entities regarding off campus conduct, creation of a block watch programs, graduate student rental market needs, listings of off campus properties/rental companies and levels of accreditation with the university, off campus housing safety and inspection protocols and schedules, educational safety programming etc.

iv. We support the Off Campus Living Working Groups suggestion of the creation of a full time, exempt position that would direct, coordinate and oversee all aspects of off campus student living, programming and community relations/events, etc.

3. Three years of diverse, vibrant, inclusive, and educational residential experiences are guaranteed and required for all undergraduate students to enhance and compliment the curricular mission of the university.

a. By 2020, the on campus residential experience will be a seamless and synonymous synthesis of living and learning.

i. Based on all of our national benchmarking (See Appendix II), something that is unique and innovated to Lehigh is bLUeprint. We recommend that this program continue to be strengthened in all of our residential facilities to continue transforming the residential experience into a holistic living and learning residential experience.

ii. Fulfilling this is something that has already begun and should be continued in an aggressive fashion. This allows the normalized living experience to become one where there is more available and expected from the residential facility than sleeping and hanging out. Options will remain that offer a more general experience, being mindful that not all students are seeking to make the on campus living experience a primary commitment or focused involvement.

iii. Thematic special interest communities will experience sustainable growth, as dictated by interest, and the facilities will be made
available, as feasible, to accommodate the needs of the diverse student or faculty/staff created living experiences. Lehigh currently offers approximately 20% of its housing options as thematic special interest communities. To grow and sustain this effort would not be possible without further staffing support.

1. We support the creation of a full time, exempt position that would coordinate and oversee all aspects of the thematic special interest housing communities housed within the Office of Residence Life, in the Student Affairs stem (See Appendix III).

iv. Residence halls will foster a feeling of home for all students by offering maximum diversity in the style of facility and inclusion of all students in an environment regardless of student specific characteristics or demographics. (Ex. increase the number of co-ed halls, expand gender inclusive bathrooms, mixed class year buildings, building with multiple living styles within them-singles, suites, apartments, etc.)

v. Due to the traditional nature of many of our current residential facilities, it is imperative that all future renovation projects and new construction consider the needs of the suggestions listed above.

b. Restructure the FY housing placement process to focus on the creative curiosity, intellectual exploration and personal growth and development of students first and foremost.

i. Residential Services will create a universal housing application & placement process. This move would set up a process by which all admitted students, once committed to Lehigh, and are given access at the same time, to housing. They would then be required to submit their housing application by a specific deadline. This is a practice that many competitive schools are moving to (away from admissions deposit date) to ensure a level of equity in the housing process. Students would still have the option to mutually select their roommate. Both roommates would need to preference the same living options in the same order and indicate each other on the application.

c. If we are unable to move to a third year housing requirement, or in the interim time to move to a third year requirement, we suggest a restructured upper class housing placement process (which will only consist of a portion the senior class) to offer the opportunity to live off campus through a lottery to move off system, releasing only the number unable to be accommodated through remaining bed spaces.
i. Established parameters (ex. Conduct history, seniority based on credit hours earned, etc.) will allow students access into the lottery to move off campus. When the number is determined the lottery will be conducted and specified students will be able to move off campus.

ii. Students will sign leases for off campus housing the spring directly prior to them moving into the housing, not years in advance, because students will not be able to predict for certain if they will be living off campus in their fourth year.

d. Examine the possibility of purchasing homes closest to the east side of campus and converting them into campus owned, off campus housing options for seniors, similar to the Warren Square model.
   i. Keeping some houses smaller in size (a duplex with 5 students living on each side, not necessarily converted to one large house with 15-25 residents like Warren Square currently) allowing students to room with a group of friends, like living in an off campus house but with the resources, support and maintenance of our residential facilities.
   ii. Explore a different method of payment/billing for these housing options (to more mirror living off campus i.e. monthly rent, bills, etc.) to begin teaching students about the responsibilities and budgeting associated with independent living.
   iii. Providing less direct oversight for these houses by live in undergraduate or graduate staff members, creating a building manager type of role with some type of duty responsibilities for these areas, similar to true apartment complexes with less oversight while offering some opportunities for community connections if desired by students.

e. We recommend that Lehigh enhance its housing and dining offerings during non-traditional class times (fall, winter, spring breaks).
   i. As we looked at this issue, we found that while housing is offered and utilized during these non-class times, there are no dining options available on campus for students to take part in.
   ii. We recommend some level of dining plan be available, as well as things like access to the gym, the library and an abbreviated set of social programs to enhance and compliment students who find it necessary to remain at Lehigh during traditional break times.
APPENDIX I
Projected Housing Numbers by Ozzie Breiner

Please see Allison Gulati for full report compiled by Ozzie Breiner.

APPENDIX II
Google Link to Benchmarking Excel Document

https://docs.google.com/a/lehigh.edu/spreadsheets/d/1SZlUxfm2vW4ZfIKr-VwCrG_po5mbKVcVKqQPRe0tDOY/edit#gid=507806179

APPENDIX II
Living-Learning Professional Staff Position Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution:</th>
<th>Position:</th>
<th>Salary:</th>
<th>Position Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State</td>
<td>Program Coordinator For Academic Initiatives</td>
<td>$35-40</td>
<td>The Program Coordinator for Academic Initiatives assists with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• overall implementation of residential learning initiatives on the Columbus and smaller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>campuses;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• provides leadership to targeted learning communities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• participates in academic initiatives team and leadership of Residence Life academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>learning programs, administrative processes, staff selection, program design and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>implementation of living learning educational experiences;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• forms positive liaison relationships with a variety of university faculty and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on behalf of students and/or staff; serves on or chairs committees;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• budget and expenditure responsibility associated with maintenance and continual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>improvement of learning communities;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- manages various co-curricular administrative tasks and programs including residence hall tutoring, learning community publications and websites, university-wide collaboration events and student educational travel experiences;
- serves as the departmental liaison with various offices.

**Specific Content Knowledge/Skills:**
Required: Master’s degree or equivalent in Student Personnel Administration or a related field and two years post-graduate experience, or equivalent education and experience; considerable work experience in residence halls. Desired: live-in Hall Director experience with residential learning community development and/or academic support programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of South Florida</th>
<th>Program Director for Living Learning Communities</th>
<th>$57-65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Duties:**
- Provide expertise, strategic leadership and vision for short and long-range planning, development, implementation, and assessment of Living Learning communities at USF. Ensure effective marketing and recruiting strategies for communities and programs. Initiate outreach opportunities to support expansion of living learning programs on campus. Implement living learning community national best practices. Identify and assess LLC learning outcomes and impact on key campus metrics.
- Establish and maintain strong partnerships between Housing & Residential Education and Living Learning Community partners across campus including faculty, administrators, and academic and other student affairs departments. Lead monthly Living Learning Community Council meetings and individual living learning community advisory boards, creating and supporting collaborative teams for each community.
- Hire and supervise Graduate Assistant and student staff. Provide leadership for recruitment, RA staff selection, and RA staff training related to living learning communities and student success.
- Collaborate to recruit and retain residents to participate in living learning communities including public presentations, articles, and publications. Ensure effective marketing and recruiting strategies for communities and programs.
- Develop and administer budgets related to Living Learning program and fees. Facilitate the room
assignment process for LLCs by liaising between the Housing Assignment Office and the LLC partners.

- Serve as a member of the Residential Life and Education (RLE) leadership team. Collaborate with Director, Program Director for Academic Initiatives and Assistant Directors in RLE to create an optimal learning environment for residential students. Assist in the design and implementation of academic initiatives, programs and events for all residents. Provide leadership for key programs.
- Work closely with the Residence Life Coordinators and attend weekly staff meetings as appropriate to infuse academic success and the integration of living learning community principles into the daily work of the residence life staff.
- Learn and maintain wide knowledge of university and community academic resources available to students; facilitate connecting residents and staff to appropriate resources for assistance.

**Minimum Qualifications:** This position requires a Bachelor’s degree in an appropriate field, and seven years of related experience, or a Master's degree and five years of related experience.

**Preferred Qualifications:** A Master's degree and five years full-time experience (graduate assistantships not included), including three years of significant experience working with living learning communities, or a doctoral degree and a minimum of three years' experience with living learning communities is strongly preferred.

**Ideal Candidate Should Possess:** Knowledge of best practices related to Living Learning Communities across the country; Student learning and development; Assessment; Development and implementation of learning outcomes; Program planning and event management; Facilitation, presenting, and training. Recruitment, selection, training and staff supervision.

Successful development and leadership of living learning communities at research intensive institutions is strongly preferred. Teaching and demonstrated close collaboration with faculty in a residential environment preferred.

| Appalachian State University | Coordinator for Student Success and Assessment for Residence Life | N/A ($30-40) | The Coordinator reports to an Assistant Director of University Housing. This position serves on a professional Residence Life team that includes seven other Master's level Coordinators, three Assistant |
Directors and a Senior Associate Director. This Coordinator is a full-time campus student affairs professional who provides direction, development, and implementation of all Residential Learning Communities, academic initiatives and assessment activities in University Housing. The Coordinator creates programs and policies which will closely tie the residence halls to the academic mission of the university, including student success and higher retention and graduation rates of students. Other duties include: chairing and serving on committees and task forces, teaching, and serving as a member of the Residence Life leadership team.

Candidates must have a Master's Degree in Higher Education, Counseling, College Student Development or related field, with at least one year full time professional experience. Candidates must have previous experience working with assessment, academic initiatives and/or learning communities.

The Coordinator for Student Success and Assessment position is a 12-month position and salary is commensurate with experience. This is an optional live-on position. No additional compensation is provided if the Coordinator chooses to live off campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virginia Tech</th>
<th>Assistant Director for Living-Learning Programs</th>
<th>$40-47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacksburg, VA</td>
<td>Reporting to the Associate Director for Academic Initiatives in Housing and Residence Life, the Assistant Director for Living-Learning Programs is a champion for student learning in the residential curriculum model; provides collaborative coordination and support for multiple living-learning communities; oversees all aspects of Housing and Residence life academic course curriculum and participates on the Housing &amp; Residence Life Leadership Team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Core Responsibilities:**

- Champion the Division of Student Affairs Aspirations for Student Learning through the residential curriculum model in all interactions, decisions, and innovations.
- Provide collaborative coordination and support for selected living-learning communities; assist in planning and implementation of new living-learning communities as directed by Associate Director for Academic Initiatives; mentor and advise Residential Learning Coordinators working with LLCs
- Supervise graduate assistant of living-learning programs
• Supervise and coordinate operation of staff learning support center ("Imaginarium").
• Support, enforce and ensure compliance with all University and departmental policies and regulations; have a working knowledge of risk management policies; assist Student Conduct colleagues in the investigation of individual and organizational conduct matters; role model professional and mature decision-making; exercise excellent communication skills.
• Serve as liaison with Housing Services staff; especially as pertaining to living-learning community student selection and room assignment process
• Teach one section of an Housing & Residence Life coordinated for-credit course including but not limited to the Principles of Peer Leadership course, Residential Leadership Community course, or Service-Learning course.
• Demonstrate and uphold the Virginia Tech Principles of Community and the values of an inclusive excellence model; foster a supportive and challenging multicultural environment through staff selection, training, community programming, and interpersonal contact with students and colleagues.
• Provide appropriate counseling, mediation and referral for individual students and staff when needed.
• Serve on emergency response duty rotation schedule for campus of 9,400 residents; assist with protocol training and review for direct reports who serve in emergency response duty.
• Perform other duties as assigned.

Required Qualifications:
Masters Degree in student affairs/higher education or related field, ability to work with a diverse student body, foster sensitivity to diversity issues in the university community, and be able to display an understanding of developmental needs of undergraduate and graduate students. Demonstrated experience related to college student development; demonstrated ability in staff supervision and administrative work; experience selection, training, or organization advising. Excellent communication skills and values collaboration.

Preferred Qualifications:
Prior work experience in a live-in housing role. Collaborative, collegial leadership style. Experience or knowledge of a residential curriculum. Prior experience in coordination/implementation of a living-learning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>University of Nebraska – Lincoln</strong></th>
<th>Coordinator of Learning Community Co-Curricular Programming</th>
<th>$38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Lincoln, NE                       | This position will assist UNL Housing, in partnership with Academic Affairs, to create and maintain vibrant Learning Communities where students live near other students who share an academic interest, take courses directly associated with the academic interest area, and participate in co-curricular programming to further connect students to faculty, staff, and opportunities to explore their majors/career paths.

The primary responsibility of this position is to support a wide array of co-curricular programming, teaming with faculty, staff, and students who work with Learning Communities. In consultation with other Learning Community staff, specifically the Assistant Director of Residence Life for Learning Communities and Academics and the Assistant Director for Academic Learning Communities, the employee will work with learning community sponsors to plan programming for specific communities.

This position will oversee the day-to-day logistics behind faculty co-curricular programming, directly work with Learning Community sponsors and mentors, coordinate the hiring and training of student staff, and support other large scale programs and initiatives within the Learning Community program.

The employee is expected to work individually with Learning Community sponsors to identify student needs within the specific academic focus of the community, design programming to effectively address and enhance the student experience, and create a plan of implementation for programming to ensure information is delivered in a timely, effective manner to students. Additionally, the employee will be responsible for the initial and ongoing training of the mentor staff determining appropriate topics, collaborating with other Learning Communities staff to ensure all necessary topics are covered, and addressing current needs as they arise. These duties are in addition to the support of other large-scale programmatic efforts undertaken by Learning Communities staff including, but not limited to recruitment, all-LC Programming, and logistical support for community-specific programming.

**Minimum Required Qualifications:**
Bachelor’s degree plus one year of experience with community. Experience working collaboratively with faculty and academic departments. Values faculty partnerships and engagement in the student learning process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Kentucky</th>
<th>Academic Program Coordinator</th>
<th>$32,635-52,229</th>
<th>The department of Residence Life is hiring a Program Coordinator to help support the goal of providing a...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missouri State University</td>
<td>Coordinator of Residence Life-Student Success Initiatives</td>
<td>$33-42,500</td>
<td>The Coordinator of Residence Life-Student Success Initiatives shapes, collaborates, and coordinates the day-to-day functions of the living-learning communities program. The Coordinator of Residence Life-Student Success Initiatives develops and builds partnerships between all living-learning communities within the area of supervision. The Coordinator of Residence Life-Student Success Initiatives shapes the environment and experiences of residential students by providing services that foster responsible involvement in campus and community life. <strong>Description of Primary Duties</strong> The coordinator will assist with all aspects of the living-learning communities in Residence Life. This includes supervision of staff members, creation of living-learning communities, and cultivation of relationships with LLC partners on and off campus. The coordinator will assist with assessment projects related to the LLCs. <strong>Minimum Acceptable Qualifications</strong> Education: A Master’s degree in College Student Personnel, Educational Administration, Counseling, or a related field is required. Experience: At least two years of post-Master’s experience as a Residence Hall Director, including programming, progressive supervisory experience, and working with an academic or learning community is required. Experience incorporating multi-cultural and multi-perspective experiences for students that are needed to succeed in a global, broadly diverse society is preferred. Experience working in a diverse environment and/or with students from diverse backgrounds is preferred.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Location: Lexington, KY | *Reports to Assistant Director of Residence Life for Academic Initiatives* | comprehensive living/learning program on campus that supports the academic missions of the University. Responsibilities include: create and implement academic initiatives; train live-in staff members, graduate assistants, and peer mentors; assist with Living Learning Program events; develop marketing materials and website content; and assist in recruitment efforts.  
**Required Education:** MA  
**Required Experience:** 1 year postgrad  
**Skills/Knowledge/Abilities:** Evidence of administrative skills, knowledge of academic support strategies in a residential setting, knowledge of student development theory. |
Working Group #: 2

Working Group Name: Fraternity & Sorority Life and Housing

Working Group Co-Chairs: Joe Sterrett and Sharon Basso

Executive Summary
Working Group 2 (Greek Life) of the Committee on the Residential Experience conducted its activities through an extensive series of discussions with key constituency groups (including a broad spectrum of students as well as parents, faculty, staff, alumni and national organization officials) followed by highly interactive dialogue among committee members. Among the many perspectives on the role of Greek Life as a part of the residential experience at Lehigh, perhaps the most important to recognize is that the issues associated with Greek Life are deeply connected to many of the other recommendations that are under consideration for residential, social and community life. Accordingly, all of the ideas advanced by the CORE process should be evaluated in the context of the full set of recommendations.

Before presenting the most significant ideas or recommendations that emerged from our working group study and discussions, we want to summarize a set of reminders our Working Group adopted that also are likely to apply to any of the conclusions that emerge from the CORE report.

1) All ideas are likely to have implications for areas beyond the scope of any specific working group. In this overall process, comparatively little time was devoted to cross working group dialogue. Therefore, it will be critical to plan and conduct additional discussion of all ideas and possible recommendations before they are adopted. The concept of recommending an implementation team that would conduct these integrated discussions has merit.

2) All conceptual ideas discussed by Working Group 2 may have a range of options including fairly extreme forms as well as comparatively modest changes to current practices. Where the CORE group might land on this continuum ought to be a function of the total number of changes that are proposed and projected impact of those changes. Like any multivariate analysis, the impact of change in one variable on all others is important to anticipate and consider.

3) A number of ideas and possible recommendations have potentially significant socioeconomic implications for students and their families. The implications of socioeconomic diversity on the Lehigh campus are among the most challenging cultural issues and merit careful thought.
4) Our working group recognized that even for recommendations around which there was strong consensus among those involved in the discussions, there may be individual circumstances that merit an exception to a proposed policy. Therefore, our working group encourages the CORE steering committee to advocate for **consideration of a process for determining when and how exceptions to recommended changes** in policy or practice ought to be made.

5) Finally, the proportion of our discussion and deliberation time that was linked to matters of "social policy" was significant. Perhaps this is characteristic of the Greek system, and our working group concluded that social dynamics and social policy considerations are important themes to any residential university, most especially those engaged in educating a cohort of students of traditional college age. Accordingly, **any planning for social policy modifications deserves to have highly integrated contributions from a range of campus personnel.** The social policy issues are complex and the risk of unintended consequences is significant.

**Core Ideas**
The full report provides six “Core Ideas” that the working group vetted and includes a discussion of each idea, along with a characterization of the level of support attributed to our working group. Some of the core ideas received unanimous support from our group, while other core ideas received mixed support and/or no support. This group wanted to provide information even on the core ideas that were vetted and not supported so the community understands that we fully and comprehensively considered many approaches.

**Detailed Report**
Information that has been gathered relevant to the following questions: Data and supporting materials appear in appendices

(1) What current Lehigh program and policies have a positive effect on the campus environment?

A. **Greek Accreditation** – Accreditation provides chapters opportunities for self-reflection, to create a roadmap for future, recognize community standards, and be accountable for consequences. It allows leadership in individual chapters to motivate members. It is an important and positive process that brings a sense of responsibility to the chapters. We recommend that this process be examined and significantly overhauled since it has been in place 10 years and was most recently revised in 2009.

B. **Staffing Support**– We are a national best practice with respect to the structure of our staff in fraternity and sorority affairs. Students have access to professional educators with Masters Degrees who are available to advise chapters, facilitate
leadership experiences, assist chapters in planning and operating, and motivating chapters to operate in congruence with institutional, national and personal values.

C. Hazing initiatives - Lehigh University was invited to participate in the National Collaborative for Hazing Research and Prevention spearheaded by the University of Maine.
http://www4.lehigh.edu/news/newsarticle.aspx?Channel=/Channels/News%202013&WorkflowItemID=41f46df6-3c7e-497a-a177-9a1bbe3ee507

D. Assessment - Our Student Affairs division, and Fraternity and Sorority Affairs within that division, employ intentional and effective assessment practices to continuously evaluate and make effective decisions. Some recent examples of this are the assessments of the Greek Emerging Mentor (GECM) mentoring programs, the Accreditation process, the Campus Perceptions (2012) and Behaviors (2013) Hazing Assessment data, and the Interfraternity and Panhellenic Council Recruitment Assessments.

E. Medical Amnesty Policy – This policy has been successful in encouraging students to call for emergency medical assistance for peers that may be in a dangerous health situation.

What universities have reputations for having a positive campus environment? Which of their programs contribute to that environment? Could those programs be implemented at Lehigh?

Many universities look to Lehigh University’s Greek System as their benchmark for aspects such as our annual Accreditation process, staffing model, emerging leadership program, and other elements. Our Greek system has won national awards including the:

- 2007 Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors Cultural Change Initiative Award
- 2009 Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors Outstanding Educational Programs Award
- 2009 and 2010 Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors New Professional of the Year Awards
- 2013 HazingPrevention.org/Zeta Tau Alpha Grant for Promising Prevention Practices
- 2014 Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors Diversity Initiatives Awards

Additionally, many individual LU chapters have been recognized as chapters of the year and most improved chapters at their national conventions.

Other universities that we regularly benchmark against (and the aspects of greek life we look to them regarding) are:
Inclusion and diversity -- Ohio State and University of Vermont
Hazing prevention: The National Hazing Consortium (we are one of eight universities in this organization), Cornell University, the University of Central Florida, the University of Virginia, Texas A&M, the University of Maine, the University of Kentucky, and the University of Arizona
Moratorium approaches: Central Florida and West Virginia
General Greek environment: Washington and Lee, the University of Maryland, Cornell University, the University of Pennsylvania

The working group believes there are lessons to be learned from Lehigh’s membership in the National Hazing Consortium, as well as from other universities.

What are the biggest challenges that Lehigh students face?

a. Cost of holding events on campus (security, venue charges, facilities set up and clean up)
b. Perceived pressure to sign off-campus housing leases for junior and senior years when students are only in second semester of first year. In addition, first semester greek sophomores are encouraged by chapters to sign up off-campus leases to secure “good party locations” such as 200-400 block of East Fifth and Hillside Street
c. Social pressures related to the current social hierarchy sub-culture which is largely based on Greek life and alcohol
d. Maintaining connections to first year friends who may not be in the same (or any) greek chapter, in upper class years
e. Divide between Greek and non-Greek students
f. Lack of appealing physical spaces for events, recreation, and socializing on campus that build community and that aren’t “owned” by any particular sub-group
g. Practicing bystander behaviors that are consistent with campus values
h. The cost of Greek parlor fees and social dues may add to the exclusive nature of the Greek system.
i. Extensive time commitment required by Greek students of sophomore and new members in chapters to attend social events with alcohol Tuesday through Saturday evenings. There is an extensive and organized system and schedule of parties and social obligations.

What current Lehigh policies would you change, and why?

a. Funding models and support that would defray the cost of events
b. Social Policy – would be potentially safer if more events with alcohol were held on campus, however, the legal age of 21 causes significant difficulty
c. Recruitment Policy and practices for Greek organizations are too focused on alcohol
d. On campus residency requirement – support a junior year on campus residence requirement with some thoughtful consideration of implementation and impact
What are the top three changes you believe would have a positive effect on the students' environment?
Below are the Core Ideas that emerged as the most prominent items we discussed, not in priority order. For each Core Idea there was robust discussion and at times, consensus was reached, while on some ideas there were not unanimous opinions. For each Core Idea listed below there is an analysis of the discussion and the resulting conclusion by the working group. You will notice some of the Core Ideas were vetted and received little or no support by the working group. The reason these are included in the report is that our group believes it is just as important to acknowledge issues discussed that could be potentially transformative, but that we ultimately did not support after thorough evaluation.

Core Idea 1: Third Year Student On Campus Residential Requirement – sophomore aspect
This working group discussed the core idea of requiring all juniors to reside in on-campus housing in the context of Greek Life. We believe this recommendation has the potential to be transformational for our university, but as stated in the executive summary, the implications and implementation must be carefully conceived, and requires more study.

**Implications for Greek Life:**
Some of the considerations our group discussed include the cost of living on campus rather than off campus, dining issues, and the consensus that housing on campus would need to more adequately resemble the 365 days/year option that exists now for off campus leases.

In particular our group discussed some options to address Greek affiliated sophomores in this new model of three years required. Until last year sophomores were required to live in their fraternity houses, reinforcing the situation that Greek affiliated students do not maintain relationships beyond first year with others outside their Greek chapter. The following options have been proposed to encourage second year students to continue to build the friendships they developed before affiliating with a Greek chapter.

1. All sophomores live in residence halls and not in Greek facilities (many options on how to implement this to contribute to inclusion)
2. Some sophomores (based on criteria such as gpa, conduct record) reside in Greek chapter facilities which reduces the number of new beds to build and also contributes to multiple class years in chapter facilities for leadership mentoring of these younger students. In this instance, we would stipulate that sophomores may not hold significant chapter leadership roles, instead they would be residing in the chapter house to learn how to assume leadership roles in the future.

**Appealing aspects:**
- If done right, this has the potential to help diminish some of the perceptions of social tiers, chapter exclusive friendships, and first year Greek/non-Greek division that exists after the spring recruitment process.
• With less sophomores living in their fraternity houses the amount of upperclassmen in the residences will increase, leading to more residential leadership and a higher percentage of 21 year-olds.
• Higher volumes of 21 year olds in fraternity houses may also contribute to social policy efforts and revisions aimed at increasing social life on campus.
• Greek sophomores residing in residence halls alongside sophomores from other chapters and non-Greek sophomores may contribute to less division amongst Greeks/non-Greeks and between chapters in their later years
• More upperclass Greeks living on campus alleviates the pressure to sign a lease two years in advance
• More upperclass Greeks living on campus hopefully reduces the volume of off-campus facilities that are used for regular social events. Risk management off campus is likely to be heightened when there are less venues to throw social events with alcohol (i.e. Chapters will be more in line with University and Inter/National Headquarters social policies with an increased focus on on-campus events.

Concerns or questions:
• If all sophomores live in residence halls (none in chapter facilities) then the University would need to build more new residence hall bed spaces (estimated 500 - 550 just to accommodate junior housing on campus, more to provide senior residence hall students the opportunity to compete for housing)
• This would require some senior Greeks to live on campus in chapter facilities to meet the 90% occupancy requirement for chapters. Will fraternities attempt to recruit larger class year cohorts so that seniors will be able to live off campus?
• If we permit all Greek sophomores to continue residing in Greek facilities, we would need to build an estimated 300 bed spaces to accommodate the first years, sophomores and juniors and also will allow us to accommodate more seniors who may wish to live on campus.
• How does a lower volume of undergraduate students living off campus impact the south side community?

Concluding evaluation by working group – continuum of support for the core idea:
Support - Members supported implementation of a third year housing requirement and acknowledged that the implementation of this needs much more discussion and planning because of the intended and unintended consequences. As it relates to the Greek system, there needs to be a strategy regarding sophomore Greek students in this new system. This is an opportunity to use the housing placement of sophomore Greek students to make progress on goals related to community and inclusion.

More Support than Concern
No perceived Support
Core Idea 2: Level of Residential Supervision

The group discussed the concept of a continuum of supervision in all on-campus residences that can be conceptualized as moving from high supervision to very little or no supervision. The group recommends that there be a strategy and plan developed so that supervision of residence hall settings and Greek residential facilities be structured around the same continuum. For example, if student age/maturity is deemed to be the essential variable, then residences with first year students could arguably be those with the most oversight/supervision (i.e. gryphons on each floor). Residences with mostly juniors and seniors could arguably be those with less/the least supervision (i.e. no live-in supervision and instead an “area director”). The differentiation of residential supervision levels should no longer be based on the variable of Greek or non-Greek residential facility. There is not a compelling argument that we came upon that indicates that a senior living in a residence hall needs more or less supervision than a senior living in a Greek facility, which is now currently the system.

Implications for Greek Life:

Appealing aspects:
- Making the supervision more equitable between Greek and non-Greek residences assists in leveling the “playing field” of one aspect of privilege.
- This model of progressive (or regressive) supervision across the system could also be applied to graduate housing using the same continuum.

Concerns or questions:
- The “how” is a question we spent a considerable time discussing. There are limitations on the pool of non-student supervisors (as an example, Assistant Directors that would live in, or near, the chapter facilities).
- We may need to build/renovate some residential spaces for supervision apartments.
- Having increased supervision on chapter houses may be a disincentive for students to use on campus venues for social events.

Concluding evaluation by working group – continuum of support for the core idea:

Support - The group believes that a more in-depth examination of the supervision system is warranted with some changes being made to assist with appropriate safety, programmatic, leadership, and facilities management issues across all residential facilities while also recognizing student developmental levels.

More Support than Concern
No perceived Support
More Concern than Support
No Support

**Core Idea 3: Spaces that Promote Community and Reduce Exclusivity**
The group discussed the transformational potential that physical spaces have on shaping behavior and supporting behaviors the campus values. Conversely, lack of adequate, desirable, and strategic spaces can and has stilted the potential for creating a more inclusive environment.
There are three categories of spaces that we recommend be improved and enhanced.

1. **Community Dining Experience**
The group recommends that a new framework of dining be examined and implemented that would incorporate Greek facility residents eating some of their meals outside of their individual residential facilities and with other LU students. An expansion of the existing dining facilities will be needed if we move to a third year on campus housing requirement and we believe that should be done strategically to design and create space that will accommodate Greeks on a dining plan with non-Greeks.

2. **Recreational/Social**
The group recommends enhancements to outdoor spaces and existing facilities to create recreational and social spaces more prominent on campus and dedicated to student use. Some examples the group discussed include lighted basketball/tennis courts on Asa Packer campus, a satellite fitness center, and an outdoor amphitheater. Preliminary plans have existed for years for one such space, the “pergola” adjacent to M&M residence hall.

3. **Community Hub**
The group supports the University Center Re-Imagined as an excellent illustration of existing space that could be transformed AND be transformative in promoting community, and providing much needed and significantly lacking square footage of open programmable space.

**Implications for Greek Life:**
**Appealing aspects:**
- Eating together is one of the oldest and most effective forums for community building. Coming together to share meals is one situation that does not exist now between upperclass Greek students and non-Greek students.
- We've seen many examples on our campus of spaces transforming behavior (the many plazas that have come to attract social life, the beautiful cross campus walkways that have pedestrians walking across campus in groups together, the open public spaces in STEPS that have come to serve as an informal gathering space for student groups). There is a need for more of these spaces amongst the residential communities as well.
Concerns or questions:
- The group did not discuss many significant concerns with this core idea, other than the many logistical considerations of implementation of a new dining model including additional dining spaces, locations, and funding.
- Some fraternity chapters have successful and long-running relationships with their house chefs
- The cost of an alternate dining plan/model would need to be comparable to the current costs students are charged.

Concluding evaluation by working group – continuum of support for the core idea:
Support - The group unanimously supports some form of the above three core ideas
More Support than Concern
No perceived Support
More Concern than Support
No Support

Core Idea 4: Affirmation of the presence of greek life in some form as one continued aspect of Lehigh University student life.
Given the national landscape of challenges universities are facing with greek life on campuses (hazing, alcohol risks, diversity and harassment issues, socio-economic considerations), the group fully discussed the continued value of greek life at Lehigh University and the potential impacts of abolishing the Greek system. A committee forum during the Strengthening Greek Life Task Force Process also had this discussion. Our group discussed the intended and unintended consequences of this idea. Across America, in the wake of news stories about sexual assault, hazing, racist incidents, alcohol related deaths, the question regularly is posed “why don’t universities just do away with Greek life completely?” Some small liberal arts colleges such as Middlebury, Colby and Williams have banned Greek chapters. Dartmouth University is in the midst of that debate now. Our working group certainly is aware of the challenges associated with Greek life both nationally and at LU including the issues mentioned above. However, there is strong evidence also of the benefits of Greek affiliation for students as well.
Affiliation as a concept is one of the strongest indicators and contributors to student retention, success and graduation – affiliation with a class, and academic major, an athletic team, a club, gryphon role, student senate, a cultural organization, as well as a sorority, fraternity, multicultural Greek group all have demonstrated their positive impact on some students’ perseverance and success. Also, when done right, these affiliations (including Greek life) are marvelous leadership opportunities. Alumni repeatedly speak about the leadership challenges they faced in their Greek roles as powerful growth moments and preparation for life beyond college. Greek affiliation
at Lehigh has also demonstrated track record of being associated with student academic success, achievement and graduation. This group affirms the continued presence of greek life at Lehigh University in some form and size, and reinforces the expectations articulated during the Strengthening Greek Life Task Force that Greek organizations must continue to demonstrate and uphold University policies and procedures, including the Student Code of Conduct and the more recent Principles of Our Equitable Community. Organizations found violating these policies, codes and visions, may forfeit their right to be recognized at this university. The continuation of expected standards of excellence and consequences for falling short of expectations are essential.

**Implications for Greek Life:**
**Appealing aspects:**
- Some might assume that issues such as sexual assault, hazing, dangerous alcohol use, and racial unrest would be “solved” in the absence of a Greek system.
- There is potential that campus climate might be positively impacted in the absence of a Greek system.

**Concerns or questions:**
- Significant potential impact on university support from alumni constituents.
- Reasonable individuals realize the troublesome issues on college campuses would not disappear by banning Greek life. Campuses with no Greek chapters also experience alcohol, hazing, sexual assault, exclusivity, racial issues, and other serious concerns.
- Lehigh prides itself on facing challenges and attempting to lead the way nationally, and walking away (abolishing) the system is not consistent with the Lehigh spirit of working to improve systems and become excellent in all that we do.
- We must address the institutional reality that many (perhaps a majority) or our current prospective students are interested in Lehigh University because of the possibility they can affiliate with a Greek chapter.

**Concluding evaluation by working group – continuum of support for the core idea:**
Support
More Support than Concern
No perceived Support
More Concern than Support

**No Support** – the group did not support this “all or nothing” approach. When the “what problems are we trying to solve” question was applied, it was clear that elimination of the system does not in and of itself “solve” the social/cultural challenges of this university
NOTE: The two Core Ideas listed below were not fully vetted and were not unanimously supported by all members of the group. But they have the potential, if implemented in some manner and scope to be transformative. However, this was one of many of our group’s discussions that was difficult to have in isolation and without a way to discuss it comprehensively in the context of other groups’ recommendations and discussions. Therefore the recommendation of the group is that there be larger, more comprehensive discussion and evaluation of these ideas by senior leadership and representation from key constituents. Their potential for transformation warrants further review.

Core Idea 5: Size of the Greek System – this idea warrants significant further exploration

A. Overall size of the system
The group discussed the issues related to the current size of our Greek system – between 38 - 45% of LU students (and a bit higher currently for females). There is concern that this large of a percentage of any subpopulation in a culture has the potential to significantly influence a community. While we do not support the elimination of the system, there was some support for examining the overall size of the system in the context of perhaps identifying an “ideal percentage” of Greek affiliated students.

There are many ways to accomplish a reduction in the percentage of any subpopulation in a community. However, if the reduction is imposed/engineered, and not accomplished by lack of student interest, then naturally it will have more challenges and be more disruptive initially. Natural attrition is the least invasive way to accomplish a reduction. However, that still doesn’t address the fact that student interest is currently driving the numbers with nearly 50% of first year Lehigh students indicating initial interest in affiliation with Greek chapters. Due to this interest, recruitment/recognition of new chapters occurs almost always after the dissolution of a previous chapter, maintaining the same overall size. Therefore any shift to reduce the percentage of students in Greek chapters must be carefully considered with the involvement of admissions, financial aid, senior leadership, and others on campus.

The other discussion we had on this topic was that the idea to consider a reduction in the size of the Greek system, is often born from a discussion of the negative characteristics and consequences of the system (hazing, alcohol use, peer pressure, social tiers, exclusivity). The group recommends that any discussion regarding an optimum size of the Greek system, approach the conversation from a visionary and “what could Lehigh look life if...?” lens, rather than from a problem to solve lens.

B. Size of Individual Sorority Chapters
Sororities face a different issue related to size. The current National Panhellenic Lehigh chapter can have membership as large as 135 students. The standard chapter member number, known as Chapter Total, is
determined by the local Panhellenic council in conjunction with the National Panhellenic Council. Sororities at Lehigh are functioning well with these relatively large numbers with the exception of the residential experience. The large membership regularly results in an "over-occupancy" situation in their on campus residential facilities. Currently, in order to house their sophomore class, most of their junior class and their chapter leadership in the residence they need to triple and sometimes quad occupy rooms. This conversation links with many of the other ideas and conversations and should be continued in a comprehensive manner.

C. Size of Individual Multicultural Greek Chapters
One of the significant successes in the past decade of Lehigh Greek life is the expansion of the number of Multicultural Greek Chapters (traditionally members of the National Panhellenic Council and the North-American Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations). These chapters are values based and not traditionally as focused on the social aspects involving alcohol. Their presence has contributed to an inclusive campus environment. The chapters are extremely active in programming events for the campus community, partnering with other Greek chapters on a regular basis, illustrating different ways to demonstrate brotherhood and sisterhood. The campus community has embraced and benefited from their growing presence. The formation of a third Greek governing body, the Multicultural Greek Council, has also been a wonderful leadership platform in joining the Inter-Fraternity and Panhellenic Councils.

Some of the challenges the multicultural Greek chapters face on many campuses (and at LU) include lack of a strong alumni group, insufficient operating funds (related to limited regional and institutional alumni), and the size of each chapters' membership is relatively small (3 – 10 members annually) which can cause them to have ebbs and flows in activity. Our working group believes that support of these chapters institutionally, warrants further campus discussion.

Core Idea 6: Examine possibilities to “right size” existing residential houses and other ways to re-design the configuration in the context of any broader residential recommendations.
This discussion really focused on the fact that it is difficult to emerge with some transformational ideas when the boundary of existing housing stock and assignments are in place. There are obvious limitations due to the current geographic locations of residential facilities with many being concentrated on one section of campus. Also, there is a historical tie that Greek chapters feel for the particular facility they occupy. This is understandable because of the alumni experience and historic financial investments in the facility by the chapter. However, some chapters would be better served in a smaller or larger capacity house and the current system and logistics does not easily allow for such a rotation. It is an extremely complicated domino situation.
In addition, and perhaps more foundational, we had a discussion about what it might look like if Greek chapters were viewed as another form of special interest housing on campus. In many ways, in the evolution of our campus, the Greek chapter affiliation is now one of many types of residential student affiliation, yet there exists separate rules, facilities, and mechanisms for evaluation. The present system of Greek chapters having sustainable access to desirable housing does provide a bit of gridlock and difficulty for others to have an opportunity at such attractive housing unless it is at the demise of a Greek chapter. We wonder if there are ways to change this for the better of the campus environment.

Description of how working group has accounted for:

(a) Health and safety, including the role of alcohol and other drugs;
(b) Diversity and inclusion;
(c) Enhancing Lehigh's academic environment; and
(d) Engagement with the South Bethlehem community.

Our working group used these considerations as foundational principles. Early we developed working definitions of each of these items and then also established a matrix that is based on these elements. Our ensuing discussions and meetings have been based in these as foundational items/considerations (see definitions and matrix in appendices).

Appendices – Appended items supplement this report and can be found in the dropbox folder for the working group report
Appendices include information on:
A faculty survey conducted by the working group
Student Focus Group Data conducted by the working group
Definitions developed by working group
Matrix developed by working group
Data analysis of academic performance
Greek Trends
Diversifying the Hill
Next Steps Report
2010 Strengthening Greek Life Task Force Report
Financial Structure of Living Groups
Preliminary Report of Working Group
Senior Campus Climate Data

In addition, a plethora of information about Lehigh University's Greek System accessed and utilized by this working group appears within the Office of Fraternity & Sorority Affairs Website at http://studentaffairs.lehigh.edu/node/75
Executive Summary:
The off campus working group determined that there are several initiatives currently in place that address the needs of off campus students but they need to be further developed and publicized. These include LUPD safety initiatives, Dale Kochard’s orientation program and off campus representatives on student senate. After exploring Lehigh’s off campus residential experience through conversations with students, faculty and staff, landlords and community members, and other working groups, as well as investigating peer and aspirational institutions the off campus working group is prepared to make five key recommendations:

1. Lehigh should develop more useable, accessible resources for off campus students, including a new re-vamped off campus website.

2. Off campus houses should be registered with the university and the university should develop requirements for students who want to move off campus, eg.: GPA, conduct record, and a mandatory orientation, since off campus living is a privilege, not a right

3. Lehigh should create and maintain an advisory board comprised of University administrators, students, city officials, landlords, and community members that can work together to address off campus issues and build community. A key task of this advisory board would be to plan a joint university and community welcome day event during the fall semester each year. The group would also work on problems identified by the group, or by people who may be affected by Lehigh students living off campus.

4. In order to successfully accomplish recommendations 1-3, Lehigh needs a full time staff person and office dedicated to off campus residence life which could work with both undergraduates and graduate students.

5. Lastly, while our working group supports a third year residency requirement in theory, we are strongly urging the university to adequately plan for and address any potential consequences before the policy is changed. We are specifically concerned about the effect of such a policy change on the neighborhoods surrounding Lehigh, a concern for both our admissions and campus life, as well as for the local community. We have heard the problem addressed as “gutting the neighborhood,” and are concerned about the potential to concentrate poverty and create new challenges in “abandoned” student neighborhoods close to campus.
Information that has been gathered relevant to the following questions:

(1) What Lehigh program and policies currently in effect have a positive effect on the campus environment?

1. Special interest housing and/or theme housing
   - other schools do a lottery for off campus and require a special interest designation to move off campus (See Appendix 7)
   - University groups are currently lifestyle driven e.g. choice, gender neutral
2. Residential Fellows Heather Johnson - but needs funding to expand
3. Light Up the Night Initiative by student senate and LUPD
4. LUPD programs are good ideas and having a positive impact - but need to reach more people
   - registering houses over breaks
   - Emergen-See app
5. Office of First Year Experience
   - New Student Orientation (Friday night dining, Steelstacks)
   - evoLUtion
   - 5x10 programs
6. Student representatives for off campus living on student senate - but need to be utilized & given responsibilities
7. Existing program for off campus students “Off Campus Student Seminar” by Dale Kochard
8. Transportation on campus such as buses - but extend into the community
9. Stores and restaurants off campus such as: Loose Threads, Home Base, the Goose, Blue Sky Café - but need more stores for students like these not like the Promenade and Mall where they can go only via university buses and cars.
10. Community block watch at Broughal

(4) What universities have reputations for having a positive campus environment? Which of their programs contribute to that environment? Could those programs be implemented at Lehigh?

Our working group struggled with how to know if there is a positive environment. We have gathered information from websites and anecdotal accounts from individual students but do the programs and policies on the websites actually work in practice?

1. An approved landlord list
2. A university staff person for off campus living and housing (See Appendix 4)
3. Changing the timing of when leases are signed
4. An advisory group comprised of community members, students, faculty, and staff with sub-committees. Need to be structured & given authority. (See Appendix 10).

(5) What are the biggest challenges that Lehigh students face?

1. No sense of community
2. No programs specifically for off campus living/housing
3. No centralized resources for off campus living/housing
4. No administrator or office at Lehigh that has responsibility for off campus living
5. Week night parties and social culture – connected to Greek Life and Athletics cultures *(part of a collaborative conversation with other CORE groups)
6. Quality of off campus housing
7. Difficulty for international students in finding quality off campus housing because of timing, distance, cost and misunderstanding of culture.
8. Increasing rental costs and advanced lease signing.
9. The needs of commuter students need to be addressed.

Potential challenges:
1. Third year on requirement may not change off campus environment (See Appendix 11):
   - Even with a third year on campus residential requirement seniors are still able to host off campus parties.
   - Students are not integrating into the local community and are not aware of what it takes to be a community member.
   - Students not having experience and education to develop housing management and life skills.
   - If substantial numbers of students are brought back on campus it could have an extremely negative effect on the neighborhoods surrounding campus. Potential neighborhood changes include a concentration of poverty, densely populated housing and an increase in crime.
2. If the university increases involvement in off campus housing it has the potential to increase university liability. General Counsel should be consulted. (See Appendix 3).

(6) What current Lehigh policies would you change, and why?
1. Things in existence that are not being used and/or hard to find. It is an effective use of resources if we have things in place that are not being used by our students.
   - Examples: student senate off campus representatives and LUPD initiatives
2. On campus party policies because of cost, registration procedures, and alcohol policies that lead to off campus parties.
3. Qualification to move off campus (e.g. GPA, conduct violations) because off campus living is an earned privilege and it would help with community relations if we had responsible students living in the community. It could also help to strengthen the surrounding community’s image and reputation which would in turn strengthen the University appeal for students, parents and other potential year round residents. (See Appendix 7).
4. Residency requirements such as juniors & seniors living in Greek houses not sophomores so that student community building from the first year can be continued.
5. A plan for the implementation of off campus living and housing changes over a period of time and assessment because of the potential impact on community. See potential challenges under question 5. (See Appendix 11).
6. Campus geography such as “the hill” creates safety challenges for students getting to and from on-campus parties for example: drunk driving and potential gender violence. Supported during joint conversations on social life and Greek life with other working groups (See Appendix 12)

7. Enforcement of ordinances and code. Police and city enforcement combined with University enforcement for safety reasons. For example: housing inspections, noise ordinances, fire exits, asbestos and radon, since parties are held in the basements of off-campus houses (information about parties from joint working group conversations with IFC and Panhel).

Description of ideas that have arisen so far in response to the following questions. Include, where relevant, descriptions of coordination with other working groups:

(2) What are the top three changes you believe would have a positive effect on the students’ environment?

Immediate:
1. Register off campus residents (See Appendix 9).
   - Register parties so safety, noise, trash, etc. can be addressed
   - Safety
   - Off campus Gryphons or some other form of responsible persons (See Appendix 3)

2. Better resources including a mandatory orientation and collaboration with OFYE (See Appendices 2, 4, 8 and 10):
   - Centralized online site
   - An office/person/committee that students can go to with question and concerns about off campus living (possibly modeled after the student senate advisory board)
   - Connect to Pete Costa in the Health Promotion and Prevention Strategies for alcohol related trainings.
   - Does our insurance company United Educators offer an online training related to off campus living issues that we could require student to complete?

3. Advisory board that works with landlords and the community, as well as plans events including (See Appendix 10):
   - A landlord summit
   - A welcome day
   - Brochures – one that covers everything
   - Student programming group
   - Block watch
   - Housing fair

4. University needs to address the issue that the primary location for parties is off campus. Issues that need to be addressed include policies, seniors, and other groups in
addition to the Greek community. This suggestion is in collaboration with other working groups.

5. Staff person and office responsible for off campus housing. In order to accomplish 1, 2 and 3 above, as well as make sustainable changes to the off campus living experience someone needs to be given authority to do so. This position needs to be able to work with students, landlords, the city of the Bethlehem, neighboring community members, and Lehigh faculty/staff. (See Appendix 4).

Long Term:

1. In spirit we see the benefits of a third year residency requirement but urge the committee to consider the consequences. We are advocating for a third year requirement with conditions (See Appendix 11):
   - Requirements to lottery off campus (GPA, conduct record, online training certification). This would allow the issue of long term lease signings to be address and could address community relation issues. (See Appendix 7).
   - Develop a strategic plan before implementation to ensure the community is not negatively affected.
   - Alternative options could include: university controlled off campus housing. For example Franklin and Marshall contracts with a third party and then inspects and approves those houses for students and Muhlenberg owns off campus houses and has off campus RAs. (See Appendix 6).

(3) What three successful programs from Lehigh’s peer and aspirational universities can we implement at Lehigh?

1. Some type of off campus block party in the community during move in weekend for students and community members. (See Appendix 5). Should include:
   - food
   - information such as brochures
   - Tabling – LUPD, landlords
   - Planned by suggested off campus staff/office see question 2.5
   - Held on student populated streets such as East 5th or Hillside

2. Revamped website and brochures (See Appendix 2):
   Examples: Tufts, Rice, Northwestern, Colorado State, Cornell, George Washington

3. Mandatory registering of off campus student houses and approval to move off campus based on GPA and conduct. (See Appendices 7 and 9).

Description of how working group has accounted for:

(a) Health and safety, including the role of alcohol and other drugs:
Discussed safety concerns about off campus party culture including the impact on the neighborhood and danger to students including:

- Overconsumption of alcohol with no monitoring
- Moving from house to house through the neighborhood which creates noise and safety concerns for inebriated students (Information provided by LUPD).
- Problem of students getting stuck at one house and can’t get home which can be dangerous, especially for women because sorority women get rides from fraternity men; once at a party, hard to leave (information from presentation by IFC and PanHel presidents).
- Problem of exclusivity of off campus parties due to safety concerns of residents: winds up becoming divisive issue when fraternities or club/athletic houses are seen as excluding people for various reasons, including race, ethnicity (because they don’t know who the person is –issue for on campus culture)
- Unsafe basement locations most parties: no fire exits, overcrowding, danger of step collapse, asbestos, etc.
- At Colorado State University they give students “party packs” that include trash bags, flashlight, notices for neighbors, water so they are ready for parties and neighbors are warned
- Many universities register parties with campus police; Colorado State University police give registered parties a 20 minute warning if they are getting too wild. Nonregistered parties go straight to city police call.
- Cost of on campus parties (is that only fraternities?) is prohibitive. Forces parties into community
- Is there anywhere else on campus that you could register a party with alcohol for those over 21? Are we forcing parties into community?

(b) Diversity and inclusion:

- Barrier between local neighbors (year round) and students- class, race, ethnicity issues. How to break those down with human contact, engagement?
- Acknowledging majority our students come from suburbs means that they may be uncomfortable in neighborhoods, and/or with people who are not of same class, race, etc.
- Greek system (presentation by IFC/Pan Hel presidents) seems toxic, encourages exclusion, classism, sexism. We identified athletics as similar system, but need to hear more from them. That Greek presentation needs to go out all over campus for discussion.
- The Greek system dominated much of our off campus life discussion, coming up again and again as a divisive, isolating force in off campus living; this affects ALL students, including unaffiliated ones (IFC/PanHel presentation reinforced this perspective).

(c) Enhancing Lehigh’s academic environment:
• Mandatory off campus orientation can educate students for life (what it is to live in a community, responsibilities, interaction with diverse neighbors, etc.)
• Changing residency requirement would enhance academic environment
• Improve/create programs that would involve community members, allow them to access academic world. Find better way to invite people on to campus for lectures, etc. (see Tufts programs for neighbors website for examples) and make them feel more welcome on campus could make both residents and students more comfortable with each other off campus. Could enhance discussions, bringing in diverse viewpoints, ideas
• Party culture does have a negative effect on student academic performance especially with the Tuesday-Saturday party schedule (Panhel/IFC presentation) – really clear that students cannot do their best academic work if they are out nearly every weeknight
• Off campus junior and senior students don’t often get back to campus for programs, lectures, etc.; need to find ways to attract them, integrate them into campus life including academic extracurricular life.

(d) Engagement with the South Bethlehem community:
• Serious concern that if we pursue our recommendation and that of many other committees to bring more upper class students back on campus, we will “gut the neighborhoods” that surround Lehigh. Need to help create a plan for those rental units that will become vacant. Problem of who will live in those houses? If they become family dwellings, likelihood of concentrating poverty on a few streets (right next to campus, too) and all the accompanying problems that may result. Also may result in overcrowding with extended families moving in to houses that are not big enough (but would have to overcrowd to afford rent). LEHIGH MUST BE PART OF THAT SOLUTION, TOO
• Off campus housing often creates ill will in the surrounding community: students are often perceived as elitist, arrogant, rude (sometimes true, sometimes it is a result of shyness, cultural barriers, fear). Residents complain about trash, students not following city rules (which are not enforced by the city on the Southside, either) like not leaving your garbage on the curb all the time, not putting garbage in cans, putting recycling out all week, etc. as well as noise, parties, taking all the parking spaces, etc. (From conversation with landlords, residents and student working group members).
• We want to see that relationship change through programs in which students and neighbors engage for fun and perhaps through service to their neighborhood (joint shoveling, cleanups, porch sitting nights, etc.).
• New welcome block party idea could kick off that interaction, but we need to work on preparing a core group of students and a group of neighbors to coach others on that day, facilitating interaction.

• Colorado State University program for welcome day really works on that relationship building: good model. And the written tips for starting a conversation with your neighbor is an interesting idea, if we could figure out incentives to employ those suggestions.

• Block watches requiring perhaps a designated representative (student) from each registered house would help with interaction and caring for the street/people on a block or two. Would increase sense of connectedness and safety.

• Tufts model (may be others?) for website that invites neighbors on to campus to free, discounted events (offer discount for those nearby?) include concerts, plays, exhibits, lectures, discussion, etc.

• Allowing free auditing of classes for people in nearby block area? Could see students and university differently and vice versa.

• Vanderbilt president hands out cookies in neighborhoods at beginning of year, chats with neighbors. Community Relations VP visits neighborhoods when there is a complaint (not sure if for one; maybe repeated?) and talks with year round residents and students. Sets tone for students, residents.

• Wesleyan University president or dean/associate deans stroll(s) through neighborhoods on party nights (not every one??). Presence changes dynamic, year round residents seek him out. He actually asks to visit parties, too, if they will let him in! Sets tone for interaction with neighbors, says university cares. Peter Likins used to do this on The Hill in the 80s.

*Additional comments: We have observed that many working groups including ours are spending significant amounts of time addressing Greek life concerns and as a result other student constituents are not being discussed even though they are also being effected by Greek life. Another large group we are aware of is Athletics including varsity, club and intramural teams. Non-affiliated students need to be considered. Unique groups include international students, graduate students and commuter students.
Appendix 1:
CORE Off-Campus Life and Housing Working Group
Landlord Meeting
March 26, 2015
Summary

Demographics: 23 landlords attended. Experience ranged from 1 year to 30 years. Number of units ranged from 1 to 108. Some shared that they were Lehigh alumni, faculty/staff or parents of students.

- Many of the landlords reported an overall good experience with a few exceptions.
- There are differences in renting to undergraduate, graduate and international students.
- Lehigh students do not have a lot of experience renting and caring for a home. They need education on their responsibilities, safety, being a member of the community, landlord rights, and leases. Could Lehigh assist with this education?
- Landlords see themselves as educators.
- Some are finding ways to involve and work with the parents as well.
- Not everyone can or should be a landlord and it is a tough job. There are landlords who care and have experience and are willing to collaborate but we need a way to differentiate the good landlords from the bad (especially “slumlords”) perhaps something like an “Angie’s List” or landlord requirements.
- Some landlords have found texting is the best form of communication and many agree that the landlords need to be present and connected.
- Partying and alcohol/drug use are a concern for some. Some expressed concerns about how Lehigh’s “social policy” is effecting (increasing) off campus partying.
- Landlords are experiencing some problems with places4students especially fraud and pricing and would like to meet with Lehigh to discuss.
- Increases in rent based on locations have changed the renting climate.
- There are a variety of different advertising and leasing techniques that are used by landlords. Advertising ranges from word of mouth to the Brown and White to Craig’s List. In terms of leasing some rent to groups and others only individuals while some have a standard lease and others had lawyers create a lease.
- Safety issues are a concern for landlords as well as the university. They have noticed a difference over the past few years due to the multi-pronged approach by police and are requesting continued police presence. Landlords would like another meeting to discuss safety concerns.
- Landlords would like resources as well, especially for new landlords. Perhaps on an “Off Campus” website. Please reference examples from peer institutions.
- Many landlords expressed interest in joining an advisory group made up of landlords, university administrators, police, city inspectors, students and community members. The group would meet regularly in order to share information and resources, as well as discuss issues.
- Other issues landlords would like to see addressed include: the overlap of graduating seniors and summer classes and information about Lehigh programs that could assist them such as registering houses with LUPD and Move Out.
Appendix 2: Website Examples

Appendix 3: Off Campus “Gryphons”
See additional attachment

Appendix 4: Off Campus Office and Staff
See additional attachment

Appendix 5: Community Event
See additional attachments

Appendix 6: Off Campus Housing Alternatives

Appendix 7: Requirements to Live Off Campus

Appendix 8: Off Campus Training Programs

Appendix 9: Registering Off Campus Houses

Appendix 10: Advisory Board
See attachment

Appendix 11: Three Year Requirement
See attachment

Appendix 12: Boswell and Spade Article
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Appendix 13: Existing Lehigh Off Campus Initiatives

LUNA Announcement
Attention Off-Campus Students - Invitation  8/26/14
from ann0@Lehigh.EDU (Anne N. Noon-Scaggs)

Come join us for food, refreshments and information about living in the community on Tuesday, August 26 at 5:00 pm. We will have Lehigh representatives, local city officials and landlords there to answer your questions and help you to know what you should know about living off campus.

Click the link below for more information.
www.lehigh.edu/~intown/OffCampusStudentsInvitationLetter.pdf

RSVP to intown@lehigh.edu

Hope to see you there!!

Health Center
We organize flu vaccine clinics throughout the fall semester. These are not specifically targeted to off campus residents, but are inclusive.

**Prevention Strategies and Health Advancement (Pete Costa)**

Program/Initiative: "**Red Watch Band**" (alcohol overdose bystander intervention)
Who/What office is responsible: Peter Costa/Health Advancement & Prevention Strategies Office
When occurs in AY '14/15: 9/15, 10/22, 11/17, 12/3, 1/28, 2/16, 3/18, 4/20 and Upon request

Program/Initiative: "**TIPS for the University**" (high-risk drinking reduction)
Who/What office is responsible: Peter Costa/Health Advancement & Prevention Strategies Office
When occurs: TBD, Upon request

Program/Initiative: "**Calling the Shots**" (general alcohol education/safety)
Who/What office is responsible: Peer Health Advisers/Health Advancement & Prevention Strategies Office
When occurs: Upon request

Program/Initiative: "**Mind Your Meds**" (prescription drug abuse/misuse)
Who/What office is responsible: Peer Health Advisers/Health Advancement & Prevention Strategies Office
When occurs: Upon request

Program/Initiative: "**Sleep for Success**" (healthy sleep/sleep hygiene)
Who/What office is responsible: Peer Health Advisers/Health Advancement & Prevention Strategies Office
When occurs: Upon request

Program/Initiative: "**ABCs of STDs**" (sexual health education)
Who/What office is responsible: Peer Health Advisers/Health Advancement & Prevention Strategies Office
When occurs: Upon request

**Student Activities**

I suppose on that note Student Activities or the extensions are not offering any specific programs that targets solely off-campus students.

The Student Senate has an off-campus constituency that is composed of students who live off-campus. Over the years they will hold safety oriented programs such as Light Up Lehigh (passing out light bulbs in the community) and off-campus forums to discuss safety issues.
Residence Life

You probably assumed this already with 'residence life’, but we do not offer anything for off-campus students.

Off-campus students probably attend the social events during the last week of classes in the spring hosted in the residence halls such as Rock the Quad or Campus Square Block party, but these are not marketed to OC students.

First Year Experience

Unfortunately and interestingly there not any 5 X 10 programs focused on serving off campus students or off campus life. Take the Throne III: The Triple Threat Step Show will take place on Saturday, October 25th at 7pm at the Broughal Middle School which is off campus. The tickets for that event at $5. All other programs are located on campus and do not mention off campus students or commuters. Off campus students are more than welcome to attend any of the 5 X 10 programs! There is definitely a need!

Women’s Center

If your working group is asking for those activities that an office does to engage students that live off-campus, the Women's Center doesn't have any.

If your working group is asking for those activities that an office does with off-campus agencies, you can use the list below.

Program/Initiative: Board book fundraiser for the Nurse-Family Partnership

Who/What office is responsible: Women's Center

When it occurs: Fall semester

Program/Initiative: Relationship with Bethlehem chapter of the AAUW

Who/What office is responsible: Rita Jones/Women's Center

When it occurs: on-going

Program/Initiative: Relationship with Turning Point of the Lehigh Valley

Who/What office is responsible: Rita Jones/Women's Center

When it occurs: on-going
Working Group #: 4

Working Group Name: Affinity and Special Interest Life and Housing

Working Group Co-Chairs: Heather Johnson & Taran Cardone

Executive Summary:
Working Group #4 proposes to create a new hybrid living-learning model of residential housing to bring Lehigh University (LU) into the next era of residential college experience with a broad array of housing options for a diverse student population. Our proposal focuses on university-driven special interest and affinity housing, and a major build-out of a new housing arena for LU that would foster new opportunities for meaningful student-faculty interaction. The goal is to offer a campus-wide, comprehensive, integrated, holistic undergraduate living-learning community, which will give students, faculty, and staff a transformative experience during their time at Lehigh, and will propel Lehigh into the next era and for generations to come. This mission is operationalized through: a) university supported faculty and staff involvement and leadership, of b) creative living-learning programs, that c) connect residence life with academic and co-curricular programs, in order to d) promote rich faculty-student interactions and enhance a sense of community on-campus, while e) fostering students’ intellectual and leadership development. The model we propose incorporates two major components, briefly outlined below.

1. **University-Driven Themed Special Interest and Affinity Housing.**
Focus on creating and/or reframing and strengthening a few (4-6) high-quality, structured, university-driven communities. These would be university-supported initiatives, advised by committed faculty and staff, and available to all students (including incoming first-year students). Each community would be rooted in a theme which explicitly focuses on synthesizing and integrating both identity issues and academic experiences (in other words, combining the personal and the intellectual). Examples may include (but are by no means limited to) Umoja, PRIDE, CHOICE, Service Learning, Entrepreneurship, International Student House, and STEM. The advisors (faculty and staff) should be vetted carefully, and there should be significant and meaningful incentives for faculty and staff involvement (i.e. stipends, merit acknowledgement, dining
privileges). The housing for these special interest and affinity options could be in current facilities. These programs would be overseen by a newly established exempt staff position, and be housed in the Office of Residence Life.

2. **A New Hybrid Model Living-Learning Community.** Create a new residential option as an integrated experience for students and faculty. This is broadly envisioned as a set of newly constructed, high-quality residential spaces (set up as a new physical space on Lehigh’s campus; a “residential college”/“park”/“campus”), incorporating upper class student housing with structured and university supported faculty-in-residence programs rooted in partnerships and collaborations across the university (connecting students, staff, and faculty). These new residential spaces would have specific pre-determined and set themes, that would change over time, as developed in each period by the various faculty-in-residence. This Living-Learning Community area would include residence halls; faculty-in-residence housing; classroom/seminar space; event space (for lectures, speakers, programs, etc.); a dining hall facility for communal dining; office space for staff; social space indoors and green space outdoors conducive to community building; common community space conducive for natural gathering of students, faculty, and staff who are not living in the area (in particular, upper-class students who live off campus), possibly in the form of a coffee cafe or food vendor; recreation/fitness/exercise space; study/library-esque space. The leadership positions (individual faculty members, or faculty families) would be chosen carefully through a selective vetting process, and there would be substantial and meaningful incentives for faculty-in-residence (i.e. contracted sabbatical leaves upon completion of time lived-on, course reductions, stipends, merit acknowledgement, dining privileges). The faculty-in-residence program would be housed in the President’s Office (or, minimally, the Provost’s Office), and would work in conjunction with the Office of Residence Life and other stakeholders across the university to support the programs and individuals involved in the leadership and operation of them. Note: this should be co-ed, multi-class year housing, capable of attracting transfers, sophomores, juniors and seniors “back to campus” (away from living off campus).

**Detailed Report:**

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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(1) What Lehigh program and policies currently in effect have a positive effect on the campus environment?

Lehigh’s “Live Lehigh” communities are a form of Special Interest and Affinity housing which have a positive impact. Live Lehigh is currently comprised of two types of housing initiatives: university-driven and student-driven. These programs are overseen by the Offices of Residence Life and Residential Services.\(^1\) In our view, the most important purpose these communities serve is their ability to offer an alternative to Greek Life and Greek housing. This need is demonstrated by the Senior Survey on Campus Climate conducted by the Office of Institutional Research in 2014\(^2\) wherein only 49.4% of seniors agreed or strongly agreed that non-Greeks/independents are visible on-campus. Currently, students can apply to create Live Lehigh communities (i.e., student-driven Live Lehigh housing options) and/or sign up to live in them (i.e., university-driven Live Lehigh housing options). This year, there are 7 student-driven options and 9 university-driven options with 5 of those 9 having been added this past year.

Current student-driven Live Lehigh communities include Coding the Future, Acts II: Christian Community, Know Thyself, Live.Learn.Serve, Green Engineering, Outdoor Adventure and Music Appreciation. While several of these communities have been highly successful, that has been the exception and not the norm. Typically, the student-driven options have been transient communities that heavily depend upon one or two core student leaders (often a Gryphon overseeing that community). Once those students leave, the community usually disappears, rendering the model unsustainable and threatening to the overall Live Lehigh community. These communities have generally focused their attention more on the facility than on the topic of interest for that community, which is part of why standardizing themes and facilities through university-driven housing seems like a better option.

University-driven Live Lehigh options include the newly created first-year Live Lehigh communities including Global Lehigh, Creative Commons, Intersecting Identities, Live.Learn.Serve, and Outdoor Adventure. Next year, STEM and N3 (Nosh, Nourish and Nutrition) will be newly offered. Other university-driven options are CHOICE (substance free), Umoja (diversity and unity emphasis), and PRIDE (gender neutral housing). These communities provide a safe space for different, often marginalized subcultures on Lehigh’s campus and provide

---

\(^1\) Please refer to the [Lehigh University Office of Residence Life website](#) for more details regarding Live Lehigh.

\(^2\) Please refer to the “2014 Lehigh University Senior Survey on Campus Climate” located in Appendix B on the Dropbox.
opportunities specific to the needs of these student populations. This need is confirmed by the 41.8% of Lehigh’s outgoing seniors that either disagreed, strongly disagreed or were undecided that the climate in our residence halls is welcoming for students from historically underrepresented/marginalized groups.\(^3\)

Lehigh’s Offices of Residence Life and Residential Services also oversee a Residential Fellows Program. Currently only one faculty member is living on-campus as part of this program, but the assessment data collected over the past two years shows a very positive impact on the campus environment.\(^4\)

South Mountain College (SMC) was another special interest and affinity housing option offered by the College of Arts and Sciences. We are using the past tense in light of recent events described by the Brown and White on March 30, 2015.\(^5\) While the program offered a curricular component, it did not include a true residential component, as SMC did not host its offerings in conjunction with the Office of Residence Life and Residential Services’ programmatic and co-curricular efforts. Although a portion of SMC students lived together, as is consistent with honors colleges at other universities, it did not also include the comprehensive residential experience typical of these kinds of communities.

Our Working Group recognizes that Fraternity and Sorority groups are, themselves, a form of Affinity and Special Interest Housing, and are a very large and active part of residential life at Lehigh. We acknowledge the challenges -- and the positive effects -- of this aspect of our campus environment\(^6\). We make special note that Greek Chapters and their housing should be acknowledged as a current form of Affinity and Special Interest Housing as we conceptualize and better understand the potential of the residential environment at Lehigh.

Our Working Group also notes that Lehigh’s second year living requirement is an important aspect of the residential experience on-campus. By requiring students to live on-campus during their second year, Lehigh ensures a strong residential component to the college experience for our first and second year students, allowing for intentional, integrated and developmentally appropriate interventions

---

\(^3\) Please refer to page 2 of the “2014 Lehigh University Senior Survey on Campus Climate” located in Appendix B on the Dropbox.


\(^5\) Please refer to the Brown and White article included in Appendix F on the Dropbox.

\(^6\) For data on student perceptions of the impact of Greek Life on Lehigh’s campus, please refer to page 7 of the “2014 Lehigh University Senior Survey on Campus Climate” located in Appendix B on the Dropbox.
such as bLUeprint\textsuperscript{7}, Lehigh’s Student Life Curriculum, within the residence halls and Greek chapter houses. Efforts like bLUeprint reinforce the value of living at a residential research university as students have ongoing opportunities to receive ongoing coaching and develop what Brandon Busteed (2015)\textsuperscript{8} calls “21st century skills” or what Lehigh University defines as Core Competencies (e.g., through one on one conversations with Gryphons, community events and programming).

(4) What universities have reputations for having a positive campus environment? Which of their programs contribute to that environment? Could those programs be implemented at Lehigh?

Universities that have reputations for having a positive campus environment are universities which have a strong residential component to campus life and incorporate faculty and staff into the culture of the campus. In other words, these schools have large numbers of undergraduate students who live -- for multiple years -- on-campus, and have involvement from faculty and staff in the life of the campus. “Living-learning communities” (aka Affinity and Special Interest Housing) is the cutting-edge for residence life on college campuses nationwide. Some schools with long-established living-learning-type campus models include Penn, Stanford, Cornell, Brown, Harvard, Yale, Miami University (Ohio), Boston College, Georgetown, and George Washington University. Of course, the living-learning concept originated with Cambridge and Oxford, which became the model for academic institutions in Europe, the U.S., and beyond (Thelin, 2011).

The most robust Living-learning Community programs tend to have academic departments and student affairs offices linked explicitly to communities of various interests and purposes. The faculty and staff associated with these programs have substantive incentives for their time and work; appropriate incentives for faculty “living on” (i.e., course reductions, stipends, research funding, etc.) are especially noteworthy, as they appear to be a critical component of symbolically showing support for faculty who go ‘above and beyond’ the traditional academic role in this way. These communities contribute to the larger campus culture, providing leadership opportunities as well as an avenue for inquiry and learning for all members of the university. Schools with well-developed programs of this nature have linked coursework where the students are taking a course together and living in community with each other. Some programs feature unique

\textsuperscript{7} Please refer to the “SLC_bLUeprint.pdf” located in Appendix F on the Dropbox.

\textsuperscript{8} Please refer to the Busteed (2015) article located in Appendix A on the Dropbox.
incentives like scholarships associated with living in those communities, special trips for community members, and, in the case of long-standing communities, an established alumni network. These features further participants’ learning within their community’s area(s) of interest and strongly link students to the institution beyond their time living in that particular residential area. Current literature explains the critical effect of students participating in learning communities particularly with an established cohort of peers and caring mentors (Busteed, 2015; Davenport & Pasque, 2014; Inkelas & Vogt, et al., 2006; Zhao & Kuh, 2004)\(^9\).

According to Lehigh’s results from the 2012 National Survey of Student Engagement\(^10\), however, only 13% of first-year students and 27% of seniors have participated in such a community. While 57% of students did not plan to participate in such a learning community by their senior year (perhaps because they were already locked into other requirements or commitments), 28% of the first-year students had planned to and 32% had not yet decided. This data suggests a few possibilities: 1) a lack of clear learning communities for students to join, 2) a lack of marketing to explain how to become involved in and the benefit of such programs, 3) a lack of support to navigate real and perceived barriers to creating/engaging in such communities. To address these types of issues, various schools including Boston College, Miami University (Ohio), SUNY Brockport, University of Buffalo and the University of Missouri, University of South Florida, Bucknell University, Colgate University, and The University of Arizona -- to name a few -- have hired staff members dedicated to overseeing, marketing and implementing such efforts.\(^11\)

Cornell University has a hybrid living-learning community/residential fellows program that we believe could be replicated at Lehigh. Cornell has created an entire section of campus dedicated toward this program that serves upperclass students (65% sophomores, 25% juniors, and 10% seniors). Up to 15% of the entire community is comprised of transfer students. There are 5 different houses in this West Campus system, each of which features a residential fellow or House Professor-Dean. The House Professor-Dean lives with their family in the particular House and is aided by a House Council and team of House Fellows who host a variety of programs and activities with residents. The Houses are

---

\(^9\) Please reference copies of these articles located in Appendix A on the Dropbox.

\(^10\) Please reference the “Core WG 4 Data on Faculty, Staff and Student Relationships.pdf” located in Appendix B on the Dropbox. This information was derived from the larger “2012 Lehigh National Student Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE) and Faculty Survey on Student Engagement (FSSE)” also located in Appendix B.

\(^11\) Please reference the sample position descriptions located in Appendix E on the Dropbox.
attractive, encouraging both faculty members and upperclass students to live there. Amenities include a library, TV lounge, laundry facilities, and a dining room in each House. The dining area especially serves as a programming and discussion space for residents and the House Fellows. The residential system also features mixed options for students including singles, doubles, and apartments throughout the community.

(5) What are the biggest challenges that Lehigh students face?

In regards to Affinity and Special Interest Housing, it is our opinion that the biggest challenge that Lehigh students face is the fact that -- in the eyes of current students themselves -- Greek Life is so dominant in Lehigh’s campus culture. There are strong incentives to join fraternities and sororities, and there are not a lot of robust, established, or flexible alternative options for living on-campus that provide similar incentives such as a feeling of increased independence (e.g., Greek chapter houses do not have Gryphon staff, residence halls require University sponsored meal plans), access to a wide network of connected peers and University alumni, and the ability to host social parties with alcohol on-campus. The dominance of Greek Life is especially problematic for first-year students, and others who are living on-campus, during the spring semester as many students participate in the Greek recruitment process and spend the majority of their time on “The Hill.”

Another major challenge is that because Lehigh students are not guaranteed a place to live on-campus as juniors or seniors, they often feel forced to find off-campus housing options very early in the academic year. Given the limited housing options, these students are sometimes signing leases for off-campus housing as early as their first-year at Lehigh. Often sophomores are signing leases for junior and senior year to ensure housing. As a result, these students can no longer opt into Affinity and Special Interest Housing options on-campus and they are locked into off campus leases with their peers -- some of which require them to live in facilities that do not meet suitable living conditions.

Data Regarding Number of Juniors and Seniors Living on Campus

---

12 Please reference the “2014 Lehigh University Senior Survey on Campus Climate” located in Appendix B on the Dropbox.
13 Please reference the description of “Inequities Among Greek versus Non-Greek Housing Options” located in Appendix C on the Dropbox.
14 Please reference the “Lehigh University Residential Services Occupancy Reports for 2013 and 2014” located in Appendix D on the Dropbox and the table labeled “Data Regarding Number of Juniors and Seniors Living on Campus” embedded in this report.
(Derived from the 2013 and 2014 Lehigh University Occupancy Reports Provided by Residential Services)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Juniors living on-campus</th>
<th>Seniors living on-campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>309 (Residence halls)</td>
<td>144 (Residence halls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>397 (Greek chapter houses)</td>
<td>75 (Greek chapter houses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total: 706 juniors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total: 219 seniors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>233 (Residence halls)</td>
<td>156 (Residence halls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>434 (Greek chapter houses)</td>
<td>79 (Greek chapter houses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total: 667 juniors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total: 235 seniors</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, as the Lehigh “party scene” has moved more and more to off-campus housing\(^{15}\), students feel the pull to live off-campus, and spend more and more time off-campus, more strongly.\(^{16}\) Since the number of social policy corporate conduct cases has decreased significantly while the number of conduct cases by individuals has remained relatively the same\(^{17}\), it can be inferred that social groups (e.g., student organizations, Greek chapters) have moved their social events off-campus. For fuller detail on issues related to campus social policies, see report from WG7 Social Life, Policy and Student Conduct.

Lastly, Lehigh students do not see faculty and staff as being actively involved in the life of the campus outside of their “jobs” and/or professional roles. In fact, 17.8% of Lehigh first-year students surveyed in the 2011 Association for Independent Colleges and University in Pennsylvania (AICUP) survey described their satisfaction with faculty’s attitude toward students as irrelevant.\(^{18}\) Further, about 20.8% of Lehigh first-year students did not know if they had one faculty member to turn to if they needed help or assistance, demonstrating that many students do not know their professors outside of class, and do not know

\(^{15}\) Please reference the documents entitled “Registered Social Events Per Semester for CORE” and “Social Policy Corporate Conduct Cases” located in Appendix C on the Dropbox.
\(^{16}\) Please reference the qualitative data in the “2014 Lehigh University Senior Survey on Campus Climate” located in Appendix B on the Dropbox.
\(^{17}\) Please reference the chart entitled “Social Policy Corporate Conduct Cases” and its accompanying explanation located in Appendix C on the Dropbox.
\(^{18}\) Please reference the 2011 findings summary for the “Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in Pennsylvania Survey” located in Appendix B on the Dropbox.
university staff outside of their offices/campus-roles. The campus is often seen to be somehow "owned" by students -- and students alone -- during nights and weekends. Faculty and staff seem detached from the life of the campus beyond the confines of their specific duties and professional responsibilities. According to the 2011 AICUP survey, 70.8% of Lehigh first-year students indicated that they had no opportunity to discuss non-course related topics with their professors outside of class. The 23.3% of students that indicated having done so, reported spending less than one hour in a typical week engaging in such conversation. The Lehigh specific information from the 2012 National Survey for Student Engagement also reports similar findings with 41% of first-year students and 27% of seniors never discussing readings or classes with faculty members outside of class. Only 23% of first-year students and 33% of seniors reported working often or very often with faculty members on activities other than coursework (e.g., committee, orientation, student life activities, etc.). As a result, there are few examples for students of adults playing multiple roles and leading multi-faceted, holistically-oriented lives. Similarly, many faculty and staff are detached from the more holistic world of the student body, and do not have a clear picture of the reality of student life.

(6) What current Lehigh policies would you change, and why?

First, in line with several of the other CORE Working Groups’ proposals, we would increase the on-campus living requirement for undergraduate students to a minimum of three years. The change would keep students on-campus longer in the residential environment allowing them to engage in educational programs and a thriving campus culture. It would also remove the burden of students having to sign leases so early in their college career. Further, it would add to the student population that might be interested in Affinity and Special Interest Housing. We understand that the implications of this change includes the need to build significantly more on-campus housing. Given the tremendous amount of time that other working groups have devoted to the 3rd-Year-in-Residence Requirement, we will defer to those groups’ reports for thorough rationale and substantiating data (see, in particular, the report from WG1 Undergraduate Residence Life and Housing).


21 Please reference the “Core WG 4 Data on Faculty, Staff and Student Relationships.pdf” located in Appendix B on the Dropbox. This information was derived from the larger “2012 Lehigh National Student Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE) and Faculty Survey on Student Engagement (FSSE)” also located in Appendix B.
Second, we would examine housing/organizational policies that stratify the housing experience on Lehigh’s campus. Through our committee’s research and conversations, it is clear that not all housing options in the residential environment are equal (e.g., there are different levels of oversight, amenities available, opportunities offered, connection to resources and alumni)\(^{22}\), impacting the future of Affinity & Special Interest Housing. Our committee encourages the CORE committee (in conjunction with related working committees) to consider the following questions in relation to such policies: To what extent are housing options equitable on Lehigh’s campus? What would it take to make housing options more equitable? If there were more equitable housing options with equally attractive incentives, how might students choose their living situation differently? How do the residential environment at large and the social policies of Lehigh’s campus need to change to allow for Affinity and Special Interest Housing to be successful at Lehigh? What infrastructure and resources need to be in place? For fuller detail on these issues, see reports from WG4 Fraternity and Sorority Life & Housing and WG7 Social Life, Policy and Student Conduct.

Third, the protocol for faculty and staff review/assessment needs to be examined in order to consider ways we can better encourage and incentivize their productive participation in campus life and culture. This is an important piece of the puzzle in making progress toward a more enriching and positive campus climate. Unless there are concrete incentives for faculty and staff to involve themselves with Affinity and Special Interest Housing, it is unlikely that they will engage themselves with this aspect of campus life given the number of pressures they face. Formal incentives, whether in the form of financial assistance (discretionary stipends, research funding, etc.), spot bonus awards, course releases, and/or credit in the tenure and promotion processes, would not only reward community members contributing to the residential environment but they would also encourage the kind of risk-taking and entrepreneurial learning at the heart of a residential research university. Clear support from the Provost’s Office and/or President’s Office and academic departments would encourage faculty and staff to become involved in Affinity and Special Interest Housing. Guidelines would need to be developed and implemented by both academic and student affairs to provide a clear pathway for integrating staff and faculty involvement (e.g., recruiting new Residential Fellows), facilitating the ongoing success of Affinity and Special Interest Housing at Lehigh. For fuller detail on issues related to faculty involvement, see report from WG8 Faculty Role in

\(^{22}\) Please reference the description of “Inequities Among Greek versus Non-Greek Housing Options” located in Appendix C on the Dropbox.
Residential Environment. Important Note: Faculty need to be involved in discussions regarding the time and effort required in faculty involvement in residence halls. We should discuss teaching and service reductions that could compensate for the time it takes to participate in valuable activities with students in the residence halls. By involving faculty on-campus, the university will get buy-in to the project. In addition, performance reviews of faculty involved in these programs will more correctly reflect the work that these programs involve.\(^{23}\)

Fourth, we would affirm that a housing placement process whereby any student regardless of deposit date would have access to special interest and affinity housing. Here again, given the tremendous amount of time that other working groups have devoted to this issue, we will defer to those groups’ reports for thorough rationale and substantiating data (see, in particular, the report from WG1 Undergraduate Residence Life and Housing).

Fifth -- \textbf{and most importantly} -- we would propose a massive restructuring of the on-campus housing structure at Lehigh. See section 2 below. With this newly envisioned structure for living-learning communities would come the dismantling of some of what is currently in place regarding Special Interest and Affinity Housing at Lehigh. Specifically, we propose to cut student-driven Live Lehigh communities. In our view, these are not thriving at LU, and the trend nationwide is that they are declining elsewhere as well. While several of the student-driven communities have been highly successful, that has been the exception and not the norm. Typically, the student-driven options have been transient communities that heavily depend upon one or two core student leaders (often a Gryphon overseeing that community). Once those students leave, the community usually disappears, rendering the model unsustainable. These communities have generally focused their attention more on the facility than on the topic of interest for that community. We propose to replace these with University-Driven Themed Special Interest Housing, as explained below.

\begin{center}
\rule{\textwidth}{0.4pt}
\end{center}

(2) What are the top three changes you believe would have a positive effect on the students’ environment?

\textit{This section represents the crux of our report and the culmination of our working group’s year of work:}

\(^{23}\) Please reference Dr. Jesus Salas’ reflection on “Faculty in Residence Politics” located in Appendix F on the Dropbox.
We propose to create a new hybrid living-learning model of residential housing to bring LU into the next era of the elite, private, residential college experience with a broad array of housing options for a diverse student population. Our proposal is for 1) enhanced university-driven themed special interest and affinity housing, and 2) a major build-out of a new housing arena for LU that would foster new opportunities for meaningful faculty-student interaction. In our view, these changes are paramount in order to bring the residential experience of our students and the culture of our campus in-line with our core institutional mission and values: “To advance learning through the integration of teaching, research, and service to others” (see Lehigh University Mission Statement).

Furthermore, in 2015 and going forward, it is our view that in order to justify and legitimize the tremendous financial cost of Lehigh, we need to truly provide the infrastructure to foster enriched interaction between faculty, students, and staff. In an era of online diplomas and relatively cheap community college options, the residential component of schools such as Lehigh -- and perhaps most importantly -- access to high caliber faculty for teaching, mentoring, interaction, and collaboration, is what sets high-quality residential colleges apart. Data shows that what makes students thrive, and what is most beneficial for students in the long run, is interacting with faculty who make them excited about learning. According to Busteed (2015), two additional experiences that have lifelong impacts on graduates engagement in their career and increased overall well-being are interactions with faculty that demonstrate care for the student as a person and access to mentors who encourage students to pursue their dreams. Many of our peer institutions already have developed, or are in the process of developing, on-campus student housing arrangements that connect residential life more closely to the academic mission of colleges and universities. Cornell, for example, went through virtually the same process CORE is going through now.24

We are proposing a hybrid living-learning model rooted in two co-operational concepts, as outlined below. The goal is to offer a campus-wide, comprehensive, integrated, holistic undergraduate living-learning community, which will give students, faculty, and staff a transformative experience during their time at Lehigh, and will propel Lehigh into the next era and for generations to come. This mission is operationalized through: a) university supported faculty and staff involvement and leadership, of b) creative living-learning programs, that c)

connect residence life with academic and co-curricular programs, in order to d) promote rich faculty-student interactions and enhance a sense of community on-campus, while e) fostering students' intellectual and leadership development. We propose the following:

1. **University-Driven Themed Special Interest and Affinity Housing.** Focus on creating and/or reframing and strengthening a few (4-6) high-quality, structured, university-driven communities. These would be university-supported initiatives, advised by committed faculty and staff, and available to all students (including incoming first-year students). Each community would be rooted in a theme which explicitly focuses on synthesizing and integrating both identity issues and academic experiences (in other words, combining the personal and the intellectual). Examples may include (but are by no means limited to) Umoja, PRIDE, CHOICE, Service Learning, Entrepreneurship, International Student House, and STEM. The advisors (faculty and staff) should be vetted carefully, and there should be significant and meaningful incentives for faculty and staff involvement (i.e. stipends, merit acknowledgement, dining privileges). The housing for these special interest and affinity options could be in current facilities. The Themed Special Interest and Affinity Housing programs would be overseen by a newly established exempt staff position. Currently, the staffing infrastructure to support this effort is not in place. What we are proposing would require the addition of a full-time professional staff member dedicated toward overseeing these themed special interest housing options, whereas now staff members are only able to devote time and energy in a piecemeal fashion (see report from WG1 for position description). These programs would be housed in the Office of Residence Life, and would work in conjunction and collaboration with other stakeholders across campus to support the programs and individuals involved in the leadership and operation of them.

2. **A New Hybrid Model Living-Learning Community.** Create a new residential option as an integrated experience for students and faculty. This is broadly envisioned as a set of newly constructed, high-quality residential spaces (set up as a new physical space on Lehigh’s campus; a "residential college"/"park"/"campus"), incorporating upper class student housing with structured and university supported faculty-in-residence programs rooted in partnerships and collaborations across the university (connecting students, staff, and faculty). These new residential spaces would have specific pre-determined and set themes, that would change over time, as developed in each period by the various faculty-in-residence. This Living-Learning Community area would include residence halls; faculty-in-residence housing; classroom/seminar space; event

---

25 Please reference the sample position descriptions located in Appendix E on the Dropbox.
space (for lectures, speakers, programs, etc.); a dining hall facility for communal dining; office space for staff; social space indoors and green space outdoors conducive to community building; common community space conducive for natural gathering of students, faculty, and staff who are not living in the area (in particular, upper-class students who live off campus), possibly in the form of a coffee cafe or food vendor; recreation/fitness/exercise space; study/library-esque space. The leadership positions (individual faculty members, or faculty families) would be chosen carefully through a selective vetting process, and there would be substantial and meaningful incentives for faculty-in-residence (i.e. contracted sabbatical leaves upon completion of time lived-on, course reductions, stipends, merit acknowledgement, dining privileges). The faculty-in-residence program would be housed in the President’s Office (or, minimally, the Provost’s Office), and would work in conjunction with the Office of Residence Life and other stakeholders across the university to support the programs and individuals involved in the leadership and operation of them. Note: this should be co-ed, multi-class year housing, capable of attracting transfers, sophomores, juniors and seniors “back to campus” (away from living off campus).

An important addendum to this proposal is the following: Although we are using the phrase “university-driven” we want to explicitly clarify that we do not mean that students would not have leadership and decision-making within their living-learning communities. Rather, we mean that the University will take on the responsibility of the infrastructure, cultivating and allocating ongoing resources for said communities annually (e.g., funding, oversight and staffing, partnerships fundamental to the community), and structurally supporting the proposed programs (and the faculty and staff leading them) in order to provide a sustainable model for consistency in keeping with best practices.

We propose to invite outside parties to help design and implement the new build-out as broadly envisioned above. When looking to repair, replace, or create university housing, institutions can benefit from a third-party opinion. Working with a third-party consultant, institutions can benefit from a specialized knowledge base that allows for constructive revision of current principles and the exposure to best practices in the field.

(3) What three successful programs from Lehigh’s peer and aspirational universities can we implement at Lehigh?
There are many successful programs in operation at Lehigh’s peer and aspirational universities that could be implemented at Lehigh. This question asks for three, and three (among many) examples are given below.

The Scholar Leader Living-Learning Community at Miami University (Ohio) is a successful program that could be implemented at Lehigh. In this self-governing leadership living-learning community, students apply to earn a spot in the community, which includes an endowed scholarship. Each room in the community is linked to a specific alumni donor, strengthening students’ affinity with that community, role modeling stewardship, and providing an incentive for opting into this type of housing. The community has been in existence since 1984 and has a strong alumni network, which is an inherent perk to living there. Community members take a leadership class together in the fall, learning theories and concepts connected to the community’s themes and learning outcomes. In the spring, the Scholar Leaders take a trip to a city where they discuss leadership with community leaders, and contribute to campus through active service and leadership roles.

At Kenyon College, the living-learning community program really invites faculty and staff advisors to take a more invested role, having them participate in the living-learning community creation process. They are asked to write a recommendation to support the community’s application and directly connect their research and inquiry to that community.

At Bucknell University, there is a Bridge the Gap living-learning community that facilitates dialogues between different subcultures on their campus (e.g., Greek and non-Greek, athlete and non-athlete). This type of community could potentially serve as a unifying place on-campus and provide an important community service in the current campus climate. Also, they have a Culinary Co-Op living-learning community that supports the local economy and teaches students how to cook locally and sustainably.

-----------------------------------------------

Description of how working group has accounted for:

(a) Health and safety, including the role of alcohol and other drugs;
We looked at conduct numbers and statistics for aspects of Affinity & Special Interest Housing. Also, we had conversations about the larger campus environment and its connections to our particular topic (e.g., the connection
between Greek Life, Off Campus Life, Social Policy and Affinity & Special Interest Housing). Please see appendices.

(b) Diversity and inclusion;
We looked at a variety of institutions in terms of size, student population, etc. In fact, many of the living-learning communities that we researched involved some aspect of students learning about their identities, having dialogue with each other, and providing a safe space for marginalized student populations. Our recommendations look at the topic of Affinity & Special Interest Housing from a student, staff and faculty perspective, including the perspectives of everyone on our committee. Further, we’ve taken into account other subcultures on-campus and how those dynamics impact Affinity and Special Interest Housing at Lehigh. Please see appendices.

(c) Enhancing Lehigh’s academic environment; and
Living-learning communities contribute directly to Lehigh being a true residential research institution. As we looked at potential Affinity and Special Interest options for Lehigh, we considered the scholarship already being done at the University and thought about how that work can serve the University’s academic mission while also enhancing campus climate and students’ experiences living on-campus with each other. Please see appendices.

(d) Engagement with the South Bethlehem community.
In doing our research and making our recommendations, our group considered the impact of buying local facilities on South Bethlehem’s landscape and community dynamics. Also, we discussed how a thriving residential environment with a robust Affinity and Special Interest Housing program could potentially serve the local community by identifying and aligning with community needs. Please see appendices.

------------------------------------------------------------------------
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Executive Summary

Undergraduate International Student Residence/Campus Life Committee

Our committee was initially known as the International Student Residence/Campus Life Committee. In consultation with other committee leaders, it was determined early on that our committee would focus exclusively on undergraduate international students. The Graduate Student Residence/Campus Life Committee agreed to focus on the graduate international student population.

We met weekly throughout the fall semester, after meeting periodically in late spring and summer of 2014. To gather information, we held interviews with key Residential Services and Residential Life staff on campus, focus groups with international students and leaders of international cultural organizations, and conducted a survey of international undergraduate students.

Through our research, we identified a number of short-term goals that are relatively cheap and easy to institute, likely bringing significant positive benefits to incoming international students. Some of the most desired aspects here include: airport pick-ups for all newly arriving international students; an extended, further customized orientation (similar to PreLUsion); expanded safety patrols and CCTV in high-density, off-campus housing areas; and a year-long peer-to-peer program, matching international students with domestic students.

Numerous mid-term goals identified include: the creation of a “one-stop” website for international undergraduate students; expansion of host family opportunities; a greater understanding of Greek life and giving international students the option to start their own fraternity/sorority; and establishment of an International House as a residential center featuring vibrant cross-cultural programming. A comprehensive list of short-term and mid-term goals can be found in Appendix A.

Co-Chairs: Rick Weisman and Bill Hunter
CORE Representative: Jacob Kazakia
Committee Members: Yiyi Chen, Dakota DiMattio, Yinwen Hua, Gorgi Pavlov, Jennifer Topp, Jose Sierra and Jim Wheeler
REPORT from the UNDERGRADUATE INTERNATIONAL STUDENT RESIDENCE/CAMPUS LIFE COMMITTEE

Co-Chairs: Rick Weisman and Bill Hunter
CORE Representative: Jacob Kazakia
Committee Members: Yiyi Chen, Dakota DiMattio, Yinwen Hua, Gorgi Pavlov, Jennifer Topp, Jose Sierra and Jim Wheeler

Our sub-committee met weekly since the beginning of the Fall, 2014, semester after meeting periodically in late spring and summer of 2014. Here, we answer the key questions. Our results are based on the following:

a) A survey of international students (Appendix B)
b) Interviews with several professionals on campus, including
   a. Gang Wang, Director, Office of International Students and Scholars
   b. Alicia Herzog, Assistant Director, Residential Services
   c. Jennifer Scaia, Assistant Dean/Director of Residential Life
c) Phone calls to and investigation of web sites of peer and aspirational universities.
d) A focus group of international students
e) Meeting with Presidents of several international student clubs

(1) What Lehigh program and policies currently in effect have a positive effect on the campus environment for undergraduate international students?

a) Existing international programming, such as International Week and the International Bazaar, various film presentations, cultural presentations are appreciated and well attended by the international undergraduate community.

b) The Office of International Students and Scholars is very beneficial to the community: orientation, immigration advising, local trips.

c) Council for International Students and Scholars Hospitality (CISH) is a community group that provides a “home away from home” for international students and scholars who come to study in the Lehigh Valley from around the globe. CISH works with international students and scholars at Lehigh University, and plans to expand to other local colleges in the future. CISH volunteers come from around the community to provide support and a sense of good will to international population at Lehigh. Whether volunteers just want to participate once or would like to be more involved, they can choose the level that works for them. Volunteers help in many ways:
   • Hosting home-cooked meals
   • Inviting guests to community events
• Providing temporary housing before or during breaks
• Providing local transportation
• Storing personal belongings over summer

d) Summer Step-Up - an intensive, seven- to nine-week program that provides comprehensive English language and American cultural training.

e) “Let’s talk” – a bi-weekly program connecting international and American students for casual conversation

f) Eat & Greet – bi-weekly time of discussion, collaboration, and socializing with other students, peers, and scholars of the Lehigh community. Meetings include the chance to connect with other international students, to learn about culture in the US, to share personal experiences, and to ask questions.

(2) What are the top (three) changes you believe would have a positive effect on the international undergraduate students’ environment?

Our committee has more than three recommendations.

a) Orientation should be more expansive -- Prelusion type program, and provide international undergraduate students the opportunity to engage with American students in tangible ways.

b) Peer-to-Peer mentoring program, preferably American/International, potentially throughout the first full academic year

c) Enhance integration of domestic and International students by: expand social activities across campus, particularly in the residence halls; create an internationally-focused Greek society; increase involvement on the part of foreign born faculty and staff in the non-academic lives of international undergraduate students

d) First-year international students should not be housed together. It would be best if they shared a room with an American.

e) Additional housing options post-first year, on-campus and off-campus – including specialty housing

f) Creation of an International House, consisting of both international and domestic students and serves as both housing and activity center

g) Continuation of airport shuttle service option for all incoming international first-year students
h) Establish a rate-my-landlord website

i) “One-stop shopping” website, including administrative linkages, program and event announcements, community-based activities, etc.

(3) What three successful programs from Lehigh’s peer and aspirational universities can we implement at Lehigh?

a) Most surveyed schools have peer-to-peer or mentoring systems that extend beyond international student orientation. Some of these programs are 1-1 (American/International), while others are one American to several international students.

b) Some of the schools reviewed have an International House or hub. International Houses are living, learning, and programming spaces shared by international and American students. Hubs are central areas on campus that allow for natural connection points for American and international students.

c) Most schools reviewed offer extended international student orientations (longer and more comprehensive) than that currently offered by Lehigh. Some of these extended orientation programs last a week or more. Some include a community service project, which serves to deepen the connection between international students and their community.

d) Many have a CISH-like programs (see above)

(4) What universities have reputations for having a positive campus environment? Which of their programs contribute to that environment? Could those programs be implemented at Lehigh?

Both Residential Life and Residential Services were asked this question. However, neither staff was able to pinpoint an institution that excels in this area. Cornell was mentioned, and was reviewed by our group. Miami of Ohio was also suggested as a potential leader in this area due to larger populations of international students - and thus more expertise in working with these students.

(5) What are the biggest challenges that Lehigh undergraduate international students face?

The common lack of integration, outside home country groups, inhibits language skills and a deeper understanding of American culture.

The current support system in place doesn’t fully enable international students to quickly gain an understanding of the American educational system.
It is widely understood that there is a lack of involvement by international students in leadership positions such as gryphons, athletics, student governance, etc. This lack of a voice on the leadership level inhibits the creation of supportive programs/policies.

Winter break – now longer, is very lonely and uncomfortable time for international students. Extensive local social programming should be planned during this period.

(6) **What current Lehigh policies would you change, and why?**

a) First-year international students should not be housed together. It would be best if they shared a room with a domestic student.

b) We understand that another CORE group will be suggesting a third year residential requirement. The CORE group believes this would be a policy change with wide ranging, positive implications for our student body. Specifically, it would enhance student’s connections with one another, enabling first year and sophomore students to life in a more traditional residential setting, rather than sophomores moving into fraternity/sorority houses and juniors moving off campus. While our CORE group’s research did not identify this initiative, we feel that a variety of on-campus housing options, with a focus on extensive special interest housing, should be made available to all undergraduate students.

**Description of how our working group has accounted for:**

(a) Health and safety, including the role of alcohol and other drugs;

Not applicable to specific group

(b) Diversity and inclusion;

Our group represents students from dozens of countries around the world. A plan for much deeper inclusion, in particular, is at the center of our recommendations.

(c) Enhancing Lehigh’s academic environment;

Our focus was directed more toward the social, emotional and co-curricular aspects of the international undergraduate student community.

(d) Engagement with the South Bethlehem community

This was less of our focus, except in relation to housing. It is clear to our group that safety, in relation to off-campus housing, is a primary concern for international undergraduate students. This comes well above cost, housing condition, etc.
Appendix A

Short and Mid-Term Recommendations

Short-Term Recommendations

On-Campus Housing
- Establish on-going system to provide airport pick-ups for newly arriving international students
- Assure that international students seeking an American roommate are guaranteed to have one
- Encourage more international students to become Gryphons
- Engage international students in program planning in the residence halls
- Provide activities during breaks, a guide to shopping/eating over break, a GA or counselor to keep the students connected and engaged

Off-Campus Housing
- Safety is #1 concern, above location and cost. Location, cost, and condition of housing all tied for second in our survey. Continue to expand police patrols and CCTV in high density off-campus student housing zones.

Residence Life/Adjustment to Lehigh
- As an expansion of the international orientation program, create a PreLUsion type program for incoming international students, lasting several days and focusing on cultural and local immersion
- Establish a peer-to-peer program, linking incoming international students with American students immediately upon arrival, and throughout the first year
- Provide students with transportation to local ethnic grocery stores

Mid-Term Recommendations
- Expand the host family network, especially over holiday and mid-year breaks, via CISH or a CISH-like program
- Expand awareness of Greek life within the international student community
- Provide international students the opportunity to create a fraternity/sorority
- Assure that student services office personnel reflect the demographics within the expanding international student population
- Create a one-stop shop website for all immigration details, support services, an updated list of internationally focused educational, cultural and social programming, a community activity board with lists of off campus and
nearby events, a link to a “rate my landlord” page and other pertinent housing information.

- Open an International House for both American and international students to reside. Vibrant programming, pursuant to the mission of the House, should occur within the House.

**Appendix B**

CORE Sub-Group "International Student Life and Housing” Survey

Dear International Undergraduate Student,

Over the summer former President Gast, Provost Farrell, and the Council for Equity and Community formed a campus-wide Commission on the Residential Experience (CORE). This Commission created 7 working groups with the idea that each will focus on specific aspects of student housing/social life issues. Our group has been charged with identifying suggestions that would enhance the international student life and housing experience.

So here’s where we need your help. The survey below is designed to be anonymous. Please answer each question honestly and fully. Your feedback will help Lehigh to strengthen the housing and social life experiences for you - the current international undergraduate students, and those to follow in your footsteps.

1. What is your class standing? 1st Year, 2nd Year, 3rd Year or 4th Year

**Orientation**

1. Should Lehigh provide an airport shuttle for first-year, international undergraduate students arriving at Lehigh? Yes No

Given that JFK and Newark airports are more than one hour from campus, are you willing to pay for this service? Yes No How much are you willing to pay for this service? A. $40 B. $50 C. $60

2. Please rate what you feel are the most important aspects of international undergraduate student orientation.

**Immigration Information**
Not at all important Somewhat important Very important Extremely important

**Campus tour**
Not at all important Somewhat important Very important Extremely important
Tour of South Bethlehem  
Not at all important  Somewhat important  Very important  Extremely important

Learning about American customs and traditions  
Not at all important  Somewhat important  Very important  Extremely important

Engaging with American students  
Not at all important  Somewhat important  Very important  Extremely important

Making friends with other international students  
Not at all important  Somewhat important  Very important  Extremely important

Learning Lehigh policies and procedures  
Not at all important  Somewhat important  Very important  Extremely important

Club, Athletics and Greek Life informational sessions  
Not at all important  Somewhat important  Very important  Extremely important

Other? __________________________________________________________

3. How important is it for Lehigh to create a peer-to-peer program, where first-year international students are connected with more senior students (American or international) throughout their first year?  
Not at all important  Somewhat important  Very important  Extremely important

Residence Life

1. Do you currently live:  On Campus  or  Off Campus

2. How serious a problem is each of the following aspects of residence life for international undergraduate students?

Roommate issues  
Not at all serious  Somewhat serious  Very serious  Extremely serious

Gryphons not culturally sensitive  
Not at all serious  Somewhat serious  Very serious  Extremely serious

Noise  
Not at all serious  Somewhat serious  Very serious  Extremely serious

Kitchens and kitchen items that don’t accommodate your cooking needs  
Not at all serious  Somewhat serious  Very serious  Extremely serious
3. Should first-year international undergraduate students be placed in a room with an American student?  Yes  No

4. What are the most important off-campus housing concerns for international undergraduate students?
   Cost
   Not at all important  Somewhat important  Very important  Extremely important

   Safety
   Not at all important  Somewhat important  Very important  Extremely important

   Location
   Not at all important  Somewhat important  Very important  Extremely important

   Condition of housing
   Not at all important  Somewhat important  Very important  Extremely important

   Other _________________________________________________

5. If given the option, would you live in an “International House” shared by American and International students?  Yes  No

**Campus Life**

1. What are the most important initiatives you believe would have a positive effect on the campus environment for international undergraduate students?

   Creation of an “international” center, similar to the Women’s Center or Multicultural Affairs Room
   Not at all important  Somewhat important  Very important  Extremely important

   A section in the Brown & White newspaper dedicated to internationally focused issues
   Not at all important  Somewhat important  Very important  Extremely important

   Additional regional trips and activities to help international students get more acquainted with American traditions, customs and history
   Not at all important  Somewhat important  Very important  Extremely important
A non-credit bearing “international leadership” training program, preparing both American and international students for the global workforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Creation of a day-long “global symposium” featuring student research and international experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Other ________________________________________

We tried to make this survey as short as possible, yet enable us to get very useful data. Did we miss anything? Is there anything else you would suggest that would make a positive impact on the housing or social experience for international undergraduate students?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________

Thank you for participating in this survey.
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Survey Results: N=70

What is your class standing?

1st Year: 25
2nd Year: 20
3rd Year: 15
4th Year: 10
Please rate the importance of the initiatives you believe would have a positive impact on the campus environment for international undergraduate students.

- Creation of an "International" center, similar to the Women's Center...
- A section in the Brown & White newspaper dedicated to internationally...
- Additional regional trips and activities to help international students...
- A non-credit bearing "International leadership" training program, pre...
- Creation of a day-long "global symposium" featuring student research...
If given the option, would you live in an "International House" shared by American and international students?
Please rate the following off-campus housing concerns for international undergraduate students.

- Cost
- Safety
- Location
- Condition of housing

Legend:
- Not at all important
- Somewhat important
- Very important
- Extremely important
Should a first-year international undergraduate student have an American roommate?
Please rate the impact that the aspects below have/had on your residential life experience.

- Roommate issues
- Gryphons not culturally sensitive
- Noise
- Kitchen and kitchen items that don’t accommodate your cooking needs

Legend:
- Not at all serious
- Somewhat serious
- Very serious
- Extremely serious
Do you currently live:
How important is it for Lehigh to create a peer-to-peer program, where first-year international students are connected with more senior students (American or international) throughout their first year?
Should Lehigh provide an airport shuttle for first-year, international undergraduate students arriving at Lehigh?
Please rate what you feel are the most important aspects of international undergraduate student orientation:

- Immigration Information
- Campus Tour
- Tour of South Bethlehem
- Learning about American customs and traditions
- Engaging with American students
- Making friends with other international students
- Learning Lehigh policies and procedures
- Club, Athletics and Greek Life informational sessions

Legend:
- Not at all important
- Somewhat important
- Very important
- Extremely important
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Executive Summary

Important Recurring Themes

There was widespread agreement that housing and graduate life issues contribute to or impede academic persistence and success. The feedback we received across respondents and groups was consistent in emphasizing that decent, affordable housing lowers graduate students’ stress levels which benefits not just the students but the faculty with whom they work.

Safety was a recurring and deeply felt concern. Many respondents shared the anxiety they experience on a continuing basis related to personal safety while walking from campus to their cars or apartments. Many reported that this impacted their ability to be in their offices or labs in the evening and had negative effects on their performance. Some voiced concerns about the safety of their current housing and some shared anecdotal reports of themselves or their friends being victimized by crime.

Since the graduate student population is diverse, challenges in the areas of graduate life and housing are not uniform. Some graduate students are long-term Lehigh Valley residents and others were Lehigh undergraduates. They are better prepared to understand the local rental market, and they enter graduate school with local friends and support networks. The challenges for graduate students relocating to Bethlehem for the first time are much greater. This is particularly true for international students who are coming to Lehigh alone or with families. They have difficulties securing housing remotely and negotiating complex lease processes, particularly when English is not their native language. In Bethlehem, many do not have cars and experience frequent challenges with routine daily tasks such as grocery shopping and laundry.

There was a commonly shared hypothesis that improvements in the area of graduate life and housing might improve recruitment, retention, and loyalty. Good housing and strong graduate life may help us to attract better graduate students. The quality of the total graduate school experience may influence retention rates and could affect sense of loyalty to Lehigh after degree completion. Given current students’ less than optimal assessment of graduate life and housing, will these alumni be ambassadors for Lehigh after graduation? Will they steer people in their network toward or away from Lehigh?

The Specific Charge to the Working Group and the Group’s Response:

1. What Lehigh programs and policies currently in effect have a positive effect on the campus environment for graduate students?

Lehigh University has made some progress within certain areas of graduate student life, such as the founding of and programs initiated by the Graduate Life Office. The Graduate Life Office has provided graduate students a number of different resources to help them excel with their academic studies and prepare them for future employment.
For example, the office provides programming and support that centers on increasing work productivity with a balance of self-care. These events include Dissertation Boot Camp, a program that provides a dedicated space to graduate students to work on and finalize the major milestones of their program’s graduate requirements. In addition, the Graduate Life Office provides a number of programs that foster connections between students of different disciplines. These events allow graduate students to talk with others of different interests and not only learn something beyond their respective field, but also allow interdisciplinary collaboration in solving some of the complex issues affecting the Lehigh community and the world-at-large. For example, “What’s Brewing” is a weekly event that provides graduate students an area to discuss the important topics of the day—a time to talk about what’s recent, relevant, and real.

The provision of Packer House on Broadhead and Packer Avenues as a small graduate student center has also provided a number of benefits for graduate students, helping to promote a sense of work-life balance. As with any group of working individuals, there is a need for space for graduate students to relax in the midst of a hard day of work in the lab and in the classroom. Packard House provides certain amenities to fulfill this need, such as a limited number of recreational furnishings in addition to the few housing units available. Furthermore, Packard House provides graduate students a place to gather and intermingle with other students, faculty, and staff, particularly for international graduate students who came to Lehigh University on their own. The space allows these individuals to make connections and establish strong relationships, enhancing the concept of Lehigh University as a second home.

At the university level, there are some recently implemented policies in place that help graduate students deal with some of the stressors affecting their lives and academic work, such as the current parental leave policy and the emergency loan program offered through the Graduate Life Office. These policies not only reduce the stress affecting graduate students, but also demonstrate to them that Lehigh University cares for their academic status and personal wellbeing. These support systems create a sense of loyalty among graduate students to Lehigh University.

Although Lehigh University, through the Graduate Life Office, has provided a number of outstanding programs to support their academic work and encourage community. Their programming attracts many students from different disciplines yet their current low budget and limited staff make it difficult to expand offerings currently provided to graduate students, or to support innovation. In order for the Graduate Life Office to provide more for the graduate students, the office is required to take something away. Therefore, even if there are a number of positive programs and policies that affect the campus environment for graduate students, the impact is limited and there is always a need for improvement.

4. What universities have reputations for having a positive campus environment for graduate students? Which of their programs contribute to that environment? Could we do these things at Lehigh?
As a result of our benchmarking efforts, we discovered some very intriguing graduate life programs at other institutions. Yale University and the University of Pennsylvania are national leaders in graduate life. At Yale, The McDougall Center at Yale College of Arts and Sciences includes a café, music room, family resource room, meeting rooms, and offers basic health supplies. The graduate life staff is comprised of a director, assistant director, a support staff person and a number of “fellows,” graduate students who work approximately 5-8 hours a week developing, coordinating, and staffing a broad variety of community-building activities in the following areas: arts and culture, café programming, family, health and wellness, international/cultural, public service, religion and spirituality, social, sports and recreation.

Penn’s offerings, structure, and staffing are similar to Yale’s. In addition, they offer personal development and health programming, and more family/spouse options. In the past few years, they added a Family Resource Center in addition to their Graduate Life Center. Penn also offers robust academic support: there is direct access between graduate students and the campus writing center, and teaching and learning centers. They have well-developed programming on navigating the dissertation, the grant, and the classroom.

Emory University stands out particularly in terms of offering support for families. Funded graduate students are eligible eight weeks of paid parental leave for birth or adoption of a child. In addition, Emory is conducting a pilot project in which they are partnering with a local agency to offer ten days of back-up care for family members of any age at very low cost. The National Science Foundations has commented that this is a “best practice” in efforts to diversify graduates in the STEM fields.

Emory has also rolled insurance premiums into the stipend/tuition packages for all funded graduate students, a decision they report has helped in their recruitment efforts. They have also partnered with a privately-affiliated apartment complex (with many amenities including transportation) to offer near-campus housing for graduate students. The rents are more expensive than other off-campus apartments, but they are primarily rented by incoming international students for their first year easing their transition to graduate school.

Boston College graduate life distinguishes itself in emphasizing the care and development of the individual, not just of the academic. They offer a program, titled the “Whole Person Education Workshop Series” which engages students at the intellectual, emotional, social/cultural, physical, occupational, and spiritual levels. Moreover, their graduate life office hosts a weekend retreat at an off-campus retreat center for first year students hosted by experienced students to engage in “meaningful conversation about the realities of grad school at BC.” Grad Talks provides a forum for graduate students to develop as individuals through engaging in thoughtful, open conversations with one another about topics that touch their lives in some way. Students will grow by learning from others and by reflecting on their own values, knowledge, and experiences. The Sparks Series aims to empower graduate students as leaders by creating an outlet through
which to lead a conversation and facilitate the growth of peers. The Graduate Mentor Program is designed to help participant graduate students share experiences around their studies, how the choice was made to pursue a particular discipline, and the challenges and rewards of being a graduate student. Finally, they also run a community services program, Grads Give Back where graduate students are paired with first generation undergraduate college students to support retention.

Could we offer these programs at Lehigh? Yes, we could offer a greater variety of programming at a variety of times, if properly resourced. Current levels of staffing, perhaps even more than funding, limit what we can offer and when. It is important to note that some of these schools charge a substantial student activities fee that funds part-time staff and activities, something we do not do. Historically, staff and faculty at Lehigh have been generous with their time allowing us to leverage our resources to offer both academic, social, and professional development programming, but these tend to be limited and ad hoc.

Offering greater family support could require a substantial financial commitment from the University. We currently offer a 50% subsidy for health insurance premiums and offer five weeks of paid parental leave. Both of these costs are covered by theProvost. Partnering with an agency to offer back-up care would also require subsidies from the University to make this affordable to students.

5. What are the biggest challenges that Lehigh graduate students face?

The graduate student population at Lehigh University is projected to grow each year and with that will come opportunities as well as increased challenges. The CORE working group on Graduate Student Life found three main types of challenges:

- Housing
- Adviser /Advisee relationships
- Leading healthy lives

First and foremost, graduate students strongly believe that the quality of their housing is related to their overall wellbeing and their ability to be successful in their academic programs. Many graduate students struggle with acquiring housing that is safe and affordable. Lehigh University has limited facilities designated for graduate student on campus housing, namely Packer House, Saucon Village Apartments, and West Packer House. Packer House has 13 single bedrooms with shared bathrooms. Saucon Village, located 3 miles from Lower Campus with bus service to campus that is perceived as inadequate and no nearby grocery shopping, has five buildings made up of 128 apartments. There are 16 efficiency units, 53 one-bedroom, 57 two-bedroom, and two three-bedroom apartments. Fourteen of these apartments are currently in use by the childcare center. West Packer House offers space for 5 residents. With over 2,000 graduate students currently enrolled at Lehigh University (roughly 1200 are enrolled full-time), the available on campus housing of fewer than 200 beds is inadequate to meet the needs of the vast majority of our graduate students. Securing affordable off campus
housing in a safe, quiet neighborhood close to campus is a challenge for our graduate students, especially for newly admitted students. They mention particular challenges for women living alone, married students seeking one-bedroom apartments close to campus, for new students in finding housemates since most houses/apartments are multi-bedroom, and most notably for incoming international students. (Moreover, many landlords rent out their properties at least one year in advance and some housing is “passed down” from year to year to established student groups.) The committee found that international students must secure housing remotely, a difficulty considering they are not sufficiently familiar with the area around campus to know where to rent. In addition, they do not know the US system of leasing apartments, and their search is constrained because most will not have cars. While graduate students ultimately secure some type of housing, many have serious concerns about their current housing, most notably: safety concerns, affordability, lack of parking, and stress engendered by maintenance problems and disputes with landlords. Graduate students believe the university should offer more help in navigating the housing search process.

The second area that the committee found to be challenging for our graduate student population is negotiating the relationship between the advisor and the advisee. While the majority of graduate students seem to receive professional and supportive mentoring from their advisors, the working group also heard complaints. Many graduate students report a lack of standardization and transparency in the number of hours they are expected to dedicate to their teaching assistant/research assistant duties. We heard reports of students not being allowed to take vacation, or if they chose to their RA position (and sometimes student visa) would be in jeopardy. Some students reported that they were asked to carry out personal assistant tasks for their advisors such as picking up dry cleaning. Some students reported being spoken to in a demeaning and threatening manner. Others reported that their advisors do not offer timely feedback on submitted papers and projects. For all of these students, the relationship with their advisor is a significant source of stress. These students feel trapped because they do not believe it is possible to switch advisors due to funding constraints or the lack of other faculty members with compatible research interests.

Finally, the CORE working group finds that graduate students struggle to lead healthy lives. Graduate students fully understand the time commitment required to take courses, fulfill assistantship responsibilities, and pursue research and/or internships. Achieving work/life balance and maintaining mental and physical health given this heavy workload is challenging among the best of circumstances. For many students, graduate training is accompanied by enormous stress. Recognizing their high levels of stress, students do see the need to pursue healthy lifestyle choices with respect to diet and exercise. They are frustrated by the difficulty in finding healthy food choices in grocery stores near campus and in finding healthy affordable food to purchase on campus in venues convenient to their departments, particularly at Mountain Top Campus. They also voice complaints about lack of access to exercise facilities on campus at times that are amenable to their work schedule.
6. What current Lehigh policies would you change, and why?

The current Parental Leave Policy for Graduate, Teaching, and Research Assistants helps funded graduate students who become parents. The University’s policy continues the students’ stipend for a parental leave up to 5 weeks, during which time the student is excused from the duties associated with the assistantship. Graduate students also experience other types of family crises. Some graduate students, including international students, may be required to go home due to unforeseen emergencies, such as a parent falling ill or passing away. Expansion of the current Parental Leave Policy into a more inclusive Family Leave Policy would allow graduate students to attend to such family emergencies without serious repercussions.

Policies and practices which govern graduate funding models may need to be reconsidered. The university budget model with respect to graduate tuition revenue involves a complex formula to return income to the colleges. Returning an increased portion of the tuition revenue to a central graduate life office should be considered. This revenue could be used to expand university wide programs that support graduate student life, including expansion of programs that facilitate graduate students’ pursuit of healthy lifestyles (more access to exercise facilities and more readily available healthy food options) and their integration into the campus wide community.

Given the extremely limited availability of on campus housing and the difficulty that newly admitted students have in locating safe affordable housing in proximity to campus, long term the university needs to vigorously explore opportunities to expand university owned or privately owned/university affiliated housing dedicated for graduate students. In the interim, we should consider how best to prioritize opportunities to secure very limited on campus housing. Some students believe that newly entering graduate students should have priority for all on campus housing. Other students strongly believe that once they are in on campus housing, they should have the ability to remain in that housing until they graduate. The working group can see advantages and disadvantages to each approach. We don’t have a consensus opinion on how to most fairly prioritize on campus housing, but we think the current housing priority system for graduate students should be reviewed. We all agree that the solution needed in the long run is to expand university owned or affiliated campus housing dedicated to graduate students.

2. What are the top three changes you believe would have a positive effect on graduate students’ environment?

Lehigh should vigorously explore options to provide more university-owned and university-affiliated housing dedicated to graduate students. Current on campus housing is inadequate. Graduate students, particularly international students and others who must secure housing remotely, experience frustration finding safe and affordable housing with reasonable amenities (parking, laundry, air conditioning) in proximity to the main campus. Once here, off campus graduate students struggle with maintenance issues, disputes with landlords, and noise issues when they live in close proximity to undergraduate students. Other universities have very successfully pursued at least two
approaches to the issue of housing for graduate students. Some universities have purchased multi-family houses or apartment buildings (extending and securing the campus perimeter), renovated the buildings, and dedicated the buildings to graduate student housing. In comparison to individual leases with private landlords, this approach has several advantages for graduate students. Students can often review and reserve these apartments online from remote locations, can rent by the semester rather than calendar year, pay no security deposit, and can live in buildings maintained by the university. The second approach is to build new housing specifically designed for graduate students. Many universities, including a successful model at RPI, have established partnerships with private developers to build and manage graduate student housing. These residential developments often include underground parking, first floor retail space, and multiple floors of apartments. There is often common space with smart technology dedicated to study and group meetings, fitness/exercise facilities, and frequently on site residence staff who facilitate social and intellectual programming. Graduate students have private bedrooms and private baths, usually in 1 to 4 bedroom suites, and common living rooms/kitchen space. There is usually within-suite laundry and units are typically minimally furnished. Apartments for families may be in a dedicated space. A 2012 study by Sightlines, LLC found that over 70% of graduate students surveyed rated housing as important or very important in their decision of which graduate school to attend. Given the housing complaints voiced by our current graduate students, failure to address the challenges in finding safe affordable housing is likely to impact not only on the well-being and productivity of current students but also have potential impact on recruitment of new students if we fall behind peer institutions in provision of graduate housing.

Graduate students are an integral component of the Lehigh community, but they do not always feel that way. Many report feeling disconnected from graduate students in other departments and from a university that focuses so heavily on undergraduates. We need to provide more social programming that facilitates connections outside their department. Graduate training, by its very nature, is work intensive and frequently very stressful. We need to support graduate students by providing options to reduce stress and encourage healthy lifestyles. We need to provide more events that support graduate student wellbeing, including events on evenings and weekends and in locations across campus including the Mountaintop campus. Our review of peer practices provides many beneficial programs that could be implemented at Lehigh. However, at present space and staffing limitations make it difficult to provide additional graduate life programming. We recommend allocation of additional university resources to support increased programming to address these graduate student life concerns.

Finally, the working group recommends a review of policies and communications surrounding TA and RA responsibilities, including expectations for hours worked per week and minimum vacation time. Our policies should be transparent and clearly communicated to graduate students and their supervisors. In addition, while most advisors provide supportive and professional mentoring to graduate advisees, we continue to learn about unacceptable requests and coercive communications from advisors. One way to address both of these concerns is to develop and disseminate transparent policies for TA/RA responsibilities and to articulate expectations between
advisers and advisees which characterize a positive, productive, mutually respectful relationship.

3. **What three successful programs from Lehigh’s peer and aspirational universities can we implement at Lehigh?**

In order to pool the wisdom to best address Lehigh graduate students’ housing, life and work-life balance issues, we are also reaching outside Lehigh to learn from our peer institutions’ success stories. The first role model comes from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute’s (RPI) City Station apartment development partnership between the university and a private developer/manager. The greatest advantage of this program is the diversity and soundness of housing options. On-campus housing is available for RPI graduate student, co-terminal students, postdoctoral fellows, visiting scholars and married students with a family. Utilities and internet are included in the rent, and each suite includes air conditioning, dishwasher, washer and dryer, and 24-hour video monitoring. All residents are provided off-street parking at no extra cost and access to an on-site exercise facility. Various retail outlets, including a coffee shop, sandwich shop, full service restaurant, and a hair salon are located on the first floors of residential houses. If implemented at Lehigh, this program would prove itself to be a one-stop life center for graduate students to enjoy all available resources within a hand’s reach.

The second great example is Emory’s Health Benefits for Graduate Students, Parental Accommodation, and Emergency Back-up Child and Elder Care programs. These programs provide an innovative solution to graduate students’ work-life balance issues, especially parental ones. To be specific, a caregiver designated as having substantial parental responsibility may be relieved of full-time Emory graduate duties and responsibilities for up to 8 weeks after the birth or adoption of a child. The contractual emergency back-up child and elder care program provides up to 10 days of emergency backup care in home or a center with small student co-pay. Evaluations are extremely positive and usage has increased an average of 20% per year. In addition, since Emory decided to bundle health insurance with all stipend/tuition packages for graduate students in PhD programs 5 years ago, that policy has been proved very attractive for recruiting new graduate students. If implemented at Lehigh, these program would have a positive effect on work life balance to provide a “safety net” for graduate students, so that they can better concentrate on their daily study or research.

The third successful program is from Boston College. Its Graduate Student Life office has implemented a series of on-campus programs to increase involvement and connection among graduate students. The Murray House Fellow program supports graduate students in all dimensions such as health and wellness, diversity and inclusion, special populations, religious and spiritual life and graduate students with children and families. Grad Talks provides a forum for graduate students to develop as individuals through engaging in thoughtful, open conversations with one another about topics that touch their lives in some way. Students will grow by learning from others and by reflecting on their own values, knowledge, and experiences. The Sparks Series aims to empower graduate students as leaders by creating an outlet through which to lead a
conversation and facilitate the growth of peers. The Graduate Mentor Program is designed to help participant graduate students share experiences around their studies, how the choice was made to pursue a particular discipline, and the challenges and rewards of being a graduate student. If implemented at Lehigh, these programs would definitely enrich graduate students’ life and facilitate their integration into the campus life and local community.

**How the Working Group has Accounted for:**

**a. Health and Safety**

Safety was a recurring and deeply felt concern of graduate students. Many respondents shared the anxiety they experience on a continuing basis related to personal safety while walking from campus to their cars or apartments. Many reported that this impacted their ability to be in their offices or labs in the evening and had negative effects on their performance. Some voiced concerns about the safety of their current housing and some shared anecdotal reports of themselves or their friends being victimized by crime. Serious safety concerns were most frequently mentioned by first year graduate students.

Graduate students struggle to lead healthy lives. Graduate students fully understand the time commitment required to take courses, fulfill assistantship responsibilities, and pursue their masters and doctoral research and internships. For many students, graduate training is accompanied by enormous stress. Recognizing their high levels of stress, students do see the need to pursue healthy lifestyle choices with respect to diet and exercise. They are very frustrated by the difficulty in finding healthy food choices to purchase on campus in venues convenient to their departments. They also voice complaints about lack of access to exercise facilities on campus at times that are amenable to their work schedule.

**b. Diversity and Inclusion**

Since the graduate student population is diverse, challenges in the areas of graduate life and housing are not uniform. The working group was vigilant in seeking input from international students as well as domestic students, from master’s level students as well as doctoral level students, from part-time students as well as full-time students, from married students as well as unmarried students, and from women and men. We did not specifically solicit or analyze comments based on racial diversity. We did receive comments that Lehigh needs to do more to recruit graduate students from traditionally under-represented racial/ethnic groups. This is challenging to address from a university wide perspective since recruitment of graduate students is done at the department level.

**c. Enhancing Lehigh’s Academic Environment**
There was widespread agreement that housing and graduate life issues contribute to or impede academic persistence and success. The feedback we received across respondents and groups was consistent in emphasizing that decent, affordable housing lowers graduate students’ stress levels which benefits not just the students but the faculty with whom they work. The academic environment for some graduate students can be improved by enhancing the advisee/advisor relationship. More clarity in effort requirements for TAs and RAs would be useful.

**d. Engagement with the South Bethlehem Community**

The majority of graduate students who live off campus live within a 20 minute walk to campus: 70\% of off campus full time graduate students live in Bethlehem and more specifically 32\% of full time graduate students live in the South Side. Graduate students are contributing to South Bethlehem through their housing choices and patronage of South Side merchants.
Methods Used to Collect Information Relevant to the Charge

1. The working group reviewed data on existing campus housing for graduate students provided by Residential Services.

2. We reviewed the 2011 report on Graduate Student Perceptions of Housing.

3. We collected benchmark data on graduate student life and housing from 12 peer and aspirational universities.

4. We reviewed information on current graduate life programming offered by the Graduate Life Office, Office of International Students and Scholars, and the College of Arts and Sciences.

5. We held meetings with the following groups:
   a. The Graduate Student Senate General Assembly
   b. The College of Arts and Sciences Graduate Student Advisory Council
   c. The Enhancing Graduate Education committee that includes the co-chairs of GRC (Graduate and Research Committee) and the college associate deans for graduate study and research
   d. Graduate student residents of Saucon Village
   e. The CORE Working Group on International Students

6. We sent an online survey to all current graduate students which asked for perceptions of successful current programs; challenges in the areas of graduate housing, graduate student life, and work life balance; and, recommendations for improvement. We received approximately 200 responses.

7. In the sections that follow, we aggregate the responses to the survey and the feedback obtained in the group meetings to provide a summary of graduate students’ own perceptions of the biggest challenges they face in the domains of housing and student life and their own recommendations for positive change.
Summary of Information Gathered by the Working Group

Graduate Housing

Campus Housing Locations for Graduate Students

Saucon Village Apartment Complex
This complex is located three miles from ASA Packer Campus with bus services to/from. The complex has a total of 15 buildings. The total complex has 16 efficiency apartments, 53 one-bedroom apartments, 57 two-bedroom apartments (with or without AC), and 2 three-bedroom apartments. Each of the fifteen buildings has 8-12 apartments. All apartments are unfurnished. In Saucon Village, 14 apartments are being occupied by the child-care center.

Packer House
This is a two-story house on ASA Packer Campus that can accommodate 13 residents. Residents share common areas, kitchen, and bathroom. The house contains two floors of bedrooms, separated by gender. All bedrooms are furnished. The Graduate Life Office shares the common area space and offers a variety of graduate programs for all students.

West Packer House
This is a three-story house on ASA Packer Campus that can accommodate 5 residents. Residents share common areas, kitchen, and bathroom. Floors are co-ed and rooms are furnished.

Graduate Housing Application Policies and Procedures

Application Process
Graduate students wishing to live in on-campus housing must enter a fall or spring lottery and compete for the opportunity to live on campus. Lottery numbers are posted at the end of the application period and offers are extended to those based on position within lottery list. Graduate students who apply outside the two-week time frame are put on a waiting list.

Offers
As vacancies become available, offers are sent out to students at various times throughout the year. Students accept the offer by returning acceptance paperwork and paying a deposit.

Lease Terms
All graduate students sign a lease for either 6 months or 1 year. Leases are eligible to be renewed as long as leaseholders remain full-time graduate students in good standing with Lehigh University. Leases are non-transferrable and students are not permitted to sublet their apartments. Families and roommates are permitted to stay in certain apartments types as long as they are registered with the Office of Residential Services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type of Housing</th>
<th># of Type</th>
<th>Occupied #</th>
<th>Vacant #</th>
<th># Remaining on a Wait List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>efficiency</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 bedroom</td>
<td>57*</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 bedroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Packer room</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>efficiency</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 bedroom</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 bedroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Packer room</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>efficiency</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 bedroom</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 bedroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Packer room</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>efficiency</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 bedroom</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 bedroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Packer room</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>efficiency</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 bedroom</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 bedroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Packer room</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>efficiency</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 bedroom</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 bedroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Packer room</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Change in two bedroom availability due to Child Care
Prior to 2013, the Office of Residential Services was permitted to use the apartments around the child-care for student housing. For the school year 2013, all apartments that shared a common entrance needed to be vacated due to security regulations. The childcare center currently occupies multiple buildings restricting us from using 14 apartments (12 two bedroom apartments and 2 one bedroom apartments) in Saucon Village.

In 2012, the Office of Residential Services changed the waitlist requirements so that priority was not given to current students. Before 2012, students who did not receive a housing offer would remain on the waitlist in the top position, receiving priority from semester to semester. Currently, each semester students need to apply and submit a new application if they have a need for housing. If at the end of the lottery period, we do not have space for them their application is closed and they need to submit a new application for housing the following semester. This allows all students, current and new students, to have an equal chance of being offered housing.

**Key Findings from the 2011 report on Graduate Student Perceptions of Housing**

- Graduate students strongly believe that the quality of their housing is related to overall life satisfaction and their ability to be successful in their educational training.

- A majority of graduate students live within a twenty-minute walk to campus.

- A majority have found housing that is at least minimally satisfactory to them.

- Frequently cited concerns about current housing:
  - safety concerns are cited by many students
  - affordability is also one of the most significant/frequent concerns
  - lack of available parking
  - lack of proximity to restaurants and shopping
  - lack of access to on-site laundry facilities
  - excessive restrictions and monitoring in on-campus housing

- Saucon Village is seen by many students as too far from campus, too far from commercial amenities, and too poorly served by the existing busing system.
Students report challenges in finding roommates:
- Many international students would prefer living with roommates with similar cultural background.
- Many graduate students do not want to live with someone in their own academic program.

Students believe the university should provide more assistance in the process of finding housing, by keeping databases on available housing, and past data on perceptions of good and bad landlords.

Many students are experiencing significant stress related to disputes with landlords and lack of attention to maintenance problems in their rentals.

Many students would like to see more university owned graduate housing as long as it is not monitored in the same tight regulatory fashion as an undergraduate dorm. They believe there would be better maintenance of university owned property and less safety concerns because of better university policing.

### Peer Benchmarking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY OWNED GRADUATE HOUSING</th>
<th>PRIVATELY OWNED UNIVERSITY AFFILIATED GRADUATE HOUSING</th>
<th>GRAD HOUSING FOR COUPLES/ FAMILIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Not any longer</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>Limited to internationals</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Only internationals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Emory             | No                                | Campus Crossings “Briarcliff” furnished, parking available, campus provided transportation, fitness center, pool and common lounges, in unit washer dryer
1 bedroom = $1100 per month;
2 bedroom = $720 per month per student;
3 bedroom = $665.
Utilized heavily by incoming international students | Yes - Briarcliff |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>On-Campus Housing</th>
<th>Off-Campus Housing</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>yes yes no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes, all types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>yes yes, two</td>
<td>just starting,</td>
<td>yes, only married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>facilities but</td>
<td>first one opening</td>
<td>(Catholic institution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>will probably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufts</td>
<td>Yes, but limited</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to international</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>first year only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>yes, 1.5 high</td>
<td>partnerships with</td>
<td>couples, yes; families, no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rises</td>
<td>developers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Rochester</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes, married complex and single complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>very limited,</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to buy meal plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPI</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>College Suites “City Station” furnished, parking included, campus provided transportation, walking distance to campus, fitness center, common lounges, in unit washer dryer, all utilities provided. 1 bedroom = $1195 per month; 2 bedroom = $835 per month per student; 4 bedroom = $715 per month per student. First floor commercial shop</td>
<td>Yes – dedicated building in City Station (unfinished)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduate Students’ Perceptions of the Biggest Challenges**

- Insufficient on-campus housing.
- Finding affordable off-campus housing in a safe, quiet neighborhood close to campus with reasonable amenities (like AC, parking, and laundry) and access to shopping.
- Finding housing on the short timeline that new grad students have – undergrads snap up good housing long before grad students are accepted and decide to come to Lehigh.
Many graduate students are not local and cannot look at places before they arrive on campus.

Most of our graduate students are international and many need a place where family can stay with them both short and long term while they are studying.

Most graduate are international and do not have a vehicle.

Furnishing a place can be a challenge for students.

Graduate students complete their studies at various times throughout the year and can’t be held to a traditional academic calendar with their leases.

Finding housemates with similar life style and interests – most houses/apartments are multi-bedroom.

Extra challenges for:
- Safe housing for women living alone
- Finding 1-bedroom housing appropriate for living with spouse, especially within walking distance to campus

Concerns about Saucon Village:
- High rent
- Complex application process
- Expensive heating costs
- Noise from daycare
- Few amenities and activities close by
- Problems traveling to and from main campus, especially at night and weekends
- Lottery period for housing doesn’t completely jibe with timing of off-campus leases.
- We really don’t know how many are denied housing (some don’t even bother to apply)

Little housing information is provided to accepted students.

Students are often pressured to make housing decisions quickly, before fully understanding important variables that have long-term impact on the quality (stress levels) of their life.
- the legal contract of the lease
- average rent and utility costs per month
- safety for precise housing location

For many international students, graduate school is the first time they have ever had to sign a lease written in English. It is important that students understand every detail of the agreement since it is often a yearlong commitment that can be difficult, expensive, and in some cases, impossible to terminate if unsatisfactory.

The block-wise safety of Bethlehem can only be explained by residents. Again, it is difficult for a new student to assess the safety of a given property without knowledge of recent crimes.

Dealing with terrible landlords and unresolved maintenance issues.

Incorrect assumption that Places4Students (link on our Residential Services site) is a list of places endorsed and vetted by Lehigh.

Graduate Students’ Recommendations
● Build graduate student housing near lower campus.
● Have Lehigh police better control noise violations and crime in the campus neighborhoods.
● Provide consultation assistance for students dealing with landlord issues.
● Improve Saucon Village:
  o control noise from daycare
  o more frequent bus transportation especially nights and weekends
  o allow small pets
● Provide a better way for newly admitted students to access information on possible housing, landlord reviews, etc. The system should not require a Lehigh ID because newly accepted students don’t have that.
● Provide assistance in finding roommates.
● Purchase housing around campus when it becomes available and improve the quality prior to renting out.
● Find a way to recognize and reward the good landlords and disseminate that information to students.
● Have current students review housing options in the area for new students who can’t visit.
● Expand campus bus service to other neighborhoods including the North side and Fountain Hill.
● Arrange access to affordable temporary housing for short-term stays.
● Prioritize first year students for university housing.
● Students are not interested in dorm-style living; they want apartments.
● Create a council of student/staff/faculty volunteers to check out apartments.
● Address campus safety issues overall – improve lighting.
● Get security assessments of off campus apartments.
● Assist students with how to interpret leases.
● Lehigh students can pool together housing data to construct an interactive map of monthly house expenses per person.
● Lehigh students can evaluate the block-wise safety of Bethlehem by documenting their living experiences. This information can also be organized into an interactive map complete with pop-ups which recite recent events/accounts which may better reflect the safety of the block.
● Many undergrads obtain their housing by “inheriting” from friends who were prior tenants. Much of the inventory of desirable housing never gets advertised. Could grad students who have had positive housing somehow work to insure it is inherited by grad students?
● There are landlords out there who would like to lease to Lehigh grad students but don’t know how to do that. Could we work with landlords to run a bureau of sorts that would include feedback from students?
Graduate Student Life

Existing Lehigh Programs/Policies

Several campus offices provide programming to enhance graduate student life. The Graduate Life Office provides orientation for new students, teaching assistant training for new students, hosts Graduate Student Appreciation Week, and a variety of academic support, professional development and social programming and activities throughout the year. In addition, the associate dean is available for consultation for students experiencing difficulty.

The Office of International Students and Scholars provides a number of programs that support the needs of graduate students. Some examples include: ISS student information seminars that provide assistance with visa issues, tax forms and acclimatization; ISS student programming that encourages international graduate students to participate in community activities with other international students; and, the OIA-CISH program in which campus volunteers host international students and, as needed, provide transportation, home cooked meals, and summer storage, etc.

The Graduate Office in the College of Arts and Sciences has begun exploring ways to improve the campus environment, particularly for students in Master’s only programs. The goal is to sponsor activities that increase graduate students’ connection to Lehigh not only in the classroom but as part of the campus. Working with a Graduate Assistant, 3 events are planned for the Fall and Spring semesters.

Graduate students provided the following responses when asked what current policies and programs currently in effect are most successful in enhancing graduate student life:

- Graduate Life Office
- Opportunities to meet other people through events
- Grad appreciation week
- Tuesdays at 10 free weekly breakfast open to entire graduate community
- University diversity activities
- Walking escort service
- Grad involvement in the Mountaintop pilot programs
- Conference travel funds
- Dissertation Boot Camp
- 6 free counseling sessions
- OISS trips
- Health insurance subsidy for funded graduate students
- Cultural breakfasts
- Dean’s luncheon
- Green route and weekend shopping shuttle
## Peer Benchmarking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>PRACTICES THAT IMPROVE GRADUATE STUDENT QUALITY OF LIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>graduate life center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>GSC organizes activities for grads and their families for a small fee. Dissertation writing workshops etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>barter culture: trading goods and services among graduate students for no cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>Lots of different support groups – campus recreation, academic support, career and prof development, international etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>Based on peer analysis, 5 years ago decided to bundle health insurance with all stipend/tuition packages for grad students in PhD programs. Has been very attractive for recruiting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>gryphons in buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>Grad Life Grant: students can apply for grant to host a program or event that benefits the graduate community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufts</td>
<td>Graduate student council, graduate center, graduate student clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>grad center; family resources center; paid graduate “fellows” who organize affinity events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Rochester</td>
<td>staff in buildings that create program opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>big student center; lots of programming. Have a Transformation Graduate Education initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Graduate Students’ Perceptions of the Biggest Challenges

- Graduate students feel disconnected from campus life.
- They feel left out of many social events on campus because the events seem to only cater to undergraduates.
- The mentor/mentee relationship can be a great stressor for some students.
- All students would like to be treated in a basic respectful manner, but some report abusive treatment by supervisors/advisors.
- Transportation issues such as getting to and from campus in bad weather and walking home after dark from late classes or lab work.
- Divisions between international and US students.
• Lack of racial diversity of the graduate student population.

Graduate Students’ Recommendations

• More ways for grad students to connect with one another, especially those who share similar interests.
• Set up a Grad Social Group Facebook page where grad students would have a place to post what they are doing and invite others to join them.
• More staffing in the GLO office to sponsor more events and trips.
• Hold more informal events like organizing half draft night at a local pub/bar if they wear a Lehigh Graduate Student tee shirt.
• Sponsor more events that focus on maintaining health.
• Publish a graduate student activities newsletter rather than the annoying daily email announcements.
• Provide more access to a swimming pool, especially during the hot summers.
• Sponsor more hiking and picnic trips that get students without cars out into the countryside.
• Work with Bethlehem to make it more biking friendly.
• A grad student pub.
• More LGBTQ activities specifically for grad students.
• More lockers in gym for grad students.
• More activities held on weekends.
• Dedicated study space for grad students away from undergrads.
• More career prep services, especially for students in humanities and social sciences.
• Training and agreement that research supervisors will treat RAs with respect.
• Hold more events on the mountaintop campus.

Working Group Recommendations for Expanding Programs that Promote Connections among Graduate Students in Different Departments and Participation of Graduate Students in the Larger Campus Community

• We share the opinion that we connect best with people when we have a shared purpose or project. At Lehigh, even though interdisciplinarity is promoted philosophically, academic barriers between programs and colleges prevent graduate students from fully pursuing this. In graduate school, graduate life and academics are more tightly intertwined, therefore, one suggestion would be to encourage more and easier possibilities for diverse teams of graduate students to pursue a common goal. For example, we have a biological sciences student who is proposing a Mountain Top project that centers on middle school science education in poor communities: he's hoping to work with others with backgrounds in education, sociology and community development.

• We also recommend a "first year experience" semester for new graduate students which could include peer mentoring. One of the recommendations from CAS graduate students was a longer Orientation Program. They felt a lot of
information was crammed into 1-2 days. They wanted follow-up sessions with LTS, media services, social networking etc. Students expressed that when they arrive at Lehigh, there is an unspoken expectation they know everything and therefore can fend for themselves. New graduate students need just as much information to thrive at Lehigh as incoming undergraduates. It would be great if more funding was given to extend graduate orientation into the semester with events for new students to attend to help them acclimate and feel a connection to campus.

- Students and staff also mentioned ways of encouraging connection/community within and across programs and departments. Here are two specific suggestions:
  1. Could we encourage/incentivize departments to hold coffee hours, for example? Could this also occur across departments that are in close physical proximity? One suggestion from graduate students was to ask each department in Packard Lab to take turns hosting a coffee and treats hour once a week. That would get people out of the lab and chatting with people both within and outside of their departments or labs.
  2. Could we give some incentives to Colleges/department to coordinate scheduling of graduate evening class in a specified building and then provide a small fund for a coffee/cookie station between classes so the students could meet and talk?

- There are other successful programs sponsored by the Graduate Life Office that are in existence but could be expanded with increased programming budget and an additional GA:
  1) What's Brewing? (a monthly interdisciplinary discussion on thorny or interesting topics--attracts students from around the university)
  2) Tuesdays at 10 free breakfast
  3) Bi-weekly women’s lunch
  4) In general, all of our programs are open to all students: holiday events, trips outside of Bethlehem, happy hours, 5Ks, etc. We are hamstrung, though, by budget, staff, and space (we have Packer House, but since it's a residence, too, we limit the number of events we hold here out of respect for the residents; also the number of people the house can accommodate is 40-50 if we are inside). For example, we offer very little on weekend evenings and in summer.
Work Life Balance for Graduate Students

Existing Lehigh Programs/Policies

- **Parental Leave Policy for Graduate, Teaching, and Research Assistants.** This policy helps graduate students, as they become parents, to strike a balance between personal or family responsibilities and the responsibilities associated with their program of study. The University’s policy is to not interrupt an assistantship for a parental leave up to 5 weeks, during which time the student is excused from the duties associated with the assistantship.

- **Sickness/Injury Insurance Subsidy Program.** The subsidy program is offered to full time or certified full time graduate students who are receiving assistantship or fellowship payments through the university payroll system.

Peer Benchmarking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>PRACTICES THAT SUPPORT GRADUATE STUDENT WORK LIFE BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>Retreat weekend for first year students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Wellness programs are in place for families etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>TGIF (tell grads it’s Friday); lots of family programs in on-campus housing; trying to offer more things for spouses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>Parental accommodation policy with 8 weeks of support Emergency back-up child and elder care under a contract with Bright Horizons. Provides up to 10 days of emergency back-up care in home or a center with small student co-pay. Evaluations are extremely positive and usage has increased an average of 20% per year. NSF reviews of the “trainee” section of proposals comment that this is a national innovation in best practice for diversifying STEM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>planned social and networking activities, 24 hour staff, video rental,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>relatively new office, just beginning to create programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufts</td>
<td>Multi-ethnic graduate alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>note: every students pays $2500/year for student life/health/gym/library/etc. Huge budget!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Rochester</td>
<td>bus stop at apartments to get to local attractions, advisors in buildings to support activities,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate Students’ Perceptions of the Biggest Challenges

- Not enough time
- Not enough money
- Working far beyond the 20 hour GA/TA/RA rule
- LU daycare costs and capacity limits

Graduate Students’ Recommendations

- Set university guidelines for vacation time and maximum number of hours of required time in the lab per week.
- Train supervisors
- Advisors should not use students as “personal assistants”
- Advisors should not have “coercive conversations” with grad students
- More activities that incorporate spouses and families
- More access to flexible gym time
- Healthier food options at locations around campus
- For part-time employed students think about the scheduling of classes – late afternoon is very hard with job and children
- Provide information about pet and child care services
- ID cards for spouses – or more free events for spouses/children
- More on campus jobs for grad students
- Mandate equal pay, vacation time, sick time for funded students
- More bus transportation to better grocery shopping
Other Ancillary Issues that were Frequently Mentioned

- Graduate students request additional support for professional development.
  - More travel funds for conferences.
  - More career advice, including for non-academic jobs.
  - Better access to journals.
  - More opportunities to improve English language skills.
  - Students also expressed a desire to have greater access to department faculty and staff; they at times feel ignored by both.
  - More mentoring for research skills and assistance with writing.

- More clarity in graduate student rules related to registration etc. It was expressed that when they arrive at Lehigh, there is an unspoken expectation they know everything or will learn it at the department level orientation. New grad students need just as much information to thrive at Lehigh as incoming undergraduates.

- Parking issues
  - Parking – can there be alternate summer parking when lots are empty on lower campus
  - Parking – the way that passes are issued to students annually
Report for April 17, 2015

Working Group 7:

Working Group Name: Social Life, Social Policy & Student Conduct

Working Group Co-Chairs: Katherine Lavinder & Lynn Columba

Working Group Members: Sherry Buss, Holly Taylor, Chris Mulvihill, Kathy Trimble, Ashley Baudouin, Riley-Elizabeth Barry, Robert Brown

Executive Summary:

For WG7 the biggest challenges students face are: (1) balancing the social and academic aspects of their lives; (2) improving the current situation for parties, most of which are held off-campus in subpar, overcrowded venues; (3) confronting what students perceive as inconsistent enforcement of policies e.g., treating on-campus parties differently than those held off-campus, lax enforcement of rules for tailgate parties versus parties held on the lower campus; and (4) misusing alcohol.

WG7, independent of the above working groups, favors requiring juniors to live on campus for many of the same reasons as cited above: to enhance student safety, to have older (more mature) students live in the Greek houses, and to make it more likely that a larger proportion of parties would be held on campus. WG7 believes that Lehigh’s Social Policy should be rewritten and work should begin on this as soon as possible. The aim of this effort is to increase opportunities for the students to socialize and to drive those activities onto campus.

WG7 identified the top three changes that we would recommend for producing a positive effect on the students’ environment: (1) require juniors to live on campus; (2) re-draft/update the Social Policy; and (3) foster socializing on campus.

Detailed Report:

Throughout our work the past two semesters, the focus of WG7 was “Safety on Campus” and “Student Safety,” which is reflected in our recommendations. This theme included getting students back on campus.

Our working group looked closely at Lehigh University’s Social Policy including creating suggestions for re-drafting that policy. Our exploration of the policy to date
recommends a close look at the sections of the document surrounding guidelines for registered social events on campus. A primary goal of re-drafting the social policy is to drive student socializing opportunities back on campus and in turn, broaden inclusivity in the social environment. The working group expresses a clear desire to develop a policy that allows students to take greater responsibility for creating safe events. We acknowledge that interventions, such as increased proactive alcohol education and bystander training, are a necessary element of this effort. These in-person interventions should begin as early as possible, and ideally at orientation.

Also, we discussed the merits of expanding the residential requirement to three years. This change would enhance student safety by housing more students on campus. It would also place older students within the Greek houses, which would mean more students over the age of 21 would be living in the houses and remaining active in their chapters. Fewer students living off campus translates to fewer opportunities to host parties off campus.

Our working group believes that recommendations need to be realistic. Policy and practice need to match up and costs should be clearly articulated.

WG7 discussed the Stanford Social Guide. Our group likes this model, particularly tiered registration timelines based on the type of event. The current registration process is unnecessarily burdensome, and a tiered system where timelines rely on complexity and risk of the event would be more appropriate for this environment. We had discussion surrounding incentivizing bringing socialization back onto campus and urging the university to reconsider having a pub on campus. Other campuses that have this option are generally in a restaurant format, and this could be a desirable model on our campus.

WG7 continues to discuss the value of a ban on hard alcohol on campus, and believes this conversation will need to occur at a wider level after the completion of our working group term. We note that the positive outcome of eliminating hard alcohol would be sending a clear message about our concern for health and safety of students. Hospital transports from campus have nearly all been related to hard alcohol consumption. The concern in taking this step is that risk would inadvertently be increased by forcing hard alcohol into settings like pre-gaming and individual rooms. Additionally, members of this working group express concern that this step would be counter to the message of demonstrating trust in students to take more responsibility in the safety of social events. We also urge conversation about sanctioning for violations involving hard alcohol. Given the increased risk, more serious sanctions in the conduct system could be an important consideration.
There is momentum behind the idea of student monitors for parties. We envision this as one part of oversight for safety and security of the student social environment, to complement a rotating event staff and/or police presence. This group has noted examples of student monitors also being trained as bartenders for events hosted by organizations other than their own.

How to reduce cost for organizations with no funding sources will be necessary and important work for the future. WG7 urges investigation to identify ways to make hosting events more affordable. Event costs feel unpredictable to student groups, and the cost to rent university owned/contracted materials seems excessive.

WG7 supports the current pilot program allowing alcohol to be served at selected on-campus student functions and hope to see this effort continue to develop in the coming year. We believe consideration for space on campus where students can socialize will be important -- space attached to new residential facility, new UC, for example.

**Information that has been gathered relevant to the following questions:**

(1) What Lehigh program and policies currently in effect have a positive effect on the campus environment?

- Code of Conduct
- Safety programs put in place by Lehigh Police and community (LUAlert, EmergenSee, TRACS, Cameras, Light up Southside Initiative, more uniformed officers, proactive safety education)

(4) What universities have reputations for having a positive campus environment? Which of their programs contribute to that environment? Could those programs be implemented at Lehigh?

1. Bucknell University uses a system of student monitoring for parties on campus. Some students have mentioned this as a desirable option and our group supports a serious effort at implementing a similar program at Lehigh. WG7 spent several meeting discussing this option. Considerations for Student Monitors included the following: 1) Qualifications; 2) Training and Development; 3) Funding/Compensation; 4) Execution; and, 5) Achieving Goals/Meeting Outcomes.

(5) What are the biggest challenges that Lehigh students face?
Balance between social and academic — implicit, strongly held social expectation. Students want to excel academically and to have a strong social network. This can be a very difficult balance in this environment when (particularly first year) students are so focused on building friendships and finding a sense of belonging. Having safe, responsible parties. One big issue is location of said parties — off campus, in single family homes, that may or may not have been properly maintained/updated to serve as apartments for college students,, with large numbers of attendees. Enforcing consistently the policies that do exist—there appear to be situations in which students perceive mixed messages. There is clearly concern surrounding student alcohol use and potential negative consequences.

(6) What current Lehigh policies would you change, and why?

Our working group has been looking closely at Lehigh University’s Social Policy and we have developed considerations for re-drafting that policy. Our exploration of the policy to date recommends a close look at the sections of the document surrounding guidelines for registered social events on campus. A primary goal of re-drafting the social policy is to drive student socializing opportunities back on campus. The document needs to be written from a framework that is applicable to all students, rather than only the fraternity and sorority community.

We have also discussed the merits of expanding the residential requirement to three years. This change would enhance student safety by housing more students on campus. It would also place older students within the Greek houses, which would mean more students over the age of 21 would be living in the houses and remaining active in their chapters. Fewer students living off campus translates to fewer opportunities to host parties off campus.

Responses to the following questions. Include, where relevant, descriptions of coordination with other working groups:

(2) What are the top three changes you believe would have a positive effect on the students' environment?

WG7 identified the top three changes that they would recommend for producing a positive effect on the students’ environment: (1) require juniors to live on campus; (2) improve the Social Policy; and (3) foster socializing on campus.
(3) What three successful programs from Lehigh's peer and aspirational universities can we implement at Lehigh?

a. Student Monitors - to assist with facilitating safe social events on campus
b. Space at a reasonable cost for students to gather (non-Greek parties - no space on campus right now)
c. Strategies for alcohol prevention plan (bystander intervention, TIPS Training)
d. Updated Social Policy-clear, to enable a more inclusive on-campus social life, more options (presently reflects only Greek life)
e. Policy that encourages students to be on campus, expanding opportunities for ALL students to host and attend events.

Description of how working group has accounted for:

(a) Health and safety, including the role of alcohol and other drugs;

On July 31, we discussed best practices, health and safety issues, FERPA, and general conversation surrounding social policy/social life topic area.

On September 16, Chris Mulvihill presented data requested at previous meeting. Student representative discussed student perspective on conduct system and off campus safety.

On September 30, Chief Shupp presented much information on campus and community safety. Discussed campus/community safety features, limit of LUPD jurisdiction, types of enforcement offered. Discussed safety initiatives.

On October 17, students presented information about safety concerns surrounding parties off campus, in addition to social expectations, and social structure of the Greek system.

On January 20, WG7 reviewed Social Policy Documents from Benchmark Institutions.

On February 16, WG7 continued to discuss Social Policy at other institutions and the hard alcohol policy. Issues focused on the decrease in hospitalizations and rather and endorsement of beer/wine would create a different outcome.
On March 2, WG7 discussed specific recommendations we believe should be included in a new social policy. The redrafted version should include:

- Students involved in monitoring social events
- Change registration — different registration windows for different types of events. Simplify process. Co-registration must be part of the process (stanford party guide provides a nice model: https://alcohol.stanford.edu/party-planning-guide)
- Quantify types of events: tailgates, open event, closed events
- TIPS training for anyone serving
- Clearly define accountability for both men’s and women’s groups. Accountability ties to people at the party, exclusivity, how set up, how processed afterwards.

On March 16 WG7 discussed the registration process of open parties and closed parties, which included Greeks vs. non-Greeks, formula for the quantity of alcohol (liability), security-checking for ID’s, types of events (tailgates, open, closed, etc.)

On March 30, 2015, Ashley Baudoin guided the discussion for the consideration for Student Monitors.

(b) Diversity and inclusion;

October 17: Student presentation given to our working group and the off campus working group. Discussed overview of Greek system and social structure (and social tiers), from men's and women's perspective. This spurred discussion on the housing structure (consider benefit of 3rd year live on requirement) and the social policy. The students identified the key issue with socializing off campus as the desirability of not having supervision and desiring that level of freedom.

We further believe that social life and social policy (the new, re-drafted version) are tied to inclusion on campus. The current off campus socialization in private residences promote exclusion.

(c) Enhancing Lehigh’s academic environment; and

The academic environment is inherently connected to all areas of our discussion. The social expectation described by the students portrayed an atmosphere that values showing up at social events above all else – most nights of the week.
(d) Engagement with the South Bethlehem community.

Discussion of the many issues of students living off-campus.

In our joint meeting with the off campus group, we discussed the idea of the third year live on requirement and the impact of expanded live on requirement to the community.

Chief Shupp and Riley Barry have discussed the Light the Southside initiative with our working group.

The Co-chairs wish to commend our committee for all of their hard work during the past two semesters. We met intensely, eight meetings each semester. WG7 attended regularly and made many constructive contributions.
Executive Summary:

Student success is linked to the connectedness that students feel to their institution to include their relationships with their faculty. That level of engagement naturally occurs in the classroom, but there is value in understanding and recognizing that learning takes place everywhere, especially outside of the boundaries of the classroom and within the residential experience of our students. There are a number of opportunities, both large and small, where faculty can engage students on our campus; examples include living in the residence halls to participating in events and discussions across campus. To that end, we recommend that a multi-tiered system be developed for faculty to actively seek opportunities to build and strengthen relationships with students in the residential setting. We also recommend that this level of faculty engagement be recognized in the promotion and tenure review process.

Detailed Report:

Information was gathered from a number of sources and is attached in total to this report with highlights of the data shared below:

We gathered benchmarking data from colleges and universities across the country that have reputable residential colleges and/or high faculty involvement as a part of the student residential experience: Boston University, Cornell University, Duke University, Elon University, Northeastern University, Northwestern University, Rice University, University of Pennsylvania, University of Virginia, Yale University. This data was helpful in deepening our understanding of programs that have been developed to foster stronger faculty-student relationships. [Attachment #1, #2]

It was critical for us to understand the perspective of our Lehigh faculty as it relates to the intentional connections they may have with students outside of the classroom, as well as the factors that encourage and discourage that level of involvement. We distributed a faculty survey and led a focused discussion with survey participants as a follow-up to the survey. These sources provide insight into both the opportunities and challenges of increasing faculty involvement with students outside of the classroom. [Attachment #3]
There is mutual benefit for faculty and students when there is intentionality in developing and supporting that relationship across campus. To that end, we gathered data that speaks to the positive impacts this level of involvement has on both the students and faculty members.

[Attachment #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #9, #10, #11, #12]

**Information that has been gathered relevant to the following questions:**

(1) **What Lehigh program and policies currently in effect have a positive effect on the campus environment?**

Given our focus on the faculty involvement in residence life, we have identified the following programs and policies that provide opportunities for the successful engagement of faculty:

- Our current residency requirement for undergraduate students provides a natural foundation for community-building amongst students. With students’ intentional and physical connection to campus, we can provide more direct education and support in ways that promote their academic and personal growth. Students are required to live on-campus for their first and second year at Lehigh; our working groups sees the value of increasing that requirement as that will increase the opportunities for faculty-student engagement.

- The Live Lehigh Program showcases our intentional efforts to connect students through their common interests and links learning to the out-of-class and residential experience for students.

- Community Development Experiences (CDEs) through the Office of Residence Life (ORL) create opportunities (coffee talks and community dinners) for faculty, staff, and community members to meet with students in the residences.

- The Residential Fellow Program (pilot program in Sayre Park residence hall with Professor Heather Johnson) serves as a framework for more in-depth engagement of faculty in residence life. In addition to underscoring the idea that learning takes place everywhere (inside and outside of the classroom), Sayre Park residents express a stronger sense of community, multifaceted benefit of having adult role models in their living space, and a significant reduction in conduct incidents for residents living in that community.

- Fraternity & Sorority Affairs: One best practice noted is the involvement of faculty and staff as adviser to chapters. The Accreditation process for chapters requires students to be intentional by fostering intellectual development amongst its members and encourages faculty involvement toward this end.
Core Competency Grants: These grants are awarded to faculty and staff to develop programs that promote students’ development in the following areas: Intellectual Development, Individual Identity Development, and Interpersonal Development, Equity, Community and Global Engagement.

The reinvisioning and renovation of the UMOJA House serves as a model for collaboration and intentional connections between residence life and academia in partnership with Academic Outreach and faculty fellows. Assessment is necessary to understand the benefits of this effort particularly since a lower than usual number of upper class students have chosen to return to Umoja as of mid-March 2015.

(4) What universities have reputations for having a positive campus environment? Which of their programs contribute to that environment? Could those programs be implemented at Lehigh?

Our working group identified a number of institutions whose faculty are heavily involved in the residential experience of their students. These colleges and universities create seamless learning environments for their students and are outlined in Question 4 of this report as it relates to successful programs that can be adopted at Lehigh. The comprehensive list of institutions we benchmarked are both attached to this report and included in its “detailed report” section.

(5) What are the biggest challenges that Lehigh students face?

Retention and overall student success is linked to the connectedness that students feel to their institution including their relationships with peers, faculty, and staff. Students’ interactions with faculty is constant within the boundaries of the classroom. Extending this level of student/faculty engagement beyond the traditional learning spaces has clear advantages. The challenge to creating these experiences is that faculty have voiced that they lack the time to commit to these service-oriented experiences given their other responsibilities as faculty members. As shared in various parts of our report, we believe that we must build a culture where out-of-class experiences with faculty is truly valued and thus rewarded in our university community.

(6) What current Lehigh policies would you change, and why?

The institutional value that is placed on faculty-student engagement beyond the traditional classroom and how it is incentivized for faculty are important factors to consider. This sentiment was shared in both the data gathered through our Lehigh faculty survey and small group discussion, as well as from our benchmark institutions. Lehigh faculty, in particular, acknowledged that their genuine interest in students would influence their decision to be more involved in the student
experience as would a course reduction or release, compensation, and research funding, among others. As a result of our review, our working group has concluded that an increase in value of service in the tenure and promotion process would create a culture shift at Lehigh that encourages, recognizes and rewards a significant level of faculty engagement in the student experience.

Responses to the following questions. Include, where relevant, descriptions of coordination with other working groups:

(2) What are the top three changes you believe would have a positive effect on the students’ environment?

We are recommending that a multi-tiered system be put in place that allows faculty to engage students within the residential communities at varying levels. This involvement would be fully recognized as service in the promotion and tenure process. Such an approach would allow faculty, regardless of their rank and without jeopardizing their promotion, to actively engage with students at the level they are comfortable based on their interest and personal/professional commitments. There are multiple points of entry for faculty involvement within the residential experience; regardless of where students live on campus, residence halls or fraternity/sorority housing, our proposal would allow students to have a direct connection to a faculty member who serves as a support and resource for them. A template for this system is detailed below and based on Lehigh-specific and faculty survey information; supporting information was also garnered from benchmark data. Depending on the type and level of involvement, faculty would serve in one of the following capacities throughout the residential communities:

**Residential College Master:** Faculty would live on campus in a faculty apartment in student housing and provide significant leadership to the Faculty Associates and students; they would have substantial involvement in designing the residential learning experience.

**Residential Faculty Fellow:** Faculty would not live on campus yet provide significant leadership to the Faculty Associates and students; they would have considerable involvement in designing the residential learning experience.

**Faculty Associate:** Faculty would not live on campus yet affiliate with a residential hall or student community; involvement would include approximately 5-10 programs, meals, events with students per semester.

**Faculty Affiliate:** Faculty would not live on campus yet affiliate with a residential hall or student community; involvement would include 1-5 programs, meals, events with students per semester.
Community Affiliate: Administrators, staff and community members/leaders would not live on campus yet affiliate with a residential hall or student community; involvement may include 1-5 programs, meals, events with students per semester.

Faculty incentives will be critical for the success of this model to include recognition in the promotion and tenure process. We recommend that course reductions/release, and funding for professional development and research be considered in addition to options noted in the faculty survey. Funding for programs, as well as staffing to manage the larger residential faculty experience should also be considered in tandem with the faculty involvement model.

Campus facilities planning including renovation and new construction is an integral part of this process and reflects the commitment that the university has to the deep involvement of faculty in the residential experience of students. To that end, we recommend that any new residential facilities include a faculty apartment to accommodate the changing and growing needs of faculty families, as well as classroom and/or spaces for academic advising.

(3) What three successful programs from Lehigh's peer and aspirational universities can we implement at Lehigh?"

Given our working group focus, our benchmarking efforts were directed to colleges and universities that have robust residential colleges and related avenues to heavily involve faculty in the residential experience of students. Though we may not be able to fully implement any one of them at Lehigh given differing campus cultures and structures, they do serve as a model for how Lehigh can engage faculty in a variety of ways. A fuller description of these and other programs are attached to this report:

**Cornell University**
Cornell University has invested heavily in creating a high-contact, prestigious faculty-in-residence program. Approximately 10 years ago, Cornell’s president named residential faculty connections as a top priority and this initiative was supported by a number of tenured Cornell faculty who eventually became the first group to live in residential facilities. West Campus is the home to 5 faculty members in residence and North Campus offers a multi-layered approach to engaging faculty in residence life from teaching courses, to living in apartments, to becoming an ‘affiliate’ by regularly hosting and attending programs as well as interacting with residents. The Cornell model is considered a best practice because it takes into account differing needs and interests of faculty members and high incentives for participation while also providing a holistic living-learning experience for students.

**Duke University**
Duke has a Faculty-in-Residence Program that was established to 1) foster faculty/student interaction outside of the classroom and 2) enhance the intellectual life of the residence hall through programming and exposure to other faculty. The Faculty-in-Residence receives funding for programs, as well as a food budget to encourage him/her to eat with their residents. They serve as mentors to the students, collaborate with residential life staff to plan events and promote and encourage the use of resources on campus.

In addition the FIR Program, has two programs that encourage students to engage faculty members. “Flunch” is publicized through word-of-mouth wherein students can request funding to go to lunch a faculty member at one of the campus eating establishments. “Finvite” provides an opportunity for upper-class students who live in residential houses on campus to receive funding for extracurricular activities involving faculty.

**Rice University:**
Rice University has a very extensive residential college program wherein all students are members of one of the 11 residential colleges on campus. Students join the colleges as first-year students and remain connected to that college regardless of whether they live on/off-campus. Each college has a Faculty Master who is tenured and living in a home adjacent to the residential building and has committed to a 5-year term in that role. Faculty Masters serve as the intellectual leaders to the colleges. Faculty Associates are non-residential members of the college and provide academic advising to students. The residential college is a hub for academic discourse and advising, as well as social programming.
Description of how working group has accounted for:

(a) Health and safety, including the role of alcohol and other drugs:

The presence of faculty and their family members does decrease the negative behavior as it relates to alcohol and other drugs. This is evident in the Residential Fellow Program that is currently in place as there is a significant reduction in conduct incidents for residents living in that community.

(b) Diversity and inclusion:

There is a tremendous opportunity to encourage and promote diversity and inclusive effort through the deeper engagement of faculty: students will be exposed to multiple academic disciplines based on the faculty who are involved; residential communities would foster multi-generational engagement amongst the students, faculty and staff involved; intentional efforts can be made to incorporate diversity and inclusion in the student/faculty dialogue and programming that takes place in the residence halls that can extend beyond the current culturally-based community.

(c) Enhancing Lehigh's academic environment:

By engaging faculty in the residential experience of students we are not only enhancing our academic environment, but expanding the idea about where learning can take place. Providing advising and classroom spaces in the residential buildings create natural avenues for continued intellectual exploration.

(d) Engagement with the South Bethlehem community:

It is important to recognize the value and benefit of the surrounding Bethlehem community and how community presence can also enhance the academic experience of our students. In addition to having faculty, staff and administrators connected to the residential communities, we can be proactive in inviting area members and leaders to share in the learning experience in the halls in an affiliate capacity. This would again expand the idea of the academic environment and from whom our students can learn.