Lehigh University

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

6 May 2002

Presiding: Gregory Farrington (University Center Room 308)

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

1. Minutes. The minutes of the March 25, 2002 faculty meeting were APPROVED.

2. Admissions Update. Bruce Gardiner reviewed admissions activity for the Class of 2006: 3,300 students applied; 200 fewer offers were made – reducing the admission rate to 44%. SAT scores are down slightly, but the yield is higher – approximately 32% so far.

3. Football Report. Head Football Coach Pete Lembo thanked the faculty for their support of the football team including time spent with recruits and for the faculty’s patience with student athletes. He announced that the team would play 12 regular season games this fall including a Thursday night game before Labor Day against Division I-A foe the University of Buffalo.

President Farrington commented that the search for a new Men’s Head Basketball Coach had attracted some really classy candidates.

4. Memorial Resolution. A tribute to James R. Frakes, late Emeritus Professor of English, was read by Professors Rosemary Mundhenk and Scott Gordon who then MOVED that their remarks be incorporated in these minutes [see Attachment 1]. The President declared the motion APPROVED by acclamation and the faculty STOOD for a moment of silence in memory of James R. Frakes.

5. Graduation Motions. Registrar Bruce Correll MOVED the four customary motions for the June 2002 graduation [see Attachment 2]. The motions were SECONDED and PASSED.

6. Committee Motions. Professor Jack Paul, on behalf of the Graduate and Research Committee, MOVED a change to R&P Section 3.23.3 [see Attachment 3]. The motion was SECONDED. Professor Neal Simon inquired why a dean is better equipped to judge the competency of faculty serving on doctoral committees. Professor Paul stated the intent was for oversight above the doctoral committee itself. The motion PASSED.
Provost Ron Yoshida moved a change to R&P Section 2.2.3.5 regarding adjunct faculty titles [see Attachment 4]. The motion was seconded and passed.

Professor Elizabeth Fifer, on behalf of the Educational Policy Committee, moved several changes to R&P Section 1.3.3 regarding library and technical services [see Attachment 5]. The motion was seconded and passed.

7. Unfinished Business
   None.

8. New Business
   None.

9. Committee Reports
   Professor Alex Levine, on behalf of the Nominations Committee, circulated the ballot for university standing committees [see Attachment 6]. He solicited nominations from the floor for the CBE representative to the FCC. Hearing none, he then solicited general nominations from the floor. Hearing none, he moved that nominations be closed. The motion was seconded and passed. Balloting then proceeded.

Professor Neal Simon, on behalf of the Faculty Compensation Committee, provided the committee's annual report. He thanked committee members, noted some progress had been made during the current academic year and acknowledged the efforts of previous chairs and committee members.

The breakup of Blue Cross/Blue Shield is a concern.

In the salary adjustment process, the university has allocated over $200,000 to address salary deficiencies.

Professor Elizabeth Fifer, on behalf of the Faculty Steering Committee, provided the committee's annual report [see Attachment 7]. She thanked all committee members for their service.

Professor Rich Aronson, on behalf of the Personnel Committee, provided the committee's annual report to the faculty [see Attachment 8]. He thanked committee members Sudhakar Neti, Arnie Spokane, Jeff Sands and Jennifer Swann.

President Farrington remarked that, for the fourth consecutive year, he was impressed by the good sense and wisdom demonstrated by the Personnel Committee.
Professor Paul, on behalf of the Graduate and Research Committee, provided a year-end report [see Attachment 9].

Professor Ed Lotto, on behalf of the Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee, provided the committee’s annual report [see Attachment 10]. One area of concern is the university’s ranking in US News and World Report which has slipped primarily because of a decline in ranking for alumni giving (from 21st to 17th in four years) and faculty resources (from 29th to 42nd in four years). President Farrington commented on the remarkable loyalty of Lehigh alumni with an increased effort at engaging younger alumni.

Professor Judi Lasker, on behalf of the Faculty Steering Committee provided the committee’s annual report [see Attachment 11]. She thanked Ron Hartranft and Nelson Marxley for their efforts.

Professor Rick Weisman, on behalf of the Equal Opportunity and Harassment Policy Committee, presented the committee’s annual report to the faculty [see Attachment 12]. He thanked committee members for their service.

President Farrington observed that the Equal Opportunity and Harassment Policy Committee was a model on how to positively impact Lehigh’s future. He thanked them for their excellent recommendations.

10. **Concerns and Issues.** Professor Seth Moglin noted the racist comments posted on the (unaffiliated and unauthorized) ‘Lehigh Daily Jolt’ web site. Students are concerned and unable to sleep. He Moved that the university faculty issue a statement in support of African American students and in protest of “The Daily Jolt” web site.

President Farrington weighed in with the observation that the university needs a method for dealing with unaffiliated web sites such as ‘The Daily Jolt.’ He cautioned that issuing such a statement may have the effect of calling unwanted attention to the site, thereby encouraging continued inappropriate behavior. He was concerned that, if every time there is a public amplification of such behavior, the university may find itself in the professional condemnation business.

Professor Roger Nagel offered a friendly amendment calling for a statement from the president affirming the university’s values.

Professor Neti suggested a private communication with students.

President Farrington asked how we express, in the long run, our solidarity with adversely affected students.
Professor Roger Simon saw no harm in the faculty reiterating its solidarity with adversely affected students and SECONDED Professor Moglin’s motion.

Professor Lasker expressed her agreement with Professor Nagel’s amendment.

Nelson Markley said a resolution by the faculty would be a wonderful news item.

Professor Fifer encouraged the faculty to express solidarity with adversely affected students.

President Farrington suggested the faculty do two things: affirm the ‘mosaic’ of Lehigh to the campus community, and, that their warmth and solidarity with adversely affected students be communicated directly to students.

President Farrington agreed to send a communication to the campus community.

The amended motion PASSED.

President Farrington stated he would convene a small group in the fall to discuss how to deal with such incidents long term.

11. **President’s Report.** President Farrington thanked the faculty for all their help during the year.

12. **Provost’s Report.** No report.

The meeting stood adjourned at 6:05 PM

______________________________
Stephen F. Thode
Secretary to the Faculty
304 Rauch Business Center
(610) 758-4557
FAX: (610) 882-9415
E-mail: stf@
James R. Frakes

James R. Frakes, Professor of English and Fairchild Professor of American Studies, died on March 13, 2002.

Frakes:

A tough, passionate, and life-changing teacher for generations of Lehigh students, hundreds of whom remember Frakes' class as the best of their 'Lehigh experience.'

A colleague, whose lacenating wit, generous support, and good-humored kindnesses are missed by his department's faculty and his graduate and undergraduate students

Jim Frakes hated few things more than long faculty meetings. Among these few greater abhorrences were sentimental novels (especially long, sentimental novels), Eugene O'Neil plays (also long), root canals, hot summers (usually too long), cullogies (always too long), and celebrations of his many years at Lehigh. On his desk, Jim displayed a fancy pen box Lehigh's gift to him on his 25th year on the faculty; when a student asked what was in the box, Frakes replied, 'A silver-plated rectal thermometer.'

Jim Frakes loved above all his family, his teaching, his students, and Henry James' novels. Among other competitors for his affection were Preston Sturges' films, the daily New York Times, everything Samuel Beckett wrote, jazz, and Marlene Dietrich.

Frakes frequently referred to Henry James as 'The Master,' but Frakes' students called Jim 'The Master.' In his last year, Jim was re-reading James' fiction. One of his favorite, much underlined passages about James is a statement by William Gass, a passage that uncannily describes James R. Frakes as much as Henry James:

If any of us were as well taken care of as the sentences of Henry James, we'd never long for another, never wander away: where else would we receive such constant attention, our thoughts anticipated, our feelings understood? Who else would rob us so richly, take us to the best places, or guard our virtue as his own and defend our character in every situation? If we were his sentences, we'd sing ourselves though we were dying and about to be extinguished, since the silence which would follow our passing would not be like the pause left behind by a noisy train. It would be a memorial, well-marked grave, just as the Master has assured us death itself is: the distinguished thing. (On Being Blue)
Aware that we violate Jim Fra kes' wishes by writing this memorial resolution, we also know that he would roll his eyes, run his hand through his hair, and tolerate our need to celebrate his wonderful life and to thank him for leaving us "well taken care of."

Scott Gordon and Rosemary Mundhenk, on behalf of the English Department, move that this remembrance be made a permanent part of the faculty record by being included in the minutes of this meeting. We ask that copies be sent to Fra kes' family: his wife Doris, his son Jonathan, his daughter-in-law Genie, and his grandchildren, Julia, Jameson, and Eliza.
May 6, 2002

GRADUATION MOTIONS

I. That, with the approbation and consent of the Board of Trustees signified by their mandamus, the appropriate academic degrees be conferred at the end of the current semester on those individuals who shall have completed all requirements for graduation no later than 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 29, 2002, and that the President of the University and the Secretary of the Faculty be authorized to sign, on behalf of the Faculty diplomas issued to those individuals;

II. That the appropriate graduation honors be awarded to those individuals whose averages as computed by the Office of the Registrar shall entitle them to be graduated with honors, high honors, or highest honors, according to regulation 3.1.1.1 of the current edition of the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty.

III. That the Committee on Standing of Students be empowered to act for the Faculty on any special cases involving candidates for bachelor's degrees which may arise between now and the close of the semester; that the Graduate Committee be empowered to so act in cases involving candidates for graduate degrees;

IV. That prizes awarded to the appropriate individuals and that the announcement be made in the commencement program.
Proposed Change to R&P  
Doctoral Committee Membership  
(5/4/02)

PROPOSED CHANGE TO R&P  
To be added to the end of § 3.003:

The minimum number of committee members is four. Of these, three, including the committee chair, are to be voting Lehigh faculty members. With the written approval of the dean of the college, one of the three aforementioned faculty members, each of whom must have a doctoral degree, may be drawn from categories that include departmentally approved adjuncts, professors of practice, university lecturers, and courtesy faculty appointees. This latter member may not serve as the committee chair. The fourth required member must be from outside the student’s department (or outside the student’s program if there is only one department in the college). Committees may include additional members who possess the requisite expertise and experience. Committee membership must be approved by the University’s Graduate and Research Committee; such approval may be delegated to the department or program sponsoring the degree.

CURRENT R&P  
At the time of admission to candidacy, a special committee is appointed by the graduate and research committee to direct the work of the candidate.

RATIONALE  
The lack of specificity in current R&P has given rise to various interpretations. This proposal seeks to establish a process that assures quality standards are maintained in the selection of doctoral committee members.
Adjunct Faculty
Change in Titles

Motion

Replace R&P section 2.2.3.5:

Part-time appointments must not exceed one year and must be at one of the ranks: adjunct lecturer, adjunct assistant professor, adjunct associate professor, or adjunct professor. Such part-time appointments may be renewed with no implication of commitment by the university beyond the specified term of the appointment.

with the following:

Part-time appointments must not exceed one year and must at one of two ranks: adjunct lecturers or adjunct professor, upon recommendation of the departmental faculty and dean and approval of the provost. The adjunct lecturer rank will be assigned to candidates without a terminal degree, usually a doctorate, while adjunct professor will be assigned to those with a terminal degree. However, this differentiation does not preclude an individual without a terminal degree from being recommended for the professorial rank. Such part-time appointments may be renewed with no implication of commitment by the university beyond the specified term of the appointment.

Rationale

Adjunct faculty members are currently appointed to differentiated ranks similar to those members of the tenure track: lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor.

The distinctions of rank within the tenure rank are important because they signify the status of tenure and distinction in terms of academic accomplishment. In the case of adjuncts, departments and colleges do not apply clear and consistent criteria when recommending candidates to these ranks. Salary recommendations are not typically related to rank.

In order to ease the process of assignment, the deans and / with support of the personnel committee recommend two ranks as stated in the motion above.
Proposal for a Revision of R&P

From: Elizabeth Fifer, Chair
   Educational Policy Committee

Proposal: to add the sentences "Any proposal for a new major, minor, or graduate program will include statements of impact on the Library and Technology Services, laboratory and classroom space, and faculty. These statements, developed by subject librarians, Information Technology consultants, the Registrar, and the Deans or their designates, working in conjunction with the faculty, will be a required element of any proposal forwarded to the Educational Policy Committee or to the Graduate and Research Committee" to the following sections of R&P:

p.27 1.3.3.1.2.1 College of Arts and Sciences course committee; after the line "These recommendations are submitted to the dean."

p.31 1.3.3.2.1 College of Business and Economics policy committee; after the line "The committee reports its findings to the dean and presents the proposals with recommendations to the faculty of the college."

p.33 1.3.3.3.2 College of Engineering/Applied Science academic policy committee; after the line "The findings of the committee would go to the college faculty through the council for consideration."

p.33 1.3.3.4 College of Education Committees; placed according to the suggestion of the Graduate and Research Committee.

Rationale:

New programs generally require new resources. Library resources may range from continuing commitments, such as databases and journals, to retrospective core book collections and a maintenance level of new monograph purchases. While the regular collection development process addresses incremental change in book and journal collection needs and priorities, more significant challenges posed by new programs require a more systematic planning effort and a proactive approach. Library and Technology Services must identify resource demands at an early stage of planning to support new programs efficiently and comprehensively.
In addition, new programs and other initiatives may have an impact on available space, from laboratories to classrooms. These must be estimated well before programs are implemented.

The impact of new programs on faculty already here and an assessment of what faculty may have to be hired to fully staff a new departmental, College, or University initiative must be part of planning at an early stage to allow for the reallocation of existing faculty or for the raising of funds for new faculty.
**Ballot**
**May 6, 2002**

**Faculty Compensation Committee**
At large (vote for one):
- Bob Volk (Physics)
- Laura Olson (Political Science)

CAS representative (vote for one):
- Barry Bean (Biological Sciences)
- Constance Cook (Modern Languages and Literature)

CBE representative (vote for one):

COE representative (vote for one):
- April Metzler (Education and Human Services)

RCEAS representative (vote for one):
- Jacob Kazakia (Mechanical Engineering)
- Richard Roberts (Mechanical Engineering)

**Committee on Nominations**
At large (vote for one):
- Kathleen Olson (Journalism and Communication)
- Jacob Kazakia (Mechanical Engineering)

**Library Users' Committee**
At large (vote for one):
- Charles Lyman (Materials Science)
- Michael Mendelson (Philosophy)
- Steven Weintraub (Mathematics)

**University Committee on Discipline**
At large (vote for two):
- Michael Behe (Biological Sciences)
- Terry Delph (Mechanical Engineering)
- James Gunton (Physics)

**Board of Publications Committee**
At large (vote for two):
- Carole Gerney (Journalism and Communications)
- Michael Mendelson (Philosophy)
- Lena Wolfgang (Modern Languages and Literature)

**Secretary of the Faculty**
At large (vote for one):
- Stephen Thode (Finance and Law)

**Honorary Degrees Committee**
CAS representative (vote for one):
- Janet Laible (Political Science)
- Anthony Viscardi (Art and Architecture)

CBE representative (vote for one):
- Karen Collins (Accounting)

**Committee on Student Appraisal of Instruction**
COE representative (vote for one):
- Linda Bamber (Education and Human Services)

**Faculty Personnel Committee**
RCEAS representative (vote for one):
- Jacob Kazakia (Mechanical Engineering)
- Roger Nagel (Computer Science and Engineering)
5/6/02

Report from the Educational Policy Committee
Chair: Elizabeth Fifer

This was an important year for the Educational Policy Committee. We discussed a number of policy changes and questions. Among this year’s issues were rules governing the giving of credit for Advanced Placement in Languages, the effect of teaching evaluations on raises and promotions, the effect of Banner on advising, grade inflation (we found there was none), the far-reaching results of the changes in the Math requirement in the College of Business, and the means by which the impact of new programs on various sectors of the University are assessed.

Many new programs came for examination from the three Colleges, some of them interdepartmental and interdisciplinary, requiring us to look at the long-range consequences for the curriculum and the budget. The impact of the Colleges of Business and Engineering’s new combined CBE core curriculum revision will be far-reaching, particularly for the College of Arts and Sciences. Through discussion and revision new programs were fine-tuned; we involved those departments most affected by changes in the process of implementation.

But during this tumultuous year the most frequent complaint made by Committee members was our inability to oversee programs comprehensively given the late stage at which we reviewed them. We are seeking to remedy this problem. A sub-committee of Ed Pol consisting of representatives from the three Colleges has drafted a proposal that will insure that in the future the Committee will be involved much earlier in the development of all programs they will be voting on.
MAY 6, 2002

Annual Report to the Faculty of the University Personnel Committee

It is the custom for the Personnel Committee to make a year-end report to the faculty. I am pleased to report that since last year we have generally been included in the interviewing of candidates for high administrative office. It is also true that Provost Yoshida, Vice President Markley, and Committee Co-chairs, Weisman and Soderland actively sought our advice on issues concerning academic titles (e.g. "Professor of Practice" and "Adjunct Professor"); the newly revised policy on harassment; and other proposed changes in R&P.

This year we also heard one case concerning a member of the faculty who believed he was being treated unfairly. We have completed our investigation and made recommendations to President Farrington. There were two or three other faculty inquiries of concern but these matters were either handled without a formal hearing or were considered be outside the jurisdiction of the committee. In general this had been a reasonably uneventful year for the committee.

J. Richard Aronson, Chair
Graduate and Research Committee
2001-2002 Report to Faculty
May 6, 2002

During the academic year 2001-2002, the GRC accomplished the following:

Proposals Submitted to the Faculty
1. Graduate Certificate Programs – The Committee presented (and the faculty passed) a proposal that delineates the characteristics of graduate certificate programs.

2. Master's Degree Transfer Credits – The GRC presented (and the faculty passed) a proposal that increases the allowable number of transfer credits for master's programs.

3. Minimum Credit Requirements for the Doctoral Degree – This proposal specified the minimum hours that must be taken at Lehigh if a student seeks to receive both the master's and doctoral degree. The proposal passed.

4. Doctoral Committee Membership – The Committee presented a proposal stipulating the criteria for membership on a doctoral committee. The proposal passed.

Revised Graduate Program Review Process
The GRC is charged with reviewing both the appropriateness and quality of graduate programs. To devise an efficient and effective method for doing this, I met with the deans of the four colleges to fashion a new process. In that meeting, we devised a process whereby the first element—appropriateness—would be addressed by having each dean give a presentation to the GRC. Each of the deans did so, presenting their views of the graduate programs in their respective colleges. The provost also gave a presentation from a university-wide perspective. The second component—quality—will be addressed by using metrics derived from the Middle States accreditation process that started this past January. Chris Cole and her subcommittee are summarizing and synthesizing the materials that have been collected. I would like to thank Chris and her subcommittee for all their hard work.

Graduate Fellowship Selection Process
A new process for awarding graduate fellowships was instituted in conjunction with David Williams, Vice-Provost for Research. The new framework takes into account the University’s strategic initiatives and interdisciplinary research.

Curriculum Review
George Wilson’s curriculum subcommittee spent numerous hours reviewing proposals for new graduate courses and programs, as well as changes in program and course. I would like to thank George and his subcommittee for all their hard work in performing this rather thankless but necessary task.

Student Issues Subcommittee
The GRC heard a presentation from the Student Issues Subcommittee, chaired by Ken Kodama. The issues raised included inadequate housing, stipends that are not competitive, and costly medical insurance. We are anticipating improvements with the hiring of Dr. Karen Wang as Director of Graduate Student Life. Indeed, the GRC invited Dr. Wang to join the Committee as an ex-officio member. I would like to thank both Karen and Ken Kodama, as well as the other members of the Student Issues subcommittee for devoting a great deal of time to these important issues.

In closing, I would like to thank Ingrid Parson for her untiring efforts and all of the GRC members for their support and the numerous hours they spent in carrying out the important work of this Committee.

Respectfully submitted
Jack W. Paul
Chair
Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee
Report to the Faculty for AV 2001-2002
May, 2002

Mary Beth Deily, Asha Jitendra.
Edward Lotto (Chair). John Smith

The Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee (FFPOC) is a standing committee at Lehigh. The committee represents the concerns of the faculty in advising the president, provost, and the vice president for finance and administration regarding financial planning. The primary purpose of the committee is to ensure that the long-range academic concerns of the faculty are represented in the financial operations of the university. To this end, the committee shall receive appropriate information and make timely recommendations in the financial planning process. The committee reports regularly to the faculty (R&P 1.2.2.3)

During the 2001-2002 academic year, the committee has considered the following issues:

1. The growth in exempt staff.
3. The 20/20 plan

Exempt Staff

1. Exempt staff are professional staff who do not get overtime. They are exempt from the laws that demand they get overtime. There has been a significant growth in exempt staff over the last four years for which we have data, along with a significant decrease in non-exempt staff. The committee has discussed this change with Ron Yoshida and Peggy Plympton, who provided us with the data we used in our analysis. There are, of course, many good reasons for an increase in the number of exempt staff, among them the new demands of our computing facilities and the changing needs of our students for various kinds of support. But the committee feels that there needs to be greater control of the growth in this area. At a time when the growth in faculty is carefully controlled we can do no less with the growth in professional staff.

Although it is difficult to say with certainty where exactly the new exempt staff have been hired, we did manage to get some sense of the areas with the greatest growth funded by unrestricted Budget Support. These include Information Resources, Advancement, and Finance and Administration. These three account for
approximately 27 new exempt positions in the last four years. Other areas with somewhat smaller growth are Student Affairs, Admissions, Financial Aid, Registrar, Government Relations, and Athletics. In general, we see an explosion of new positions in three areas and a steady creep in a number of others for a total of almost 37 new exempt positions over the last four years. We can see some justification for a great growth in Information Resources with all the growth in computing needs. If the new Advancement positions enable us to bring in significantly more money in future campaigns, they make a lot of sense. But for the present they strain the unrestricted budget, and some thought should be given to relieving this strain with money brought in by Advancement. It is somewhat more difficult to see the reason for the growth in Finance and Administration, and the committee will try to find out more about this growth next year.

Ongoing and New Issues concerning exempt staff:

In addition to the growth in exempt staff supported by unrestricted funds, there has been a significant growth in exempt staff supported by soft money. Here the greatest growth has been in Athletics and Zoological. We are uncertain of the effect of this growth in soft money positions on the budget as a whole, and will consider this question next year also.

We are also in the middle of addressing a number of other questions in terms of exempt staff. One concerns the percentage of the new exempt staff hired for research projects. Another is the relationship between overall dollars spent on staff vs. dollars spent on faculty over time. We also have started to address the question of the relationship between staff and faculty salaries. One surprising fact we discovered is that 45 exempt staff members make over $80,000 a year. This number does not include what are called unclassified exempt staff such as deans, vice provosts, general counsel, vice presidents, provost and president.

Recommendations:

The committee and administration need to keep careful track of growth in staff, and need to make sure that budget dollars are allocated to positions that will best serve the needs and advancement of the university. The committee will develop a set of data that will enable us to clearly track progress in this matter. We don’t have the data for 2001 yet, but will receive it shortly.

US News and World Report Rankings

2. The committee spent a great deal of time wrestling with the arcane of the US News and World Report articles on America’s Best Universities. A few years ago there was a sense that we were trying to “look” like the universities in the top 25 even if actually getting into the top 25 proved impossible. So our analysis focused on the factors we might change in our quest to look different. Unfortunately the largest factor in the rankings is Academic Reputation, a figure very difficult to change in the
short run, and perhaps in the long run also. We talked a bit about various strategies for improving Academic Reputation, including hiring "star" faculty, holding more conferences, offering year long distinguished professorships, and finding other ways to influence the opinions of college presidents, provosts, and deans of admissions, the people surveyed in deciding Academic Reputation. But in the end, none of these seemed feasible.

Other major factors in the ranking are Six-Year Graduation Rate (16%), Financial Resources (10%), and Faculty Salaries (7%). In fact, we do better than our overall ranking (38) in terms of Graduation and Retention (28) but worse in terms of Faculty Resources (42) and Financial Resources (53). Our ranking in Faculty Resources has decreased between 1999 and 2001 from 29 to 42. It is difficult to know what exactly to make of all these figures, but one possible conclusion is that we need to increase the amount of money devoted to Faculty Resources and the area called Financial Resources, which really is a measure of spending per student on such things as instruction (although how this is different from faculty salaries is hard to say), research, and student services.

Recommendations:

In the end, the committee is not sure that devoting much more time to a study of The US News and World Report articles is worthwhile. Recent university documents do not mention these articles as a measure of quality very much and, in fact, our ranking has been decreasing from 34 in 1999 to 38 in 2001. There are probably more direct ways of measuring the factors in the report for our internal use. But we would suggest that the US News articles suggest some worrisome trends and some directions for further study.

The first worrisome trend is the decrease in alumni giving. In 1996 we were ranked number 2 in alumni giving and in 2001 we had fallen to 17. We are uncertain how this translates into actual dollars given but suggest that the committee look into this question, taking into consideration the tremendous increase in Advancement Staff. We also note the precipitous fall between 1999 and 2001 in Faculty Resources from number 29 to 42. This factor is made up of faculty salary along with various measures of availability of faculty to students such as student-faculty ratio. We realize that the administration is making a strenuous effort this year to raise faculty salaries in areas where they are low. We encourage the administration in this goal. We also note that hiring more faculty would help raise us in almost all the other parts of this factor of Faculty Resources.

It is uncertain if the university still has as a goal of "looking like" the top 25 Research Universities in the country. If so, the committee should continue the analysis of the US News and World Report articles. If not, we suggest this line of analysis be discontinued in favor of more focused studies concerning such things as percentage of budget spent on the academic side of things, a cost-benefit analysis of the advancement office, and a consideration of the ideal number of faculty and students.
The committee has not had a lot of time to discuss the 20/20 program with the provost. We do feel, however, that the charge to the committee makes it imperative that we keep track of the progress and direction of the program. We would like to say first of all that we are immensely pleased and gratified that the president and provost obtained $75 Million from the Trustees for investment in academics over the next seven years. Lehigh needs this kind of forward-thinking move to keep itself in the first rank of national universities. The university exists to teach and generate knowledge, a goal that this investment helps us meet. We also approve of the use of the money to strengthen academic areas that are becoming increasingly important in the 21st Century. As we understand the plan, part of the money will enable the university to hire new faculty in quickly growing disciplines. In this rush to hire, we need to make sure that we decrease faculty in disciplines where demand is not so critical. The 20/20 money allows us to phase in this attrition naturally over the life cycle of faculty members. In all our considerations of the 20/20 plan we need to be careful that we balance increases in one area with decreases in another and allow growth in faculty and students only in a reasoned and carefully planned way. We need to be wary of excessive claims of increased revenue from tuition or ICR. This money must be spent well and we look forward to working with the provost in finding ways to do so.

**Issues to Work on Next Year**

1. Develop an ongoing accounting of staff positions with appropriate categories to allow us to track changes over time. In addition, get some sense of total money spent on staff as opposed to faculty over time.

2. Analyze the budget to get some sense of percentage of money spent on academics as opposed to other items. Are staff salaries in line with faculty salaries?

3. Find out the effect of soft money staff appointments on the budget.

5. Come to some understanding of relationship between money donated for specific purposes as opposed to general purposes. In other words, try to find out if money is channeled into specific purposes that might well go into the general fund.

6. Study the graduate programs and money used for research. How can we use our money to encourage research and graduate work? Is the new plan for graduate tuition working?

7. Effects of building campaigns on the budget.

8. Long term effect of Zelinger on budget.

9. Is there any way to hold down the increase in funding for computing services?
FSC report, May 6, 2002

The Faculty Steering Committee meets approximately once a month to hear reports from five faculty committees—Ed. Pol, FCC, FFPOC, Personnel, and ORC—and to discuss other issues of importance to the faculty. This year we discussed ways of improving recognition of faculty members' impact on students' lives through enhanced follow-up with alumni. We also reviewed a report on changes in the numbers of faculty and staff that was requested by FFPOC in response to concerns from the faculty on the rising proportion of staff positions.

Our most pressing activity in the past year has been the pursuit of the r&p review. A subcommittee of the FSC, made up of the 4 college representatives and Frank Gunter (until he was called up to military duty), has met weekly with Nelson Markley to oversee this review. We recommended the names of faculty to be appointed to the 5 specific review committees, met with the chairs of the three committees that are already active, and reviewed and commented on the charges to these committees. We have also reviewed policy documents such as the statement on academic freedom that should be coming to the faculty in the fall. We also recommended a process that was approved by the faculty to approve r&p changes emerging from this review. Our efforts have been guided by the overriding concern that faculty be as actively engaged in these changes as possible.

The EOHP committee has done an extraordinary job in shepherding through a new Harassment policy, and we will hear an update from them on their recommendations with regard to equal opportunity in a few minutes. The Faculty Personnel Policy Review Committee has begun its work and will also report shortly on the status of its work. The formation of a committee to review student life policy in r&p will be announced soon, and a group studying athletic policy has already begun its work under Nelson's leadership. The final committee, the one that will examine our governance structure, is in the process of formation and will also be announced. They will begin their work in the fall.

Very dedicated people are working hard on these committees to make sure that we have fair and effective policies, and we owe them all our gratitude for taking on this task. The work of these groups is extremely important in improving the environment at Lehigh and preserving faculty integrity. The recommendations regarding equal opportunity coming from the Equal Opportunity and Harassment Policy committee are essential for addressing the continuing challenges with regard to diversity on campus, seen in Lehigh’s lagging far behind national norms. For example, according to the American Council on Education, the percentage of women faculty nationally in 1999 for private doctoral institutions was 36%. At Lehigh, in the same year, women were 20% of full-time faculty. In 2001, we were slightly above 20%. We have also experienced a decline in the number of African-American faculty over the last several years. We have a great deal of work to do to make this campus more welcoming to a diverse group of students, staff, and faculty, and the committee’s work will surely help improve this situation.
The governance committee will also have its work cut out for it. We all recognize, I think, that most faculty are not engaged in governance and that there are widespread concerns about the lack of faculty say in university decision-making. It is our hope that the committee will, in collaboration with the faculty and administration, find a structure that will give us a greater voice in determining the future of Lehigh.

I want to thank the Faculty Steering Committee members—Mary Beth Deily, Elizabeth Eifer, Matt Melone, Sudhakar Neti, John Paul, Gary Lutz, Neal Simon, and in particular Ron Hartranft, who is going off Faculty Steering Committee after 4 years of dedicated service. I also want to thank Nelson Markley, who has been a very valuable partner in the r&d review process.
April 30, 2002

TO: President Greg Farrington and Provost Ron Yoshida
FROM: Equal Opportunity and Harassment Policy Committee
RE: Draft Report

The EOHP Committee held its first meeting in September, when we discussed our charge with President Greg Farrington and Provost Ron Yoshida. We organized our goals according to the priority established by mandate of the Board of Trustees that a new harassment policy be adopted this year. Our three goals, in sequential order, were:

1. Draft and obtain endorsement of a new harassment policy.
2. Draft an equal opportunity policy for the University.
3. Recommend actions to implement the equal opportunity and diversity components of Lehigh's strategic plan.

As part of this charge, because our committee is one of the R&P task forces, we also recognized a responsibility to identify necessary changes in R&P on issues of diversity.

We have fulfilled our goals in full consultation with the Lehigh community, including initial meetings with many individuals on campus who are particularly involved with issues of equal opportunity and harassment. We received feedback to our request for information about campus climate and responses to policy drafts from undergraduate and graduate students, administrators, staff, and faculty.

1. Policy on Harassment (see attachments 1A-B)

In drafting, revising, and obtaining support for the Policy on Harassment, we held open meetings with students, staff, and faculty; attended meetings of the Graduate Student Council, the Student Senate, the Employee Relations Advisory Committee, faculty committees and administrative councils, University Faculty meetings, and faculty meetings of the four colleges. We met with individuals about their concerns and responded to scores of emails. We received crucial assistance and guidance from student, staff, and faculty leaders. The Faculty Steering Committee and R&P Committee were very helpful in drafting the process by which faculty considered amendments and voted electronically.

The Employee Relations Advisory Committee endorsed the harassment policy on April 3, 2002.

The Student Senate endorsed the policy on April 9, 2002.

The voting faculty endorsed the policy with a vote of 133 in favor and 16 opposed. This vote, by electronic ballot ending April 18, 2002, exceeded the required quorum.

The Graduate Student Council endorsed the policy on April 24, 2002.

2. Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action, Non-Discrimination Policy (attachment 2A)

The EOHP committee reviewed the EO/AA policies of many peer institutions, using the best elements in drafting this policy. As with the harassment policy, we depended heavily upon the
expertise of Frank Roth, the University General Counsel. We first distributed our draft EO policy to many administrators and others on campus with expertise in EO/AA. We then distributed the draft policy to the entire Lehigh community, and received helpful feedback for revision. Because the policy seems relatively uncontroversial, we recommend that the Board of Trustees adopt this draft policy without going through the process of endorsement by student staff, and faculty governing bodies.

3. **Implementation of Diversity Steps in Lehigh’s Strategic Plan**

The most important next steps are to appoint a tenured faculty member as Equal Opportunity Officer and establish an Equal Opportunity Commission. Lehigh currently lacks an institutional framework devoted specifically to oversight of equal opportunity and diversity issues throughout the University. Our recommendations for the EO officer’s position and the EO commission are detailed in attachments 3A and 3B.

The EOHF committee has already recommended several specific actions to improve the climate for diversity at Lehigh, including: a) adoption of a same-sex domestic partners benefits policy (attachment 3C); and b) evaluation of the use of Packer Church for official University events (attachment 3D). Attachment 3E includes our recommendations for improving the campus climate, based on our interviews and meetings with students, staff, administrators, and faculty. Because approval of the harassment policy took more time and energy than we hoped, we have not been able to conduct the thorough evaluation of campus climate that we anticipated. We ask President Harrington and Provost Yoshida to accept these recommendations as a starting point and work with the EO officer and EO commission to pursue these recommendations and identify others.

4. **Recommended Changes in R&P**

Attachment 4A identifies sections of R&P related to equal opportunity, harassment, and diversity that require change.

**Documents**

1. **Policy on Harassment**
   - 1A. Policy on Harassment
   - 1B. R&P changes endorsed by faculty vote

2. **Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action/Non-Discrimination Policy (2A)**

3. **Recommendations for improving campus climate for diversity**
   - 3A. Equal Opportunity Officer
   - 3B. Equal Opportunity Commission
   - 3C. Same-sex domestic partners benefits
   - 3D. Use of Packer Church for official University events
   - 3E. Recommendations for Improving Lehigh University Campus Climate for Diversity

4. **Recommended Changes in R&P (4A)**