

NEXT MEETING: 4:10 PM 19 March 2007. Sinclair Auditorium.
Refreshments at 3:30 in Sinclair Auditorium lounge.

Lehigh University

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

12 February 2007

Presiding: Alice Gast (Sinclair Auditorium)

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

1. **Minutes.** The minutes of the December 4, 2006 faculty meeting were APPROVED.
2. **President's Announcement.** President Gast introduced Professor Ed Kay as Parliamentarian. She stated that faculty meetings would henceforth use Robert's Rules of Order (Revised), and that she will request that the R&P Subcommittee submit a motion to change R&P to reflect this.
3. **Memorial Resolutions.** Professor Steve Weintraub read a tribute to A. Everett Pitcher, late University Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Mathematics, who then MOVED that his remarks be incorporated in these minutes [see Attachment 1] and that a copy be sent to the family. The President declared the motion APPROVED by acclamation and the faculty STOOD for a moment of silence in memory of A. Everett Pitcher.

Professor Robert Barnes read a tribute to Thomas Haines, late Professor Emeritus of Philosophy, who then MOVED that his remarks be incorporated in these minutes [see Attachment 2] and that a copy be sent to the family. The President declared the motion APPROVED by acclamation and the faculty STOOD for a moment of silence in memory of Thomas Haines.

4. **South Mountain College.** President Gast said it was her opinion that this proposal should never have been TABLED in the first place. She noted that Robert's Rules of Order (Revised) states that a motion to LAY ON THE TABLE is only appropriate when national security issues are at stake (laughter). She also stated that no faculty member would be allowed to speak more than twice on any particular motion and that a motion to LAY ON THE TABLE would not be allowed from this point forward. She then MOVED that the South Mountain College proposal be TAKEN OFF THE TABLE BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Professor Keith Gardiner, on behalf of the Educational Policy Committee, MOVED TO DIVIDE the South Mountain College proposal into two pieces - separating Item 7 from Items 1 through 6 and Item 8. The motion to divide was SECONDED and PASSED.

Professor Weintraub, noting the absence of copies of the proposal at the meeting inquired as to exactly what the faculty is being asked to vote on.

[Faculty Secretary's note: the complete South Mountain College proposal is available on the Registrar's website]

The first part of the motion is a vote on Items 1 through 6 and Item 8

Professor Sudhakar Neti asked how many students would be involved in South Mountain College (SMC hereafter, for brevity). The answer was approximately 25 per year.

Professor Barry Bean asked if a cost/benefit analysis had been performed, and how the university intended to pay for SMC. Dean Anne Meltzer replied that the university was looking for external sources of funding, and that proposals will be sent to foundations. She indicated her support for the proposal. Provost Mohamed El-Aasser noted that a small financial allocation for SMC had been placed in the university budget.

Professor Art King offered his support for this program saying it was an enormously exciting proposal that charts a new path.

Professor Steve Thode cited numerous violations of R&P contained in the SMC proposal particularly with regard to Section 3.14.1.2 which states

"The Bachelor of Arts degree requires the completion of a minimum of 121 credit hours of collegiate work, apportioned to cover distribution and concentration requirements. A cumulative average of 2.0 or better in courses required in the student's major program **and the completion of all general requirements apply to all candidates for baccalaureate degrees.**"

Professor Thode also cited R&P Section 6.3.1 which states

To the extent possible the University Catalog and the Student Handbook shall be interpreted to avoid conflict and inconsistency with R&P. **Whenever there is a conflict or inconsistency between R&P and either the University Catalog or Student Handbook, or both, the provisions of R&P shall control and the inconsistent or conflicting language in the other document shall automatically and retroactively be deemed to have been revised to reflect terms or provisions consistent with R&P.**"

Professor Lee Stanley stated the faculty should ignore the violations to R&P and allow the exceptions.

Professor Roger Nagel suggested that the faculty approve the SMC proposal and worry about R&P at a later date.

Registrar Bruce Correll said Section 3 of R&P was out-of-date, and that his office has frequently ignored Section 3 as written. He cited the Eckhardt Scholars

program as an example.

President Gast CALLED THE QUESTION. The CALL was SECONDED and PASSED.

President Gast rendered her opinion that the motion should be acted on now and the discussion of potential R&P issues be deferred to a later date.

The first part of the motion PASSED.

The second part of the motion focused on Item 7

Professor Mike Raposa suggested that there was confusion on the part of those who misinterpreted the SMC proposal as permitting "pass/fail" grading. According to Professor Raposa SMC students will not receive a "pass/fail" grade - they will receive a "CR" grade.

Professor Frank Gunter wondered how this would look to graduate schools.

Professor Raposa said he had no doubt SMC students would do well in securing admission to graduate school.

Professor Aronson noted that SMC students would be ineligible for Presidential Scholarships.

Professor Raposa acknowledged that SMC students would not qualify for Presidential Scholarships under current rules but that an attempt would be made, at a later date, to revise the rules

Professor Nandu Nayar wondered how prospective employers would view SMC students' transcripts

Professor Raposa said detailed narratives of students' performances would be attached to their transcripts

Professor Weintraub asked if these narratives would be placed on Banner.

Registrar Correll said the narratives would not be attached to the transcripts, but might some day, be attached to Banner.

When asked if letter grades could be given, Professor Raposa said that letter grades did not fit the philosophy of SMC.

Professor Neti asked how badly an SMC student would have to perform to not get a "CR" grade.

Professor Raposa said that subpar students would be identified very early on - primarily through peer evaluations.

President Gast CALLED THE QUESTION. The CALL was SECONDED and PASSED.

The second part of the motion PASSED.

5. **Committee Motions.** Professor Ed Shapiro, on behalf of the R&P Subcommittee, MOVED removal of sections 4.1.7.1 and 4.1.7.2 from R&P and a renumbering of subsequent sections [see Attachment 3]. The motion was SECONDED.

Professor Gunter asked if the change meant that NCAA contests could now be scheduled during examination periods. Professor Shapiro replied in the affirmative, as these were NCAA rules.

Professor Gunter asked if an NCAA contest then became a valid excuse for missing an exam. Professor Shapiro replied in the affirmative.

The motion PASSED.

Professor Shapiro then deferred to Professor Rick Matthews who MOVED a Faculty Motion on Academic Freedom [see Attachment 4]. The motion was SECONDED.

Professor Neti asked if the Board of Trustees would go along with this motion.

President Gast said she would do her best.

President Gast CALLED THE QUESTION. The CALL was SECONDED and PASSED.

The motion PASSED.

Professor Mike Kolchin, on behalf of the Faculty Personnel Committee, MOVED a modification to section 2.2.9.9 of R&P [see Attachment 5]. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

Professor Gardiner, on behalf of the Educational Policy Committee, MOVED course changes in the Finance Department and Marketing Department as a combined motion [see Attachments 6 and 7]. The combined motion was SECONDED.

Professor Kolchin noted that the CBE vote on these proposals occurred after 6 PM with only 24 voting faculty in attendance at that time.

Professor K. Sivakumar said the purpose of the change was to give students a choice, permitting them a longer time to complete their majors and prepare for summer internships.

Professor Mary Beth Dally said she had understood that some other changes would accompany this proposal. She worried that CBE students might take up to 9 CBE courses in their sophomore year.

Professor Jim Greenleaf stated that the CBE implemented a similar change 10 years ago with minimal disruption.

Professor Sue Sherer said she believed the issue is what courses are 'gateway' courses and what courses are part of the CBE undergraduate core.

Professor Shapiro viewed this as a college matter. If it's OK with Ed Pol. it should be OK with the faculty.

Registrar Correll noted that other curricular changes have occurred in the last 10 years.

Professor Anne Anderson observed that there is no requirement for students to take 9 CBE courses their sophomore year, and that our students should be treated like adults in selecting their courses.

Professor Nayar noted the excellent advising done by the CBE dean's office.

Dean Tom Hyclak produced data showing that in the Class of 2003 (the last class with the current proposed option), the typical sophomore took 6.8 CBE courses.

President Gast CALLED THE QUESTION. The CALL was SECONDED and PASSED.

The motion PASSED.

Professor Gardiner then MOVED changes to the IBE curriculum [see Attachment 8]. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

Professor Gardiner then MOVED changes to the Supply Chain Management curriculum [see Attachment 9]. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

6. **Unfinished Business.** None.
7. **New Business** None.
8. **President's Report.** President Gast noted Sue Rankin's work on the climate survey.

She said she has learned much on the job the last 6 months. She is committed to attracting and retaining the best faculty which requires competitive salaries - as competitive as possible. She is determined to work with the FCC and the

deans to set salary goals. As a first step, the Board of Trustees has approved a 4.0% salary increase for 2007-08, and an increase in benefits funding which, together, bring the total compensation increase to 4.3% - the second largest increase in a decade.

9. **Provost's Report.** Provost El-Aasser had two items.

First, Lehigh will have a great entering class this fall. More than 12,000 applications have been received by the admissions office – a 13.6% increase over last year. The median SAT score is 10 points higher, and the median SAT score for early admittees is 18 points higher (1281 this year vs 1263 last year) He also noted that the applicant pool is more diverse this year.

The provost also updated the searches underway. Professor Paul Brown of NYU's Stern School of Business has accepted the position of Dean of the College of Business and Economics. Professor Brown will be onboard by July 1 2007.

The searches for the Vice Provost for Research and Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid are in process. The last candidate for the Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid will be on campus next week.

The meeting stood adjourned at 5:51 PM.

Stephen F. Thode
Secretary to the Faculty
304 Rauch Business Center
(610) 758-4557
FAX: (610) 882-9415
E-mail: sft@lehigh.edu

Memorial Resolution
For
Arthur Everett Pitcher

The Faculty of Lehigh University mourns the death on December 4, 2006 of Arthur Everett Pitcher, University Distinguished Professor of Mathematics, and offers its deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

Everett Pitcher was born in Hanover, New Hampshire, on July 18, 1912 and received his A.B. from Case Western Reserve University in 1932. He received the degrees of M.A. (1933) and Ph.D. (1935) from Harvard University. Everett was awarded the honorary degree of D.Sc. (1957) by Case Western Reserve University. He married Sarah Mathiott Hindman in 1936. Two children were born: Susan Pitcher and Joan Pitcher Morrison. Sarah passed away in 1972. Everett married Theresa Sell in 1973. Terry died in 2001.

After two years as Benjamin Pierce Instructor at Harvard, Everett came in 1938 to Lehigh University. He served on the Lehigh Faculty for 40 years, retiring in 1978 as University Distinguished Professor of Mathematics. From 1960 until 1978 he led the Mathematics Department – first as head and later as chairman. On the occasion of Everett's 90th birthday, Lehigh professor Donald Davis said of him: "He was, by far, the most important person in building up the department from a service department to one which is heavily involved in mathematical research."

Everett's personal research program began with graduate work under the direction of his advisor, Marston Morse. Donald Davis says that the work in this area (now called Morse theory) turned out to have "tremendously important applications" to modern homotopy theory. In 1947, Pitcher and J.L. Kelley published the seminal paper: "Exact Sequences in Homotopy Theory". The notion of exact sequences is now fundamental in mathematics research and in graduate education. Davis points out that the Kelley/Pitcher paper marks the first published discussion of this notion.

Everett's service contributions fall into two major components. One component consists of the major contribution he made to national and international mathematics through his work with the American Mathematical Society and with the Mathematical Association of America. He served both organizations in many ways – in particular as secretary of AMS for a period of 22 years. For his service contributions Everett earned the MAA Award for Distinguished Service in 1985. The mathematician David Roselle, then secretary of MAA and now president of the University of Delaware, says: "It was a great favor to

mathematicians that Everett Pitcher devoted so much of his professional life to their service. His good work advanced both individuals and their discipline.”

The second service component is Lehigh itself. Everett Pitcher served Lehigh notably. Aside from his direct leadership as department chairman, he served on countless committees and acted as mathematical advisor to several Lehigh presidents. For example, Everett worked closely with President Deming Lewis in establishing the Center for the Application of Mathematics in 1965. Moreover, he supported Lehigh mathematics, both teaching and research, through many generous financial contributions. Each year the Everett Pitcher Lecture Series brings distinguished mathematicians to the university. The Everett Pitcher Fund supports a chair in mathematics. Outside Alumni Memorial Building stands The Leadership Plaza which recognizes “Lehigh’s Principal Benefactors”. The names Theresa Sell Pitcher and Arthur Everett Pitcher are there engraved.

In retirement Everett turned his research attention to a deep problem known as the Poincaré Conjecture. This conjecture, set down by Henri Poincaré in 1904, remained open – neither proved nor disproved – for more than a century. Over the years many of the world’s best mathematicians tried to settle it. All failed against its iron-like hardness. The old anvil laughed at many broken hammers.

The Poincaré conjecture has now been proved – not by Poincaré and not by Everett Pitcher. Everett never solved the problem but neither did George Leigh Mallory climb Mount Everest. And like heroic Mallory, both men are remembered.

Both now rest in peace.

Memorial Resolution for
Thomas M. Haynes, Professor Emeritus of Philosophy

Thomas M. Haynes, Professor Emeritus of Philosophy, died on September 26, 2006, after a long and greatly enjoyed retirement, during which he continued to serve Lehigh, coordinating the Freshman Seminar program he had previously developed.

When Tom retired in 1983, his colleagues in the Philosophy Department presented him with a Lehigh chair. On the back of the chair was a small plaque reading "Thomas M. Haynes", his dates of service, and a short quotation from Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, describing the scholar: It read, "Gladly would he learn, and gladly teach." It's been said that all of Western philosophy is but a gloss on Plato. In that sense, whatever might be said of Tom is but a gloss on that quotation.

But much may be learned from such glosses, and so I shall attempt one. Tom came to Lehigh in 1945 from the University of Illinois, where he had done his doctoral work and had been awarded a postdoctoral fellowship. Shortly afterwards, he developed the course for which he was best known, "The Philosophy of Contemporary Civilization". Not a usual sort of philosophy course, but it echoed Tom's deep conviction that philosophy was important in order to understand the world we live in. That conviction also underlay Tom's refusal to be bound by the lines of narrow professional specialties. For a good part of the last century, philosophy was riven by the split between Anglo-American "Analytic" Philosophy and Continental Philosophy—the former apparently setting aside the traditional questions of the discipline in order to more finely tune its technical tools, the latter more centrally concerned with the traditional questions, but writing about them in ways that seemed "obscurantist" to the Anglo-Americans. Tom refused to be bound by that division; driven by the conviction that philosophy was important to living a good life, he tried to blend Anglo-American clarity with Continental concerns. He thought highly of the work of the English ethicist Richard Hare, and greatly enjoyed his visits to Lehigh, but also led the philosophy faculty seminar through the thickets of Michel Foucault's *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, and arranged for the appearance of Don Ihde, a prominent American phenomenologist, as the Visiting Philosopher that year.

Tom loved teaching—large classes or small—partly because of his deep convictions about the importance of philosophy in living a life. As his former colleague Norman Melchert remarked, "He greatly loved Plato, and one of his great joys was introducing first-time readers to the deep and dramatic thought of this fountainhead of western philosophy." A former student of Tom's, Evan Conyers, recalls an occurrence in a freshman ethics course, in which discussion was focused on the Socratic practice of persistent questioning. A student in the course felt that the device, while working well in a literary dialog, would scarcely hold up in a real-life situation. Tom patiently and respectfully questioned the student and gradually the student began to shift his position, until he was arguing the very opposite. As the bell rang for the end of the class, he walked confidently to the door, convinced that he had won the argument with the professor, but in the hall, suddenly realized what had happened. After a burst of profanity, he charged back in and said to Tom, "Do you realize what you just did?" Tom, fully appreciating the irony of the situation, with a gentle smile simply answered, "Yes."

Tom was also a thoroughly decent man. One should not take that as faint praise, for it encapsulates his very nature. Seldom angry, but sometimes indignant, never petty, always kind and helpful, especially to new members of the department. Another former colleague John Hare recalls when newly at Lehigh being uncertain about teaching philosophy to engineers, an audience he had never experienced. Tom reassured John that engineering students often did very well in philosophy because of their love of clarity and dislike of muddle. And so John found it. Tom well knew engineering students in that way, since he had developed the general Studies program of the College of Engineering and directed it for seventeen years. The two often had discussions on various philosophical topics, especially the Ontological Argument for the Existence of God, which Tom felt might be successful in some variant form, which he never quite found. In these conversations, John recalls, Tom often shared graham crackers from a stash kept in his desk. John added, "He was unfailingly kind and unpretentious; a philosopher who did not boast of specialized expertise, but who cared about the ancient philosophical questions of how we should live and what we could know, and had wisdom to share about them."

But Tom was not simply an ivory tower academic. Tom loved nature—passionate about the environment and the abuses rendered to it, and for some years was president of the local Audubon Society. He was an excellent photographer, especially of nature and still life, always offering praise and encouragement to younger photographers. He loved sailing, and the family had many happy times on the water in a variety of sailboats, most notably a 32-foot ketch Tosca. He loved to travel, especially to France, with his wife Jane, a Professor of French at Moravian College. All in all, he was greatly engaged with the world, and always had a sense of wonder towards its many features.

In sum I repeat—Thomas M. Haynes: "Gladly would he learn and gladly teach". And may that be said of all of us.

I request that a copy of this resolution be sent to his children, Christopher, Jonathan, and Carolyn.

Submitted to the Lehigh faculty for endorsement on Monday, February 12th, 2007, by Robert F. Barnes, Professor Emeritus of Philosophy.



January 22, 2007

To: University Faculty

From: R & P Subcommittee

Re: Removal of sections 4.1.7.1 and 4.1.7.2 from R & P

In 2002 – 2003, a committee chaired by Ken Sinclair reviewing aspects of student life, recommended that sections 4.1.7.1 and 4.1.7.2 be deleted from R & P, as these were perceived to be governed by NCAA regulations and are unnecessary, as well as out of date. The recommendation was made to President Farrington, however, no action had been taken.

The R & P subcommittee is recommending that the action of the original faculty committee be enacted and that these sections be deleted, and subsequent sections of R & P be renumbered. This recommendation was reconfirmed with Joe Sterrett in December, 2006, who agreed it should be enacted.

Attached first is the original memorandum of the 2002-2003 committee recommending removal of the sections. Following that memorandum is the material for this motion.

**Language used by Athletics Self-Study Interim Report Sub-Committee
Recommending Deletion of section 4.1.7.1 and 4.1.7.2 from R&P**

Specific recommendation:

"The section of the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty (R&P) devoted to athletics (4.1.7.1 and 4.1.7.2) is obsolete and the faculty should delete it from R&P through its normal procedures for amending R&P."

Rationale:

"The Governance Subcommittee carefully reviewed the contents of R&P 4.1.7.1 and 4.1.7.2. All of the items in this portion of R&P with one exception (mentioned below in recommendation III) are now covered by NCAA rules or are vacuous. For example, we no longer have junior varsity teams, but they are still included in R&P."

Response by President Farrington (recipient of report and recommendations):

"Recommendations II and III in the attached memo pertain to the *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty*. They are already in the hands of the R&P Committee, where I trust they will receive careful attention this fall."

Interpretation of current status of recommendation and process:

It seems that the final action steps to delete the above noted provision (or in the case of recommendation III, to make a modest revision or interpretation), are to be taken by the R&P Committee, and then perhaps, ultimately, by a vote of the faculty (the normal procedure for amending R&P).

Note:

Recommendation III from this group relates to the specific comment in R&P 4.1.7.1 stating "No student on scholastic probation may represent the university in any intercollegiate sport without special permission of the Committee on the Standing of Students." The group concluded that it could be and should be interpreted under Chapter 3 of R&P that while "such requirements were appropriately in the domain of the faculty, [they] should apply to all students irrespective of athletic status," and should not require a separate section in R&P.

This effectively eliminates the need for any section 4.1.7.1 or 4.1.7.2 in R&P.

Motion:

That subsections ~~4.1.7.1~~, 4.1.7.1 and 4.1.7.2 included below be removed from R & P.
That subsections ~~from 4.1.7.3 to 4.1.7.4~~ be renumbered as 4.1.7. ~~1.6.1.1~~

To be removed from R & P

4.1.7 Intercollegiate athletics

4.1.7.1 Eligibility regulations

The university is a member of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the Patriot League, the Eastern College Athletic Conference, (which includes the Eastern Intercollegiate Wrestling Association) and conforms to all the rules and regulations prescribed by these organizations, including the limitations of the number of contests scheduled in each sport.

The rules defining the eligibility of players in intercollegiate sports are formulated by the organizations mentioned above, subject to the approval of the president of the university.

The director of intercollegiate athletics, intramurals and recreation has the authority and responsibility to interpret and enforce these rules and regulations and to certify the eligibility to participate in any intercollegiate athletic competition.

A student to be eligible to represent the university in any intercollegiate athletics shall be an amateur in good standing. A player shall be a matriculated undergraduate student carrying a full roster of work at the time of participation.

No student may represent the university in any sport if after entering the university he or she has received or is receiving any pecuniary compensation from any source for participation in athletic games or contests.

No student holding a baccalaureate degree from any college other than Lehigh is eligible to represent the university in any intercollegiate sport.

No student on scholastic probation may represent the university in any intercollegiate sport without special permission of the committee on standing of students.

No student shall represent the university in any one varsity intercollegiate sport for more than four academic years. The academic years in which a student has represented any other college in a varsity intercollegiate sport shall be deducted from the four years of allotted participation in that sport at Lehigh.

The academic years in which a student has represented a junior college in extramural sports counts as intercollegiate participation, the first year counting as freshman competition, and any subsequent years counting as varsity competition, except when such competition is of a secondary school character.

Junior varsity competition is governed by all the rules of eligibility governing varsity competition.

No student who has matriculated at any other university or college or at any junior college of recognized standing may represent the university in any freshman intercollegiate sport.

The advance approval of the department of intercollegiate athletics, intramural and recreation is required for a student who represents, in any athletic contest open to the general public, any organization not under the supervision of the university, or who coaches any athletic team, or serves as an official at any athletic contest open to the general public. Failure to obtain this approval renders the student liable to the suspension of his or her athletic eligibility pending the committee's determination that the conduct has not in fact rendered the student permanently ineligible for intercollegiate competition. This rule is intended to apply with equal emphasis to students who, being on scholastic probation, are temporarily ineligible.

4.1.7.2 Schedules

No games are scheduled for the midyear examination period or for the spring examination period. The schedules in the respective sports are limited as follows with respect to games which involve absences from classes:

SPORT	VARSITY	FRESHMAN
Basketball	10	7
Baseball	15	9
Cross Country	4	2
Football	5	4
Golf	15	6
Lacrosse	8	4
Soccer	7	4
Swimming	7	4
Tennis	8	4
Track	6	3
Wrestling	7	5

Postponed games in all sports may be played on a date mutually agreed upon by the schools concerned.

Games may be played during the Christmas and spring vacation periods.

Junior varsity schedules are limited in number of games involving class absences to one-half of those authorized for the varsity in any sport.

Teams or individuals may be entered in championship meets in those cases where the university is a member of an association or conference, and then only when, in the judgment of the director of intercollegiate athletics, intramural and recreation, they are qualified to enter. These championship meets are not included in the above schedules.

Club sports are recognized formally by the dean of students and thereafter are under the administration and supervision of the department of intercollegiate athletics, intramural and recreation. Not more than five games or meets involving class absences will be scheduled in any one of these club sports.

All schedules of intercollegiate athletic contests are reported to the registrar at least one month prior to the first game scheduled in any academic year.

Faculty Motion on Academic Freedom

Lehigh University's mission of teaching, learning, research and scholarship for the common good depends on an atmosphere in which Faculty enjoy the fullest protection for freedom of inquiry, thought, expression, research, publication, and peaceable assembly. Academic Freedom is essential to the unfettered search for knowledge and its free expression. This spirit of free inquiry is personified by Socrates's example to follow the argument wherever it leads, and it applies to teaching as well as research and publication. Academic freedom includes a corollary concept of responsibility on the part of teacher-scholars to their profession, students, colleagues, institution, and community. In a democratic society, the University in particular plays a crucial role as the quintessential marketplace of ideas upholding the principle that free thought must prevail, not just "free thought for those who agree with us," as Justice Holmes wrote, but "freedom for the thought we hate." Democracy's future, as Justice Brennan observed, "depends upon leaders trained through the wide exposure to that robust exchange of ideas which discovers truth out of a multitude of tongues, [rather] than through any kind of authoritative selection." To these ends, Faculty must be free from the coercive fear that others, inside or outside the University, may threaten their professional endeavors through censorship, discipline, or any other form of punishment because their views may differ. Additionally, when speaking or writing as citizens in the public arena, Faculty are free, within their civil rights and liberties, from institutional censorship or discipline, although they should strive to avoid creating the impression that they speak for the University.

To: Voting Members of the Faculty
From: The Faculty Personnel Committee
Re: Modification of Section 2.2.9.9

Motion:

The Faculty Personnel Committee proposes that the last two paragraphs of section 2.2.6.9, College Tenure Review Committee, be added at the end of section 2.2.9.9, College Promotion Review Committee.

Rationale:

In reviewing these sections with the Tenure and Promotion Subcommittee and Faculty Personnel Committee chairs, they believed the intent of the Tenure and Promotion Review Subcommittee was to include these two paragraphs in section 2.2.9.9 and that the omission was inadvertent. These paragraphs were included in the previous version of R&P.

Adding these two paragraphs would make the language contained in the College Tenure Review and College Promotion Committees consistent.

The Faculty Personnel Committee endorses these changes.

2.2.6.9 College tenure committee review

The college tenure committee is responsible for recommending for or against promotion and/or tenure of any member of the college.

The college tenure committee is empowered to solicit from the candidate, the department, the chairperson, the dean, and the provost any materials it deems relevant. The committee's recommendation on the merits of each case is to be based solely on the criteria as stipulated in section 2.2.1.5, i.e., excellence in teaching, research and scholarship, and service to the university. The committee's recommendation, the departmental recommendation, and the tenure review file are forwarded to the dean.

The college committee is to make its own substantive and independent recommendation on whether or not a candidate merits tenure or promotion. At least five members of each committee must vote without abstention on any tenure or promotion case. No faculty member may vote more than once on any tenure case (i.e., if a faculty member votes as a department member, he/she shall not vote on any college or university committee reviewing the same case.) All votes, including abstentions, shall be recorded. The committee will write a letter that summarizes the vote and the majority recommendation.

When the college tenure committee agrees with the departmental recommendation, their recommendations together constitute a "faculty recommendation." If the committee's recommendation is contrary to that of the department, the chairperson must be notified in writing. The department may submit a rebuttal. The tenure committee must include this departmental rebuttal with its recommendation. In this instance, there is not a "faculty recommendation," as defined in section 2.2.2.1.

In the absence of a unanimous committee recommendation, the committee chair designates a member representing the minority opinion to write a letter to the dean expressing the reasons for the vote of the minority.

2.2.9.9 College promotion committee review

The college promotion committee is responsible for recommending for or against promotion of any member of the college. The college committee is to make its own substantive and independent recommendation on whether or not a candidate merits tenure or promotion. The college promotion committee is empowered to solicit from the candidate, the department, the chairperson, the dean, and the provost any materials it deems relevant. The committee's recommendation on the merits of each case is to be based solely on the criteria as stipulated in section 2.2.1.5 and as applied in the triennial evaluations of the candidate. The committee's recommendation, the departmental recommendation, and the promotion review file are forwarded to the dean.

At least 5 members of each committee must vote without abstention on any promotion case. No faculty member may vote more than once on any promotion case (*i.e.*, if a faculty member votes as a department member, he/she shall not vote on any college or university committee reviewing the same case). All votes, including abstentions, shall be recorded. The committee will write a letter that summarizes the vote and the majority recommendation.

When the college promotion committee agrees with the departmental recommendation, their recommendations together constitute a "faculty recommendation." If the committee's recommendation is contrary to that of the department, the chairperson must be notified in writing. The department may submit a rebuttal. The promotion committee must include this departmental rebuttal with its recommendation. In this instance, there is not a "faculty recommendation," as defined in section 2.2.2.1.

In the absence of a unanimous committee recommendation, the committee chair designates a member representing the minority opinion to write a letter to the dean expressing the reasons for the vote of the minority.

November 3, 2006

To: College Policy

From: Richard J. Kish, Chair Perella Department of Finance

Finance Proposal: Finance Course Numbering Change FIN 225 to FIN 125

Proposal:

- ◆ Change the course FIN 225 Introduction to Finance (3 credits) from a junior level course to FIN 125, a sophomore level course.
- ◆ Course would still have the same description and prerequisites (ECO 129, ECO 145, MATH 21 (or MATH 75/76), and ACCT 151).

Course Description: An introductory finance course stressing links between corporate finance and investments. Major topics will include: financial statement analysis, time value of money, risk and return valuation of stocks and bonds, capital budgeting, and cost of capital. Prerequisites: ECO 129, ECO 145, MATH 21 ACCT 151.

Rationale:

- 1) Internships. Obtaining high quality internships between the junior and senior years has become a necessary condition for landing the top entry level positions. The recruiting for these positions often begins in the fall of the junior year. Currently, our students interview with as little as a few weeks of FIN 225 in their background. This situation takes away the possible relative advantage that our students might have versus much of the competition. This proposal provides the student the opportunity to gain valuable finance background to be better prepared for obtaining an internship.
- 2) Placement. Similar rationale as (1). In addition, we must do all that we can to make sure that our students are very knowledgeable both in term of their academic studies, but also their career awareness. More time pursuing content within the finance major is better in both regards.
- 3) Bailout Options. Some students electing the finance major find out that through their coursework, information gathering, and internships that a career in finance is not the career path they chose to take upon graduation. Given the late start of our core finance courses (Fin 323 and Fin 328), such students have little choice but to "run out the string" which is not good for the students, the faculty, potential employers, or Lehigh's reputation.
- 4) Remediation. There are students that may need additional time to successfully complete the requirements for the finance major. This may be caused by the need to repeat a course or to sequence the finance core (FIN 323 and FIN 328) over two semesters versus the

recommended one semester option. By starting earlier, the student has greater flexibility in scheduling not only their finance coursework, but also their breadth track requirements.

- 5) Study Abroad. Students that opt for a one semester study abroad program face further compression under the existing junior level entry (FIN 225) and wind up taking all their finance major courses during their senior year.
- 6) Finance Electives. A sophomore offering provides an opportunity to reduce the compression for the finance major courses. Currently, the finance major courses are completed in the last three semesters. The early start offers the option to stretch things out one more semester, plus would span the summer following the sophomore year. This would provide students a means to fully digest the knowledge that they obtain in the classes instead of being forced to cram it all in over three semesters.
- 7) Senior Year Experience. An earlier offering of the introductory finance class provides an opportunity for a senior year experience where students that have completed their formal course studies have opportunities to engage in applied research. This has been an objective going back several years, plus it was "sold" as being one of the objectives of the FSL. Unfortunately, such activities are limited if students are still taking formal courses during the fall of the senior year.
- 8) Survey Results. A survey of recent graduates (93 finance graduates from the 2002 – 2006 graduating classes), alumni (109 alumni within our data base with titles of MD, VP, President, or CEO) and current senior finance majors (approximately 100) were contacted through emails to fill out a survey on "Survey Monkey." The 132 responses (close to a 45% response rate) support the placement of Introduction to Finance in the second semester of the sophomore year. See Appendix I for a summary of the results. Anecdotal comments from students over the years also show a desire for taking FIN 225 as a sophomore.
- 9) Competition. The number 1 undergraduate business program as rated by Business Week, University of Pennsylvania, which is a main competitor for students and for placement of our graduates, has their introductory finance class in the sophomore year. They also offer the class in small sections. A copy of the article which can be found at <http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/> (under search type in undergraduate business and click on "The Best Undergraduate B-Schools" May 8, 2006.)
- 10) Sequencing. Appendix II offers a suggested sequence of courses and requirements for taking Fin 125 (Introduction to Finance) during 2nd semester sophomore year which minimizes the impact on the current curriculum. Although the option exists for students taking a majority of their business core classes during this period, the sophomore year does not have to be overloaded with business courses. The attached appendix shows reasonable options for spreading out these core business classes. Further, the members of the Perella Department of Finance believe that students will self-select the core courses that are pertinent to their intended majors. It is quite unlikely that a majority of students will overload their sophomore year with core business classes with the potential negative impact on their GPA. For those students tempted to overload on core business classes during this sophomore year, we have set in place an excellent advising process through the UG dean's office that should minimize any potential problems.

Resource Requirements: Some issues remain unresolved and are under discussion at various levels. During the initial switch, there are sure to be unbalanced sections between semesters for the business core courses. No additional computer or library resources are required.

**Appendix I: Survey Monkey Responses
 Fin 225 versus Fin 125
 Fall 2006**

The preferred placement for an introductory course in finance should be:

1	Sophomore Year	120
2	Junior Year	11
0	No response	1

If the introductory course in finance is taken in the sophomore year rate the importance of the following factors.

Overall, taking the introductory course in the sophomore year would be beneficial.

1	agree strongly	99
2	agree somewhat	21
3	neutral	0
	disagree	
4	somewhat	3
5	disagree strongly	1
6	no response	9

Taking the introductory course in the sophomore year would help to secure an internship between the sophomore and junior years.

1	agree strongly	33
2	agree somewhat	43
3	neutral	0
	disagree	
4	somewhat	10
5	disagree strongly	0
6	no response	47

Taking the introductory course in the sophomore year would add flexibility to the finance major requirements to allow for study abroad.

1	agree strongly	65
2	agree somewhat	45
3	neutral	0
	disagree	
4	somewhat	2
5	disagree strongly	0
6	no response	21

Taking the introductory course in the sophomore year add the option of starting the finance major requirements sooner

1	agree strongly	91
2	agree somewhat	27
3	neutral	0
	disagree	
4	somewhat	4
5	disagree strongly	0
6	no response	11

Taking the introductory course in the sophomore year would help make the finance major a stronger job candidate,

1	agree strongly	55
2	agree somewhat	37
3	neutral	0
	disagree	
4	somewhat	6
5	disagree strongly	2
6	no response	33

If the introductory course in finance is taken in the sophomore year, the finance major course work could start during the first semester of the junior year. Rate the importance of the following factors.

Overall, starting the finance major course work during the first semester of the junior year would be beneficial.

1	agree strongly	66
2	agree somewhat	19
3	neutral	14
	disagree	
4	somewhat	13
5	disagree strongly	9
6	no response	12

Starting the finance major course work during the first semester of the junior year would help secure an internship between the junior and senior years

1	agree strongly	56
2	agree somewhat	32
3	neutral	20
	disagree	
4	somewhat	11
5	disagree strongly	3
6	no response	11

Starting the finance major course work during the first semester of the junior year would help the student gain experience in an internship and thus be better prepared for job interviews during the senior year.

1	agree strongly	60
2	agree somewhat	31
3	neutral	15
	disagree	
4	somewhat	11
5	disagree strongly	5
6	no response	11

Securing a quality internship during the junior and senior years are critical for obtaining a job.

1	agree strongly	77
2	agree somewhat	30
3	neutral	9
	disagree	
4	somewhat	4
5	disagree strongly	2
6	no response	11

Comments: Please add any comments (for or against) concerning the placement of the introductory finance class in the sophomore year.

Will attract some who normally gravitate to an accounting major

An introductory course should be more applied than theoretical

No brainer - it allows the student to take more electives in the senior year etc..

I consider one of Lehigh's strength its orientation teaching material that the graduate can use in his work-life. If one has chosen a vocation in finance delaying the study denies an advantage.

The biggest problem is people not wanting to put the effort required to get a finance degree at this school. Finance is a difficult major and the classes should be rigorous as well.

Many have to wait until junior year to choose a major because they have not experienced an intro finance course. This result in several negative issues.

I believe the earlier students begin learning finance the better off they will be down the line in school, career, etc..

Starting the intro finance course in the sophomore year allows the student more opportunity to take in depth finance/accounting classes in the junior and senior years

I took the introductory finance course during my sophomore year and I believe it helped me immensely. I strongly recommend it.

This would allow students to take corporate and investments in 2 different semesters, making the workload much more manageable and perhaps improving the grades of the students in those courses.

I think it is a good idea

The earlier, the better.

I strongly regret not starting my finance curriculum sooner.

Finance students need to be more prepared (i.e : need more knowledge of the finance world) following sophomore year.

The earlier the student gets introduced to basic finance the more prepared they will be going forward and it will allow them more flexibility to specialize later on.

It would only add options for students regarding international study experiences, multiple majors and advanced course work senior year all of which make a more attractive job candidate.

The sooner that a student can begin studying finance the better. Also it is not critical to have an internship, but, it cannot hurt.

This should be taken as early as possible. It is a good gauge that can help unsure students begin to form their opinion about the majors offered.

By exposing a student to his/her major in the earlier years they can ultimately gain more internships (summer of sophomore and junior year) and allow them to organize any dual majors or minor easily.

Professor Kish: I took Mkt 111 (before it became 211) as a Freshman. Allowing me to take Fin 225 (still 225 I think) as a Soph. was a great advantage. Able to study abroad and could've easily double

Taking the intro to finance sophomore year allows more schedule flexibility and the opportunity to switch majors if a student realizes, after taking the class that they aren't interested in finance.

An introductory course is just that; introductory. It is beneficial to allow all students in the business college to get some insight into the area before they declare a major.

The introductory course would only work if done during sophomore year

pro: would allow more time to complete requirements, con: pushing the course to sophomore year would just speed up prerequisite completion process (take crunch out of one end and put it in the beginning)

I wish I took Fin225 sophomore year so that I would have declared my Finance major earlier on and therefore got an earlier start on career research.

Completing the core courses earlier will allow the students more opportunity to take financial mathematics and accounting courses that will be beneficial in their careers

Just a quick point, have one of the courses go into m & a arbitrage and or credit default swaps.

I say this because working for Bloomberg I see which articles get viewed the most. Maybe intro them in

None

This is a necessary change!! I had the ability to move the class to the spring of my sophomore year and it gave me an advantage over people who hadn't. This was true for both internship interviews and, I would also suggest considering the introductory finance course as an option for 2nd semester freshman year

Isn't it more important to offer this course earlier so students can decide if they prefer finance to say accounting? This seems to be the major reason to allow for it earlier.

I think it would help for students to be better committed to their major

I took it my sophomore year (bc I took money and banking early) and it helped me with everything.

I think it's extremely important to get a background earlier so that Finance majors know the important banks and job opportunities and when they should apply for these jobs.

No brainer here, just combine stats & micro into one class. I would even suggest combining financial & managerial accounting into one class for finance majors. This leaves senior year for specifics.

Not being able to take these finance classes until junior year allows for a more diverse schedule in the first two years which helps to establish a well rounded individual.

Accounting 2nd semester fresh year, to fit in the finance, good move.

Intro to finance spring soph year is a very good idea, especially to be competitive for an internship jr year

I would have preferred to have taken the introductory course as a sophomore although no real harm would be caused if it was left in the junior curriculum.

I was lucky to have taken them in sophomore year because of AP credits, and feel better prepared as a younger student in the major classes.

I was more mature and hard working from an academic standpoint junior year but I would have had more options if I had taken fin 225 sophomore year

A general overview of finance and wall street jobs and what they entail would be very helpful for students to gain deeper insight.

I believe the earlier the student is exposed to the vocabulary and concepts of finance during college, the greater the opportunity for mastering the vocabulary and concepts.

I think it's a good idea. It will strengthen their familiarity and knowledge of the subject and will place them better for internship and job interviews.

Recognizing that the best internships for the summer after junior in college are obtained by the end of first semester junior year - the introductory finance course should be in the sophomore year.

The earlier the better.

I would strongly encourage Finance majors to take Fin 225 during sophomore year or the summer.

I think it is better to take Intro Finance right before Investments and Corporate so it's still fresh in your memory, but people should have the option of taking it early.

In order to secure and be successful in an internship after junior year, I believe that it is imperative that some higher level finance courses are taken. The sooner the better to shine in interviews.

I think that homework assignments in the class should be stressed. It will help the students stay up to date on the material

Completely for the finance major to begin sophomore year. You get an introduction to accounting sophomore year, why should you not get an introduction to finance as well?

I think it would help the student immensely, and also help them decide if Finance is right for them. If not, majors can be changed more easily earlier in the college years.

The sooner the course is taken the more quickly one can decide the path that needs to be taken to get where they want to be

Appendix II

Suggested sequence of courses and requirements for taking Fin 125 (Introduction to Finance) during 2nd semester sophomore year

(Total number of credits required to complete degree is 124)

Freshman		
<i>Fall</i>	Engl 1	Composition and Literature I (3)
	Math 21	Calculus I (4) ¹
	Bus 1	Introduction to Business (3) Humanities Elective (3 or 4) Social Sciences Elective (3 or 4)
<i>Spring</i>	Engl 2	Composition and Literature II (3)
	Math 22	Calculus II (4) ²
	Eco 1	Principles of Economics (4) Humanities Elective (3 or 4) Social Sciences Elective (3 or 4)
Sophomore		
<i>Fall</i>	Acct 151	Introduction to Financial Accounting (3)
	Eco 145	Statistical Methods (3)
	Eco 129	Money, Banking and Financial Markets (4) Sciences Elective (3 or 4) Elective
<i>Fall or Spring</i>	BIS 111	Management Information Systems (3) ³
<i>Spring</i>	Fin 125	Introduction to Finance (3) ³
	Eco 146	Applied Microeconomic Analysis (3) ³ Elective
<i>Sophomore-Spring or Junior-year³</i>	Acct 152	Introduction to Managerial Accounting (3) ³
	Mkt 111	Principles of Marketing (3) ³
	Mgt 186	Supply Chain Operations Management (3) ³
Junior		
<i>Fall</i>	Fin 323	Investments (3) ⁴
	Fin 328	Corporate Financial Policy (3) ⁴
	Law 201	Legal Environment of Business (3) ³ CBE Core (3) CBE Core (3) Non-CBE Elective (3)
<i>Spring</i>	Mgt 243	Management of Organizations (3) ³
	Fin 3XX	Finance Major Elective (3) ⁶ Breadth Track Elective (3) ⁵ CBE Core (3) Non-CBE Elective (3)

Senior*Fall*

Mgt 301 Business Management Policies (3)
Fin 3XX Finance Major Elective (3)⁶
Breadth Track Elective (3)⁵
Non-CBE Elective (3)
Elective (3)

Spring

Non-CBE Elective (3)
Non-CBE Elective (3)
Non-CBE Elective (3)
Elective (3)
Elective (3)

¹Math 31 Honors Calculus I (4); Math 51 Survey of Calculus I (4); and the combination of Math 75 Calculus I, Part A (2) and Math 76 Calculus I, Part B (2) will also satisfy the mathematics requirement.

²Although not required, a second course in calculus is recommended. A second math course would count as a non-CBE elective.

³Sequencing of the business core courses should be major dependent. For instance, for Finance Majors Acct 151, Eco 145, Eco 129, Eco 146, and Fin 125 should be taken in the Sophomore year. The remaining business core course (BIS 111, Acct 152, Mkt 111, Mgt 186, Law 201, and Mgt 243) can be spread out over the second semester sophomore year and the junior year.

⁴Prerequisites for both Fin 323 (Investments) and Fin 328 (Corporate Financial Policy) include Fin 125 and Eco 146. Both courses should be taken simultaneously.

⁵All finance majors must satisfy a 2-course Breadth Track from one of the following 4 areas: Financial Analysis (Acct 315, Acct 316, Acct 398); Financial Engineering (Eco 357, Eco 358, Eco 395); Financial Marketing (Mkt 319, Mkt 320, Mkt 325); or Financial Mathematics (Math 205, Math 231, Math 242, Math 309, Math 334, Math 338, Math 467). Note that a proposal has been made to modify the tracks.

⁶Courses that satisfy the current finance major depth area include: Fin 324 Security Analysis & Portfolio Mgt, Fin 330 Financial Mkts & Inst, Fin 333 Global Finance, Fin 334 Derivatives & Mgt of Risk, Fin 335 Adv Topics of Financial Mgt, and Fin 336 Real Estate Finance. The prerequisites for all courses within the finance major depth area include both finance core courses: Fin 323 and Fin 328.

R1-November 12, 2006

DEPARTMENT OF MARKETING Curriculum Revision

Marketing Course Numbering Change from MKT 211 to MKT 111

Proposal: To change the course MKT 211 (Principles of Marketing) (3 credits) from a junior level course to MKT 111, a sophomore level eligible course. The course title, description, and prerequisites remain the same.

Course Description: An overview of the entire marketing function. Topics include: the meaning and terminology of marketing, activities involved in marketing, the role of marketing in society, marketing strategies, how managers make and implement decisions in marketing, and how they evaluate the results. Prerequisite: ECO 001.

Rationale (This rationale is being adapted from that for FIN 225/125 with minor modifications, as the logic is the same; their intellectual property is gratefully acknowledged):

- 1) Internships. This is among the most important reasons from the students' perspective. Obtaining high quality internships between the junior and senior years has become a necessary condition for landing top entry level positions. For this reason, internships have long been part of the marketing curriculum at Lehigh. For these positions, the recruiting starts in late fall in junior year just when our students are starting the marketing core. This situation takes away the possible relative advantage that our students might have versus much of the competition. The proposal provides the student the opportunity to gain marketing experience to prepare them for an internship.
- 2) Placement. Same rationale as (1). In addition, we must do all that we can to make sure that our students are very knowledgeable both in term of their academic studies, but also their career awareness. This is especially applicable for the marketing major where the breadth of career options is such that both good advising and experiential learning is required. Of all the business majors, marketing is among the most experientially based discipline. Our conversations with recruiters also confirm this logic (please see exhibit 2) More time pursuing content within the marketing major is better in both regards. In addition, students will be able to more effectively participate in meetings and field trips by Marketing Club.
- 3) Bailout options. Some students electing the marketing major find out that through their coursework, information gathering, and internships that a career in marketing is not the career path to take upon graduation. Given the current late start for MKT 211 and the resultant lateness of other core courses (MKT 311, 312), such students have little choice but to continue with the major which is not good for the students, the faculty, potential employers, or Lehigh's reputation.
- 4) Remediation. The proposal will help students requiring additional time to successfully complete the major requirements by spreading their marketing major coursework over a longer period of time. By starting earlier, they can have more flexibility in completing their coursework and benefit from better planning based on their career track preferences.

- 5) Study Abroad. Students that opt for a one semester study abroad program face further compression and wind up taking all their major courses during their senior year frequently undermining the planned sequence of courses optimizing knowledge acquisition in the major. Similarly, the proposal will offer more opportunities for participating in other study abroad programs such as summer programs. Given Lehigh's and other top institutions' increasing emphasis on globalization, such opportunities for enhancing student's global perspectives will be valuable for their learning.
- 6) Reduce compression for the marketing major courses: Currently, the marketing major courses are completed in the last three semesters. The early start will stretch things out one more semester, plus would span the summer following the sophomore year enabling a discipline-based internship between the sophomore and junior years. This will also give more time to digest knowledge from the major instead of allowing only a compressed period for learning which is not beneficial from a pedagogical perspective.
- 7) Flexibility to pursue a more rigorous senior year opportunities: Provide an opportunity for a more flexible senior year experience where students who have completed their formal course studies have opportunities to engage in undergraduate research, focused independent studies, and so on. The University has increasingly advocated and embraced a philosophy of encouraging undergraduate students to participate more fully in the research activities of the University. Unfortunately, such activities are limited if students are still taking multiple required courses during the fall and spring semesters of the senior year. The increased flexibility will offer more opportunities for the department to think about future enhancements to the curriculum.
- 8) Sequencing. As Principles of Marketing has only ECO 1 as a prerequisite, giving the students the option to take Principles of Marketing either in their sophomore year or in their junior year will not produce any scheduling challenges especially because ECO 1 is typically taken in their freshman year. We endorse the sequencing plan presented by the Finance Department. We also believe that the fear of overloading by students is not justified for the following reasons: (1) The sequencing of business core courses should be dependent on their major. For example, marketing majors can take MKT 211 in the spring semester of their sophomore year while other majors can take the course in their junior year. (2) Students will self select their course work depending on the major and therefore, overloading core courses in the sophomore year will not occur; (3) For those that are tempted to overload on core business courses during their sophomore year with an adverse impact on their performance, the advising process in the Undergraduate office should be able to counsel students appropriately. (4) we will have a meeting for all (potential) marketing majors at the beginning of the fall and spring semesters (to which the UG Associate Dean will be invited) advising them of their overall course planning.
- 9) Student feedback. The student feedback on the proposal is very favorable and consistent with the feedback obtained by the Department of Finance. Key findings: (1) 83% of those surveyed are in favor of the proposal (2) 80% of the students prefer the placement of MKT 211 in their sophomore year. (3) 65% view the opportunity to obtain internships between the sophomore and junior year as desirable. (4) 82% support the flexibility offered to get into study abroad and other ILE programs. (5) 90% view the early start as preparing them better in their knowledge acquisition and career preparation. Selected student quotes are presented in Exhibit 1.
- 10) Recruiter feedback. Several recruiters were contacted to offer their feedback on the proposal. They were all overwhelmingly favorable to the proposal. Some recruiter comments are enclosed in Exhibit 2.

Resource Implications

Some issues remain unresolved and are under discussion at various levels; some change in the relative distribution of number of sections of MKT 211 in fall and spring semesters will be addressed

Time Plan of Implementation

Fall 2007

EXHIBIT 1

SELECTED STUDENT QUOTES ON MKT 211/111 PROPOSAL

I think the marketing major is too limited right now. If students want the option to take marketing their sophomore year, they should have it.

I think sophomores should be allowed to take marketing because it will expose them to it and allow them to decide if they want to pursue it as a major or not.

I like the option of taking it either sophomore or junior year. This way marketing majors can get what they need out of it and other business majors can take it with whatever balances their schedule best.

This move is absolutely critical, especially for students who don't know what major to decide. I feel that the content is something that a sophomore can handle perfectly.

People should be able to do what they feel is acceptable and manageable class schedule.

I think that allowing a business student to take accounting sophomore year, and not marketing, influences their major decision. Why would a student choose to major in marketing at the end of sophomore year when they haven't taken a class in it?

Declaring a marketing major without ever taking a marketing class while numerous economics and accounting classes seems like it isn't weighted as being as important.

Advantages: Students can better prepare their curriculum for future semesters if the MKI courses are more spread out. Students are given more time and better opportunity to achieve minors if they have more openings to put electives in their schedule later on. Those who go abroad don't need to take summer classes or three marketing classes in one semester.

Students take all other "intro to major" classes in sophomore year, so why not marketing? Students don't need so much accounting/economics as sophomores and marketing would help in other classes.

Why didn't this happen when I was a freshman?

This will help with study abroad as well. I think it is a great idea to have every intro class to the different majors sophomore year so students can have a better understanding when declaring a major.

I think that all introductory level business classes (MKT211, FIN225, ACCT152) should be given sophomore year so that student can accurately choose a major and have time to pursue and/or change it.

EXHIBIT 2

SELECTED RECRUITER QUOTES ON MKT 211/MKT 111 PROPOSAL

I think that it is a great idea, getting students in the business school to take other business classes, whether or not they have declared their majors, is better for the students to help them understand which topics they like and are good at. Often times, students declare in their junior year and then change and have to take several "major" classes late junior year and into their senior semesters. I know that having a basis of curriculum taken by the time the students interview for jobs (usually the first semester of senior year) help better them prepare for some potential interviews.

I would allow the students to take the class sophomore year. It would give them the opportunity to understand the different functions of marketing and help them select electives.

My opinion would be to expose undergraduates to the core courses sooner, rather than later. I can understand if some of the core courses have prerequisites, but from my recollection of Marketing, it did not

I believe this change, will expose business majors to one of the most versatile, and important courses in the curriculum.

I would give my stamp of approval to the changes you propose.

I am in complete agreement with the idea of letting a student take an introductory course similar to MKT 211 in the spring of their sophomore year. That timing allows two full years of directed course work and the potential of two summers in major appropriate internships. Clearly the student's major, course work and internships (or summer jobs) are the most valuable aspects of their first resume. Those are the topics I always scan first.

I think this is good idea. Not only to expose students sooner to this area of business but form them to understand the principles, marketing isn't just in big NYC firms anymore either! For example at our company we are now even more so acknowledging the importance that every business person should have marketing experiences or understand the importance of marketing... We especially look for some marketing experience in some of internships as well.

I totally agree with the thought process that the students should be exposed to this course earlier than their junior year. Or at least have the option to take it earlier.

Proposed New Courses for Integrated Business and Engineering Honors Program

Summary

We propose to make permanent the courses developed specifically for the Integrated Business and Engineering Honors program. All courses have been offered at least 4 times, thus this proposal is long overdue.

1. Proposed new course number and course description (as it will appear in course catalogue):

IBE 010 Integrated Business and Engineering Freshman Seminar (1) fall

Introduction to business and engineering professions through seminars by faculty, business and industry leaders. Diversity of business and engineering career opportunities and curricular choices, leadership, team building and career planning. Open only to first-year students in the Integrated Business and Engineering Honors Program.

2. Instructional mode (lecture, recitation, laboratory seminar independent study, or other) and number of contact hours per week:

Seminar, 75 Minutes per week

3. Rationale for proposed new course:

Since IBE students need to choose a major from either the CBE or the RCEAS by the end of the freshman year, they need to be exposed to the various disciplines as potential majors and careers. IBE students are encouraged to become campus leaders either in their living group, their sports team, a club or some other campus group. The leadership seminar helps students understand the very different ways people can be "leaders" in an organization. Since much of the integrated course work within the IBE Honors Program involves students working in teams, the team building seminar is good preparation for understanding how teams need to function if a project is to be completed.

- 4 Academic impact on programs affected by new course:

A. Is the proposed course to be cross-listed?

NO.

B. Identify any known effects of the proposed new program on other programs at the University.

None since course is limited to IBE students only.

C. If there are known effects, individuals in charge of the affected programs must be consulted about the proposed new program and the following information provided:

NA

(1) Who was consulted?

NA

(2) Is the proposed new program acceptable to all other programs affected?

NA

(3) Will any changes be required in the affected programs? If so, please describe below:

NA

D. Does the proposed new program affect the University's commitment to diversity in any way? If so please describe below:

5. Resource Impact

A. Provide impact statements in the four areas listed below:

(1) Library impact statement

NONE

(2) Computer impact statement

NONE

(3) Faculty impact statement

The course has been offered seven times and has been taught by the IBE Honors Program's Co-Directors as part of their regular duties. No additional faculty resources are required.

(4) Facilities impact statement

NONE.

B. Provide a statement indicating who will assume financial responsibility for any new resources required:

If any new resources are required, the IBE Program will assume responsibility.

1. Proposed new course number and course description (as it will appear in course catalogue):

IBE 050 Integrated Business and Engineering Freshman Workshop (3) spring
Introduction to business and engineering activities with a focus on innovation, design and the business value chain. Project based product development activities focusing on competitive strategy, marketing mix, financial modeling, distribution channels, technical specifications, testing and measurement. Open only to students in the Integrated Business and Engineering Honors Program.

2. Instructional mode (lecture, recitation, laboratory, seminar independent study, or other) and number of contact hours per week:

One 50 minute lecture, one 50 minute group meeting with faculty advisor, one 3 hour Lab.

3. Rationale for proposed new course

This is a project course taught using a hands-on approach and attempts to integrate business with engineering by focusing on the product development process. It lays the groundwork for the next three years of the IBE Honors Program. Students improve their written, oral and graphical communication skills and become better decision makers when facing unstructured, uncertain and ill-defined problems.

4. Academic impact on programs affected by new course:

A. Is the proposed course to be cross-listed?

NO.

B. Identify any known effects of the proposed new program on other programs at the University.

None since course is limited to IBE students only.

C. If there are known effects, individuals in charge of the affected programs must be consulted about the proposed new program and the following information provided:

NA

(1) Who was consulted?

NA

(2) Is the proposed new program acceptable to all other programs affected?

NA

(3) Will any changes be required in the affected programs? If so, please describe below:

NA

D. Does the proposed new program affect the University's commitment to diversity in any way? If so, please describe below:

5. Resource Impact

A. Provide impact statements in the four areas listed below:

(1) Library impact statement

NONE

(2) Computer impact statement

NONE

(3) Faculty impact statement

The course has been offered six times and has been co-taught by a faculty member from Economics and a faculty member from Mechanical Engineering. Funds were provided by the IBE Honors Program budget. No additional resources beyond the IBE budget are required.

(4) Facilities impact statement

The Wilbur Power house will continue to be used by participants in the course. The IBE program continues as a supporting member of Wilbur along with IPD, Entrepreneurship, and Design Arts.

B. Provide a statement indicating who will assume financial responsibility for any new resources required:

If any new resources are required, the IBE Program will assume responsibility.

1. Proposed new course number and course description (as it will appear in course catalogue):

IBE 150 Integrated Business and Engineering Sophomore Laboratory (1) fall
Cases integrating elements of business and engineering. Introductions to cost benefit analysis, modeling and optimization, team dynamics, and international negotiation and joint ventures. Oral presentations and written reports. Open only to students in the Integrated Business and Engineering Honors Program.

2. Instructional mode (lecture, recitation, laboratory seminar, independent study or other) and number of contact hours per week:

One 3 hour Lab.

3. Rationale for proposed new course

This a "case" course taught using a hands-on approach that attempts to integrate elements of business and engineering. The original designers of the IBE Honors Program envisioned a required one-credit course during the sophomore year that would help students see how topics in engineering have a business component and vice versa. The designers also felt that it was important that each IBE cohort group share a one-credit course in the sophomore to maintain group cohesion.

4. Academic impact on programs affected by new course:

A. Is the proposed course to be cross-listed?

NO.

B. Identify any known effects of the proposed new program on other programs at the University.

None since course is limited to IBE students only.

C. If there are known effects, individuals in charge of the affected programs must be consulted about the proposed new program and the following information provided:

NA

(1) Who was consulted?

NA

(2) Is the proposed new program acceptable to all other programs affected?

NA

(3) Will any changes be required in the affected programs? If so please describe below:

NA

D. Does the proposed new program affect the University's commitment to diversity in any way? If so, please describe below:

5. Resource Impact

A. Provide impact statements in the four areas listed below:

(1) Library impact statement

NONE

(2) Computer impact statement

NONE

(3) Faculty impact statement

The course has been offered six times by four full-time faculty members. Funds were provided by the IBE Honors Program budget. No additional resources beyond the IBE budget are required.

(4) Facilities impact statement

NONE.

B. Provide a statement indicating who will assume financial responsibility for any new resources required:

If any new resources are required, the IBE Program will assume responsibility.

1. Proposed new course number and course description (as it will appear in course catalogue):

IBE 250 Integrated Business and Engineering Junior Laboratory (1) fall
Interdisciplinary teams of IBE students compete against each other in a business simulation game. Market analysis, working capital management, capital budgeting, raising long-term capital, plant location, and inventory control. Oral presentations and written reports. Open only to students in the Integrated Business and Engineering Honors Program.

2. Instructional mode (lecture, recitation, laboratory, seminar, independent study, or other) and number of contact hours per week:

One 3 hour Lab.

3. Rationale for proposed new course

This a "simulation" course taught using a hands-on approach that attempts to integrate elements of business and engineering. The original designers of the IBE Honors Program envisioned a required one-credit course during the junior year that would help students see how decisions traditionally made in engineering have a business component and vice versa. The designers also felt that it was important that each IBE cohort group share a one-credit course in the junior year to maintain group cohesion.

4. Academic impact on programs affected by new course:

A. Is the proposed course to be cross-listed?

NO.

B. Identify any known effects of the proposed new program on other programs at the University.

None since course is limited to IBE students only.

C. If there are known effects, individuals in charge of the affected programs must be consulted about the proposed new program and the following information provided:

NA

(1) Who was consulted?

NA

(2) Is the proposed new program acceptable to all other programs affected?

NA

(3) Will any changes be required in the affected programs? If so please describe below:

NA

D. Does the proposed new program affect the University's commitment to diversity in any way? If so, please describe below:

5. Resource Impact

A. Provide impact statements in the four areas listed below:

(1) Library impact statement

NONE

(2) Computer impact statement

NONE

(3) Faculty impact statement

The course has been offered five times by a full-time faculty member (from the RCEAS) with one TA. Funds are provided by the IBE Honors Program budget. No additional resources beyond the IBE budget are required.

(4) Facilities impact statement

NONE.

B. Provide a statement indicating who will assume financial responsibility for any new resources required:

If any new resources are required, the IBE Program will assume responsibility.

1. Proposed new course number and course description (as it will appear in course catalogue):

IBE 380 Integrated Business and Engineering Capstone Project I (3) spring
The first of a two course capstone design sequence. Cross-disciplinary teams of 5 to 6 IBE students work with faculty mentors and corporate sponsors on the marketing, financial and economic planning, and technical and economic feasibility of actual new products. Written reports and oral presentations to sponsors and invited venture capitalists are required. Open only to students in the Integrated Business and Engineering Honors Program.

2. Instructional mode (lecture, recitation, laboratory seminar, independent study, or other) and number of contact hours per week:

Project based course with two 50 minute seminars, weekly group meetings with faculty advisor, and weekly group meetings with corporate sponsor.

3. Rationale for proposed new course

This is an inquiry-based course taught using a hands-on approach that attempts to integrate elements of business and engineering. The course also provides student with direct exposure to innovation and the entrepreneurial process by working closely with small start-up firms. The original designers of the IBE Honors Program envisioned a required two-semester six-credit course during the junior and senior year that would help students understand that engineering and business decisions are often interrelated and must be made simultaneously. The designers also felt that it was important that each IBE cohort group share a two-semester integrated capstone experience.

4. Academic impact on programs affected by new course:

A. Is the proposed course to be cross-listed?

NO.

B. Identify any known effects of the proposed new program on other programs at the University.

None since course is limited to IBE students only.

C. If there are known effects, individuals in charge of the affected programs must be consulted about the proposed new program and the following information provided:

NA

(1) Who was consulted?

NA

(2) Is the proposed new program acceptable to all other programs affected?

NA

(3) Will any changes be required in the affected programs? If so please describe below:

NA

D. Does the proposed new program affect the University's commitment to diversity in any way? If so, please describe below:

5. Resource Impact

A. Provide impact statements in the four areas listed below:

(1) Library impact statement

NONE

(2) Computer impact statement

NONE

(3) Faculty impact statement

This course has been offered four times. It is now being taught by an IBE Professor of Practice with two TA's. Funds are provided by the IBE Honors Program budget. No additional resources beyond the IBE budget are required.

(4) Facilities impact statement

The Wilbur Power house will continue to be used by participants in the course. The IBE program continues as a supporting member of Wilbur along with IPD, Entrepreneurship, and Design Arts.

B. Provide a statement indicating who will assume financial responsibility for any new resources required:

If any new resources are required, the IBE Program will assume responsibility.

1. Proposed new course number and course description (as it will appear in course catalogue):

IBE 385 Integrated Business and Engineering Capstone Project II (3) fall

Students continue to work with the detailed design including the fabrication and testing of working prototypes of their new products designed in IBE Capstone Project I course. Detailed financial and marketing plans are required. Written reports and oral presentations to sponsors and invited venture capitalists are required. Open only to students in the Integrated Business and Engineering Honors Program.

2. Instructional mode (lecture, recitation, laboratory seminar independent study or other) and number of contact hours per week:

Project based course with two 50 minute seminars, weekly group meetings with faculty advisor, and weekly group meetings with industry sponsor.

3. Rationale for proposed new course

This is an inquiry-based course taught using a hands-on approach that attempts to integrate elements of business and engineering. The course also provides student with direct exposure to innovation and the entrepreneurial process by working closely with small start-up firms. The original designers of the IBE Honors Program envisioned a required two-semester six-credit course during the junior and senior year that would help students understand that engineering and business decisions are often interrelated and must be made simultaneously. The designers also felt that it was important that each IBE cohort group share a two-semester integrated capstone experience.

4. Academic impact on programs affected by new course:

A. Is the proposed course to be cross-listed?

NO.

B. Identify any known effects of the proposed new program on other programs at the University.

None since course is limited to IBE students only.

C. If there are known effects, individuals in charge of the affected programs must be consulted about the proposed new program and the following information provided:

NA

(1) Who was consulted?

NA

(2) Is the proposed new program acceptable to all other programs affected?

NA

(3) Will any changes be required in the affected programs? If so, please describe below:

NA

D. Does the proposed new program affect the University's commitment to diversity in any way? If so, please describe below:

5. Resource Impact

A. Provide impact statements in the four areas listed below:

(1) Library impact statement

NONE

(2) Computer impact statement

NONE

(3) Faculty impact statement

This course has been offered four times. It is now being taught by an IBE Professor of Practice with two TA's. Funds are provided by the IBE Honors Program budget. No additional resources beyond the IBE budget are required.

(4) Facilities impact statement

The Wilbur Power house will continue to be used by participants in the course. The IBE program continues as a supporting member of Wilbur along with IPD, Entrepreneurship, and Design Arts.

B Provide a statement indicating who will assume financial responsibility for any new resources required:

If any new resources are required, the IBE Program will assume responsibility.

The Wilbur Power house will continue to be used by participants in the course. The IBE program continues as a supporting member of Wilbur along with IPD, Entrepreneurship, and Design Arts.

Proposed Revisions to the Undergraduate Supply Chain Management Major Curriculum

Proposed Change #1: Replace the required option for supply chain majors of selecting MKT 348 (Marketing Channels) or MKT 321 (Business-to-Business Marketing) with SCM 340 (Demand and Supply Chain Planning).

Rationale: The new course reflects the importance of the value chain by introducing ways to specifically integrate supply with customer demand. This reflects the current evolution of supply chain management theory and practice and most closely reflects the competitive advantage of our program which is closely linked to an emphasis on value chain through research and practice in the Center for Value Chain Research. Industry feedback on this proposed change has been very positive.

Resource Requirements: The management department faculty member who previously taught MKT 348 will be teaching SCM 340 (Demand and Supply Chain Planning).

Proposed Change #2: No longer require IE 168 as a required course for supply chain majors

Rationale: With the passage of two supply-chain related courses, IE 168 is too redundant with other required supply chain courses. The topics addressed in IE 168 will be covered in the new *Supply Chain Operations Management* core course as well as the new *Demand and Supply Chain Planning* course required of all majors. Additionally several IE 168 topics are also addressed in the currently required SCM 354 (Integrated Logistics and Transportation Management) course.

This action will reduce the number of credits required for supply chain management from 21 to 18.

Resource Requirements: No resources required

**Summary of Changes and Addition
(Modifications are highlighted)**

Current SCM Curriculum	Proposed SCM Curriculum
SCM 309 Purchasing and Supply Management	SCM 309 Purchasing and Supply Management
Mkt 321 Business to Business Marketing <u>or</u> Mkt 348 Marketing Channels	SCM 340 Demand and Supply Chain Planning

SCM 328 Pricing Concepts and Negotiation	SCM 328 Pricing Concepts and Negotiation
SCM 354 Integrated Logistics and Transportation Management	SCM 354 Integrated Logistics and Transportation Management
Bus 211 Integrated Product Development	Bus 211 Integrated Product Development
IE 168 Production Analysis	No longer required
SCM 342 E-Business Systems	SCM 342 E-Business Systems
21 credits	18 credits

None of these proposed changes has any information technology resource implications at this time.

Proposed New Course

1. Proposed new course number and course description (as it will appear in course catalogue):

SCM 340 – Demand and Supply Chain Planning (3)

Students will learn how businesses work with other businesses to build relationships and integrate demand and supply planning activities across the supply chain to deliver value to customers. They will learn about tools and technologies enabling integration, and the critical drivers and key metrics of supply chain performance. Current readings, case studies, simulations and written assignments will be used. Prerequisite: MGT 186 or MGT 280 and MKT 211 or consent of instructor.

2. Instructional mode (lecture, recitation, laboratory, seminar, independent study, or other) and number of contact hours per week:

Lecture

3. Rationale for proposed new course:

This course is intended to be a required course for all Supply Chain Management (SCM) majors, replacing the current requirement of either Marketing 321 (Business-to-Business Marketing) or Marketing 348 (Management of Marketing Channels). This new course will introduce more salient topics germane to the SCM domain to which students currently are not exposed. Specifically, by introducing the concept of integration between the demand and supply processes, the SCM program will be offering content reflecting the current evolution of SCM theory and practice. The updated content will offer a competitive advantage over most SCM programs that currently do not offer an integrative course. Feedback from industry has been very positive.

4. Academic impact on programs affected by new course:

A. Is the proposed course to be cross-listed?

No

B. Identify any known effects of the proposed new program on other programs at the University.

SCM Majors will no longer be required to take either Marketing 321 or Marketing 348.

SCM majors will no longer be required to take IE 168.

C. If there are known effects, individuals in charge of the affected programs must be consulted about the proposed new program and the following information provided:

1) Who was consulted?

K. Sivakumar, Department Chair Marketing
J. Hartman Department Chair Industrial and Systems Engineering

2) Is the proposed new program acceptable to all other programs affected?

Yes

3) Will any changes be required in the affected programs? If so, please describe below:

No

D. Does the proposed new program affect the University's commitment to diversity in any way? If so, please describe below:

No

5. Resource Impact

A. Provide impact statements in the four areas listed below:

1) Library impact statement (attach statement if provided by LTS)

N/A

2) Computer impact statement (attach statement if provided by LTS)

N/A

3) Faculty impact statement (how proposed program affects load on existing faculty or requires new faculty)

This course will be taught by a SCM faculty member who previously taught Marketing 321.

4) Facilities impact statement (how proposed program affects load on existing facilities or requires new facilities)

N/A

B. Provide a statement indicating who will assume financial responsibility for any new resources required:

N/A