

NEXT MEETING: 4:10 PM 7 February 2000, University Center Room 308.
Refreshments at 3:30 PM in the Faculty Lounge.

Lehigh University

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

6 December 1999

Presiding: Gregory Farrington (University Center 308)

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

1. **Memorial Resolution.** A tribute to Raymond L. Armstrong, late Professor Emeritus of English, was read by Professor Emeritus Albert Hartung who then MOVED that his remarks be incorporated into 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 Raymond L. Armstrong.
2. **Minutes.** Yong Kim asked that his remarks be incorporated into the minutes of the previous faculty meeting and be distributed via campus mail. The minutes were APPROVED.
3. **Unfinished Business.** Registrar Bruce Correll MOVED the customary January graduation motions [see Attachment 2]. The motions were SECONDED and PASSED.
4. **Committee Motions.** Professor Duke Perreira, on behalf of the Educational Policy Committee, MOVED adoption of the Joint RCEAS/CBE Proposal for an Honors Program leading to the degree Bachelor of Science in Business and Engineering [see Attachment 3]. The motion was SECONDED.

Professor Ed Kay presented an amendment [see Attachment 4] which would open the program to all Lehigh students in good academic standing. The amendment was SECONDED.

Professor David Wu, a member of the program task force, noted the proposal passed Educational Policy Committee by an 8-1 vote. He addressed the amendment and provided a rationale for the honors program.

Senior Associate Dean Art King noted that CBE departments have bought in^o to the proposal with major programs.

Professor Perreira noted that the proposal is a shell – the details will be provided downstream. He noted that students have two chances for entry into the program – initial admission and also after the freshman year.

Professor Terry Boult asked why the 'Honors' label does not take students away from regular programs. Professor Wu replied that the program would generate an additional 50 students in steady state - not from the current student body. Professor Boult circulated a memorandum from his pen [see Attachment 5].

Professor Barbara Traister asked if these honors students would be coming in "on top" of the regular freshman class. Professor Wu replied in the affirmative.

Professor Traister then noted this would require more sections of freshman English.

Dean Richard Durand stated that the goal is not to put more on the backs of faculty. The program would provide additional tuition revenue.

Dean King observed that the 4 deans certified the resources.

Professor Bob Folk asked why it was necessary to term this an 'Honors' program suggesting such programs are often more trouble than they are worth.

Professor Forbes Brown articulated the combined program interest and need for this kind of program. There is not a lot of national experience. This will work for students of higher caliber. Natural to be an honors program. Later on Lehigh might see if a broader group could benefit.

Professor Boult asked where the new funds would come from for scholarships.

President Farrington stated that's not how financial aid works. Financial aid works in terms of a fractional discount rate.

Professor Mohamed El Aasser reported that the ChemE department voted a limited honors program and observed that a vote for the amendment would defeat the entire program. He urged his colleagues to let the experiment go forward.

Professor Cliff Queen stated that the program does not leave Lehigh harmless – funds flow based on majors, not service courses. He also noted that this is a historic departure for Lehigh – the first time a degree program requires different student credentials.

Professor Susan Szczepanski asked what criteria a student would have to meet for entrance at the end of the freshman year.

Dean King stated the requirement for entry at the end of freshman year would be a minimum 3.25 GPA, but that there would be no automatic admission at that point.

Professor Richard Decker asked what happens after the third semester.

Professor Brown said there would be a decision about continuation in the program – students can be admitted as long as they don't affect the cohort.

Dean John Chen said the issue is the 'Honors' label, which is not necessarily bad – might be better. Positives: crosses college boundaries; 12 credits of integrated courses; improvements in curriculum. He believes we hamper ourselves by not having honors programs.

The amendment FAILED.

Back to the main motion.

Professor Bruce Fritchmann noted several positives: trying to attract best students helps attract other students; CBE commitment to minors; and more curriculum options.

Professor Boulton said there was no hard data to support claim of new students.

Dean Durand stated that the program will put the CBE on the map – differentiable – not a traditional degree.

Professor El Aasser favored the motion and that the ChemE visiting committee is aware of the demand for graduates of this type of program.

Professor Dave Williams expressed his support for the program.

Professor Wu noted that structure has been discussed in all Engineering departments.

Professor Dave Williams expressed his support – competition is out there.

The motion PASSED.

Professor Nick Odrey, on behalf of the Graduate Committee MOVED adoption of the Joint Masters Degree Program in Business Administration and Engineering [see Attachment 6]. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

6. **Committee Reports** Professor Richard Decker, on behalf of the FFPOC, reviewed the goals of the budget process and the FFPOC noting an anticipated net surplus of about \$2.5 million. He also suggested that the faculty needed to engage the administration in a more strategic discussion about budget priorities.

Dean Kathy Trexler asked about the budget match.

Professor Folk observed that academic departments used to be 'king.' He worries about the long-term effects and said it was hard to get information on the capital budget.

President Farrington made several observations: 1) growth in undergraduate tuition is less than expected; 2) growth in graduate tuition is even worse. Lehigh is living off the stock market. The market is rising, but it won't go on forever. BSBE program is one solution. More attractive programs mean better students. There is a deliberate decline in freshman admissions to improve the matriculation rate.

Professor Frank Gunter asked if adjournment was in order.

Professor Jim Largay, on behalf of the FCC, reviewed the new proposal for faculty compensation [see Attachment 7]. FCC is meeting with the deans - Chen and Carson have been in - Yoshida and Durand visiting soon. Faculty compensation plan at Wheaton College will be given a look. Professor Largay introduced the proposal and said FCC will schedule an open meeting with the faculty.

Professor Gunter raised two issues: 1) whether pool of dollars for compensation is large enough; and, 2) how is the pool to be allocated? He stated his support for the plan.

President Farrington expressed his support for Professor Largay's realism. With respect to the 14 reference schools, he observed that these analyses are not nuanced enough.

The president concluded his remarks by noting that, if you don't make it, you can't spend it.

There being no other business before the faculty, the meeting stood adjourned at 6:00 PM.

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

Professor Richard Decker asked what happens after the third semester.

Professor Brown said there would be a decision about continuation in the program – students can be admitted as long as they don't affect the cohort.

Dean John Chen said the issue is the 'Honors' label, which is not necessarily bad – might be better. Positives: crosses college boundaries; 12 credits of integrated courses; improvements in curriculum. He believes we hamper ourselves by not having honors programs.

The amendment FAILED.

Back to the main motion.

Professor Bruce Fritchmann noted several positives: trying to attract best students helps attract other students; CBE commitment to minors; and more curriculum options.

Professor Boulton said there was no hard data to support claim of new students.

Dean Durand stated that the program will put the CBE on the map – differentiable – not a traditional degree.

Professor El Aasser favored the motion and that the ChemE visiting committee is aware of the demand for graduates of this type of program.

Professor Dave Williams expressed his support for the program.

Professor Wu noted that structure has been discussed in all Engineering departments.

Professor Dave Williams expressed his support – competition is out there.

The motion PASSED.

Professor Nick Odrey, on behalf of the Graduate Committee MOVED adoption of the Joint Masters Degree Program in Business Administration and Engineering [see Attachment 6]. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

6. **Committee Reports** Professor Richard Decker, on behalf of the FFPOC, reviewed the goals of the budget process and the FFPOC noting an anticipated net surplus of about \$2.5 million. He also suggested that the faculty needed to engage the administration in a more strategic discussion about budget priorities.

Dean Kathy Trexler asked about the budget match.

Professor Folk observed that academic departments used to be 'king.' He worries about the long-term effects and said it was hard to get information on the capital budget.

President Farrington made several observations: 1) growth in undergraduate tuition is less than expected; 2) growth in graduate tuition is even worse. Lehigh is living off the stock market. The market is rising, but it won't go on forever. BSBE program is one solution. More attractive programs mean better students. There is a deliberate decline in freshman admissions to improve the matriculation rate.

Professor Frank Gunter asked if adjournment was in order.

Professor Jim Largay, on behalf of the FCC, reviewed the new proposal for faculty compensation [see Attachment 7]. FCC is meeting with the deans - Chen and Carson have been in - Yoshida and Durand visiting soon. Faculty compensation plan at Wheaton College will be given a look. Professor Largay introduced the proposal and said FCC will schedule an open meeting with the faculty.

Professor Gunter raised two issues: 1) whether pool of dollars for compensation is large enough; and 2) how is the pool to be allocated? He stated his support for the plan.

President Farrington expressed his support for Professor Largay's realism. With respect to the 14 reference schools, he observed that these analyses are not nuanced enough.

The president concluded his remarks by noting that, if you don't make it you can't spend it.

There being no other business before the faculty the meeting stood adjourned at 6:00 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
RAY LIVINGSTONE ARMSTRONG

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY
DECEMBER 6, 1999

The faculty of Lehigh University notes with sorrow the death of Ray Livingstone Armstrong, Professor Emeritus of English, on November 3 and offers its deepest sympathy to the members of his family. Born in Brooklyn, NY, in 1910, he attended Adelphi Academy there (1921-1926). He received his B.A. from Williams College in 1930, and B.A. and M.A. (1932, 1936) from Exeter College, Oxford University. He was awarded a Ph.D. by Columbia University in 1941. He was an Army veteran of WWII and was a member of the Lehigh faculty for thirty years, retiring in 1975.

Ray was supervisor of the "off-beat" freshman English program for several years in the late 40's and 50's. Rather substantially populated in those days this was the program for out-of-phase students (because of freshman placement, failure in the regular sequence, or late matriculation). Supervision of it was a demanding task. Later Ray supervised the entire freshman English program until his retirement. He was very active over many years in cooperative ventures with the ETS in determining standards and strategies for evaluating college composition. His area of specialization was 17th-century literature, in which he regularly taught an upper level course and also a graduate seminar in the poetry of John Donne. He published an edition of the poet John Shirley, was co-editor of *Six Early Plays*, and published a number of articles. But he never fancied himself as a graduate teacher. His interests and best skills were at the undergraduate level. Nor did he fancy himself as a pedagogical therapist, or a politically correct (he would have hated that expression) student counselor. He was a teacher. He held his students to traditional standards—as, for example, in the following excerpt from a Section III note to a delinquent

student, whose greatest success so far had been to pull his cumulative average up to 1.36: 'If I thought you were doing the best you could do, there would be no point in my suggesting, as I do, emphatically, that the time has come for you to pull up your socks and accelerate the transition from schoolboy to young adult. The alternative is not to be contemplated with equanimity' I hope the student appreciated the beautiful prose in which the note was written.

However, Ray made another contribution to the English department and University, a distinctively more personal one. Some of this is shown in his book of personal essays appearing first in separate issues of the Lehigh University Alumni Bulletin, then later collected under the title "That's a Lot of Bulletin." In the tradition of James Thurber and S.J. Perlman, both of whom Ray loved, they are among the best personal essays I have read. One of them is on the kinds of letters Class Correspondents receive and includes Ray's invention of a letter to the class correspondent at the University of Wittenberg from Horatio about his visit to his former classmate and fellow alumnus Hamlet at Elsinore, Denmark. It is a gem. In it Horatio is understandably confused about what the hell is going on (as indeed have been many beginning students of Shakespeare since then). It shows what all of us knew about Ray. The man was an original. Students and colleagues who were capable of responding to and cherishing an original seemed to be drawn to Ray, who inspired intense loyalty and affection, not from a large group but, I like to think, from a select group. He was the most widely read man I have known. Odd, out-of-the-way authors; forgotten classics—for example, Erskine Childers, Somerville & Ross, who because of Ray's introducing me to them have provided me with pleasure that I would be sorry to have missed. A sensitive, subtle and avid reader, he communicated his own enthusiasm to others. Nor were his enthusiasms only literary. Gardening was one of them. His collection of early crocus when he lived outside Nazareth was spectacular, together with aconite and tear drops. Ray favored those plants that were the first to greet the spring. And there were the dogs and cats. I remember best the two Sealyhams and the Scottie (Daisy, Daphne, and Cassie). Among the cats one stood out, Mary Delia, brought home pregnant from the shelter by Mary, Ray's wife ("she purred at me when I stopped in front of her cage"), and destined to be a mainstay for the Armstrong cat population during her unstinting career. There were also two

beautiful white crested ducks with their jaunty top knots gracing the lawn. Other enthusiasms-- Ray was a ferocious rooter for Lehigh football, once startling a lady sitting in front of us on the occasion of a sacked Lafayette quarterback by shouting "Kick him when he's down!" The Brooklyn Dodgers were his baseball team, a serious thing (he went back to Zack Wheat). His ultimate dream-come-true was the victory at long last of the Dodgers over the Yankees in the World Series. He loved the operas of Richard Wagner, once trying to win me over from my own love of Italian opera by having me for a record evening of *Siegfried* supplemented by a light repast of caviar on buttered toast and a bottle of Chateau Yquem. (Whenever I hear *Siegfried*, as seldom as possible, I think mainly of the Chateau Yquem.) He shared an office in Christmas-Saucon with Professor Dilworth, who with his fondness for post-Impressionist art had prominently displayed on his wall a print of Picasso's Absinthe Drinkers a rather gruesome thing. Ray's counter to it was a large framed print of a six-horse hitch (Percherons) pulling a beer wagon (I think it was Pabst). There was also a Norman Rockwell little girl (unbelievably sweet) standing in a corner (she was being punished) with her puppy (also unbelievably sweet) watching her with concern. Both pictures made a refreshing statement about the Picasso.

A wry sense of humor, a gift of wit and irony, a master of language, unusual and surprising insights, one who found life interesting, and together with these a notable contribution to the work of the department in that area of our endeavor that was most unglamorous, most drudgery, yet what we felt in those days was probably our main mission for the university, the freshman program--these were what Ray gave to us. And with them was always the feeling that the person you were looking at was the real Ray. He was indeed a presence in the department and for us had a special value.

Respectfully submitted,

Albert E. Hartung
Albert E. Hartung

Mr. President, I move that this Memorial Resolution for Professor Armstrong be incorporated

into the permanent record by inclusion with the minutes of this meeting and that copies be sent to members of his family.



December 6, 1999

GRADUATION MOTIONS

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 Wednesday, January 5, 2000, 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 these individuals;

That the appropriate graduation honors be awarded to those individuals whose averages the as computed by the Office of the Registrar, shall entitle them to be graduated with honors, high honors, or highest honors according to the regulation published in section 3.11.1 of the current edition of the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty;

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 January 5 and that the Graduate Committee be empowered to so act in cases involving candidates for graduate degrees.

November 23, 1999

**A Joint RCEAS/CBE Proposal for an Honors Program Leading to the Degree
Bachelor of Science in Business and Engineering (BSBE)**

The following new honors degree program in business and engineering was passed at the meetings of the Rossin College of Engineering and Applied Science and the College of Business and Economics on October 25 and 26, 1999, respectively. The BSBE Task Force responded to Ed Pol's questions with an explanatory addendum on November 10, 1999, included below.

The Educational Policy Committee will offer the following motion to the University faculty at the December 6, 1999, University faculty meeting:

Motion

We move that the University faculty approve a new program leading to the degree of Bachelor of Science in Business and Engineering, as described below [including the addendum]. Faculty approval is based on the assumption that the Deans of the respective colleges agree that sufficient resources are, or will be, available for this program. This approval does not include details of the requirements of the major programs in engineering, which will be proposed at a later date. The resources [as described in the addendum] must cover the basic cost of program administration, the development and offering of the indicated special program courses, needed continuing development, and the recruiting and placement of students.

Program Summary

This is an honors degree program directed at exceptionally well qualified students who will perform at a high level for the benefit of society and Lehigh University. To assure quality, there will be no minimum target for the number of entrants in any given year. The program includes core requirements in science, business and engineering, a foreign language, and a major in any of the present areas in the College of Business and Economics or most of the central areas in the College of Engineering and Applied Science. A major in an area of business also will satisfy the general requirements for the degree Bachelor of Science in Business and Economics, and therefore this program is expected to be accredited by the AACSB. A major in an area of engineering for which Lehigh also offers a BS degree will be approximately a semester of study short of satisfying the requirements of that degree; the program therefore will not be accredited by ABET. Students enrolled in the program and in satisfactory standing may transfer to a dual-degree (business and engineering) program at any time, and still remain within the honors program cohort.

A "shell," or structure of the program follows on the next sheet. The major programs in business are the same as given in the catalog for the degree of Bachelor of Science in Business and Economics. The major programs in engineering will be fully described at a later date, but will be consistent with the shell requirements. Further faculty approval will be necessary regarding these additional details, and any new courses proposed.

The proposal rationale and the 11/10/99 addendum, revised 11/23/99, follows the description of the shell.

Degree Requirements

Area	Credits	Details
English Composition	6	
Foreign Language	-	Demonstrate proficiency in a modern foreign language At the intermediate level (MFL 12 or equivalent).
Humanities/Social Sc.	9	Must include Comm 130 or SSP 135. Must include at least 3 credits designated as Humanities and 3 credits designated as Social Science. May be used to help satisfy the language requirement.
Computing	3	Eng 1 or Csc 11
Science Core	30	Math 21, 22, 23 and 231 (see Note 1); Physics 11, 12, 21, 22; Chem 21, 22
Engineering Core	20	A coherent set of existing courses, to be developed from the attached list (see Note 2), including at least 1 credit of laboratory.
Business Core	33	Same set of courses which are standard core courses for CBE students; some courses could be restructured to integrate engineering aspects (see Note 3)
Major	18	Business or engineering, to be specified. A major program also can specify courses within the engineering core. A business major must include a designated Humanities or Social Science course to raise the total Humanities credit to 6 and the total Social Science credit to 6. (See Note 4)
Integrated courses in Business/Engineering	12	Freshman course (3 credits), senior capstone course (6 credits), program seminar course(s) (3 credits) in sophomore/ junior years
Free Electives	6	
Summer Internships		At least one professional internship; other internships, including an international internship, are to be strongly encouraged.
Total	137	A student's choice of 4-credit humanities, social science or elective courses might increase the de facto graduation requirement by one or two credits. Extra humanities and social science credit will be given free elective credit.

Note 1: Math 231 may be substituted by IE 111 under the condition that IE 121 is taken as part of the engineering core.

Note 2: Students who major in a designated field of engineering are to follow the core requirement defined by the associated RCEAS department; see Note 4 below for other engineering majors; students majoring in business will be given guidance to configure a mixture of courses subject to prerequisites. The proposed list of courses for the Engineering Core follows:

chemical engineering:	ChE 31, ChE 44, ChE 210
electrical and computer engineering:	ECE 33, ECE 81, ECE 108
engineering mathematics:	IE 121, Math 205
fluid mechanics:	CE 121 or ChE 44 or ME 231
graphics, design:	CE 15 or IE 112 or ME 10
industrial engineering:	IE 115, IE 131
materials:	Mat 33 or Mat 192, Mat 203, Mat 205
mechanics:	Mech 2, Mech 12, Mech 102
thermodynamics:	ChE 210 or Mat 285 or ME 104
courses satisfying laboratory requirement:	CE 14, ECE 82, IE 116, IE 132; Mat 10, ME 21
other:	Chm 31, Chm 187, CSc 17

Note 3: Current list of courses for the Business Core: Bis 211; Eco 1, 115, 129; Mgt 280*; Mkt 111; Fin 125; Acct 151, 152*; Law 201*

* Courses for which an integrated Engineering component could be developed.

Note 4: The Academic Policy Committee, RCEAS, will consider but wishes to discourage major programs in engineering that exceed the indicated 18 credits. (One member of the committee, representing his department, prefers 21 credits.) An undesignated major in engineering also may be proposed to allow students to fashion coherent interdisciplinary concentrations such as bioengineering, electromechanical engineering, environmental engineering, integrated product development, software engineering, etc.

Rationale

The proposed program directly addresses the constantly changing realities of the new industrial and professional marketplace: rapid technological innovation, diffusion and obsolescence; emergence of new standards; short product life-cycles and decaying margins due to increased global competition; and outcome-focused development and delivery of new products and services. Organizations now seek new forms of competition based on cooperation, often pooling physical and intellectual resources to speed up the profitable design, development, manufacturing and delivery of products and services. These changes in the marketplace demand new capabilities, which can only come with the combination of the technical with the commercial.

The program resides in two colleges and reflects an effort on the part of Lehigh to align its programs with the rapidly changing market conditions. The program likely will engage special attention from groups such as admissions, placement, development, employers and alumni. The

hallmark of this state-of-the art program will be graduates with a unique set of skills and competencies who will be prepared to lead the corporate world in the coming century.

The director of Lehigh's Career Services is enthusiastic about the employment prospects for students who complete the program.

Objectives

In addition to mastery of the concepts and procedures taught in individual courses in each college, this program will seek to develop competencies that require an integrated knowledge from both engineering and business such as:

- Ability to make decisions related to technology, product and process development, in a way that combines technical, financial, marketing and strategic dimensions; ability to make design decisions based on target costs and return on capital, etc;
- Ability to perform economic analyses for new products, technologies and processes; ability to prepare detailed business plans that include financial and well as operational details related to the production cycle;
- Understanding the changing nature of domestic and global competition, the value chain and the use of acquisitions, alliances and joint ventures necessary for competitive advantage.

These competencies will be developed through courses, integrative elements and program experience (including field visits, guest lectures, internships, externships, mentorships, etc.) These students will have combined detailed engineering knowledge with business skills and detailed business tools with a keen awareness of technology issues.

Further Details

The program requirements are based largely on existing courses. The students also will take special new integrated business and engineering courses in the first and fourth years of the program, as well as seminar course(s) in their sophomore and/or junior years. They will be required to take at least one professional summer internship, and are strongly encouraged to take further summer internships, including an international internship in a country that speaks the foreign language chosen by the student for the proficiency requirement. Special social programs will be arranged for the cohorts in the group. The directors of the program will expedite these matters, including seeking appropriate financial support.

Practical issues notwithstanding, the program should undergo a continuous improvement process, as do other academic programs. The directors should begin immediately upon their appointment by the deans to develop further curriculum integration. Integration of selected course materials between business and engineering should be given the highest priority to build a coherent program that leverages Lehigh's strengths in cross-disciplinary learning. For example, the target should be for at least one course per year as an integrated course between the two colleges. The Business faculty have noted that core courses in Accounting, Business Information Systems, Economics, Finance, Law, Marketing and Management have elements conducive to integration with engineering topics at the 100 and 200 levels for potential sophomore and junior year courses.

The proposed requirements include the *current* business core requirements for the CBE. The core is likely to evolve over time. The CBE is about to conduct an extensive "Undergraduate Curriculum Audit" which will continue for several months and may result in a new or reformulated Business Core, most likely with more integration of business subjects. Any such improvements should obviously be applied to the program requirements. As appropriate, the directors should seek faculty involvement in the planning and approval process for new or changed courses.

This document is the result of interaction between the following entities:

Task Force for RCEAS/CBE Joint Undergraduate Degree Programs:

S. David Wu (IMSE), Task Force Co-Chair, RCEAS
 Therese Maskulka, Art King (CBE), Task Force Co-Chair, CBE
 Steve Buell (CBE)
 Mohamed El-Aasser (ChE)
 Mike Kolchin (Management)
 Vince Munley (Economics)
 Jack Paul (Accounting)
 Chuck Smith (ME)
 Rick Weisman (RCEAS)

Academic Policy Committee, RCEAS:

Forbes Brown, chair (ME)
 Alwyn Eades (Mat)
 Douglas Frey (EECS)
 Mike Groover (IMSE)
 Steve Pessiki (CE)
 Ceasar Silebi (ChE)

College Policy Committee, CBE:

Matt Melone, chair
 Steve Buell
 Marilyn Greenstein
 Parveen Gupta
 Jon Innes
 Ted Schlie
 Manash Ray

Addendum from the BSBE Task Force:
 Responses to the Queries from Ed Pol
 (for the 11/10/99 meeting, revised 11/23/99)

Definition of BSBE as an "Honors" Program:

Currently there are two uses of "honors" for undergraduates in some official capacity at Lehigh. There are "Graduation Honors" based solely on overall GPA: cum laude = 3.25, magna cum laude = 3.5 and summa cum laude = 3.75. Also, "Departmental Honors" are awarded by a any department which sets a specific set of requirements (as listed in the University catalog), usually some combination of GPA and specified courses. All of these conditions are based on demonstrated academic achievement. Other "honors-type" programs such as Dean's Scholars have minimum GPA requirements of 3.0; academic scholarships may also have GPA minima.

In our discussions of the BSBE program, there are at least two reasons for the use of "honors" at the point of program entry (usually at matriculation into Lehigh). First, this word will indicate that this is a special program for students of high potential academic ability and promise. Also, during the duration of the program it will set expectations for the students of the need for extraordinary and continued performance in a program that will require more effort than a usual major program.

In the first category of unusual potential ability level are those applicants in the oft cited top (20%) of Lehigh's applicant pool which is determined by academic index, AI (above approximately 215). The AI combines the applicant's high school GPA, class rank, SAT and other factors. This is the highly competitive group from which Lehigh seeks to improve the yield from application to matriculation. In order to compete realistically for these new students, scholarship aid should be a key factor in addition to a high quality academic program.

In order to set expectations of demonstrated academic excellence during the program, a criterion based on GPA is the most easily measured, and probably generally acceptable. A student would be placed on probation for the program if, at any time from the end of the freshman year to the end of the sophomore year, the student's GPA falls below the Graduation Honors threshold of 3.25. The student would then transfer to a different program if this GPA was not achieved within two semesters. By continuing to maintain a GPA of at least 3.25 the student would be on target for at least cum laude Graduation Honors.

Entrance to the Program after Entering Lehigh

Most of our discussion on post-matriculation entry to the BSBE program has centered around the practicalities of completing the required curriculum if a student would start the program "too late" Our consensus is that the student would have to enter by the end of the freshman year, preferably having taken some of the first year courses (Eco 1, Math 21, Physics 11, Chem 21, etc), although probably not with their BSBE cohort. Further, the student must have demonstrated high academic achievement, well above the target to meet the program's guideline for the expected GPA. We anticipate that this student would be considered for any scholarship aid that is consistent with the rest of the program participants' situations. If a student already has financial aid, we would recommend no "double dipping" beyond the student's BSBE peers.

Finally, the program should accommodate a limited number of additional students at the end of the freshman year, approximately 20% of the current freshman BSBE cohort. Possibly in the first two or three years, this percentage might be higher in order to allow the BSBE enrollment to reach steady state more quickly. This post-matriculation admission process should be overseen by the program co-directors as the program develops.

Resources

BSBE Academic Program Expenses

Administrative

Salaries

Co-directors (2)	= \$32,000	(release time of 2 courses per co-director @ 8000)
Administrative Asst.	= \$25,000	(75% time)
Program promotion	= \$50,000	(advertising, recruiting, printing, special prgms, etc)

Faculty

Course developmt., implemt= \$15,000 (initial integrated course(s): Intro to Bus/Eng)

In addition to these out-of-pocket costs for the first year, for the second year \$30,000 should be included to cover additional integrated course development and implementation for the sophomore, junior and senior courses.

Also we briefly discussed the possibility of developing a 10-14 day summer orientation program for late August to build cohort group dynamics. A quick cost estimate for such a program would be \$20,000 if room and board were paid by the program. More likely, this program would be developed for the second year and beyond.

In the future, after the second or third year of successful operation of the program with about 100-150 net new BSBE students, we anticipate that the program resources should be sufficient to target two net new faculty members, one in the RCEAS and one in the CBE to accommodate these students. The estimated cost would be about \$125k per faculty member.

An estimate for scholarship costs for 25 - 30 students for the first year (@ \$12,000) would be in the range of \$300,000 - \$360,000. However, much of this cost could be offset if these funds were raised from outside sources. In steady state as the program reputation builds, we anticipate that all not all BSBE students would require scholarships.

At the 6 December faculty meeting I intend to move to amend the motion for the BSBE program as follows:

Att: 4

Moved: That admission to the BSBE program be open to any Lehigh student in good academic standing, i.e., any student not on academic probation.

Rationale:

1. In limiting access to the program, the BSBE proposal sets a bad precedent. No other major program is so limited. This precedent would open the door to other programs with such limitations. This would lead to two classes of students, those who could enroll in such programs and those who could not. It would also rob Lehigh of an important recruiting tool. Unlike some other universities, Lehigh offers its students great freedom of movement among its colleges and major programs.
2. There is no good way to predict which entering students will be successful in the BSBE program, so that the academic careers of many students recruited to the program will be disrupted. Only the "best" entering students are allowed entry into the program, with a relatively few additional students allowed entry after their first year, based on their GPA's. The BSBE program assumes that the direct measure of the "best" students is their GPA's, but the GPA is notoriously difficult to predict. The best tool the Admissions Office has for predicting GPA is the Academic Index (AI). It is well known that subjective estimates by Admissions Staff are considerably less effective at predicting success than the AI.

But how well does the AI predict GPA? I have the AI scores and first year GPA's of the 1063 Lehigh students who entered in 1993. The two measures have a correlation of .50, which indicates the AI does predict GPA quite well. On the other hand, it is less than perfect. For example, of the 23 students with an AI of 210 or greater, 5 failed to attain a GPA of 3.25, the standard for retention in the BSBE program. In general, the lower the AI bar is set the greater is the percentage of the students who fail to get a GPA of 3.25. It is quite interesting that a student ranked 1004 by AI actually attained a GPA greater than 3.25.

3. Of less importance than the above two points, the BSBE, as presently constituted, goes against Lehigh's wise policy of saying to the incoming students, "Choose your college but not your major. Many of you either do not know what you major you desire or may change your mind before choosing your major after your first year at Lehigh."

Note: There are presently two programs at Lehigh which are selective, the accelerated MCP Hahnemann Program and the College Scholars Program, but neither is analogous to the BSBE program. In neither case does the selectivity bar students from taking a particular major program.

Edwin J. Kay
Electrical Engineering and Computer Science

Among the issues on today's addenda is a proposal to approve a NEW joint program between COBE and CEAS. This contains some points of "discussion" arguing against that proposal.

Let me start with a positive note. I think joint Business-Engineering programs should be developed. My objections are not with the idea, just with the implementation. My message is a tad long, but I consider this a pretty significant change to Lehigh's program and worth the time to do it right. Note these are my personal views, not necessarily those of my department.

What is potential upside if we move on the BSBE quickly... ?
 maybe 10-20 new students for next year
 Parents & colleagues see us as aggressively innovative

What is potential downside if we move on the BSBE quickly... ?
 Parents & our colleagues see us as recklessly introducing program without supporting data/details.
 Parents & students annoyed as potential "majors" don't materialize or are marginalized due to resource constraints
 Influx of resources to where politically expedient rather than where justified
 The cadre of BSBE students in an area is too small and too spread out to achieve group synergies in any advanced topic area
 Diffusion of students/resources to the point of minimal/little impact
 Define a program that needs changing almost immediately

Now for some more details on some problems with the proposed BSBE (or why I think we should tell the BSBE task force to go back and start over) before we approve the program:

- 1) No hard data to "support" claim of new students
 - no data from other schools.
 - no data from people that turned Lehigh down
 - no data from people that came to Lehigh
 - The argument for "New Resources" are based on INCREASED undergraduates but anecdotes are not the antidote we need.
- 2) No data from companies/industry on what are skills these students need.
 - e.g. broad engineering core versus depth in an Engineering field
 - accreditable in Bus. or in Engineering?
 - Are some integrations of some areas of Eng./Bus Fields more critical than others?
 - Would other approach be better, e.g. COBE minors for Engineers and Engineering Minors for COBE. (At 18 credits the current current proposal is not too far from a Eng. Minor)

- 3) No Cost/Benefit Analysis (It would be meaningless without hard data:-) .
It is nice that we want to give the students the:

"Ability to make decisions related to technology, product and process development, in a way that combines technical, financial, marketing and strategic dimensions; ability to make design decisions based on target costs and return on capital, etc;

Ability to perform economic analyses for new products, technologies and processes; ability to prepare detailed business plans that include financial and well as operational details related to the production cycle;"

Too bad the proposal does not..

- 4) Model for "support/impact" ignores impact on A&S faculty. The email draft was the first public announcement of how the "support" part of the BSBE will work. As I see it, the impact on the Math (15 credits for 25 students = 375 credits), physics (250 credits) and English departments (150 credits) is probably greater than or equal to the impact on any single engineering department (see next item).

- 5) With no list of departments/"majors" in CEAS(see below), it is not clear what CEAS resources mean or how they will be distributed. With ~25 students per year, and expecting half of the students will be BSBE majoring in a Business field that leaves about 12 students per year doing a BSBE and "majoring" in engineering. With 6 departments, no department will have too many. The Eng "Majors" (counting stuff in the Eng. core) will be something like 24 credits in the students "major" Eng Department. With 2-4 students per department per year that is 48-96 credits per year). If it becomes an IE/ME/Chem.Eng only program then some department's impact might be higher (e.g. 150 to 200 credits, i.e. more than English but less than Physics/Math.)

Once again its clear how the "administration" side grows but not the faculty.

- 6) No list of "majors" to be offered.
I believe that, to date, no BSBE "major" curriculum had been passed by its associated departmental faculty. I think it is a poor idea to approve a "program" without such details. If we will have to approve them at a later date, why not approve the whole thing then? Is the approval of the BSBE contingent on K engineering departments providing accepted "majors"? Or can we admit BSBE students next year with only Business Majors defined?

Sample curriculum have been floated for IE and ME but we don't know for sure if/when they will be accepted. I've heard both positive and negative things from Chem. Eng. and have heard nothing about/from the other departments (who are not "represented on the committee").

As it is currently formulated I personally consider it highly unlikely that any BSBE major will be offered by EECS, even though the 3 majors from EECS accounts for about 1/3 of all engineering majors. Objections to both the way the program was being defined, and the details of the program itself, were put forward over the summer. These objections are found in this discussion; not a single one has been "resolved".

What is the point of approving a shell without the "majors". What are we going to tell parents/students?

- 7) No model of how "resource" goals will be assessed. Thus once the BSBE is approved it will probably count all "BSBE" majors, even if they would have been at Lehigh in COBE or CEAS anyhow, and there are no new resources. Thus we will be told it is a success with no way to actually measure the true impact.
- 8) A Language requirement that cannot be satisfied without 2 terms of Advanced Placement or overloading. The program has only 3 "available" credits of HSS in program but required equivalent of 3-4 terms of foreign language (i.e. 12-16 credits). Objections were raised at the CEAS faculty meeting, but never addressed.
- 9) Not a single "major" described in detail..

Can they be scheduled with existing classes (fall/spring issues) or will new sections be needed?
Will the sequence that depend on freshman year courses be satisfiable. (COBE and CEAS each have full first year's, what will the combined program keep from each?

How can they justify the statement
"A major in an area of engineering for which Lehigh also offers a BS degree will be approximately a semester of study short of satisfying the requirements of that degree; the program therefore will not be accredited by ABET."
without these details.

- 10) Limited entry "Honors" program, unlike anything we do now.. (with no serious discussion of it yet). The email draft is the first public announcement of how the "honors" part will work. (I presume a student who's GPA drops will become a COBE major with the BSBE substitutions' applied. The distance from the BSBE to a real engineering major is too large to be made up in a reasonable time after the end of freshman year but they don't get dropped from BSBE until at least sophomore year. If the program does proceed it should be open to anyone.
- 11) Calling 18 Credits in engineering a "Major" is inappropriate. In A&S college, minors are often 18 credits or more. Objection to use of term "major" was raised at CEAS faculty meeting, but squashed.
- 12) Where are the "objectives" that are needed for AACSB Accreditation? To state "program is expected to be accredited by the AACSB" suggests that they have looked at this in detail. For the BSBE who major in Business this is covered by the current program, but what about a BSBE who "major" in engineering.
- 13) Lack of discussion
First "public" announcement in CEAS allowed no discussion or questions. At the second CEAS faculty meeting, the only discussion was moderately different in program details and only allotted a short time for limited discussion. Many issues were never resolved.
- There was no details let alone discussion on the resources (tracking or allocation).
- No rationale was ever offered for "Engineering Core" (It appears to be a hodge podge of courses the committee liked).
- 14) Lack of Procedure (examples):
What will be the procedure for changes to this program?
What group oversees the proposed changes?
When do BSBE majors declare majors?
- What was "approved" by CEAS faculty is not what is being considered now. Furthermore, the differences seem politically oriented. For example, a request by Chem.Eng for a change to core had to be discussed at CEAS meeting and was turned down. However IE's private math classes were magically included after the CEAS faculty meeting.
- 15) No list of "courses to be developed".. @15k each we should have an idea of how many, how quickly and how will they be prioritized? If 1 "integrated" class is added per "major" in the program that is a total of 15 "classes". If the pairwise interactions are considered for integration (E.g Marketing of Mechanical products, Chem.Eng. and Finance), the number of courses approaches 50.

November 4, 1999

To: Graduate and Research Committee
From: College Policy Committees of RCEAS and CBE

Proposal for a Joint Masters Degree Program in Business Administration and Engineering

Rationale

Today's employees are expected to work successfully on cross-functional teams and need exposure to the technical and human side of both disciplines to work effectively. Employees with these skills are vital for companies to remain competitive.

Based upon student inquiries, and our survey of prospective students and managers in regional firms, there appears to be an interest in the interdisciplinary study of engineering and business for part-time and full-time students.

The Global Council is particularly interested in supporting interdisciplinary international programs and believe that there is a significant market of potential full-time students for this degree program. At their meeting in November, the Global Council will be exploring ways to support such programs through internships, recruiting and financial support for international students.

Vital Statistics

The joint degree is expected to attract full-time, part-time and distance students. In the initial year we hope to attract 10 students to the program. Based on information from the Global Council Task Force, the program may attract up to 50 students at steady state.

Both deans have expressed their willingness to provide the resources for the program's initial development. As the program grows, it should generate sufficient revenue to cover the related costs.

Admission

Since this is a joint degree, applications must be accepted by the MBA Program and by the appropriate department in the College of Engineering and Applied Science.

Students will take the GRE if required by the engineering program. If the engineering program does not require the GRE, the student will be required to take the GMAT. Students will not be required to take both exams but must take at least one of them.

The language requirement for international students applying to the program is TOEFL. International students applying for teaching assistantships through the College of Business and Economics must also take the TSE (Test of Spoken English).

Full-time students must have at least 2 years of professional, post-graduate work experience to apply for the joint degree program. Part-time students may fulfill the work experience requirement while taking the engineering portion of the curriculum.

Masters Degree Requirements

Outline is attached. No thesis is required. No comprehensive examinations are required.

Instructional Mode

Lectures, laboratories, and independent study. Internships will be required for full-time students.

Academic Implications

By introducing this interdisciplinary degree, the graduate program offerings at Lehigh will be broadened.

Resource Requirements

For the first year, all courses are currently being offered and no new faculty resources will be required for coursework. In subsequent years, joint interdisciplinary courses will be developed that will require faculty resources. These courses will generate a unique niche for this Lehigh program.

Faculty and administrative resources will be necessary to help coordinate the internships for full-time students.

As additional students are attracted to the program, revenue sharing with the University will provide the resources necessary to support the program.

Library and computer resources will not be significantly impacted. Most part-time students do not use University resources for computing. Most research within the MBA Program is currently conducted using the web. Full-time students will likely use both library and computer resources but no special resources are required.

Commitment to Diversity

Since this program will be presented to the Global Council with a request for support in recruiting international students, the proposal should increase the diversity within the graduate student body.

Target Populations

Target populations for students are as follows:

Full-time Students

International students - Professional managers, 25 to 35 years old with a bachelor's degree in engineering or applied science.

Domestic students - bachelor's degree in engineering or applied science and at least 2 years of work experience.

Part-time Students

On-campus and distance students - Bachelor's degree in engineering or applied science. Since several programs in the College of Engineering and the MBA Program have a distance learning component, the joint degree could be offered through distance education with no additional resources.

**Joint Masters Degree in
Business Administration and Engineering (MBAE)
(45 Credits)**

Requirements:**Credits****MBA Core Courses**

MBA 401, Introduction to the Organization and Its Environment

1

MBA 402, Managing Financial and Physical Resources

4

MBA 403, Managing Information

4

MBA 404, Managing Products and Services

4

MBA 405, Managing People

4

MBA 406, Integrative Experience

1

MBA Electives

6

Engineering Core Courses

Defined by department

12

Engineering Electives

6

Free Elective (may be taken in either MBA or engineering)

3

Total

45

Full-time students will also be required to complete an internship during the summer. There is no credit assigned to this internship.



Department of Accounting
 Rauch Business Center
 621 Taylor Street
 Bethlehem, PA 18015-3117
 (610) 758-3451 Fax (610) 758-6429
<http://www.lehigh.edu>

MEMORANDUM

December 6, 1999

TO: Lehigh University Faculty Colleagues
FROM: Jim Largay
SUBJECT: Interim Faculty Compensation Committee Report

We had three meetings in November and will have at least two during December. Two of these involved planning discussions and the other three were for our interviews with the college Deans. In addition, I met with Provost Markley on November 23 to discuss a creative faculty compensation plan in place at Wheaton College (MA). We all agreed to obtain more information from Wheaton College as a next step.

Planning Discussions

Because we view the meetings with the Deans as very high priority, we devoted one meeting to planning how we would address these discussions with the Deans. Additional discussions were held to debate and polish the proposal I will address momentarily.

Interviews with College Deans

We met with John Chen on November 18 and with Bobb Carson on December 2. Ron Yoshida will be joining us on December 16 and Dick Durand sometime in January. Our discussions with John and Bobb were cordial and frank. Both seek to improve the salary administration process and to work closely with the department Chairs to make sure that all faculty contributions are appropriately recognized. Moreover, they are well aware of our concerns over morale and the need for more money to be dedicated to faculty compensation.

Draft Proposal for a New Faculty Compensation Process

The FCC was created about 20 years ago, following a period of collaboration between the faculty, the administration and the Board of Trustees. This collaboration led to a multi-year plan to mitigate the gap in compensation at that time between the Lehigh faculty and a group of reference institutions. More recently, though, the administration first implicitly abandoned the reference group approach, and then explicitly disavowed it. We are now locked in an adversarial face-off, and the FCC knows it is not making the progress the faculty are entitled to expect.

Because we want results, not rhetoric without results, we drafted a proposal outlining a new approach to determining the level and administration of faculty compensation. This proposal was distributed to you electronically earlier today but I have some copies with me. It recommends establishing departmental reference groups to assess compensation levels and vest the principal salary adjustment decisions with the department Chair. The FCC will schedule an open meeting of the faculty in the spring semester to assess your reactions to this proposal.

Attachment



MEMORANDUM

December 3, 1999

TO: Lehigh University Faculty Colleagues
FROM: Faculty Compensation Committee
SUBJECT: A Proposal for a New Process for Determining Faculty Compensation

WHY A NEW COMPENSATION PROCESS IS NEEDED

For over ten years the FCC's efforts with the administration failed to produce any significant improvement in overall compensation status. The operative model during this period focused on comparisons to various subsets of reference institutions, including a 14-school reference group chosen by the administration in the early 1980s, "Pense's Picks," and most recently "Markley's Marks." Although these comparisons demonstrated deficiencies, the FCC, despite considerable effort, has been unable to move the administration toward substantive gains for the faculty or meaningful changes in compensation policy.

This absence of progress reduced the credibility of the FCC in the eyes of the Board of Trustees, the administration, and most importantly, its own constituency, the faculty. An additional factor impacting on the credibility of the committee is a perception among many faculty that the new administration links only funded research to significant salary increases. If true the FCC was unable to react because it was not consulted.

The question, then, is how to define a new framework that productively changes these circumstances, improves the compensation status of the faculty, and reestablishes the mission and credibility of the FCC. In attempting to address this issue, the current FCC recognized that any proposal must incorporate two basic components: (1) salary increases based on merit and (2) a definition of merit consistent with maintaining an outstanding educational experience for our students and enhancing the national stature of our University.

INTRODUCTION TO THE FCC'S PROPOSAL

The FCC believes that a fundamental change in the way faculty compensation is determined is required to achieve the objectives stated above and, more broadly, to restore institutional commitment and a sense of community on the part of the faculty. Therefore, we propose implementing a new system that views faculty performance within the context of operating units and in relation to defined objectives. This approach allows for departmental specificity and recognition that balanced performance across scholarship, teaching, and service is essential for building upon Lehigh's traditional strengths and advancing its scholarly reputation.

One of the most important features of this proposal is that primary responsibility for assessing performance and awarding salary increases is vested with the Department Chair. This key element is needed to assure the best use of faculty talents and that the breadth of contributions that make for a distinctive intellectual and educational environment are appropriately recognized and rewarded.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSED NEW PROCESS

A. Benchmarking

- Each DEPARTMENT, in consultation with the appropriate Dean, identifies a relevant and realistic reference group of five similar departments at other institutions.
- Upon the agreement of the Dean and Provost, the Department Chair contacts his/her counterparts at the reference group to ascertain current departmental salaries by rank and years in rank, as well as benefits. These data will be both anonymous and confidential, although the Chair will share aggregate reference group information with his/her colleagues.
- Data are reported to the Provost's Office for compilation and for influencing University budget priorities. The information should be used as the basis for a multi-year plan for salaries that incorporates a gap adjustment policy. This plan should be developed jointly by the administration and FCC and be made available to all faculty.

B. Salary Administration

- Budgetary allocations for salaries are determined by the Provost and made to each college based primarily on that unit's performance indicators (see below). The Provost also should act to remedy department-specific deficiencies and, in consultation with the appropriate Dean, designate funds to systematically redress these deficiencies.
- Deans then allocate budgeted increases for salaries based on merit to their respective departments on the basis of that department's prior year performance. Funds designated to remedy deficiencies should be distributed only after consultation between the Dean and the Department Chair.
- The Chair of each department then makes individual salary recommendations based on the stated goals set for each faculty member at the beginning of the prior year.

C. Evaluation Guidelines

- Individual performance is based on contributions made in the traditional areas of Scholarship, Teaching, and Service. All faculty are expected to contribute in each area. Emphasis in each area and balance among them can change over time. The important point is that the goals in each area are determined for each faculty member PRIOR to the start of the year. Similarly, the goals for the department are determined ahead of time and it is the responsibility of the Dean to hold each Chair accountable for the department meeting its goals. In turn, the Dean is accountable to the Provost for having his/her college meet their annual goals. This system can lead to differential allocations for merit-based raises across departments within a college and across colleges in the university.
- Each department must publish commonly accepted definitions of meritorious performance in its specific discipline, in demonstrable terms, across the three criteria.

Trustees' Resolution on Faculty Compensation

#1 Board of Trustees

It is the intention of the Board that Lehigh University make every effort, consistent with sound financial management, to attain and maintain faculty compensation, including direct salary and benefits, at a level competitive by field and rank with that of peer institutions. It is further the intent of the Board that the salary component of faculty compensation be merit based.

#2 Administration

The President of the University acting through the Provost, shall have the ultimate responsibility for the administration of faculty compensation. The strategy established for competitive referencing of faculty compensation is to be developed in concert with the Faculty Compensation Committee.

The President is responsible for including in the annual University budget a recommendation for overall faculty compensation. He or she will consult with the Faculty Compensation Committee in the process of establishing that figure.

#3 Academic Affairs Committee

The Academic Affairs Committee of the Board will periodically review faculty compensation information and will be provided with the administration's recommendation for faculty compensation prior to the approval of this recommendation by the Board.

Adopted by the Board of Trustees on October 12, 1990

Subject: A Proposal for a New Process for Determining Faculty Compensation

Date: Mon, 06 Dec 1999 09:05:46 -0500

From: Eileen Gorzelic <ekg0@Lehigh.EDU>

To: ekg0 <ekg0@lehigh.edu>

NOTE: Document is also provided as an attachment.

MEMORANDUM

December 3, 1999

TO: Lehigh University Faculty Colleagues
FROM: Faculty Compensation Committee
SUBJECT: A Proposal for a New Process for Determining Faculty Compensation

WHY A NEW COMPENSATION PROCESS IS NEEDED

For over ten years the FCC's efforts with the administration failed to produce any significant improvement in overall compensation status. The operative model during this period focused on comparisons to various subsets of reference institutions, including a 14-school reference group chosen by the administration in the early 1980s, "Pense's Picks," and most recently "Markley's Marks." Although these comparisons demonstrated deficiencies, the FCC, despite considerable effort, has been unable to move the administration toward substantive gains for the faculty or meaningful changes in compensation policy.

This absence of progress reduced the credibility of the FCC in the eyes of the Board of Trustees, the administration, and most importantly, its own constituency, the faculty. An additional factor impacting on the credibility of the committee is a perception among many faculty that the new administration links only funded research to significant salary increases. If true, the FCC was unable to react because it was not consulted.

The question, then, is how to define a new framework that productively changes these circumstances, improves the compensation status of the faculty, and reestablishes the mission and credibility of the FCC. In attempting to address this issue, the current FCC recognized that any proposal must incorporate two basic components: (1) salary increases based on merit and (2) a definition of merit consistent with maintaining an outstanding educational experience for our students and enhancing the national stature of our University.

INTRODUCTION TO THE FCC'S PROPOSAL

The FCC believes that a fundamental change in the way faculty compensation is determined is required to achieve the objectives stated above and, more broadly, to restore institutional commitment and a sense of community on the part of the faculty. Therefore, we propose implementing a new system that views faculty performance within the context of operating units and in relation to defined objectives. This approach allows for departmental specificity and recognition that balanced performance across scholarship, teaching, and service is essential for building upon Lehigh's traditional strengths and advancing

its scholarly reputation.

One of the most important features of this proposal is that primary responsibility for assessing performance and awarding salary increases is vested with the Department Chair. This key element is needed to assure the best use of faculty talents and that the breadth of contributions that make for a distinctive intellectual and educational environment are appropriately recognized and rewarded.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSED NEW PROCESS

A. Benchmarking

* Each DEPARTMENT in consultation with the appropriate Dean, identifies a relevant and realistic reference group of five similar departments at other institutions.

* Upon the agreement of the Dean and Provost, the Department Chair contacts his/her counterparts at the reference group to ascertain current departmental salaries by rank and years in rank, as well as benefits. These data will be both anonymous and confidential, although the Chair will share aggregate reference group information with his/her colleagues.

* Data are reported to the Provost's Office for compilation and for influencing University budget priorities. The information should be used as the basis for a multi-year plan for salaries that incorporates a gap adjustment policy. This plan should be developed jointly by the administration and FCC and be made available to all faculty.

B. Salary Administration

* Budgetary allocations for salaries are determined by the Provost and made to each college based primarily on that unit's performance indicators (see below). The Provost also should act to remedy department-specific deficiencies and, in consultation with the appropriate Dean, designate funds to systematically redress these deficiencies.

* Deans then allocate budgeted increases for salaries based on merit to their respective departments on the basis of that department's prior year performance. Funds designated to remedy deficiencies should be distributed only after consultation between the Dean and the Department Chair.


* The Chair of each department then makes individual salary recommendations based on the stated goals set for each faculty member at the beginning of the prior year.

C. Evaluation Guidelines

* Individual performance is based on contributions made in the traditional areas of Scholarship, Teaching, and Service. All faculty are expected to contribute in each area. Emphasis in each area and balance among them can change over time. The important point is that the goals in each area are determined for each faculty member PRIOR to the start of the year. Similarly the goals for the department are

determined ahead of time and it is the responsibility of the Dean to hold each Chair accountable for the department meeting its goals. In turn, the Dean is accountable to the Provost for having his/her college meet their annual goals. This system can lead to differential allocations for merit-based raises across departments within a college and across colleges in the university.

* Each department must publish commonly accepted definitions of meritorious performance in its specific discipline, in demonstrable terms, across the three criteria.

 FCCproposal.wpd	Name: FCCproposal.wpd Type: WordPerfect Document (application/wordperfect5.1) Encoding: base64
---	---

Trustees' Resolution on Faculty Compensation

#1 Board of Trustees

It is the intention of the Board that Lehigh University make every effort, consistent with sound financial management, to attain and maintain faculty compensation, including direct salary and benefits, at a level competitive by field and rank with that of peer institutions. It is further the intent of the Board that the salary component of faculty compensation be merit based.

#2 Administration

The President of the University acting through the Provost, shall have the ultimate responsibility for the administration of faculty compensation. The strategy established for competitive referencing of faculty compensation is to be developed in concert with the Faculty Compensation Committee.

The President is responsible for including in the annual University budget a recommendation for overall faculty compensation. He or she will consult with the Faculty Compensation Committee in the process of establishing that figure.

#3 Academic Affairs Committee

The Academic Affairs Committee of the Board will periodically review faculty compensation information and will be provided with the administration's recommendation for faculty compensation prior to the approval of this recommendation by the Board.

Adopted by the Board of Trustees on October 12, 1990

Subject: A Proposal for a New Process for Determining Faculty Compensation

Date: Mon, 06 Dec 1999 09:05:46 -0500

From: Eileen Gorzelic <ekg0@Lehigh.EDU>

To: ekg0 <ekg0@lehigh.edu>

NOTE: Document is also provided as an attachment.

MEMORANDUM

December 3, 1999

TO: Lehigh University Faculty Colleagues
FROM: Faculty Compensation Committee
SUBJECT: A Proposal for a New Process for Determining Faculty Compensation

WHY A NEW COMPENSATION PROCESS IS NEEDED

For over ten years the FCC's efforts with the administration failed to produce any significant improvement in overall compensation status. The operative model during this period focused on comparisons to various subsets of reference institutions, including a 14-school reference group chosen by the administration in the early 1980s, "Pense's Picks," and most recently 'Markley's Marks.' Although these comparisons demonstrated deficiencies, the FCC, despite considerable effort, has been unable to move the administration toward substantive gains for the faculty or meaningful changes in compensation policy.

This absence of progress reduced the credibility of the FCC in the eyes of the Board of Trustees, the administration, and most importantly, its own constituency, the faculty. An additional factor impacting on the credibility of the committee is a perception among many faculty that the new administration links only funded research to significant salary increases. If true, the FCC was unable to react because it was not consulted.

The question, then, is how to define a new framework that productively changes these circumstances, improves the compensation status of the faculty, and reestablishes the mission and credibility of the FCC. In attempting to address this issue, the current FCC recognized that any proposal must incorporate two basic components: (1) salary increases based on merit and (2) a definition of merit consistent with maintaining an outstanding educational experience for our students and enhancing the national stature of our University.

INTRODUCTION TO THE FCC'S PROPOSAL

The FCC believes that a fundamental change in the way faculty compensation is determined is required to achieve the objectives stated above and, more broadly, to restore institutional commitment and a sense of community on the part of the faculty. Therefore, we propose implementing a new system that views faculty performance within the context of operating units and in relation to defined objectives. This approach allows for departmental specificity and recognition that balanced performance across scholarship, teaching, and service is essential for building upon Lehigh's traditional strengths and advancing

its scholarly reputation.

One of the most important features of this proposal is that primary responsibility for assessing performance and awarding salary increases is vested with the Department Chair. This key element is needed to assure the best use of faculty talents and that the breadth of contributions that make for a distinctive intellectual and educational environment are appropriately recognized and rewarded.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSED NEW PROCESS

A. Benchmarking

* Each DEPARTMENT, in consultation with the appropriate Dean, identifies a relevant and realistic reference group of five similar departments at other institutions.

* Upon the agreement of the Dean and Provost, the Department Chair contacts his/her counterparts at the reference group to ascertain current departmental salaries by rank and years in rank, as well as benefits. These data will be both anonymous and confidential, although the Chair will share aggregate reference group information with his/her colleagues.

* Data are reported to the Provost's Office for compilation and for influencing University budget priorities. The information should be used as the basis for a multi-year plan for salaries that incorporates a gap adjustment policy. This plan should be developed jointly by the administration and FCC and be made available to all faculty.

B. Salary Administration

* Budgetary allocations for salaries are determined by the Provost and made to each college based primarily on that unit's performance indicators (see below). The Provost also should act to remedy department-specific deficiencies and, in consultation with the appropriate Dean, designate funds to systematically redress these deficiencies.

* Deans then allocate budgeted increases for salaries based on merit to their respective departments on the basis of that department's prior year performance. Funds designated to remedy deficiencies should be distributed only after consultation between the Dean and the Department Chair.


* The Chair of each department then makes individual salary recommendations based on the stated goals set for each faculty member at the beginning of the prior year.

C. Evaluation Guidelines

* Individual performance is based on contributions made in the traditional areas of Scholarship, Teaching, and Service. All faculty are expected to contribute in each area. Emphasis in each area and balance among them can change over time. The important point is that the goals in each area are determined for each faculty member PRIOR to the start of the year. Similarly, the goals for the department are

determined ahead of time and it is the responsibility of the Dean to hold each Chair accountable for the department meeting its goals. In turn, the Dean is accountable to the Provost for having his/her college meet their annual goals. This system can lead to differential allocations for merit-based raises across departments within a college and across colleges in the university.

* Each department must publish commonly accepted definitions of meritorious performance in its specific discipline in demonstrable terms across the three criteria.

 FCCproposal.wpd	Name: FCCproposal.wpd Type: WordPerfect Document (application/wordperfect5.1) Encoding: base64
---	---