

Lehigh University
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING
(Sinclair Auditorium)
December 8, 2008

Presiding: President Alice Gast

President Gast called the meeting to order at 4:12 PM.

1. Minutes: The November 3, 2008, meeting minutes were approved unanimously by the Faculty, as posted on both the Registrar's Web page and the Secretary of the Faculty/2008-09 folder on the Lehigh University Faculty Blackboard.

2. Consent Calendar: (See end materials included with these minutes.)
Consent Calendar motions were posted on the "Lehigh University Faculty" Blackboard website. The motions are for COE Counseling Psychology course changes, CPSY 460, 484 and 492. With no objections to any of these items on the consent calendar, it was accepted by unanimous consent.

3. Committee Motions: None.

4. Unfinished Business: (See end materials included with these minutes.)
The President brought back to the floor Prof. Steve Weintraub's motion to update R & P Section 3.2.1, Changes in Curricula or Courses, so that such changes in undergraduate programs would follow a similar approval process to graduate course or program changes. This motion had its first reading at the November 3 meeting. Prof. Weintraub stated that the intent of this motion was to reduce work on such changes by departments and to improve the accuracy of the most current version of the course catalog. This second reading included a phrase added to his original version, "for substantive changes in existing undergraduate" [courses must be submitted...].

Prof. Lowe-Krentz immediately proposed a first amendment to the main motion with wording from the Educational Policy Committee in order to improve the accuracy of the language. This amendment's primary difference with Prof. Weintraub's version is that undergraduate course changes should be approved by the college's undergraduate associate dean's office to coordinate the proposed course changes across undergraduate programs in other colleges. Many courses are used by specific programs to meet accreditation requirements that may be unfamiliar to the department from which the courses originate. Associate deans should be aware of inter-college issues and how proposed course changes may have unintended consequences. This amendment to Prof. Weintraub's main motion was seconded by a faculty colleague.

Prof. Weintraub expressed strong opposition to Ed Pol's amendment because it vitiates his intent to streamline the course change process. Certainly oversight is needed, but not in as strict a form as proposed by Ed Pol. For example, dropping a course from the catalog should be considered as "substantive," but content changes to modernize the course should be allowed as a simple fact of academic life. A number of colleagues raised the point that there may be a difference between the catalog description and the actual course content as taught. To this point, Prof. Lowe-Krentz stated that it was changes specifically in content that Ed Pol wishes to coordinate among colleges because of the effects on student learning required for a particular program's required educational outcomes. Prof. Weintraub proposed a second amendment to the first amendment, that his point could be included in the Ed Pol version by adding to the list of non-substantive description changes the phrase, "or changes to indicate modernization." The second paragraph of Ed Pol's amendment would then read:

“Editorial changes to course descriptions and titles, “or changes to indicate modernization” are not substantive. ...” [Secretary’s note: in the Ed Pol hard copy of the amendment distributed at the faculty meeting, this sentence was underlined.]

This second amendment was seconded by Prof. Lasker. The President called for the vote for it, which passed. She then called for a vote on the (first) Ed Pol amendment. The voice vote was mixed but the “ayes” prevailed, passing the Ed Pol amended wording, according to the President and Faculty Secretary.

Returning to the main amendment to R&P 3.2.1 (with the new Ed Pol wording as amended by Prof. Weintraub), the faculty voted to pass the overall change to R&P 3.2.1.

5. New Business (See also end materials included with these minutes.)

Prof. MJ Bishop introduced a recommendation from The Council for Equity and Community (CEC) that the following statement be formally adopted by the faculty for suggested use in course materials (such as syllabi, Blackboard sites, and the like):

Lehigh University is committed to fostering a supportive learning environment that both
1) welcomes the myriad viewpoints among individuals of all abilities, ages, ethnicities, genders, nationalities, races, religions, sexualities, and socio-economic backgrounds;
and 2) challenges all of us to set aside comfortable stereotypes and prejudices that get in the way of learning. Students, faculty, and staff share responsibility for creating this learning environment both inside and outside the classroom. Questions and/or concerns may be directed to the course instructor or the University Ombudspersons, Professors Chuck Smith [x85532, crs1@lehigh.edu] or Rosemary Mundhenk [x83308, rjm4@lehigh.edu].

She stated that the Council wants a discussion of this statement in today’s meeting for comments that will give further direction to them for possible revisions. A formal motion will be brought to the faculty at a later date for approval. Prof. Bishop called faculty attention to recent events and issues, specifically during the recent Presidential Election period, with misstatements about biases on campus, blatant heckling or harassment of Lehigh community members implicitly or explicitly invoking biases. The Council wants to encourage dialogue among all members of Lehigh in order to pursue a multipronged effort to counteract such negative behavior. First, to address blatant, unacceptable behaviors, everyone must know the appropriate contacts to approach with complaints. Second, for many of the other related concerns, the Council wants to foster an open and honest dialog that very likely will challenge everyone’s “comfortable stereotypes.”

Prof. Lowe-Krentz reported that Ed Pol, which included three students from the three undergraduate colleges, had discussed this statement at length and had decided not to bring it forward from the committee. There was concern on the committee that it might not be appropriate for a specific course syllabus statement, but more of an overall University-level policy. A second concern was that the specific names (Profs. Smith and Mundhenk) could change over time and if such a statement was widely distributed, it must be easily updated with current information. In addition, Ed Pol suggested that having only these two names listed might give an incorrect impression that this was the only appropriate contact for complaints. In reality, Lehigh has a large network of contact points to allow complainants plenty of a variety of access routes to seek help with problems of this nature.

Prof. Weintraub commented that the statement appears to be prescriptive and may be appropriate for some courses but far too broad for others. For example, what does “individuals of all abilities” mean? How widely would the Council’s statement intend faculty to interpret “all abilities?” Prof. Eades asked what the function of “comfortable” is. Prof. Bishop replied that the Council welcomes suggestions for re-

wording and alternate versions. Prof. Raposa said that academic activities are generally not proposed to make students “comfortable,” but to challenge their ideas and thoughts. Prof. Kodama opined that the statement doesn’t make sense. Prof. Matthews asked whether the statement had been seen by the local AAUP committee. Prof. Bishop answered that they had not, but thought it was a good idea for the Council. Prof. Matthews continued that he thought the statement was too vague and that if faculty desire students to participate in open learning, such a statement must be much simpler.

Prof. Lasker made a practical suggestion for a web site to be included with names of contact people; this could easily be updated without changing all of the individual statements in use. Prof. Bishop replied with the question of who were the appropriate persons, because the Council had deliberated quite a bit on it. Prof. Szczepanski commented that the implicit purpose of the statement was not as much to deal with blatant and openly expressed biases, but to counteract the less visible but existing biases that, e.g., faculty project to students often unintentionally, and more from ignorance or insensitivity but not intentionally vicious or combative. Prof. Bishop added that the Council believes that any statement must have some “teeth” to have meaning, in that there must be distinct, clear routes open to seek redress. Prof. Moglen observed that some students in distress remark that faculty create an “unwelcoming environment.” He liked the specificity of the statement in recommending options for students, “If you are uncomfortable, here’s who to call.” Prof. Nagel said that he thought the statement was a good idea because it reminded students that there may be misunderstandings in any human interactions.

Prof. Szczepanski endorsed both the comments of Profs. Bishop and Nagel in that a number of students who spoke at the Council’s town meeting immediately after the election clearly had experienced great personal pain from the harassing comments. They had no sense of any resolution process available to them without resorting to additional animosity or even violence. Thus, this statement was proposed by the Council as a starting point, regardless of where the final list of appropriate communication entry points is decided. The immediate, important message to be known by all in the Lehigh community is that there is a forum for complaints, perhaps reported not only to a faculty member, but other Lehigh persons within the community. Prof. Bishop added that the faculty will be at the forefront as key players because of our proximity by necessity with our students. Prof. Weissler suggested that these types of problems are not exclusive to racial stereotyping, but also to gender and age differences. There have been problems in the past for younger, especially untenured, women faculty who have been harassed by their students. She continued her comments that faculty have to take responsibility for open and respectful discussion among all faculty, students and staff.

A colleague suggested that the syllabus statement may be more appropriate for humanities courses as opposed to science and technology ones, as far as content and instructional goals are concerned. Prof. Arrington was concerned that if students get the message that all viewpoints are welcome and that this makes theirs “right,” how could a faculty member grade any student’s answer as “wrong” on an exam, without incurring pointless challenges to grades? Prof. Weissler expressed reservations about gender, racial or socio-economic class biases about who is appropriate for which career. Prof. Scott favored the Council’s statement because it presents a foundation for student-instructor relationships. He asked whether the Council would find any hypothetical examples to illustrate possible situations.

Finally, Prof. Mundhenk observed (to much collegial laughter) that the Ombudspersons “have no authority” to take specific actions in any particular case brought to their attention. Their role is mainly to provide confidential advice and offer options for resolutions to Lehigh community members who approach them with questions or problems. Prof. Bishop announced that quite a bit of information on processes for redress are on the Ombudspersons’ web site. Also, she reminded everyone that the Council’s email address, CEC@lehigh.edu, is available for anyone to provide input to the CEC on this or any other issue.

6. Committee Reports (See end materials included with these minutes.)

Faculty Compensation Committee

Prof. Roger Nagel presented a brief report on the 2008-9 faculty market equity salary adjustments. An additional 0.5% was set aside for 111 faculty members to be allocated by the Provost or Deans to address market inequities in current salaries. This is the first year of a three year process. Prof. Nagel expressed the FCC's satisfaction that the administration had taken their suggestion to begin realignment of Lehigh faculty salaries with the current market conditions.

7. Reports and Announcements (See end materials included with these minutes.)

President's Report:

President Gast began with the observation that, while the overall market financial situation has worsened since our last faculty meeting in early November, Lehigh remains strong and capable of fulfilling our mission. She said she would email the community the next day about actions that will be considered or taken to ensure that we can fulfill our mission. We must prepare for several years of a recession economy by careful management of our budget and operations. Lehigh remains committed to three objectives: Our mission of teaching, research and service; support of financial aid policies and meeting greater anticipated need of students and families; and, continuation of investment in faculty and staff. While we benefit from our prudent financial management, a big challenge over the next several years will be to decrease costs. The administration, faculty and staff must act together to keep Lehigh a strong and vibrant academic community. Faculty searches will continue and we have a goal to have modest merit increases and to continue the faculty market adjustments; senior leadership will have zero salary increases. We will identify where non-salary unrestricted funded activities can be reduced and where unrestricted fund balances can serve as our "rainy day" back-up to support ongoing activities.

Similar to last month, as of November 1, our endowment is down about 20% from July 1. She explained the two main principles governing the management of Lehigh's endowment, a future orientation to preserve the principal's purchasing power, yet also support current spending for current educational operations. The latter is based on a three-year trailing average of market value to damp short-run swings in the market; however, we are exploring new spending models that allow current operations and physical assets to share the losses in order to enable a speedy recovery as the overall economy returns to growth. On the revenue side, the administration is increasing communications with parents about financial aid resources and planning new financial products for students such as Lehigh serviced loans, tuition prepayment plans or payment schedules.

President Gast stated her conviction that this downturn is but one of many that Lehigh has survived in its history, and will continue to do so successfully. The three key strengths that we have are our motivated faculty and staff who care about the Lehigh mission, engaged students who will graduate into leadership roles in business and society, and alumni/ae and donors dedicated to the continued growth of our demonstrated excellence in higher education. She then opened the floor to questions or comments. Prof. Swann opened with a concern about our grounds care staff, especially those employed by One Source, because of they are among the lowest paid workers on our campus. If we reduce these jobs in search of cost cuts, we may inadvertently harm the University's key ties to the South Bethlehem community. The President acknowledged that there is a complex "balancing act" to consider at an organization for which about half of the annual budget is compensation and includes many other fixed costs. Plus, as with other institutions of private higher education, Lehigh is tuition dependent, meaning that financial aid is a key element in recruiting excellent students. At this point, she has focused on the unrestricted funds rather than fixed costs, to maintain our focus on mission, financial aid, faculty/staff.

Prof. Shapiro suggested that for perceptions of Lehigh would be important to keep tuition constant this year, insofar as possible. With families' finances stretched beyond their breaking points, raising tuition would send the wrong message to them. President Gast mentioned that many of the "high end" schools have already increased their '09-'10 tuition rates. Or, in other Lehigh competitors, tuition has been held in check, but room and board charges have skyrocketed; in some cases other schools have heavily used their endowment to support current operations. Prof. Neti asked whether Lehigh has established any communication links with parents to hear their input as the ultimate bill-payers. President Gast responded that the Admissions Office has increased their information available to parents. She noted the need to communicate clearly and openly with families.

Provost's Report:

Provost El-Aasser reported on two brief items. First, in response to the faculty's 2004 request for regular, semi-annual updates on the results of the Patriot Act to restrict academic and research activities, in the Fall, 2008, there was one summer ESL student from Mongolia who self-reported that a visa was denied, as also a COE international student was. No research output was reported as suppressed.

Second, the Provost led a team of Lehigh faculty and staff to Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia for the first regional international meetings with key businesses, academic institutions and Lehigh alumni. The population of this country has 3 races and religions that manage to work together harmoniously with a successful economy based on palm oil, rubber and petroleum production. The government is investing heavily in infrastructure to modernize the country and education is on top of their agenda. The government, in particular is providing full financial support for their students to matriculate into US undergraduate and graduate programs as well as providing resources for faculty exchange programs via the "Brain Gain Program," administered by the Malaysian Academy of Science. The LU delegation learned at their meeting with the Malaysian-American Commission on Educational Exchange (MACEE) that Lehigh University ranks highly within the Malaysian government scholarship program. This will ensure students who are interested in coming to Lehigh will be eligible for full government funding. It is anticipated that, as a direct result of this trip, Lehigh will start to have a pipeline for fully funded, well-prepared Malaysian undergraduates and graduates. They will arrive at Lehigh starting as early as next fall, with a good prospect for a longer-term arrangement to sustain and formalize the process for regularly recruiting students via a Memorandum of Understanding. Another outcome of the trip was that a faculty member from the International Islamic University Malaysia will spend two days at Lehigh early in the spring semesters meeting with faculty and students and giving lecture. His visit was organized by Jack Lule, Director of the Globalization and Social Change Program, who was one of the three faculty who participated in the Malaysian regional meeting. In addition, all three Lehigh University faculty who participated in these meetings have been invited to revisit Malaysian universities to explore other areas of research collaboration and international internships for Lehigh's undergraduate students. They also have continued to communicate with these academic institutions via email.

8. Other (See end materials included with these minutes.)

President Gast introduced Bruce Koel, Interim Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, to make an announcement about the all-day, 2009 Lehigh Academic Symposium, "A Tradition of Excellence," which will be held on April 16, 2009, in Baker Auditorium, Zoellner Arts Center. This event will build on the April, 2007, symposium which was part of the inauguration ceremonies for President Gast. There will be four outstanding keynote speakers: Barry Eichengreen (Political Science and Economics at UC Berkeley and the NBER), Andrea Ghez (Physics and Astronomy, UCLA), Alan Kazdin (Psychology, Child Psychiatry and Institute of Social Policies, Yale), and Joan Wallach Scott (Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton). VP Koel thanked the faculty organizing committee for their efforts to create an

excellent program for the Symposium. There will be an exhibition to celebrate the research performance of Lehigh students. He asked the faculty to encourage their students to attend.

9. Adjournment at 5:32 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "A. King".

Next Meeting:

February 9, 2009, 4:10 p.m., in Sinclair Auditorium; 3:30 p. m. reception.

College of Education: Counseling Psychology Program

Proposed Course Changes

1. Current course number, title, course description, and credits (from present course catalogue):

CPSY 492. Advanced Field Placement (1). Students perform counseling in university and community agencies under the supervision of the Ph.D. psychologists at the field placement. Open only to students in counseling psychology. Course may be repeated for up to 2 credits. Prerequisites: CPSY 491 and permission of the counseling psychology practicum coordinator.

2. Proposed course number, title, course description, and credits (as it will appear in course catalogue):

CPSY 492. Advanced Field Placement (1-3). Students perform counseling in university and community agencies under the supervision of the Ph.D. psychologists at the field placement. Open only to students in counseling psychology.. Course may be repeated for up to 6 credits. Prerequisites: CPSY 491 and permission of the counseling psychology practicum coordinator.

3. Nature of proposed change(s)

A. Course title change? If so, provide rationale below:

No

B. Course number change? If so, provide rationale below:

No

C. Change in course credits? If so, provide rationale below:

Reflects need for increased clinical experience for internship and professional positions.

D. Change in course description? If so, provide rationale below:

Reflects change in CP field toward broader intervention strategies and models including social justice, social ecology, etc. as compared to prior emphasis on individual counseling theory.

E. Other change(s)? If so, please describe below and provide rationale for each change.

No

4. Resource Impact

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

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

This course has been offered previously and as such, all necessary materials have already been procured and are readily available. It is not foreseen that any additional resources will be required.

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

No impact anticipated.

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

This course has been offered previously and as such, all necessary faculty are in place and are readily available. It is not foreseen that any additional faculty will be required.

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

As in past semesters, the course will affect facilities in that it will require an on campus room assignment. The classroom will need to be equipped with instructional technology (i.e., LCD projector, computer) in order to aid the faculty member in disseminating the course content. However, because the course has been taught before, it will not create any additional impact.

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

The dean of the College of Education would assume any financial responsibility. However, because this course has been offered for a number of years, no additional financial responsibility is anticipated.

College of Education: Counseling Psychology Program

Proposed Course Changes

1. Current course number, title, course description, and credits (from present course catalogue):

CPSY 460. Theories of Psychological Counseling (3). Analysis and synthesis of concepts drawn from counseling theorists. Research and current trends in counseling concerning educational, social and vocational problems. Prerequisites: admission to the Ph.D. program in counseling psychology or permission of the counseling psychology program coordinator.

2. Proposed course number, title, course description, and credits (as it will appear in course catalogue):

CPSY 460. Foundations of Counseling Psychology (3). Knowledge in the core foundations of Counseling Psychology, including the history of Counseling Psychology, multicultural issues, career and vocational counseling, counseling/psychotherapy process and outcome, ethics, prevention and health promotion, social justice and disaster intervention. Prerequisites: admission to the Ph.D. program in counseling psychology or permission of the counseling psychology program coordinator.

3. Nature of proposed change(s)

A. Course title change? If so, provide rationale below:

Yes. This title better reflects the content change in this course and the broadening intervention strategies in the field. Counseling theories are comprehensively covered in a separate course, CPsy 442- Counseling and Therapeutic Approaches, which is required at the master's level for all doctoral students.

B. Course number change? If so, provide rationale below:

No

C. Change in course credits? If so, provide rationale below:

No

D. Change in course description? If so, provide rationale below:

Yes. This description better reflects the purpose and goals of this course and the general topics addressed within the course.

E. Other change(s)? If so, please describe below and provide rationale for each change.

No

4. Resource Impact

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

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

This course has been offered previously and as such, all necessary materials have already been procured and are readily available. It is not foreseen that any additional resources will be required.

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

No impact anticipated.

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

This course has been offered previously and as such, all necessary faculty are in place and are readily available. It is not foreseen that any additional faculty will be required.

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

As in past semesters, the course will affect facilities in that it will require an on campus room assignment. The classroom will need to be equipped with instructional technology (i.e., LCD projector, computer) in order to aid the faculty member in disseminating the course content. However, because the course has been taught before, it will only create a minimal room assignment challenge.

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

The dean of the College of Education would assume any financial responsibility. However, because this course has been offered for a number of years, no additional financial responsibility is anticipated.

College of Education: Counseling Psychology Program

Proposed New Course

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

Cpsy 484/SchP 484: History and Systems of Psychology (3). This doctoral level course is designed as an overview of the history of psychology in the Western world. The historical approaches to this task will include a historical developmental approach to the origins and changes of ideas over time, the study of great persons and schools of thought, and a look at the Zeitgeist of each. This course will examine the nature of psychology as a whole, and the influence of philosophical worldviews in areas such as epistemology, ontology, teleology, and axiology. Part of this study regards the nature of science, and its power and limitations as applied to the understanding of human beings.

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

This course will be offered in a lecture format.

3. Rationale for proposed new course:

The course is a requirement of all accredited American Psychological Association doctoral programs in psychology. Historically this course has been offered as a special topics seminar under the course number CPSY466 for the past 8 to 10 years. We are requesting a dedicated course number.

4. Academic impact on programs affected by new course:

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

course will be cross-listed with School Psychology.

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

This course will satisfy a course requirement for both school psychology and counseling psychology doctoral students.

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

(1) Who was consulted?

Faculty from school psychology and counseling psychology were consulted.

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

Yes the course is acceptable for all programs affected.

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

No significant changes will be required.

D. Does the proposed new course 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)

No additional resources will be required.

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

No impact anticipated.

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

The course has been offered previously and as such, all necessary faculty members are in place and are readily available. It is not foreseen that any additional faculty will be required.

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

No impact anticipated.

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

The Dean of the College of Education would assume any financial responsibility. However, because this course has been offered for a number of years, no additional responsibility is anticipated.

3.2.1 Changes in curricula or courses

Proposal from the faculty (Add the language in boldface)

All proposals for new undergraduate curricula or courses or for changes in existing undergraduate curricula or **for substantive changes in existing undergraduate** courses must be submitted to the appropriate college faculty for recommendation to the committee on educational policy, which reviews the proposals before they are submitted to the university faculty for final action. All proposals for new graduate curricula or courses or for changes in existing graduate curricula or for substantive changes in existing graduate courses must be submitted to the appropriate college faculty. The college faculty recommends all graduate curricula changes and substantive changes in graduate courses to the graduate and research committee, which reviews the proposals before they are submitted to the university faculty for final action. Editorial changes to course descriptions and titles, or changes to indicate modernization of a course, are not substantive. Changes to general requirements, to pre-requisites, or to course level, are considered substantive. Numbers for all courses must have the approval of the registrar.

Committee on Educational Policy recommended revisions:

All proposals for new ~~undergraduate~~ curricula or courses or for changes in existing ~~undergraduate~~ curricula or **for substantive changes in existing undergraduate** courses must be submitted to the appropriate college faculty for recommendation to the committee on educational policy or graduate and research committee, which reviews the proposals before they are submitted to the university faculty for final action. ~~All proposals for new graduate curricula or courses or for changes in existing graduate curricula or for substantive changes in existing graduate courses must be submitted to the appropriate college faculty. The college faculty recommends all graduate curricula changes and substantive changes in graduate courses to the graduate and research committee, which reviews the proposals before they are submitted to the university faculty for final action. Editorial changes to course descriptions and titles, or changes to indicate modernization of a course, are not substantive. Changes to general requirements, to pre-requisites, or to course level,~~ course content, credit hours, changes that might affect other courses or cross listing are considered substantive. Numbers for all courses must have the approval of the registrar. Dropping a course from the catalog for reasons other than its not being offered for more than two years is considered substantive. ((Courses that have not been offered for two years are dropped per another R&P section.))

Editorial changes to course descriptions and titles, are not substantive. (Moved from above) These changes for graduate level courses require only the department's approval. Undergraduate editorial changes must also have the approval of the Dean's Office.

Current R&P language reads:

3.2.1 Changes in curricula or courses

All proposals for new undergraduate curricula or courses or for changes in existing undergraduate curricula or courses must be submitted to the appropriate college faculty for recommendation to the committee on educational policy, which reviews the proposals before they are submitted to the university faculty for final action. All proposals for new graduate curricula or courses or for changes in existing graduate curricula or for substantive changes in existing graduate courses must be submitted to the appropriate college faculty. The college faculty recommends all graduate curricula changes and substantive changes in graduate courses to the graduate and research committee, which reviews the proposals before they are submitted to the university faculty for final action. Editorial changes to course descriptions and titles, or changes to indicate modernization of a course, are not substantive. Changes to general requirements, to pre-requisites, or to course level, are considered substantive. Numbers for all courses must have the approval of the registrar.

Motion presented by Professor Steven Weintraub to receive its Second Reading at the faculty meeting on December 8, 2008.

Proposed Change to R&P Section 3.2.1 (Second Reading):

3.2.1 Changes in curricula or courses

Add the language in boldface:

All proposals for new undergraduate curricula or courses or for changes in existing undergraduate curricula or **for substantive changes in existing undergraduate** courses must be submitted to the appropriate college faculty for recommendation to the committee on educational policy, which reviews the proposals before they are submitted to the university faculty for final action. All proposals for new graduate curricula or courses or for changes in existing graduate curricula or for substantive changes in existing graduate courses must be submitted to the appropriate college faculty. The college faculty recommends all graduate curricula changes and substantive changes in graduate courses to the graduate and research committee, which reviews the proposals before they are submitted to the university faculty for final action. Editorial changes to course descriptions and titles, or changes to indicate modernization of a course, are not substantive. Changes to general requirements, to pre-requisites, or to course level, are considered substantive. Numbers for all courses must have the approval of the registrar.

Current R&P language reads:

3.2.1 Changes in curricula or courses

All proposals for new undergraduate curricula or courses or for changes in existing undergraduate curricula or courses must be submitted to the appropriate college faculty for recommendation to the committee on educational policy, which reviews the proposals before they are submitted to the university faculty for final action. All proposals for new graduate curricula or courses or for changes in existing graduate curricula or for substantive changes in existing graduate courses must be submitted to the appropriate college faculty. The college faculty recommends all graduate curricula changes and substantive changes in graduate courses to the graduate and research committee, which reviews the proposals before they are submitted to the university faculty for final action. Editorial changes to course descriptions and titles, or changes to indicate modernization of a course, are not substantive. Changes to general requirements, to pre-requisites, or to course level, are considered substantive. Numbers for all courses must have the approval of the registrar.

Below is the updated R&P language as passed by the faculty on December 8, 2008, with minor typographical edits (Secretary's note: Bolded font below in text does not need to be used in actual R&P).

3.2.1 Changes in curricula or courses

All proposals for new curricula or courses or for changes in existing curricula or for substantive changes in existing courses must be submitted to the appropriate college faculty for recommendation to the committee on educational policy or graduate and research committee, which reviews the proposals before they are submitted to the university faculty for final action. Changes to general requirements, pre-requisites, course level, course content, **or** credit hours, **or** changes that might affect other courses or cross listing are considered substantive. Numbers for all courses must have the approval of the registrar. Dropping a course from the catalog for reasons other than its not being offered for more than two years is considered substantive.

Editorial changes to course descriptions and titles or changes to indicate modernization are not substantive. These changes for graduate level courses require only the department's approval. **Editorial changes to undergraduate course listings** must also have the approval of the Dean's Office.

Syllabus Statement Proposal

The Council for Equity and Community is recommending that the following statement be formally adopted by the faculty for suggested use in course materials (such as syllabi, Blackboard sites, and the like):

Lehigh University is committed to fostering a supportive learning environment that both 1) welcomes the myriad viewpoints among individuals of all abilities, ages, ethnicities, genders, nationalities, races, religions, sexualities, and socio-economic backgrounds; and 2) challenges all of us to set aside comfortable stereotypes and prejudices that get in the way of learning. Students, faculty, and staff share responsibility for creating this learning environment both inside and outside the classroom. Questions and/or concerns may be directed to the course instructor or the University Ombudspersons, Professors Chuck Smith [x85532, crs1@lehigh.edu] or Rosemary Mundhenk [x83308, rjm4@lehigh.edu].