Faculty Meeting Agenda
17 October 2005

Call to order at 4:10 p.m., Sinclair Auditorium
Refreshments will be served at 3:30 p.m.

1. Minutes

Corrections or approval of the 12 September 2005 faculty meeting minutes.

2. Memorial Resolution

- Professor Yong Kim will give the memorial resolution for Raymond J. Enrich, professor emeritus of physics

3. Committee Motion

- Graduate & Research Committee – Professor Mary Deily
  Change in R&P 3.23.2 PhD/EdD Residency Requirement

  Motion is available on the Registrar’s web page:
  http://www.lehigh.edu/~inrgs/ccindex.shtml

4. Unfinished Business

5. New Business

6. Committee Reports

- Faculty Steering Committee – Professor Rosemary Mundhenk
  A proposal for the Amendment & Balloting Process for the Faculty Governance Proposal

- Faculty Governance Sub-Committee – Professor Mike Kelchin
  Review of Proposal Outline for New Governance Structure and Timeline

7. Other Report – Advancement Report – Vice President Bonnie Devlin

8. President’s Report

9. Provost’s Report

10. Adjournment

NEXT MEETING: 5 December 2005 in Sinclair Auditorium. 3:30pm reception; 4:10pm meeting.

2005-6 Meeting Schedule
12 September 2005
17 October 2005
5 December 2005
6 February 2006
20 March 2006
1 May 2005
Lehigh University

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

17 October 2005

Presiding: Gregory Farrington (Sinclair Auditorium)

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

1. Minutes. The minutes of the September 12, 2005 faculty meeting were APPROVED.

2. Memorial Resolutions. Professor Yong Kim read a tribute to Raymond J. Emrich, late Professor Emeritus of Physics. Professor Kim then MOVED that his remarks be incorporated in these minutes [see Attachment 1] and that a copy be sent to the family. The President declared the motion APPROVED by acclamation and the faculty STOOD for a moment of silence in memory of Raymond J. Emrich.

3. Housekeeping. President Farrington reassured the faculty that for the next eight months there will be no change in the Alumni Building; he is moving forward on all fronts. He stated that he is totally healthy, despite any rumors to the contrary. President Farrington is working on the budget through this fall; he intends to raise a lot of money. There are major opportunities that should be seized. Founder's Day marks the 200th birthday of Asa Packer; the dedication for the optics lab will be held after the parade.

4. Committee Motions. Professor Mary Beth Delly, on behalf of the Graduate & Research Committee, MOVED a revision to R&P 3.23.2 - Residence Requirement [see Attachment 2]. The motion was SECONDED. The motion PASSED.

5. Unfinished Business. None.


7. Committee Reports. Professor Rosemary Mundhenk, on behalf of the Faculty Steering Committee, introduced a resolution for the Amendment and Balloting Process for the Faculty Governance Review [see Attachment 3]. The ballot will be the same as used for changes to R&P. Amendments will be submitted in writing.

Professor Bob Thornton asked if there were any downsides to the process. Professor Mundhenk indicated that there might be more email.
Professor Mundenkenk proposed that the University Faculty establish a Blackboard site to improve communications. The purpose of the blackboard site would be to supplement communication not supplant it.

Professor Robert Folk stated that under Roberts' Rules, in order to change governance one-third of the voting faculty must vote. Furthermore, to carry the change in governance two-thirds of those voting must concur.

Professor Mundenkenk stated that she would look into Roberts' Rules.

Professor Mike Kolchin indicated that a statement noting the two thirds quota will be included.

Professor Rich Aronson asked if the vote would be live or electronic.

Professor Kolchin replied the vote would be electronic; the newer faculty have indicated a preference for electronic voting.

Professor Kolchin, on behalf of the Faculty Governance Subcommittee, provided an overview of the Faculty Governance Proposal for review and comment [see Attachment 4]. The first draft of the proposal will be distributed to the faculty by mid November. The first proposal will be presented at the University Faculty meeting on December 5. [A timeline for the process is outlined in Attachment 4]

Professor Folk recommended changing the order of the agenda for the December 5 meeting and placing the proposal prior to new and unfinished business.

Professor Kolchin reported that approximately thirty people attended each of the town hall meetings. While the attendance was not high, the meetings generated good conversation.

Professor Thornton asked what if the new governance is passed and implemented but does not work?

Professor Kolchin replied that the new governance structure would be reviewed after three years.

8. President's Report. President Farrington stated that he will not be present at the December 5 meeting; he will be in Zurich visiting Hans Baer. President Farrington turned the floor over to Vice President Bonnie Devlin.

Vice President Devlin provided an update on the current Shine Forever campaign [see Attachment 5]. The campaign was launched one year ago. It is the largest capital campaign in Lehigh's history. Previous
campaigns have focused on buildings; the paradigm has shifted to endowment. Now that Lehigh has renewable terms for chairholders, chairholder interaction and communication with donors is key. The level of gifts in the form of bequests and planned gifts from estates has increased dramatically and bodes well for the future.

Provost's Report. Provost Mohamed El-Aasser has introduced eleven of the new faculty this fall; one member will arrive in late October and the remainder will join the faculty in January.

Provost El-Aasser has met with the deans and the academic planning for the colleges will be completed by the end of the semester. He assured the faculty that nothing will fall through the cracks.

The CBE dean's search is on track. The pool is "rich in background and diversity."

Vice Provost Jean Soderlund presented a brief report on diversity. The University is setting up a structure to address diversity over the long term and has identified recruitment of undergraduate students of color as a priority. Eric Kaplan is devising a strategy to address this. Retention of undergraduate students of color is a function of overall social and intellectual climate at Lehigh. A joint multicultural program linking Student Affairs and Academic Affairs is being established. Establishing a mentoring program where faculty and staff work one on one with students on life issues will insure that students have connections at Lehigh. The committee on Student Diversity will be hiring an outside consultant to look at retention and the overall climate.

The meeting stood adjourned at 5:50 PM.

______________________________
Stephen F. Thiode
Secretary to the Faculty
304 Rauch Business Center
(610) 758-4557
FAX: (610) 832-6415
E-mail: stf@
Memorial Resolution for Raymond Jay Emrich

October 17, 2005

Raymond Jay Emrich died Wednesday, September 7, 2005 in Kirkland Village, Bethlehem as emeritus professor of physics. He was 87 years old. Born on November 30, 1917, in Denver, Colorado, he was a son of the late Jay Lecoy and Mary Lola (Baker) Emrich. A 1938 graduate of Princeton University, he did doctoral degree work at the University of Cambridge under Sir Lawrence Bragg building a cyclotron in 1938-39 but returned to the U.S. in 1939 because of World War II. During the war, he did anti-tank ballistics research at Princeton and received a Presidential Citation for his work. He received his Ph.D. from Princeton University in 1946 and joined the physics faculty of Lehigh University. He retired from the Lehigh University Physics Department after teaching 41 years and serving as department head for 10 years. He taught and did research altogether for a year and a half in Germany, a year in Novosibirsk, Siberia as a Fulbright Senior Fellow and six months in Minsk, USSR, and then taught at Istanbul Technical University, Turkey for a year.

His research at Lehigh was in the field of the physics of fluids. Following on the wartime research and doctoral dissertation work at Princeton University, he established large and sustained investigations into high-speed flows accompanying shock waves near solid boundaries. He pioneered the techniques of using sub-micron tracer particles in the measurement of fluid flows at distances as small as a micron from the wall. He recognized the competing influence of Brownian motion on the tracer particles, and this led him to new investigations into anisotropy of the fluctuations in the presence of flow non-uniformity. He produced thirteen Ph.D. students. During the sabbatical year in Novosibirsk, he investigated explosive vaporization of liquid carbon dioxide and continued the study after his return to Lehigh. This line of research gave him opportunities to develop and perfect new techniques of flow visualization, imaging of vortices as in hurricanes, high-speed timing and short pulse light sources. He edited an Academic Press volume on experimental methods in fluid flow measurement.

He played leadership roles in the American Physical Society. He attracted the annual meeting of the Division of Fluid Dynamics of the American Physical Society to Lehigh as program chair in three consecutive decadal meeting years: 1957, 1967 and 1977. He served the Division as its secretary and chair. He also played active roles in organizing the biennial international symposia on shock tubes; he co-edited the proceedings volume of its sixth symposium in Freiburg, Germany.

He was elected a fellow of the American Physical Society in 1953, and a fellow of the American Association for Advancement of Sciences in 1980.

During the years as Department head, the Physics Building was renovated, and many faculty members were hired changing the character of the Physics faculty from that of returning wartime physicists to another of those educated under the peacetime blossoming of American scientific research. He took interest in younger faculty and never ceased to share his experiences and insights. Ray’s teaching both in class and in graduate degree mentorship was characterized by his insistence on precise measurement, clear explanation and concise writing. He practiced these rules to the letter himself and carried on with such structures in his scientific life. Ray had an ability to make us think about what could be deemed intractable, difficult, complex problems in a simple, but logical way. Under his exacting façade, he had ample humour and a sense of scepticism about many fashionable but passing ideas. He was a sympathetic person, always willing to help. His interest in classical music was quite serious to the point of being a practicing pianist himself.
One of us (WRS. BS. 50) remembers the first time meeting with Ray in 1949 in Physics 340 (thermodynamics) which Ray taught for the first time. The class was made up of mostly returning veterans. The discussions were frequent, long lasting, loud and raucous. The class was not going to take anyone's word for anything. These were veterans who had been bossed around in the service and they were not going to take just anybody's word on anything until they felt they knew and understood all of the details. It was like sitting in on a political argument. The class only got halfway through the book, but it was the most exciting class he had ever had. Ray did not enjoy it as much as the rest of the class, for while struggling to secure his own personal understanding, he felt chagrined that only half of the material had been covered. It was this class, however, coupled with working in Ray's research laboratory as a senior the following year, that helped him to choose to teach.

Ray was generous in serving the University, the College of Engineering and Physical Sciences and the community at large in many ways. He was secretary of the College for several years until his retirement in 1987. He received the 1984 R.R and E.C. Hillman award of the University. He had been on the Committee of Science and the Arts of the Franklin Institute from 1960 until his death; this duty entailed his researching and composing the research profiles of potential awardees for various annual Franklin Institute medals for each year. Ray remained committed to the Department of Physics until his death, contributing to the memorial resolution for Lehigh faculty member Cassius Carus who died last year.

He is survived by wife of 63 years, Carolyn (Schleicher) Emrich; daughters, Fredrica, a rheumatologist in Los Alamos, New Mexico, and her husband, Paul Smith, and Lynn, a professor of classics and archaeology at University of California at Davis, and her husband John Wagner, and their twins Sarah and Charles, brother, Paul and his wife Ann of Denver, Colorado; sister, Lucile and her husband Howard Reed of Fallbrook, California.

Ray Emrich's life was a personification of the Lehigh Physics Department and his conduct a signature testimony of what being a student or a faculty meant. We take great satisfaction in having consumed his dry humour been instructed and helped by him, and shared some part of our lives together as colleagues and friends. In his long association with Lehigh he brought lasting visibility and distinction to the University, and we celebrate his being.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert T. Folk

Robert T. folk

Yong W. Kim

Wesley R. Smith

Wesley R. Smith

Michael Stavola

Mr. President, I move that this Memorial Resolution be made a matter of permanent record by inclusion in the minutes of this meeting and that copies be sent to the members of Professor Emrich's family.
Proposed Action:
Ph.D./Ed.D. ‘residency’ should be retained but recognized as an evolving requirement in the face of changing educational trends, especially as affected by new technology-based opportunities. As such Lehigh should amend its requirement to reflect current realities by changing the name to Concentrated Learning Requirement and extend the time period in which a student might take the current 18 credits of course work from the present 12 months to 15 months.

Proposed change to R&P: (Note: Additions are underlined; (deletions) are in parentheses.)

From:
3.23.2 Residence requirement

To fulfill the residence requirement for the degree, a candidate must complete two semesters as a full-time graduate student, or at least 18 credit hours of graduate study within a twelve-month period at Lehigh University. The residence requirement is intended to ensure that doctoral students spend a period of concentrated study and intellectual association with other scholars.

To:
3.23.2 Concentrated Learning Requirement

To fulfill the concentrated learning (residence) requirement for the doctoral degree, a candidate must complete two semesters as a full-time graduate student or at least 18 credit hours of Lehigh graduate study within a (twelve-) fifteen-month period either on or off campus, (at Lehigh University.). The concentrated learning (residence) requirement is intended to ensure that doctoral students spend a period of concentrated study and intellectual association with other scholars.

Individual departments may impose additional stipulations. Candidates should check with their advisers to be certain that they have satisfied their concentrated learning requirements.

Proposed Catalog Change:
From:
Residence. Each Ph.D. candidate must satisfy Lehigh’s residence requirement. The residence requirement is intended to ensure that doctoral students spend a period of concentrated study and intellectual association with other scholars. Either two semesters of full-time graduate study or 18 credit hours of graduate study within a twelve-month period must be completed.

Individual departments may impose additional stipulations. Candidates should check with their advisers to be certain that they have satisfied their residence requirements.

To:
Concentrated Learning Requirement. Each doctoral degree (Ph.D.) candidate must satisfy Lehigh’s concentrated learning (residence) requirement. This (The residence) requirement is intended to ensure that doctoral students spend a period of concentrated study and intellectual...
association with other scholars. (Either) Two semesters of full-time Lehigh graduate study or 18 credit hours of Lehigh graduate study, either on or off campus, within a (twelve) fifteen-month period must be completed.

Individual departments may impose additional stipulations. Candidates should check with their advisers to be certain that they have satisfied their concentrated learning (residence) requirements.

Rationale:

The objective of the current 'residency' requirement entails two elements: "a period of concentrated study and intellectual association with other scholars."

For many students such a concentrated learning experience will be met in a traditional manner of taking two or more semesters of full-time work on campus. Others, however, might find themselves involved in regularized, but shorter term, 'residencies' on campus. These could be in the form of quarterly meetings between the student and his/her committee, including research and progress reports to the home department. Still others, especially international students, might be on campus for two summers, but not available to do so during the regular academic year—hence the proposed extension to 15 months to accommodate a concentrated learning experience that might include 2 summers. Yet other students might find that Lehigh takes the University to them by offering programs in an off-site location, either with faculty traveling to the site, or offering courses electronically at a distance. In all cases, it is expected that there will be a period of concentrated study and intellectual association that takes place. The current wording of the 'residency' rule does not appear to fully capture the changing nature of the opportunities available to meet the intent of the requirement and hence the proposed change. For those departments or programs that feel an 'on-campus' residency in the traditional sense is an essential component of developing the necessary intellectual association among scholars, they remain free to enforce such a requirement.
RESOLUTION

Amendment and Balloting Process for Faculty Governance Review

RATIONALE
The Faculty Governance Subcommittee of the Faculty Steering Committee has been working since March 2005 to draft a proposal for a new faculty governance structure at Lehigh. The subcommittee plans to present a draft revision of the relevant sections of R&P at the December 3, 2005, faculty meeting. It has been the subcommittee's overriding goal to make this process open and consultative, and we have sought faculty input on the process at every stage.

The following motion sets forth the process by which the voting faculty will discuss, consider amendments for, and vote upon the Faculty Governance Subcommittee's proposal for a new governance structure. There are several considerations that we have taken into account in seeking the best possible way to proceed:

1. In the same spirit of full consultation that has guided this process, all faculty members must have the opportunity to vote on the proposal for a new governing structure. There are a variety of conflicts that make it difficult or impossible for some faculty members to attend meetings at 4:00 P.M. on Monday.

2. We are also cognizant of the fact that, particularly when changes to R&P have important legal ramifications, or when the proposed changes are structural and complex, the vote must be on a document that has been written carefully so that it is understandable, explicit, and consistent with applicable laws. The final document should reflect the wisdom of the committee that has intensively studied the issue and the many people who have offered thoughtful suggestions for change.

3. Faculty members should also have an opportunity to read and reflect on the final version that they will be voting on; this, and #2, both militate against last minute changes of wording or intent.

4. Because the process of creating a new governance structure (or constitution) requires more than the usual attention to checks and balances, the faculty should have two opportunities to propose and discuss amendments.

With these considerations in mind, we propose the following motion:

RESOLUTION
The Faculty Steering Committee moves that the Faculty Governance Subcommittee carry on extensive consultation with the voting faculty and appropriate members of the administration as it drafts and revises the proposal for a new governing structure;

that faculty and appropriate members of the administration will have a number of opportunities to review drafts of the proposed governing structure and to make suggestions for changes, both electronically and in faculty meetings;
that after such opportunities for feedback and revision, the proposal will be distributed to the faculty electronically. Any faculty member desiring to propose amendments to the subcommittee’s proposal must submit those in writing for distribution to the faculty seven days in advance of a meeting where they will be discussed and voted on;

that the subcommittee will incorporate amendments approved by the faculty, along with amendments the subcommittee considers friendly, into the proposal. The subcommittee will then distribute the revised proposal electronically. During this second amendment process, any faculty member desiring to propose amendments to the subcommittee’s revised proposal must submit those in writing for distribution to the faculty seven days in advance of a meeting where they will be discussed and voted on;

that the final proposal for a new governing structure, with the amendments approved by the faculty, will be submitted to the entire voting faculty for an electronic vote, with two weeks allowed for a response. At least one-third of the voting faculty must cast ballots for the vote to be valid. The electronic votes will be submitted to a secure site where the votes will be tallied. This site will be monitored to insure there are no duplicate votes. The Personnel Committee, the Faculty Steering Committee, and the President or Provost will each designate one person to serve on a committee to oversee the voting procedure.
Faculty Governance Proposal

What it is and What it isn't!

What it is:

- The formation of a faculty senate comprised of 28 members (see slide)
- The elimination of one current faculty standing committee - the faculty steering committee (this committee will be replaced by the executive committees of the senate).
- The combining of FFPOC and FCC into the Financial Resources Allocation Committee.
- The addition of the Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Diversity Committee

NEW FACULTY GOVERNING BODY

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Chief (1)
Vice Chair (1)
Past Chair (1)
Secretary (1)

College Representatives:
- Arts and Sciences (7)
- Business and Economics (1)
- Education (2)
- Engineering (4)
- Health Sciences and Technology (3)

Standing Committee Representatives:
- Educational Policy (1)
- Graduate and Research Policy (1)
- Faculty Recruitment (1)
- Student Affairs (1)
- Diversity (1)

Senior Faculty Council (1)
- Arts and Sciences (1)
- Business and Economics (1)
- Education (1)
- Engineering (1)
- Health Sciences (1)
- Technology (1)
What it is:

- The reformation of the composition of the Educational Policy Committee and the Graduate Research Committee.
- The change in the terms of members of the standing faculty governance committees from three years to four years to be consistent with terms of senators. (The Faculty Personnel Committee will retain its current five-year term for members.)
- The means for developing better linkages and communication between the faculty, administration, and the board.

What it is Not:

- It is not eliminating the faculty's ability to vote on important issues affecting their lives at Lehigh.
- There will be at least two university faculty meetings a year—one in each semester. All senate meetings will be open to the faculty and they will have the ability to express their views.
- Faculty members can bring issues to the senate for consideration with the support of five (5) other faculty members.
- Faculty members can call for a referendum of the entire faculty with a petition containing the signatures of at least 20 (20) percent of the faculty.
- All major issues will be voted on (at least by a simple majority of the faculty.

What it will do:

We are proposing that:

- The senate will meet at least monthly.
- The executive committee will meet with the president and provost.
- Representatives of the senate will meet with selected committees of the Board of Trustees.
What it is:

- The reformation of the composition of the Educational Policy Committee and the Graduate Research Committee.
- The change in the terms of members of the standing faculty governance committees from three years to four years to be consistent with terms of senators. (The Faculty Personnel Committee will retain its current five-year term for members.)
- The means for developing better linkages and communication between the faculty, administration, and the board.

What it is Not:

- It is not eliminating the faculty's ability to vote on important issues affecting their lives at Lehighton:
  - There will be at least two faculty meetings a year – one in each semester. Alternate meetings will be open to the faculty and they will have the ability to propose agenda items.
  - Any faculty member can bring an issue to the faculty for consideration with the support of 10 (10) of their faculty members.
  - Any faculty member can call for a referendum of the entire faculty with support comprising the signatures of at least 25 (25) of voting members of the faculty.
  - All major issues will be voted on (electronic) by all voting members of the faculty.

What it will do:

We are proposing that:

- The senate will meet at least monthly.
- The executive committee will meet with the president and provost.
- Representatives of the senate will meet with selected committees of the Board of Trustees.
Faculty Governance Proposal

What it is and What it isn't!

What it is:

- The formation of a faculty senate comprised of 28 members (see slide).
- The elimination of one current faculty standing committee – the faculty steering committee (this committee will be replaced by the executive committee of the senate).
- The combining of FFPC and FCC into the Financial Resources Allocation Committee.
- The addition of the Faculty Recruitment, Retention, and Diversity Committee.

NEW FACULTY GOVERNING BODY

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Chair (1)
Vice Chair (1)
Past Chair (1)
Secretary (1)

College Representatives:

Arts and Sciences (7)
Engineering (6)
Business and Economics (6)
Education (2)

Standing Committee Representatives:

Education Policy (9)
Graduate and Research Policy (1)
Faculty Recruitment (1)
Faculty Retention (1)
Diversity (1)
How it will communicate:

- The agenda, meeting place, and time of Faculty Senate meetings will be sent to all faculty members at least one week in advance of each meeting.
- Senate representatives will report to their respective college faculty at college faculty meetings.
- At the university faculty meeting in the fall, the senate will announce the agenda for the coming year (additional items may be added).
- At the university faculty meeting at the end of the academic year, the senate will report back to the faculty on its activities.
Senate Faculty Compensation Committee

Executive Committee

Chair (1)
Vice Chair (1)
Past Chair (1)
Secretary (1)

Standing Committee Representatives

Education (2)
Business and Economics (3)
Engineering (4)
Arts and Sciences (7)

Education (1)
Business and Economics (1)
Engineering (1)
Arts and Sciences (1)

Recruitment, Retention, and Diversity (1)
Faculty Personnel (1)
Graduate and Research Policy (1)
Educational Policy (1)

Representatives

College Faculty Senate
Faculty Senate

Senate Faculty Compensation Committee

Standing Committee Representatives

Education (1)
Business and Economics (1)
Engineering (1)
Arts and Sciences (1)

Education (2)
Business and Economics (3)
Engineering (4)
Arts and Sciences (7)

College Representatives

Secretary (1)
Past Chair (1)
Vice Chair (1)
Chair (1)

Executive Committee
How it will communicate:

- The agenda, meeting place, and time of Faculty Senate meetings will be sent to all faculty members at least one week in advance of each meeting.
- Senate representatives will report to their respective college faculty at college faculty meetings.
- At the university faculty meeting in the fall, the senate will announce the agenda for the coming year (additional items may be added).
- At the university faculty meeting at the end of the academic year, the senate will report back to the faculty on its activities.
The FCC Committee of the Student Senate will be the members of the Graduate Student Senate and the Student Senate. Members of ERCAC and Professional Staff.

- At Large - 1
- COE - 1
- CBE - 1
- RCEAS - 1
- CAS - 1
- EFPOC (5)

Composition:
- RAP - FCC & EFPOC

Committees - Financial Resources Allocation, Comparisons by Proposed and Existing.
The FCC Committee of the
Graduate Student Senate
Student Senate
Students - 2 (treasurers of
members of ERAC)
1 Professional Staff
1 Support Staff and
Provost
and Administration
Vice President for Finance
- At Large - 3
- COE - 1
- CBE - 1
- Recas - 1
- CAS - 1
- Elected Faculty - 7
- Elected Student - 7

Composition:
RRP - ECC & EPPOC

Committees - Financial Resources Allocation
Comparisons b/w Proposed and Existing

Composition:
ECC - FAC
Senate Established on July 1, 2007

Timeline for the Proposal for Changing Faculty Governance

- May 2007: Faculty Meeting
- May 2007: Election
- Nov 2006: Ballot Meets for Faculty
- Nov 2006: Ballot Proposal
- Feb 2007 Meeting
- Feb 2007: Final Approval by Senate
- Mid-January 2006: Approval of Final Faculty Board
- May 2006: Ballot Proposal
- May 2006: Town Hall Meeting
- Oct 2006: Proposal Submitted
- By mid-November: Final Approval by Faculty Board
- By mid-November: Final Approval by Senate
- By mid-November: Final Approval by Senate
- By mid-November: Final Approval by Senate
- By mid-November: Final Approval by Senate
- By mid-November: Final Approval by Senate
- By mid-November: Final Approval by Senate
- By mid-November: Final Approval by Senate
- By mid-November: Final Approval by Senate
- By mid-November: Final Approval by Senate
- By mid-November: Final Approval by Senate
- By mid-November: Final Approval by Senate
- By mid-November: Final Approval by Senate
- By mid-November: Final Approval by Senate
- By mid-November: Final Approval by Senate
- By mid-November: Final Approval by Senate
- By mid-November: Final Approval by Senate
Campaign for Lehigh Progress Report

October Faculty Meeting

Ronnie N. Davis
Vice President, Advancement
October 17, 2005

Campaign Priorities
$500M goal

Campaign Progress
To Date

$235M committed (47% goal)
$47M/22 endowed chairs (30%)
$43M endowed scholarships (43%)
$26M facilities (30% goal)
$56M Lehigh Fund (50%)
Top 10 gifts: $65 million
Trustee giving: $33 million
Endowed Chairs
$150 million/75 chairs
- Recruitment & Retention
- Academic Reputation
- Benefits Chairholders, Departments, and Colleges
- Permanent funding but renewable terms for chairholders
- Importance of college strategic plans in identifying key areas
- Chairholder/donor interaction

Cash Receipts FY99-05

FY06 Goals
- Raise $30M in cash receipts
- Add $67M to reach $300M (60%) in campaign by 6/03
- Expand role of volunteers
- Endowed chairs: $15M
- Endowed scholarships: $10M
- Lehigh Fund: $12M
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Phase</td>
<td>2001-2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Kickoff</td>
<td>October 15, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Phase</td>
<td>2004 – 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff Phase</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>December 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Senate at Notre Dame, Angry Over Lack of Clout, Votes to Dissolve

BY ALEX P. KELLOGG

The Faculty Senate at the University of Notre Dame has voted to dissolve, frustrated that it didn’t have any real power or influence. But the senators may have exceeded their power with the vote, so the body may survive after all.

The 15-11 vote to dissolve was taken by the Faculty Senate for 2000-1. But members of the Faculty Senate for the new academic year voted to keep the body alive, despite the vote to eliminate it.

The senate’s power is limited to making recommendations on academic matters. Eliminating the body would require the approval of the university’s Academic Council, president, and board.

The vote to dissolve was the culmination of years of festering dissatisfaction among faculty members with what they view as an insufficient voice in the decision-making process at the university, according to Jacqueline Y. Brogan, the new acting chairwoman of the senate. Ms. Brogan was among those on the new board who voted to rescind the vote to dissolve.

“There is a huge division between the faculty and administration now,” said Ms. Brogan, a professor of English. “The morale of the faculty is very, very low and has been for some time, precisely because we’re not heard.”

The new, 2001-2 Senate voted 10 to 6, with three abstentions, to reverse the decision to dissolve.

Questions arose about whether the proper procedures had been followed, however, since all new members were not present and thus a plurality and not a true majority of the senate had voted for the reversal.

Members agreed to resolve the issue at the next senate meeting, which will be held this week.

LOOKING FOR AN ALTERNATIVE

Administrators did not immediately respond to the move and have not made a formal statement about the dissolution. They have however, discussed it in private.

“We can’t seriously consider dissolution of the Faculty Senate unless there’s some alternative vehicle for the faculty voice. The long-term health of the university depends on there being a vehicle for the faculty to voice their concerns,” said Carol A. Mooney, vice president and associate provost of the university.

Ms. Mooney denied there was a growing rift between faculty members and the administration or that the faculty lacked any real structural power. “The senate has right of agenda to the Academic Council,” meaning it can present resolutions for consideration, she said. “That in and of itself is significant.”

At least one member of the senate expressed his dissatisfaction with the decision to dissolve.

“I believe that an existing senate that goes to work restructuring itself is a better place to start from right now than no senate at all,” said John H. Robinson, an associate professor of law who served on both Faculty Senates and who voted against the dissolution. “I’d rather get rid of the only voice that the faculty at Notre Dame has. I think that thereby you’ll be vesting the faculty with a better voice is part of human logic.”
Senate seeks to reverse apathy, drafts six goals

By CHRISTIE JEPHSON
News Writer

Members of Student Senate said apathy is holding the Lehigh community back and students should get involved in Senate's goals for the year, which include the creation of a new student center.

"The students on this campus need to stop being so apathetic toward everything," Senator Andy Nolf, '08, said. "They have a complaint about something, but they don't voice their opinion to anyone who can start to create change. That is what Senate is for."

Student Senate President Kim Wallen, '06, said all students can attend Senate meetings.

"We hold meetings every other Tuesday at 4 p.m. in Kessinger Theater," Wallen said. "They are open for all students to attend, but students who are not in Senate rarely show up."

When an idea or suggestion is brought to the Lehigh administration, the first thing administrators ask is whether there is student support for the idea, Wallen explained. Emailing your concerns to the Senate and filling out surveys sent through campus e-mail will help, Wallen said.

"The administration takes surveys very seriously," Nolf said. "If students would take five minutes to fill them out instead of deleting them, the administration will see what really needs to be done. Each survey makes a difference."

At the annual Student Senate retreat, held in Alexandria, Va., last weekend, senators spent time creating six goals for the 2005-06 academic year.

"This year's goals are huge," said Clark Cohen, '08, a member of Student Senate. "We are going to need a lot of student support to accomplish them."

Clark is in charge of one of the biggest and most talked about goals: a new student center.

"This is really going to happen," Wallen said. "The administration came to me with plans for building a more effective student center. They want to do this for us, and they want to do it right."

Wallen said there are no formal plans as of now, but members of the Senate would like to see the center include student resources such as mailboxes, a post office, tutoring centers, club offices and student areas. Senators also hope the new center will be located in a more central area with ample space for dining, relaxing and mingling, Wallen said.

Although the center is a long-term goal in its preliminary stages, members of the Senate said they are enthusiastic.

"I'm excited about what Senate has planned for this year," Nolf said. "We have a lot of motivated and genuinely... etc.
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