Lehigh University

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

1 May 2006

Presiding: Gregory Farrington (Sinclair Auditorium)

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

1. Minutes. The minutes of the March 20, 2006 faculty meeting were APPROVED.

2. May Day. President Farrington announced that today is the day that candidates for the Class of 2010 must inform Lehigh of their intention to matriculate. So far, 1,200 students have declared their intention. Minority enrollment has doubled for the Class of 2010. Separately, President Farrington announced that the university has received a $5 million bequest from a 101 year old alumnus’ estate. The money will be placed in the financial aid endowment.

3. Memorial Resolution. Provost Mohamed El-Aasser read a tribute to John Karakash, late Dean Emeritus of Engineering. Provost El-Aasser 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 John Karakash.

4. Nominations. Professor Rick Kish solicited nominations from the floor for election to the various university faculty standing committees. There being none, Professor Kish circulated paper ballots to the assembled faculty.

5. Graduation Motions. Registrar Bruce Correll MOVED the four customary May graduation motions [see Attachment 2]. The motions were SECONDED and PASSED. Registrar Correll then MOVED the three customary September graduation motions. [see Attachment 3]. The motions were SECONDED and PASSED.

6. Committee Motions. Professor Mary Beth Delly, on behalf of the Graduate and Research Committee, MOVED a change in the requirements for the PhD in Business and Economics [see Attachment 4]. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

Professor Delly then MOVED a waiver of the ‘7-Day Rule’. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED. Professor Delly then MOVED a new
course – ECO 4XX [see Attachment 5]. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

Professor Deily then MOVED a change to R&P 3.2.1 [see Attachment 6]. The motion was SECONDED.

Professor Steve Weintraub offered an amendment to insert the word “graduate” before the word “curricula” and to insert the words “in graduate courses” before the words to the graduate and research committee” in the third sentence. Professor Deily accepted these as “friendly” amendments. Professor Weintraub offered an amendment to insert the words “substantive changes in undergraduate curricula” in the second sentence. Professor Deily indicated that Educational Policy Committee did not support this change, and, therefore, considered the amendment “unfriendly.” Professor Deily then MOVED a waiver of the ‘7-Day Rule’ to consider Professor Weintraub’s amendment. The motion was SECONDED, but FAILED. Professor Weintraub’s “unfriendly” amendment was referred to Ed Pol.

Professor Weintraub then asked for an amendment to insert the words “substantive changes in existing” before the words “graduate courses” in the second sentence. Professor Deily accepted this as a “friendly” amendment.

The original motion with the “friendly” amendments, PASSED.

Professor Deily then MOVED changes to R&P 1.2.2.3, 1.2.3, 1.2.3.2, and the Student Handbook [see Attachment 7]. The motion was SECONDED. Professor Jack Paul asked how many petitions were received each year. Professor Deily replied that between two and nine petitions were received every other week. The motion PASSED.

Professor Keith Gardiner, on behalf of the Educational Policy Committee, MOVED a revision to R&P 3.8.1 [see Attachment 8]. The motion was SECONDED.

Professor Bob Folk opined that this motion goes against Lehigh tradition that expunges all student disciplinary records upon graduation. Dean Chris Mulvihill noted that expelled or suspended students’ disciplinary records remain forever. He also noted that disciplinary records are typically released to graduate schools.

Professor Roger Nasel indicated his lack of support for the motion. Professor Barry Bean said the option would be used rarely, but it would be important for students to know it could be employed. Professor Mike Kolchin agreed there should be a sanction – failure for disciplinary reasons should be noted. Professor Alastair MacAulay asked if the proposed change would reduce cheating.
Professor Jacob Kazakia said the emphasis should be on preventing academic dishonesty. Professor Paul asked that the faculty impose a code of conduct. Professor Weintraub proposed an amendment that the University Committee on Discipline be allowed to assign an 'F' or 'FD' grade for disciplinary reasons. Professor Kolchin replied that the UCoD can recommend an "F" grade to the faculty member.

Professor Ken Sinclair called for a vote. Professor Gardiner indicated that Ed Pol considered Professor Weintraub's amendment 'unfriendly.' Professor Weintraub's amendment PASSED by a vote of 42 'aye' and 25 "nay."

The main motion FAILED by a vote of 36 'aye' and 43 'nay.

Professor Ed Kay, on behalf of the Disciplinary Appeals Committee MOVED changes to the University Student Conduct System [see Attachment 9].

In light of the previous FAILED motion to change R&P 3.8.1, Professor Alwyn Eades asked that proposed changes that make reference to the "FD" grade be stricken from the original motion.

With these changes, original motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

Professor Hannah Stewart-Gambino MOVED to RECONSIDER THE MOTION. Her motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

Professor Chaim Kaufmann MOVED an AMENDMENT to Article V, Section 1c to change the language to state "...whose testimony might implicate them in a crime or a violation of the Code of Conduct."

The amendment was SECONDED.

Professor Kay deemed the amendment 'unfriendly.'

Professor Roger Simon asked if the committee can grant immunity. Professor Kay replied in the negative.

Professor Rosemary Mundhenk suggested that the amendment be considered separately at a later time.

The amendment FAILED.

The original motion PASSED.

Professor Mundhenk asked for an adjournment of the meeting until Thursday May 4. She subsequently withdrew her request.
Professor Jacob Kazakia, on behalf of the Personnel Committee, **MOVED** an Extension of the Tenure Clock for Untenured Faculty who become the Parent of a Child [see Attachment 10]. The motion was **SECONDED**.

Professor Eades **MOVED** to amend the original motion by deleting the third sentence under Section 2.2.6.7. The amendment was **SECONDED**.

The amendment **FAILED**.

Professor Sinclair **MOVED** an amendment so that the motion would cover untenured faculty currently in the tenure process. The amendment was **SECONDED**.

Professor Kazakia deemed the amendment *unfriendly*.

Professor Helbatollah Sami asked why the amendment was “unfriendly.”

Professor Kazakia replied that this would alter the board of trustees agenda, i.e. require the repeat of a (current) tenure candidate’s evaluation.

The amendment **PASSED** by a vote of 25 “aye” and 21 “nay.”

Professor Ward Cates noted that passage of this amendment puts the original motion at risk. Professor Vince Munley suggested that, if the amended motion passes, the trustees should be asked to act on this motion before considering the tenure decisions.

The original, amended motion **PASSED**.

The meeting stood adjourned at 6:15 PM.

______________________________
Stephen F. Thode
Secretary to the Faculty
304 Rauch Business Center
(610) 756-4557
FAX: (610) 882-9415
E-mail: sft@
Memorial Resolution
for
John J. Karakash, Dean Emeritus
before the faculty, Lehigh University
May 1, 2006
Mohamed S. El-Aasser Provost

With deep sorrow, but with deeper gratitude for the privilege of having known him, Lehigh University honors and remembers John J. Karakash, a philosopher, a teacher, an engineer, an athlete and a writer who gave 60 years of his life to Lehigh and to its students and faculty.

John Karakash, the dean emeritus of engineering at Lehigh died March 22 at his home in Bethlehem. He was 91 years old.

We remember John as a javelin thrower who won the 1935 Balkan Olympics as an inventor of the world’s first electronic computer, as a devoted teacher and dean, and as a writer whose passion for world politics drove him to write newspaper columns almost until the day he died.

We honor him for the leadership he displayed in building the department of electrical engineering and the engineering college into world-class research institutions.

But we remember him most as a man for whom people always came first. And we honor him especially for the wisdom, humor and joy that he brought to the lives of the many people about whom he cared.

John Karakash was born to Greek parents in what is now Istanbul, Turkey, on June 14, 1914. He was educated in French schools and he grew up speaking three languages. Coming of age at the geographical crossroads of the world, he witnessed major events that shaped the 20th century – the bitter aftermath of the First World War, the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia and the rise of modern Turkey from the breakup of the Ottoman Empire.

John’s appreciation of history – and of the United States – was shaped by his father, a merchant who was kidnapped, held captive for a year and left partially paralyzed by the Bolshevik Army while traveling to Ukraine in 1919. Three decades later, after John had emigrated to the U.S., his father, an admirer of Presidents Woodrow Wilson and Harry Truman, told John he must repay his new homeland for the opportunities it had afforded him.

“You are a citizen of the country that saved the world from tyranny.” John often recalled his father telling him, “Serve it.”
Sports became John’s ticket to America. While a student at Istanbul’s Robert College in 1935, he represented Turkey as a javelin thrower in the Balkan Olympics and won a gold medal. A year later, he traveled to Duke University, where he had been offered an athletic scholarship.

John earned a B.S. in electrical engineering from Duke in 1937 and an M.S. from the University of Pennsylvania the following year. Before and during World War II, he helped develop radar and other defense equipment for the American military. He also wrote classical music reviews and editorial columns on world affairs for U.S. newspapers and he traveled the American heartland to give talks on foreign policy to Rotary Clubs and other organizations.

After the war, John helped a team of engineers at Penn develop ENIAC, the world’s first electronic computer. He also collaborated with Hahnemann Medical College physicians in a study of mechanical hearts.

In 1948, answering an ad in the newspaper, John came to Lehigh to take a one-year appointment as assistant professor of electrical engineering. He stayed on became head of his department in 1956, and then served as dean of the engineering college from 1968 until his retirement in 1981.

When John arrived at Lehigh, the electrical engineering curriculum at universities across the United States focused almost exclusively on electrical power. Lehigh was no exception to this rule. But the field was about to undergo a major transition and it was John who led this transformation at Lehigh. Often acting surreptitiously to avoid the ire of senior and traditional faculty, John organized lectures on communications, radio, radar and telephony – technologies that had seen tremendous development during World War II. Soon John became a force in moving the emphasis of the undergraduate curriculum away from applications and towards mathematics and the fundamental sciences, such as electronics, electromagnetics, telecommunications and control theory.

Lehigh’s students benefited from John’s clear vision, from his modernization of the curriculum and from the personal interest he took in their education and careers. Many of these students became captains of industry and contributed significantly to Lehigh’s reputation. As department chair and as dean, John attracted considerable corporate support by calling on these alumni.

As electrical engineering department chair and especially as engineering college dean, John played a central role in recruiting to Lehigh a number of highly talented faculty. These younger professors updated the curricula in their disciplines, made fundamental contributions to their fields, and gained recognition from national and international professional societies, including the National Academy of Science and the National Academy of Engineering.
John also oversaw a major effort to update and expand Lehigh's research and teaching facilities, often working closely with the office of university development in this endeavor. During his tenure as dean of what was then the College of Engineering and Physical Sciences, which lasted from 1966 to 1981, Lehigh built the Martin Dewey Whitaker Laboratory, for materials science and engineering and chemical engineering, and also the Seelye G. Mudd Building (chemistry), the Francis Donald Sinclair Laboratory (surface sciences), and the Sherman Fairchild Center for the Physical Sciences (microelectronics and semiconductor physics).

As professor and dean, John kept late hours to talk with students and sometimes even slept overnight on a cot in his office. He encouraged engineering students to take liberal arts courses and he set the example by showing up at campus poetry readings to recite Victor Hugo and François Coppée— in French. In 1976 the Epitome called John Lehigh's "Renaissance Man."

John insisted that all students had potential that could be developed—provided they made the effort to learn and their teachers did not give up on them. He frequently said, "We don't educate students in engineering we educate students through engineering." John became known for his pithy sayings. "Education," he said, "should be for those who can grow, not those who can pay," and "It is a disgrace to try to improve our biological and material lives when our spiritual and cultural lives are declining."

In 1981, when Lehigh's board of trustees dedicated the north wing of Packard Laboratory in John's honor, the words to John's philosophy of education were inscribed on a plaque that hangs there today:

"Our goal is to produce good people—young men and women who learn to think to the point where thinking is a habit who have been exposed to, and encouraged to develop and live by, a set of values who have developed methods and approaches to the intelligent application of knowledge; and, last but not least, who accept the virtue of work as a vehicle of service and the will to work as a self-discipline."

John retired from Lehigh in 1981, then spent a dozen years as a consultant to IBM, helping the company promote educational programs for its employees. He traveled the world to speak on education, and stressed the need for formative, or character, education in America's schools.

In 1992, the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools honored John as 'Engineer, Scientist, Philosopher and Teacher for all ages for his eloquent and professional message to elementary schools on human formation through commitment to the Constitutions of our Earth and our Nation"
In the late 1990s, John returned to his first love—history and world affairs—and began writing editorial columns for the *Morning Call* of Allentown, Pa. He turned out more than 30 articles, focusing most of them on American foreign policy, particularly the wars in Bosnia and Kosovo and the more recent conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq. His final column, titled 'My First 70 Years as an Immigrant,' was published three weeks after his death.

In his last years, John made frequent trips to campus, dropping in unannounced to chat with his successors in the engineering dean's office and stopping to talk foreign policy and university politics with secretaries in Packard Lab and with friends in other university offices.

John received an array of honors in his lifetime. He was the first person to win both Lehigh's Robinson Award for outstanding service and its Hillman Award for advancing the interests of the university. He received an outstanding teaching award from the student body; won awards from the professional societies to which he belonged; and was listed in *Who's Who in America*.

Lehigh also awarded John an honorary doctorate of engineering degree and established a visiting professorship and $1-million student-scholarship endowment in his name. In 1990, the Lehigh Class of 1980 and the Alumni Association gave John the Distinguished Leadership Award.

In 2004, on his 90th birthday, the Pennsylvania House of Representatives approved a proclamation that commended John for 'demonstrating the highest ideals of citizenship' and for 'an exemplary record of service, leadership and achievements.'

For those of us who knew John as dean and as fellow faculty member, he will remain always the consummate citizen and one of the grand old men of Lehigh. He set the bar high for us, as he did for his students, and he made his expectations clear. But he supported us and affirmed us unequivocally in our endeavors.

John was a great mentor and a caring and loyal friend. His legacy will live on in every engineer who graduates from Lehigh and in every engineering faculty member who teaches here.

John Karakash touched our minds, our souls and our hearts.

We have been truly blessed.

Mr. President, I move that these remarks be included in the faculty minutes and be forwarded to John J. Karakash's son, John T. Karakash.
MAY GRADUATION MOTIONS

I. That with the approbation and consent of the Board of Trustees signified by their mandamus, the appropriate academic degrees be conferred at the end of the current semester on those individuals who shall have completed all requirements for graduation no later than 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 17, 2006, and that the President of the University and the Secretary of the Faculty be authorized to sign, on behalf of the Faculty, diplomas issued to those individuals.

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

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

IV. That prizes awarded to the appropriate individuals and that the announcement be made in the commencement program.
May 1, 2006

SEPTEMBER 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,
August 30, 2006, 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 August 30 and that the Graduate Committee be
empowered to so act in cases involving candidates for graduate degrees.
Graduate and Research Committee

Proposed Program Changes

1. Name and summary of current program (as it currently appears in the catalog, p. 63):

Doctor of philosophy in business and economics

Once admitted to the College, the student will meet with the Ph.D. advisor to discuss a suitable program of study. Each student will choose two fields of specialized study in addition to a core study of economic theory, econometrics, and mathematical models. The doctoral student must pass written comprehensive examinations for the economic-theory core material and the two fields of specialization. The macro exam is normally to be taken at the end of the first year of full-time study, while the micro exam will be administered in January of the second year. Examination in the two fields of specialization should be completed by the end of the third year of full-time study. After successfully completing the course requirements and the written (comprehensive) examinations, the student will then select a chairperson from the department of economics to guide him or her to successful completion of the dissertation.

2. Proposed program changes (as they will appear in the catalog):

EXISTING STATEMENT

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

The Ph.D. degree in business and economics is designed to provide advanced knowledge and the capacity to carry on independent research in various areas of business and economics. Holders of the Ph.D. are normally employed in academic positions in departments of economics or in schools of business administration, or in policy analysis and research positions in banks, business, government, and research organizations. Employment opportunities are excellent for graduates with this degree.

The Ph.D. program requires a minimum of 48 semester hours of study (including dissertation) beyond the master’s degree or 72 hours of study beyond the bachelor’s degree. Each student is expected to choose three major fields of specialized study. Economic theory must be included as one of the major fields. Each student must take the eight core courses in micro-economics, macroeconomics, econometrics, mathematical economics, and economic history. Students must also take written and oral comprehensive examinations in their major fields. The chairperson of the doctoral committee will help to arrange a plan of study suitable for each student’s program and to prepare the student to pass the examinations.

Major fields of specialization normally available include economic theory, international economics, labor economics, managerial economics, money and banking, and public finance.

Under the guidance of a dissertation chairperson and committee formed after passing of the examinations, the candidate undertakes research culminating in an acceptable dissertation. The Ph.D. is awarded upon the successful completion of the doctoral dissertation and its oral defense.

For additional information or an application packet, please contact Dr. James Dearden, Adviser, Ph.D. Program, College of Business and Economics, Lehigh University, 621 Taylor Street, Bethlehem, PA 18015 or call (610) 758-5280.
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

The Ph.D. degree in business and economics is designed to provide advanced knowledge and the capacity to carry on independent research in various areas of business and economics. Holders of the Ph.D. are normally employed in academic positions in departments of economics or in schools of business administration, or in policy analysis and research positions in banks, business, government, and research organizations.

The Ph.D. program requires a minimum of 48 semester hours of study (including dissertation) beyond the master's degree or 72 hours of study beyond the bachelor's degree. Each student is expected to choose four major areas of study, including fields in microeconomics and macroeconomics and fields in two specialized areas. Each student must take the eight core courses in microeconomics, macroeconomics, econometrics, mathematical economics, and economic history. Students must also take written and oral comprehensive examinations in macroeconomics, microeconomics and one of the major specialized fields. In the remaining specialized area, the student must take at least two courses. Students also must also write a third-year paper. The chairperson of the doctoral committee will help to arrange a plan of study suitable for each student's program and to prepare the student to pass the examinations.

Major fields of specialization normally available include economic theory, international economics, labor economics, managerial economics, money and banking, and public finance.

Under the guidance of a dissertation chairperson and committee formed after passing of the examinations and the third-year paper, the candidate undertakes research culminating in an acceptable dissertation. The Ph.D. is awarded upon the successful completion of the doctoral dissertation and its oral defense.

For additional information or an application packet, please contact Dr. Shin-Yi Chou, Adviser, Ph.D. Program, College of Business and Economics, Lehigh University, 621 Taylor Street, Bethlehem, PA 18015 or call (610) 758-5280.

3. Description of proposed change(s):

The Third-Year Paper Requirement

The third-year paper requirement is composed of three requirements: obtaining an interim advisor, writing a satisfactory third-year paper, and presenting the paper.

As a condition for advancement to candidacy, a student must obtain an interim advisor and write an original paper suitable for submission to a scholarly journal. This requirement gives training in the integration of theoretical and econometric tools and ensures that students become familiar at an early stage with research practice.

After the end of the second year, all doctoral students face the following requirements, whether or not they have completed the core requirements.

Obtain an Interim Advisor:
By the end of the second year, students must obtain an interim advisor whom they shall retain until candidacy (when the interim advisor either becomes or is replaced by the student's dissertation advisor). It is the responsibility of the student, with the help of the graduate advisor, to find an interim advisor. **Students are urged to approach faculty they are interested in early, as a faculty member with an already heavy advising load is not expected to take on further students.** Students may change interim advisors at any time provided they have found a replacement. However, a change of advisor will not be acceptable as an excuse for failure to complete any of the following requirements on time unless explicitly approved by the graduate director.

*Write a Third-Year Paper:*

By last day of finals of the third-year second semester, each student must submit a paper consisting of original research in a topic discussed with and approved by the interim advisor. Previously-written original papers may be used as the basis for this paper if approved. However, since the standards will be higher than, say, the standards of course papers, substantial improvement will be expected in such cases. The paper may be in any area, and the ideas explored in it often will be the genesis of at least one paper in the thesis, but may be a self-contained paper that is unrelated to the dissertation.

The paper should be written in a professional style and format. Students are advised to read published articles on empirical topics, paying close attention to how articles are organized, how data are described, and how results are presented. The format of the paper should be consistent with standards commonly used in economics. Students submit one copy to their advisor and one copy to the PhD director. Two faculty members will read the paper: the interim advisor and another faculty member who volunteers to read the paper, subject to the approval of the Ph.D. director. The program permits the student and the interim advisor to work on the paper jointly, possibly even submitting the paper as a jointly-authored piece to an academic journal. If so, the second reader must not be an author.

If the paper is submitted by the due date and either reader feels that it is unsatisfactory, the student will be able to revise the paper and resubmit it for re-evaluation. If a paper is submitted late, the department does not guarantee that the readers will evaluate and return comments to the student in time for the paper to be revised, should it be judged unsatisfactory. A student failing to meet these requirements will be placed on academic probation and required to submit a satisfactory paper before the first day of classes of the fourth year.

*Third-Year Original Presentation:*

During the second semester of the third year, each student must present a scheduled workshop based on his or her third-year original paper. Although this presentation may be made before the paper is complete, it must consist of an essentially complete discussion of the topic and results of the paper. Students are responsible for scheduling their own presentations and should sign up early in the term for a scheduled time. (Note: the presentations will not be graded.)
4. **Rationale for proposed change(s):**

This requirement gives training in the integration of theoretical and econometric tools and ensures that students become familiar at an early stage with research practice.

5. **Academic Impact Statement:**
   
   a. Is the proposed program change interdisciplinary?
   
   No
   
   b. Identify any known effects of the proposed program change on other programs at the University.
   
   None
   
   c. If there are known effects, individuals in charge of the affected programs must be consulted about the proposed program change and the following information provided:
      
      (1) Who was consulted?
      
      Passed unanimously in both Economics Department and CBE faculty meetings.
      
      (2) Is the proposed program change acceptable to the affected programs?
      
      Yes
      
      (3) Will any changes be required in the affected programs? If so, describe.
      
      Yes. Doctoral students must pass the third-year paper requirement in order to graduate.
      
   d. Identify any known effects of the proposed program change on the University's commitment to diversity.
      
      None.

6. **Resource Impact Statement:**

   a. Provide each of the following:
      
      (1) Library impact statement
      
      None
(2) Computer impact statement

None

(3) Faculty impact statement
The faculty time required to write and grade field comprehensives will be reduced. Furthermore, with better-trained dissertation students, the faculty time devoted to dissertations should be reduced. So, the overall effect of the requirement change on faculty time should be negligible.

(4) Facilities impact statement

None

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

The Economics Department will assume financial responsibility.
Proposal to the University Graduate and Research Committee
From: Dept. of Economics (contact: Art King, Director HBPE program)
April 18, 2006

Re: Proposed New HBPE Graduate Course passed by CBE faculty, 4/18/06

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

Eco 4XX: Health and Bio-Pharmaceutical Economics (HBPE) Practicum (1-3);
This practicum provides an opportunity for HBPE program students to work on an
intensive project or consulting engagement within the health and biopharmaceutical field.
Students work with client firms on individual or team projects which focus on HBPE
activities such as outcomes research, cost-effectiveness analyses and regulatory reporting.
Written reports and formal presentations are required. All course and placement arrangements
must be approved by the HBPE director before practicum starts. Summer session only;
enrollment cap, 10. Pre-requisites: completion of HBPE core courses, or permission of the instructor King

2. Instructional mode and number of contact hours required:

While the HBPE program director will assist in locating suitable companies for this
practicum, we cannot guarantee a placement will be automatically available for a student.
Thus, the student must understand that s/he has a responsibility to participate in the
search process. No course registration for this can occur until there is a placement
available and approved by the HBPE director.

This course will be project based, closely supervised by the instructor and a firm
coordinator, to be identified as soon as the company agrees to participate; a likely person
would be the firm’s project director. Once the project topic is set during the spring, the
instructor will work with the student to develop a list of relevant current literature to be
read to prepare the student “to hit the ground running” when s/he joins the project.
During the project, the student will make regular (i.e., at least weekly) progress/update
reports to the instructor. At the end of the practicum, the student will present both oral
and written reports to the instructor and the firm. If any submission for publication of
results with the student as co-author is considered, both Lehigh and company protocols
must be agreed upon before the student starts the practicum, or as soon as submission is
contemplated.

The number of contact hours (between the student and instructor or firm’s project
supervisor) over the course will be a minimum of 5 hours per credit. In addition, there
will be at least 45 hours of work per credit involved by the student who will keep a
detailed daily record of his/her practicum activities. It is likely that this course will be
taken during the summer at the end of his/her course work. The course will begin in
summer, 2006, as the first, full-time program cohort completes most of their required
courses. Prior to this, during the spring, the HBPE director will work with the interested students on a company placement, identify the project topic and other course details, all of which will be ready for the practicum to begin in late May, 2006. During the summer '06, Prof. Shih-Yi Chou has agreed to work with Prof. King on overseeing the practicums, if this is necessary while he is away from Lehigh.

3. Rationale for proposed new course:

This course will be a component in the new MS program in health economics to provide all program participants the opportunity to obtain experience in the field before seeking a permanent job upon graduation. This will be a strongly recommended elective primarily for students without such background. The offering of this course is consistent with College and University initiatives in biopharma and economics ("bio-business") areas, and also with a potential MBA concentration in health and biopharmaceutical economics.

4. Academic impact on programs affected by new course:

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

No.

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

This course will be an elective course in the new M.S. program in health economics but given the course prerequisites, we do not anticipate an impact on other programs.

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? Art King, Director of the HBPE MS program; Jim Dearden, Chair, Dept. of Economics, and the faculty of the Department; HBPE faculty; Mary Therese Taglang, Director of Graduate Programs, K. Sivakumar, Chair, Dept of Marketing; Joan DeSalvatore, CBE Associate Dean.

(2) Is the proposed new course acceptable to all other programs affected? Yes, for the Economics Department and HBPE faculty.

(3) Will any changes be required in the affected programs? If so please describe below.
None.
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)
None.

(2) Computer impact statement (attach statement if provided by LTS)
None

(3) Faculty impact statement (how proposed program affects load on existing faculty or requires new faculty)
This course will require a commitment by the Economics faculty to supervise a Summer Session course for the HBPE students choosing this elective course. At this time, Prof. King, program director, has agreed to do this

(4) Facilities impact statement (how proposed program affects load on existing facilities or requires new facilities)
Inasmuch as this course is designed to be located off campus, there will be no impact on Lehigh facilities.

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

This course will be the responsibility of the HBPE MS program and the Dept. of Economics
April 19, 2006

To: Lehigh University Faculty
From: Graduate & Research Committee
Re: Change in R&P Section 3.2.1

R&P currently reads:

3.2.1 Changes in curricula or courses

All proposals for new curricula or courses or for changes in existing 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 courses, which are open to graduate students for credit, must be submitted to the graduate and research committee for recommendation to the committee on educational policy. Numbers for all courses must have the approval of the registrar.

Proposed New Language:

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 courses must be submitted to the appropriate college faculty. The college faculty recommends all curricular changes and substantive course changes 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.

Rationale:

1) Currently EdPol takes responsibility for the undergraduate curricula while GRC has responsibility for graduate curricula. The language change brings R&P into agreement with current procedures.

2) The GRC proposes that it review, and forward to the LU faculty for approval, only substantive changes in graduate courses. The change reduces the paperwork and time lags involved in keeping catalog descriptions current, but it means that only college approval is necessary for course changes that are not considered substantive.
April 19, 2005

To: Lehigh University Faculty
From: Graduate & Research Committee
Re: Change in R&P Section 3.2.1

R&P currently reads:

3.2.1 Changes in curricula or courses

All proposals for new curricula or courses or for changes in existing 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 courses, which are open to graduate students for credit, must be submitted to the graduate and research committee for recommendation to the committee on educational policy. Numbers for all courses must have the approval of the registrar.

Proposed New Language:

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 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.

Rationale:

1) Currently EdPol takes responsibility for the undergraduate curricula while GRC has responsibility for graduate curricula. The language change brings R&P into agreement with current procedures.

2) The GRC proposes that it review, and forward to the LU faculty for approval, only substantive changes in graduate courses. The change reduces the paperwork and time lags involved in keeping catalog descriptions current, but it also means that only college approval is necessary for course changes that are not considered substantive.
April 12, 2006

To: Lehigh University Faculty
From: Graduate & Research Committee
Re: Change in R&P Sections 1.2.2.3, 1.2.3, 1.2.3.2, & the Student Handbook

The relevant parts of the three R&P sections currently read:

1.2.2.3 Graduate and Research Committee

The committee considers policies and regulations on graduate education and research. The responsibilities and duties of the committee include, but are not limited to:

1. Develop general policies and regulations on...

2. Review the appropriateness and quality of graduate programs and ...

3. Review and approve graduate course changes and curriculum proposals...

4. Interpret and apply faculty rules governing graduate students and degrees, including questions concerning student petitions and appeals.

5. Establish policies for awarding fellowships...

6. Recommend approval of the formation...

7. Recommend policies and procedure for coordinating research-related...

8. Recommend policies and procedures to stimulate and satisfy...

The committee consists of...

1.2.3 Faculty administrative committees

The following committees carry out policies promulgated by the faculty in the faculty regulations. With the exception of the standing of students committee, faculty members are elected by the faculty. All faculty administrative committees are accountable to the faculty. Each reports directly to the faculty, and each is linked to a designated member of the faculty steering committee as indicated for purposes of inter-committee communications.

The faculty administrative committees (and their links to the faculty steering committee) are as follows:

committee on nominations (1.2.3.1)
Committee on standing of students

The committee on standing of students consists of the provost or a faculty representative of the provost, the dean of students, the deans of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business and Economics, and Engineering and applied Science (or their representatives), a faculty member chosen by Ed Pol from its membership, and the registrar who shall act as recording secretary. After seeking the advice of the committee, the provost will appoint from among these members the chairperson of the committee. An executive secretary to the committee (not a member of the committee) will be appointed by the vice president for student affairs.

The committee has jurisdiction over all undergraduate matters concerning the application of faculty rules to the scholastic standing of students and has power to act in cases of scholastic standing and status. It is responsible for acting upon all petitions pertaining to the following: student academic progress, qualifying for the baccalaureate degree, examinations, rosters, academic disciplinary action, removal from academic probation, special curriculums, curriculum transfer, waiver or substitutions of graduation requirements, readmission or reinstatement of separated students, attendance, awarding of honors, and all such matters pertaining the maintenance of academic standards.

On issues of scholastic standing, which relate to educational policy, the committee will develop and transmit its recommendations to Ed Pol for review and submission to the faculty for approval.

Proposed Language:

Graduate and Research Committee

The committee considers policies and regulations on graduate education and research. The responsibilities and duties of the committee include, but are not limited to:

1. Develop general policies and regulations on...

2. Review the appropriateness and quality of graduate programs and...

3. Review and approve graduate course changes and curriculum proposals...
4. Interpret and apply faculty rules concerning student or department appeals of petition decisions.

5. Establish policies for awarding fellowships...

6. Recommend approval of the formation....

7. Recommend policies and procedure for coordinating research-related....

8. Recommend policies and procedures to stimulate and satisfy....

The committee consists of...

1.2.3 Faculty administrative committees

The following committees carry out policies promulgated by the faculty in the faculty regulations. With the exception of the two standing of students committees, faculty members are elected by the faculty. All faculty administrative committees are accountable to the faculty. Each reports directly to the faculty, and each is linked to a designated member of the faculty steering committee as indicated for purposes of inter-committee communications.

The faculty administrative committees (and their links to the faculty steering committee) are as follows:

- committee on nominations (1.2.3.1)
  (chairperson, steering committee)
- committee on standing of undergraduate students (1.2.3.2.1)
  (chairperson, educational policy)
- committee on standing of graduate students (1.2.3.2.2)
  (chairperson, graduate & research)
- Williams senior prize committee (1.2.3.3)
  (chairperson, educational policy)
- University disciplinary appeals committee (1.2.3.4)
  (chairperson, steering committee)

1.2.3.2.1 Committee on standing of undergraduate students

The committee on standing of undergraduate students consists of the provost or a faculty representative of the provost, the dean of students, the deans of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business and Economics, and Engineering and applied Science (or their representatives), a faculty member chosen by Ed Pol from its membership, and the registrar who shall act as recording secretary. After seeking the advice of the committee,
the provost will appoint from among these members the chairperson of the committee. An executive secretary to the committee (not a member of the committee) will be appointed by the vice president for student affairs.

The committee has jurisdiction over all undergraduate matters concerning the application of faculty rules to the scholastic standing of students and has power to act in cases of scholastic standing and status. It is responsible for acting upon all petitions pertaining to the following: student academic progress, qualifying for the baccalaureate degree, examinations, rosters, academic disciplinary action, removal from academic probation, special curricula, curriculum transfer, waiver or substitutions of graduation requirements, readmission or reinstatement of separated students, attendance, awarding of honors, and all such matters pertaining the maintenance of academic standards.

On issues of scholastic standing, which relate to educational policy, the committee will develop and transmit its recommendations to Ed Pol for review and submission to the faculty for approval.

1.2.3.2.2 Committee on standing of graduate students

The committee on standing of graduate students consists of the provost or a faculty representative of the provost, the dean of students (or their representative), the deans of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business and Economics, Education, and Engineering and Applied Science (or their representatives), a faculty member chosen by the Graduate & Research Committee from its membership, and the Registrar who shall act as recording secretary. After seeking the advice of the committee, the provost will appoint from among these members the chairperson of the committee.

The committee has jurisdiction over all matters concerning the application of faculty rules to the scholastic standing of graduate students and has power to act in cases of scholastic standing and status. It is responsible for acting upon all petitions pertaining to the following: graduate student academic progress, qualifying for a graduate degree, examinations, rosters, extension of a grade of incomplete, academic disciplinary action, academic probation, waiver or substitutions of graduation requirements, readmission or reinstatement of separated students, and all such matters pertaining to the maintenance of academic standards of graduate students.

On issues of scholastic standing, which relate to educational policy, the committee will develop and transmit its recommendations to the Graduate & Research Committee for review and submission to the faculty for approval.

The Student Handbook would need to be amended in two places. It currently reads:

Page 8:
Committee on Standing of Students (S.O.S.). This committee has jurisdiction over all undergraduate matters concerning the application of faculty regulations to the scholastic
standing of students, scholastic probation, drop actions and exceptions to academic regulation procedures.

Petitions to the committee are filed with the Associate Dean of Students (UC 210) who is the Executive Secretary of the Committee after consultation with the appropriate academic adviser or curriculum directors, and college dean. The committee consists of the Dean of Students as Chairperson, a representative from the Office of the provost, the Vice Chairperson of the committee on Educational Policy, and the Associate Deans of the Colleges of Arts and Science, business and Economics, and Engineering and Applied Science, and the Registrar who also serves as Recording Secretary.

Page 23:

Redress of Academic Grievances. A student (or group of students) with a complaint arising out of any course should bring the complaint first to the instructor of the course in which the grievance occurred. If, after meeting with the instructor, the student feels that satisfaction has not been received, the complaint should then be taken to the instructor’s immediate superior, and so on up the line, from the instructor of a section to the faculty member in charge of all sections of the course, the department chairperson, and the dean of the college.

If the student (or group of students) believes the grievance should not go to the instructor, he or she should take it to the instructor’s immediate superior. In case of doubt as to whom to bring the grievance, the student should consult the dean of the college or the Dean of Students Office.

Right of Appeal of Academic Grievances. A student failing to gain satisfaction in the manner described above may appeal by petition to the Committee on Standing of Students, or, for graduate students, the Graduate and Research Committee.

The Student Handbook should be amended to read:

Page 8:

Committee on Standing of Undergraduate Students (S.O.S.). This committee has jurisdiction over all undergraduate matters concerning the application of faculty regulations to the scholastic standing of students, scholastic probation, drop actions and exceptions to academic regulation procedures.

Petitions to the committee are filed with the Associate Dean of Students (UC 210) who is the Executive Secretary of the Committee, after consultation with the appropriate academic adviser or curriculum directors, and college dean. The committee consists of the Dean of Students as Chairperson, a representative from the Office of the provost, the Vice Chairperson of the committee on Educational Policy, and the Associate Deans of the Colleges of Arts and Science, business and Economics, and Engineering and Applied Science, and the Registrar who also serves as Recording Secretary.

Committee on Standing of Graduate Students. This committee has jurisdiction over all matters concerning the application of faculty regulations to the scholastic standing of graduate students. Petitions to the committee are filed with the Registrar, after consultation with the appropriate academic adviser or curriculum directors, and college dean. The committee consists of the provost or a faculty representative of the provost,
the dean of students (or their representative), the deans of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business and Economics, Education, and Engineering and Applied Science (or their representatives), a faculty member chosen by the Graduate & Research Committee from its membership, and the Registrar

Page 23:
Redress of Academic Grievances. An undergraduate (or group of undergraduates) with a complaint arising out of any course should bring the complaint first to the instructor of the course in which the grievance occurred. If, after meeting with the instructor, the student feels that satisfaction has not been received, the complaint should then be taken to the instructor’s immediate superior, and so on up the line, from the instructor of a section to the faculty member in charge of all sections of the course, the department chairperson, and the dean of the college.

If the student (or group of students) believes the grievance should not go to the instructor, he or she should take it to the instructor’s immediate superior. In case of doubt as to whom to bring the grievance, the student should consult the dean of the college or the Dean of Students Office.

A graduate student (or group of graduate students) with a complaint arising out of any course or research activity should bring the complaint first to the responsible faculty member. If, after meeting with the faculty member, the student wishes to pursue the matter further, the complaint should then be taken to the department chairperson, and the dean of the college.

If the student (or group of students) believes the grievance should not go to the faculty member, he or she should take it to the department chairperson. In case of doubt as to whom to bring the grievance, the student should consult the dean of the college, the Dean of Students Office, or the University Ombudsperson.

Right of Appeal of Academic Grievances. A student failing to gain satisfaction in the manner described above may appeal by petition to the Committee on Standing of Undergraduate Students, or, for graduate students, the Committee on Standing of Graduate Students.

Formation of such a committee establishes a structure for graduate students parallel to that which currently exists for undergraduate students. The GRC is proposing the formation of this new faculty administrative committee principally to increase consistency in decisions over time. In addition, creation of such a committee will insure that each college has voting representation. (On GRC, only the elected faculty are voting members, and the petitions subcommittee may not include an elected faculty member from each college). Such a committee will also insure greater privacy for those making appeals, and have resources the GRC lacks to investigate claims of those making appeals.
January 18, 2006

To: Committee on Educational Policy

From: Chris Mulvehill and Bruce Correll

Revision of Code of Conduct and
Revision to R&P 3.8.1 Definition add section 4.

--------- Code of Conduct ---------
*Sanctions related to academic integrity violations*. In addition, to the primary sanctions as listed in Section I, the hearing panel may impose a course grade of "FD", which would remain on the transcript permanently. The University’s transcript will define a "FD" grade as failing performance as a result of being found responsible for academic dishonesty. The "FD" Grade will have the mathematical equivalence of an "F". In the event that the student had already voluntarily withdrawn from the course in question, the "FD" grade would replace the "W". If the hearing panel does not assign a grade of "FD" in the course, they may provide recommendations to the course instructor regarding grading (e.g., lowering the course grade by some amount). In any case in which a student is found responsible and a grade of "FD" is not assigned, the grading of all exercises and the determination of the course grade are left to the sole discretion of the course instructor and could result in a regular F being assigned.

R&P 3.8.1

4. The University Committee on Discipline may assign a "FD" grade as failing performance as a result of being found responsible for academic dishonesty. The "FD" Grade will have the mathematical equivalence of an "F". The "FD" will not count in earned hours toward a Lehigh degree.
UNIVERSITY STUDENT CONDUCT SYSTEM

NOTE: The university student conduct system is regularly reviewed and amended. Please consult the Lehigh web site (http://www.lehigh.edu) for the most recent conduct information.

Philosophy. Intellectual honesty and mutual respect are not accidental values in a university. They are, for students and professors alike. A presupposition of the pursuit of truth, which brings universities into existence in the first place. It is essential that an academic community uphold these values through rules designed to protect the freedom to teach and learn. The student conduct system is one mechanism by which the university endeavors to develop in all students a sense of responsibility to the Lehigh University community. When students fail to act in accordance with the rules and regulations of the community, the university must hold them accountable for their actions. The purpose of the student conduct system is not solely to punish students for transgressions, but to help them understand and accept their obligations as citizens of this academic community. This University Code of Conduct has been developed to promote student growth, to provide accused students with fundamental fairness and educate the University community about the meaning of that phrase, to protect the rights of individuals, and to uphold the educational mission of the university.

ARTICLE I - Definition of Terms

A. The term “university” means Lehigh University.
B. The term “student” includes all persons taking or scheduled to take courses at Lehigh University, both full-time and part-time, pursuing undergraduate, graduate, post graduate, or professional studies. Persons who are not enrolled at Lehigh University for a particular term but have a continuing relationship with the university are considered students.
C. The term “court, instructor” means any person hired by the university to conduct classroom activities and/or research.
D. The term “university official” includes any person employed by Lehigh University, performing assigned administrative or professional duties. This includes student workers, including but not limited to residence hall staff.
E. The term “member of the Lehigh University community” includes any person who is a student, course instructor, faculty member, university official, or any other person employed by the university. A person’s status in a particular situation shall be determined by the Conduct Officer.
F. The term “Dean of Students” refers to the person employed by Lehigh University to fulfill the duties of that position. Under this code, the Dean may authorize other members of his/her staff to perform those duties.
G. The term “Conduct Officer” means the person designated by the Dean of Students to be primarily responsible for the administration of the University conduct system.
H. The term “hearing officer” shall refer to any person designated and trained by the “Conduct Officer” to manage disciplinary conferences and/or assist with hearings before the University Committee on Disciplining.
I. The term “Lehigh University premises” includes all land, buildings, facilities, and other property owned, used, or controlled by Lehigh University, as well as adjacent streets and sidewalks.
J. The term “university housing” refers to any building in which students reside that is owned, operated, used and/or controlled by Lehigh University.
K. The term “student organization” means any number of persons who are recognized in a formal manner by Lehigh University.
L. The term “hearing” refers to any meeting, disciplinary conference, Dean’s hearing, University Committee on Discipline hearing, or hearing before a subcommittee hearing body in which decisions are made regarding disciplinary cases.
M. The term “hearing panel” means any person or persons authorized by the Dean of Students or the Conduct Officer to determine whether a student has violated the Code of Conduct and to impose sanctions.
N. The term “shall” is used in the imperative sense.
O. The term “may” is used in the permissive sense.
P. The term “policy” is defined as any written regulation of Lehigh University as found in, but not limited to, the student handbook.
ARTICLE II – Authority and Jurisdiction and General Provisions

I. Authority

A. The authority for administering student discipline in accordance with the student conduct system is vested by the university charter in the faculty. The student conduct system described in this Code of Conduct has jurisdiction over all Lehigh University students and all student groups and organizations approved by or associated with the university.

B. Jurisdiction of the Lehigh University Code of Conduct shall not be limited to conduct that occurs on Lehigh University premises. It will be applicable to any conduct which affects the Lehigh University community as a whole, its individual members, or the pursuit of its objectives.

C. The Conduct Officer shall develop policies for the administration of this system and procedural rules for the conduct of hearings which are consistent with provisions of the Code of Conduct.

D. Decisions made by a hearing body, the Conduct Officer or a case officer, shall be final pending the normal appeals process defined below.

E. All individual students who are accused of violating the Code of Conduct fall under the authority of the student conduct system, even when those students act as part of a group that is reviewed separately as a corporate entity.

F. Campus groups and organizations that violate the Code of Conduct fall under the authority of the student conduct system, although the rights and the processes they are provided may differ from those afforded to individuals.

G. Any group or organization may be held accountable for the actions of any of its members if the violation of the Code of Conduct is in any way related to the group or organization. Group misconduct need not be officially approved by the entire membership in order to be considered grounds for possible disciplinary action against the group. There is no minimum number of group members who must be involved in an incident before disciplinary action may be taken against the entire group. In some instances, the conduct of a single member may provide sufficient grounds for action against the entire group. An appropriate but not exhaustive test to determine whether a group may be held accountable for the conduct of individuals is to ask whether it is likely that the individuals would have been involved in the incident if they were not members of the group or, if by group action, the incident was encouraged, fostered, or might have been prevented.

H. All students are expected to make themselves familiar with this code; unfamiliarity with the code is not grounds for failing to live up to the expectations set forth below.

I. Because the university has an interest in inappropriate behavior separate from that of the civil authorities, it has the right and responsibility to exercise its jurisdiction and take such action as is appropriate to protect this interest. The university reserves the right to enforce this code whether or not civil authorities have acted. In those instances where civil authorities have acted, the university may also exercise its jurisdiction. When the university has jurisdiction in a matter subject to this code it also has the right to report the matter whenever appropriate, to civil authorities.
ARTICLE III – Expectations of Conduct

Lehigh University is a community that has expectations of its student members. These expectations and a list of non-inclusive examples of behavior that might breach these expectations are below.

I. Academic Integrity
Lehigh University expects that all students will act in a manner that reflects personal and intellectual honesty.

Proscribed Conduct
A. Cheating. This includes but is not limited to:

1. The use of any unauthorized assistance in taking quizzes, tests, or examinations.
   1.1. The possession at any quiz or examination of any articles which are prohibited will be regarded as evidence of responsibility.

2. The dependence upon the aid of sources beyond those authorized by the instructor in writing papers, preparing reports or homework, solving problems, or carrying out other assignments.

3. The acquisition, without permission, of tests or other academic material belonging to a member of the university faculty or staff.

4. Any attempt to falsify an assigned grade in an examination, quiz, report, program, grade book, or any other record or document.

5. The creation and/or submission of falsified data in any experiment, research paper, laboratory assignment, or other assignment.

6. Collusion occurs when students willfully give or receive unauthorized or unacknowledged assistance. Both parties to the collusion are considered responsible.

B. Plagiarism. This includes but is not limited to:

1. The direct use or paraphrase, of the work, themes or ideas, of another person without full and clear acknowledgement.

2. Submitting the work of another as your own in any assignment (including papers, tests, labs, homework, computer assignments, or any other work that is evaluated by the instructor).

II. Respect for Others
Lehigh University expects that all students will act in a civil manner that reflects maturity, social responsibility, and respect towards others and the Lehigh Community.

Proscribed Conduct
A. Physical Violence or Making Threats of Physical Violence

B. Harassment

1. As defined in the Lehigh University Policy on Harassment.

C. Sexual Misconduct

1. Sexual contact that occurs without the explicit consent of each student involved may be considered sexual misconduct. Consent must be clearly communicated, mutual, non-coerced, and given free of force or the threat of force. A student who is physically or mentally incapacitated by drugs, alcohol, or other circumstances is not capable of giving consent. A student must be fully conscious and awake in order to give consent.

D. Hazing

1. Hazing is any action taken or situation created, whether on or off campus, to produce mental or physical discomfort, embarrassment, harassment, or ridicule. Hazing includes but is not limited to
Black Text = From Previous Code
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any brutality of a physical nature, such as paddling, whipping, beating, branding, forced calisthenics, exposure to the elements, forced consumption of any food, liquor, drug or other substance, or any other forced physical activity that would subject the individual to physical harm or mental stress, such as sleep deprivation, forced exclusion from social contact, forced conduct which could result in extreme embarrassment, or any other forced activity which would adversely affect the mental health or dignity of the individual. Among prohibited activities are forced or coerced activities which create excessive fatigue; cause physical and psychological shocks; involve kidnapping; involve morally questionable quests, treasure hunts, scavenger hunts, or any other such activities; involve publicly wearing apparel that is conspicuous and not normally in good taste; cause students to engage in public stunts and buffoonery, morally degrading or humiliating games and activities, or late night activities which interfere with scholastic activities. Also prohibited are any activities that are in violation of federal, state, or local laws, this Code of Conduct, or accepted standards of good taste or propriety. For purposes of this definition, any activity described in this paragraph upon which the admission into or affiliation with an organization is directly or indirectly conditioned shall be presumed to be "forced or coerced" activity, the willingness of an individual to participate in such activity notwithstanding.

F. Intentionally or recklessly interfering with the activities sponsored by, affiliated with, or participated in by members of the university community, including but not limited to studies, teaching, research, administration, fire prevention, police activities, emergency services, and the activities of student organizations.

F. Other conduct which threatens or endangers the health or safety of any person or group of people. This would include the possession, or storage of weapons, explosives, fireworks, or other materials that could be harmful to the members of the community or the community as a whole.

III. Respect for Property
Lehigh University expects that its students will treat the property of Lehigh University and the property of others with the same respect that they would ask others to show to them.

Proscribed Conduct

A. Intentionally or recklessly interfering with the property of another, including taking without permission, destroying, defacing, or damaging the property of another.
B. The theft of services, such as telephone or computer services, including copyrighted computer programs, and other copyrighted material such as movies and/or music.
C. Knowingly possessing stolen property.
D. Entering, occupying, or using without authorization Lehigh premises, facilities, or property.
E. The theft, mutilation, destruction, defacing, and/or gross disregard of any Lehigh property.
F. Misuse of Lehigh University laboratory facilities.

IV. Respect for the Lehigh University Community
As members of the Lehigh University community, students are expected to serve as positive representatives. They are expected to know and follow the Code of Conduct, and show respect for the faculty, staff, community members and administrative processes that are in place to maintain and support our community standards.

Proscribed Conduct

A. Intentionally furnishing false information to a university official, hearing panel, or Conduct Officer.
B. Intentionally initiating or causing to be initiated any false report, warning, or threat of fire, explosion, or other emergency.
C. Forging, unauthorized alteration, or unauthorized usage of any university document, record (including computer records), or instrument of identification.
D. Failure to comply with the reasonable requests of university officials (including law enforcement) while acting in the performance of their duties.
E. Failure to provide identification when asked by university officials while acting in the performance of their duties.
F. Failure to complete any sanctions imposed by Lehigh University.
V. Respect for Self
Lehigh University expects that its students members will act in a manner that respects their own health and well-being, especially concerning the use and/or abuse of alcohol and drugs.

Proscribed Conduct
A. The unauthorized or illegal consumption, distribution, or possession of alcohol.
B. The consumption or distribution of alcohol in a manner detrimental to one's health and safety (or the health and safety of others).
C. The unauthorized or illegal use, distribution, or possession of any controlled substance or illegal drug.
D. The possession of drug paraphernalia.
E. The possession of alcohol paraphernalia that encourages or promotes excessive consumption of alcohol (for example, kegs, beer bonging, keg/coolers, etc.).
F. Other conduct which threatens or endangers the health or safety of the individual.

VI. Respect for the Law
Lehigh University expects that its students members will act in accordance with all applicable federal, state, or local laws.

ARTICLE IV - Emergency Situations

I. Emergency authority of the Dean of Students. Because situations may arise that may not be fully covered by this code, the Dean of Students is granted the authority to exercise his or her good judgment in emergency situations.

II. Temporary rules and regulations. The Dean of Students shall have authority in emergency situations to issue temporary rules and regulations to uphold the behavioral expectations of Lehigh University. The Dean of Students shall report his or her actions and the reasons for them to the full faculty at its next meeting. Such emergency rules and regulations shall remain in effect until they are withdrawn by the dean or by action of the faculty.

III. Interim suspension. The Dean of Students shall have the authority in emergency situations to suspend a student's (or student organization's) rights to be present on campus, or on other property owned, operated, or controlled by the university prior to a formal hearing. This authority may be invoked if the Dean of Students has a reasonable belief that a serious offense may have occurred, and/or that the continued presence of the student on campus may be dangerous to property, to the student involved, or to others. Subject to the emergency nature of the situation and the information available, the Dean of Students shall permit a student to challenge the evidence presented. A formal hearing of the matter shall be held at the earliest feasible time.

IV. Interim removal from housing. In instances where there is a reasonable belief that a serious offense has occurred, the Dean of Students or his/her designee may require the immediate removal of the individual or individuals involved from university housing until a formal disciplinary hearing occurs.

ARTICLE V - Responsibilities and Fundamental Fairness

I. Responsibilities of Individual Students
A. As stated in Article II, Section I.H., students are responsible for knowing and adhering to the expectations outlined in the Code of Conduct.
B. Students are responsible for cooperating with the University in investigations of violations of the Code of Conduct.

C. Students are responsible for appearing before a hearing panel when called to do so and providing truthful and complete information to hearing panels and/or the Conduct Officer when asked. Students who have been accused of violating the Code of Conduct have the right not to answer questions.

II. Fundamental fairness for Individual Students. The University has an interest in providing fundamental fairness in all conduct matters. The University will strive to provide the following to students in relation to conduct violations:

A. Presumption of non-responsibility. The hearing body shall consider all accused students not responsible until such time as sufficient evidence is presented to the contrary. No accused student shall be found responsible for a charge unless a "preponderance of evidence" presented at the time of the hearing indicates his/her responsibility. This means that hearing panels must believe that it is more likely than not, based on the information presented at the hearing, that the student is responsible.

B. Written notification of charges and hearings. Accused students are entitled to written notification of any charges brought against them and an outline of the disciplinary procedures. If additional charges are brought, a further written notice must be sent. These notices may be sent via campus mail, registered mail (to the last known address maintained by the University) or personally delivered to the accused student. Any of these methods of notification shall be considered sufficient. When and if a hearing is scheduled, the Conduct Officer shall notify the student at least seven days before the hearing of the time, date, and location of the hearing.

C. Review of available information. Accused students are entitled to review the available information, documents, and a list of witnesses who have been called by the Conduct Officer to present information. Accused students must provide the Conduct Officer a list of witnesses they intend to present, along with information supporting the relevance of the witnesses. This list must be presented at least three days prior to the hearing. If the student fails to provide proper notification that they are bringing witnesses, the admission of his/her testimony will be at the discretion of the hearing panel and no appeal shall be granted for denying their admission.

D. Advisory assistance. Accused students are entitled to advisory assistance by any member of the University community (current students, faculty, and staff) provided he/she is not an attorney. The advisor's role is to assist, support, and advise students at any stage of the conduct process. The advisor may not, however, ask or answer questions for students or make summation statements on their behalf. This person is an observer and will not be a participant in the hearing. Generally, legal counsel shall not be permitted to attend the hearing to represent the student. However, in cases where there are pending criminal charges, the accused student may have legal counsel present as an advisor. If present, the counsel may not participate in the hearing in any way except in advising the accused student. In these cases, the Conduct Officer may request that university counsel be present in a non-participatory role.

E. A pre-hearing interview. For all hearings above the level of a disciplinary conference, the student shall have the right to a pre-hearing interview in which the Conduct Officer will explain the concepts of fundamental fairness and the conduct processes. Failure to schedule or attend the pre-hearing interview is not grounds for a rescheduling of a hearing or for an appeal. For disciplinary conferences, an outline of the conduct process shall be considered sufficient to meet this requirement and shall be supplied by the Conduct Officer.

F. Right to be heard. Accused students shall have the right to hear all testimony, present relevant information on their own behalf, ask questions of witnesses, and ask questions of anyone present at the hearing. If individuals cannot be questioned at the hearing (by reason of health, absence from campus, etc.) the hearing panel has a special obligation to determine the credibility of any information that those individuals have provided. The student is also permitted to have persons submit written character statements directly to the Conduct Officer for review by the panel or hearing officer. Students may not bring character witnesses to a hearing or disciplinary conference.
G. **Challenge of hearing body members.** Accused students shall have the right to challenge the presence of hearing body members for reasons such as a personal bias towards a participant or a preformed judgment in the particular case. In the case of hearings before the University Committee on Discipline or its subsidiary boards, the removal of a hearing body member will be by majority vote of the remaining members. In cases involving disciplinary conferences, the decision shall be at the discretion of the hearing officer.

H. **Refuse to answer any question or make a statement.** Accused students are not required to make statements or answer questions. In this situation, the hearing body shall make its decision solely on the basis of evidence presented to it. It should be noted that witnesses do not have the right to refuse to answer questions.

I. **Withholding of past record.** In hearings before the University Committee on Discipline, the past disciplinary records of accused students will not be disclosed until after a decision of responsibility is reached, except if introduced by the accused or in cases in which the accused is charged with failure to complete sanctions imposed by Lehigh University. If a student is found responsible for the charges, information concerning the accused student's past disciplinary record will be presented to the hearing body by the Conduct Officer in the presence of the accused, for consideration in determining appropriate sanctions. In cases in which the student chooses to self-disclose a past conduct record, this information will be admissible and considered relevant.

J. **Notification of Outcomes.** Accused students have the right to be informed of the outcome of a case.

1. Oral notification. Immediately after the hearing, the chair of the hearing body will notify the student of the findings, including any sanctions imposed. At this time, the Conduct Officer shall inform students found responsible for their rights of appeal.

2. Written notification. The Conduct Officer shall forward the written decision of the hearing body to accused students within a reasonable time, no longer than 10 days. The written decision shall include: (i) a statement of the charges; (ii) a summary of the information presented at the hearing; (iii) the findings of the hearing body and key facts used in making those findings; (iv) the sanctions and the rationale for them; and (v) a statement regarding the right to request an appeal and the procedures for making such an appeal.

K. **Right of appeal.** As outlined in the Code of Conduct, students found responsible for a violation by any hearing panel shall have the right to an appeal before the Disciplinary Appeals Committee. Decisions of that committee are final.

L. **Admission of relevant evidence.** Evidence is admissible when, in the opinion of the majority of the hearing body, it is shown to be relevant to the factual issues of the case. The hearing body shall determine the relevance and admissibility of all testimony, whether proposed or actual. Evidence obtained by a search of a student's person or property shall be admissible if that search was conducted by university officials while acting in accordance with their duties.

M. **Closed Hearings.** Generally, all disciplinary hearings and conferences will be closed to the public. An accused student may request that a hearing be opened. This request must be in writing and be presented to the Conduct Officer three days prior to the hearing. The request will be reviewed by the Conduct Officer. In consultation with the hearing panel, the Conduct Officer shall either grant or deny the request. If a request for an open hearing is granted, the hearing panel may order the removal of any individual not directly involved in the case at any time, and may close the hearing to the public at any time. Witnesses will not be permitted to be present at an open hearing except when they are giving testimony.

III. **Responsibilities of Student Organizations**

A. Organizations are responsible for educating their members on the Lehigh University Code of Conduct as it relates to student organizations.
B. Organizations are responsible for cooperating with University officials in investigations of violations of the Code of Conduct.

C. Organizations are responsible for having a representative appear before a hearing panel when called.

D. Organizations are responsible for ensuring that their members provide truthful and complete information when providing information to a hearing panel or the Conduct Officer. Students representing organizations are required to answer questions asked by the hearing panel.

IV. Fundamental Fairness for Student Organizations. The University has an interest in providing a fundamentally fair system to adjudicate student organizational conduct. With this in mind the University will strive to provide the following to student organizations in relation to conduct cases.

A. Presumption of non-responsibility. The hearing body shall consider all accused organizations not responsible until such time as sufficient evidence is present to the contrary. No accused organization shall be found responsible for a charge unless a “preponderance of evidence” presented at the time of the hearing indicates its responsibility. This means that hearing panels must believe that it is more likely than not based on the information presented at the hearing, that the organization is responsible.

B. Written notification of charges and hearings. Accused student organizations are entitled to written notification of any charges brought against them and an outline of the disciplinary procedures. If additional charges are brought, a further written notice must be sent. These notices may be sent via campus mail, registered mail (to the last known address maintained by the University) or personally delivered to the accused student. Any of these methods of notification shall be considered sufficient. When and if a hearing is scheduled, the Conduct Officer shall notify the student at least five days before the hearing of the time, date, and location of the hearing.

C. Review of available information. Accused student organizations are entitled to review the available information, documents, and a list of witnesses who have been called by the Conduct Officer to present information. Accused student organizations must provide the Conduct Officer a list of witnesses they intend to present, along with information supporting the relevance of the witnesses. This list must be presented at least three days prior to the hearing. If the organization fails to provide proper notification that it is bringing witnesses, the admission of that testimony will be at the discretion of the hearing panel and no appeal shall be granted for denying its admission.

D. Advisory assistance. Accused organizations are entitled to advisory assistance by any member of the University community (current students, faculty, and staff or an attorney/lawyer of the organization, provided that he/she is not an attorney). The advisor’s role is to assist, support, and advise the organization at any stage of the conduct process. The advisor may not, however, ask or answer questions for the organization or make summation statements on its behalf. This person is an observer and will not be a participant in the hearing. Legal counsel shall not be permitted to attend the hearing to represent the student organization.

E. A pre-hearing interview. For all hearings above the level of a disciplinary conference, the organization shall have the right to a pre-hearing interview in which the Conduct Officer will explain the concepts of fundamental fairness and the conduct process. Failure to schedule or attend the pre-hearing interview is not grounds for a scheduling of a hearing or for an appeal. For disciplinary conferences, an outline of the conduct process shall be considered sufficient to meet this requirement, and shall be supplied by the Conduct Officer.

F. Representation by a member. Student organizations shall have the right to choose one student member to represent it before a hearing panel, if the organization chooses to appear at a hearing. Students who have had formal legal training are not permitted to represent organizations. The accused organization is also permitted to have 2 additional student members, witness the proceedings. These members may not be called as witnesses, may not participate in the hearing in any way, and may be removed by the hearing officer or the panel if they are disruptive or prove distracting or intimidating to any participant.
9. **Right to be heard.** Accused organizations shall have the right to hear all testimony, present relevant information on their own behalf, ask questions of witnesses, and ask questions of anyone present at the hearing. Individuals cannot be questioned at the hearing (by reason of health, absence from campus, etc.) the hearing panel has a special obligation to determine the credibility of any information that those individuals have provided. The organization is also allowed to have persons submit character statements directly to the Conduct Officer for review by the panel or hearing officer. Organizations may not bring character witnesses to a hearing or disciplinary conference.

10. **Challenge of hearing body members.** Accused organizations shall have the right to challenge the presence of hearing body members for reasons such as a personal bias towards a participant or a prejudgment in the particular case. In the case of hearings before the University Committee on Discipline or its subsidiary boards, the removal of a hearing body member will be by majority vote of the remaining members. In cases involving disciplinary conferences, the decision shall be at the discretion of the hearing officer.

11. **Withholding of past record.** In hearings before the University Committee on Discipline, the past disciplinary records of accused student organizations will not be disclosed until after a decision of responsibility is reached, except if introduced by the organization or in cases in which the accused organization is charged with failure to complete sanctions imposed by Lehigh University. If the student organization is found responsible for the charges, information concerning its past disciplinary record will be presented to the hearing body by the Conduct Officer in the presence of the accused organization's representative, for consideration in determining appropriate sanctions. In cases in which the student organization chooses to self-disclose a past conduct record, this information will be admissible and considered relevant.

12. **Notification of Outcomes.** Accused organizations have the right to be informed of the outcome of a case.

1. Oral notification. Immediately after the hearing, the head of the hearing body will notify the organization of the findings including any sanctions imposed. At this time the Conduct Officer shall inform organizations found responsible of their right of appeal.

2. Written notification. The Conduct Officer shall forward the written decision of the hearing body to accused organizations within a reasonable time no later than 10 days after the hearing. The written decision shall include: (i) a statement of the charges; (ii) a summary of the information presented at the hearing; (iii) the findings of the hearing body and key facts used in making those findings; (iv) the sanctions and the rationale for them; and (v) a statement regarding the right to request an appeal and the procedures for making such an appeal.

3. In cases involving organizations that are heard by subsidiary hearing panels, the accused organization has the right to be notified of the recommendations at the hearing and a right to be notified of the final decision of the Conduct Officer within a reasonable time, no later than 10 days after the hearing.

K. **Right of appeal.** As outlined in this Code of Conduct, student organizations found responsible for a violation by any hearing panel shall have the right to an appeal before the Disciplinary Appeals Committee. Decisions of that committee are final.

L. **Admission of relevant evidence.** Evidence is admissible when, in the opinion of the majority of the hearing body, it is shown to be relevant to the factual issues of the case. The hearing body shall determine the relevance and admissibility of all testimony, whether proposed or actual. Evidence obtained by a search of a student's person or property shall be admissible if that search was conducted by university officials while acting in accordance with their duties.

M. **Closed Hearings.** Generally, all disciplinary hearings and conferences will be closed to the public. An accused student may request that a hearing be opened. This request must be in writing and be presented to
the Conduct Officer three days prior to the hearing. The will be reviewed by the Conduct Officer in consultation with the hearing panel. The Conduct Officer shall either grant or deny the request. If a request for an open hearing is granted, the hearing panel may order the removal of any individuals not directly involved in the case at any time, and may close the hearing to the public at any time. Witnesses will not be permitted to be present at an open hearing except when they are giving testimony.

N. Organizational Accountability. Any group or organization may be held accountable for the actions of any of its members if the violation of this Code of Conduct is in any way related to the group or organization. Group misconduct need not be officially approved by the entire membership in order to be considered grounds for possible disciplinary action against the group. There is no minimum number of group members who must be involved in an incident before disciplinary action may be taken against the entire group. In some instances, the conduct of a single member may provide sufficient grounds for action against the entire group. An appropriate but not exhaustive test to determine whether a group may be held accountable for the conduct of its individuals is to ask whether it is likely that the individual would have been involved in the incident if they were not members of the group or, if by group action, the incident was encouraged, fostered, or might have been prevented.

ARTICLE VI - SANCTIONS

1. Primary Sanctions for Individuals. Individuals found responsible for a violation of this Code of Conduct will receive a sanction of disciplinary warning, disciplinary probation, disciplinary deferred suspension, disciplinary suspension, or expulsion. In certain specific cases the sanctions of disciplinary revocation of a degree or disciplinary withholding of a degree may be imposed. They may also receive additional sanctions as outlined below.

A. Disciplinary Warning. A disciplinary warning is a written statement of a student's responsibility for a violation of this Code of Conduct with the caution that any future violation may result in more serious sanctions. Other sanctions may be imposed along with the warning.

B. Disciplinary Probation. Disciplinary probation is the imposition of a trial period in which students must show that they are willing to live up to the expectations in this Code of Conduct. This trial period may not exceed four semesters. This status implies that further violations of this code may result in disciplinary suspension or expulsion. Other sanctions may be imposed, and additional requirements may be imposed as conditions for reinstatement in good standing.

C. Disciplinary Deferred Suspension. The sanction of disciplinary suspension may be placed in deferred status for a limited period of time. During this period of time, the student is on notice that any further violations of the Code of Conduct will result in the suspension that was originally defined becoming effective immediately without further review. Disciplinary Deferred Suspension may not be imposed for longer than one regular semester. If this sanction is imposed during a semester, it may be imposed for the remainder of that semester and one additional semester. Disciplinary Probation may be imposed for a period of time not to exceed three semesters after the period of Disciplinary Deferred Suspension. Additional student conduct sanctions appropriate to a new violation also may be imposed. A student who is on deferred suspension is subject to the following restrictions:

1. Ineligibility to hold an office in any student organization recognized by the university or to hold any elected or appointed office of the university.

2. Ineligibility to represent the university to anyone outside the university community in any way, including representing the university at any official function or in any official manner.

D. Disciplinary Suspension. Disciplinary suspension is the temporary separation of the student from the Lehigh University Community, not to exceed seven consecutive fall and spring semesters. Students on disciplinary suspension are not permitted to participate in any university activities, academic or nonacademic. They may not take part in any official exercise including graduation. They are not allowed
on Lehigh premises during their suspension unless prior approval has been granted by the Dean of Students. Any request for the privilege of visiting Lehigh University during the suspension must be received by the Dean of Students in writing seven days prior to the date the privilege is desired. It should be understood that submission of a request in no way guarantees approval. Students requesting reinstatement upon passing of the suspension period must schedule a meeting with the Dean of Students prior to being granted approval for reinstatement. Additional requirements may be imposed at the time of suspension as conditions for reinstatement in good standing. For students who have been suspended, the Registrar will, during the period of the suspension, send with the transcript a letter stating the reasons and length of the suspension. Disciplinary suspension must be applied for at least one full semester as defined above.

E. Expulsion. Expulsion is the permanent removal of a student from the university. All cases in which the sanction of expulsion is imposed shall be referred to the Disciplinary Appeals Committee to ensure that the sanction is not unduly harsh or unjustifiable. If the student does not submit a letter of appeal, the Conduct Officer shall supply a summary of the case to the disciplinary appeals committee for review. The Disciplinary Appeals Committee is required to affirm or deny this summary. If it is denied, the student shall be suspended for seven semesters.

F. Disciplinary Withholding of Degrees. The conferring of an academic degree may be postponed as a disciplinary sanction if the following criteria are met:

1. The accused student is of senior standing.
2. The sanction of Probation, Deferred Suspension, or Suspension might otherwise be imposed.

The student may be allowed to remain on campus to complete academic requirements of degree status, but the conferring of that degree would be postponed until a regularly scheduled commencement exercise after the one in which the student would have participated in. Degrees may not be withheld for longer than 4 semesters.

A student who is subject to a pending disciplinary case is not eligible to receive a degree or participate in graduation until that case is resolved.

G. Disciplinary Revocation of Degrees. The University Committee on Discipline may recommend to the Board of Trustees the revocation of a degree if the following criteria are met:
1. The accused student has already been granted a degree by Lehigh University.
2. The sanction of suspension or expulsion might otherwise be imposed.
3. The information leading to the charges did not come to light until after the conferring of the degree in question, but occurred before the degree was conferred.

Only the Board of Trustees may revoke a degree. If the Board of Trustees does not uphold the sanction of Revocation, the case against the student will be considered dismissed.

II. Secondary Sanctions for Individuals. Sanctions in addition to the primary sanctions may be imposed to educate the accused student, or protect and educate the Lehigh University Community as a whole.

A. This is a list of specific but non-exhaustive examples of secondary sanctions:
1. Restitution or replacement of lost, damaged, or stolen property.
2. Suspension of privileges to participate in any activity sponsored by the university.
3. Suspension of privileges to use or occupy certain facilities.
4. Suspension of rights to represent the university.
5. Suspension of rights to occupy a position or office in a group or organization officially recognized by Lehigh University.
6. Referral for alcohol or drug abuse counseling; and mandatory periodic meetings with a dean or counselor.
Sanctions that suspend students' privileges shall have a specific time of duration indicating when and under what conditions students may regain the privilege.

B. Sanctions related to academic integrity violations. In addition to the primary sanctions as listed in Section I, the hearing panel may impose a course grade of “FD,” which would remain on the transcript permanently. The University’s transcript will define a “FD” grade as failing performance as a result of being found responsible for academic dishonesty. The “FD” grade will have the mathematical equivalence of an “F.” In the event that the student had already voluntarily withdrawn from the course in question, the “FD” grade would replace the “W.” If the hearing panel does not assess a grade of “FD” in the course, they may provide recommendations to the course instructor regarding grading (e.g., lowering the course grade by some amount). In any case in which a student is found responsible and a grade of “FD” is not assigned, the grading of all exercises and the determination of the course grade are left to the sole discretion of the course instructor and could result in a regular F being assigned.

III. Sanctions for cases involving drugs and/or alcohol
A. In cases involving drugs and alcohol the following secondary sanctions will be imposed.
1. Counseling Center Interaction. In all disciplinary cases involving drugs and alcohol in which the student is not suspended or expelled, a mandatory interaction with the Department of University Counseling and Psychological Services (UCPS) shall be imposed. The nature and content of these interactions shall be developed by the UCPS in conjunction with the Conduct Officer and the Dean of Students.

2. Parental Notification. The parents of students under the age of 21 will be notified of all violations of the Code of Conduct as related to drugs and alcohol as permitted by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

B. Serious Offenses involving Drugs and/or Alcohol. While disciplinary suspension is an option for any single serious alcohol/drug violation, individuals found responsible for two serious alcohol or drug violations (i.e., creating risk to self or others which includes but is not limited to, physical violence, serious property destruction, or other serious infractions) will be suspended for a minimum of one regular semester.

IV. Primary Sanctions for Organizations. Organizations found responsible for a violation of this Code of Conduct will receive a sanction of disciplinary termination, disciplinary dissolution, deferred disciplinary dissolution, disciplinary probation, or disciplinary warning. They may also receive additional sanctions as outlined below.

A. Disciplinary Warning. A disciplinary warning is a written statement of responsibility of a group or organization for a violation of this Code of Conduct, along with the caution that any future violation may result in a more serious sanction. Other sanctions may be imposed along with the warning.

B. Disciplinary Probation. Disciplinary probation is the conditional continuance of a group or organization for a specific period of time not to exceed four semesters. This status implies that any further violation of this Code of Conduct may result in dissolution, termination, or other authorized sanctions. Other sanctions may be imposed, including limitations or social activities, and additional requirements may be imposed as conditions for reinstatement of recognition in good standing.

C. Disciplinary Dissolution. Dissolution is the loss of university recognition for a period of time not to exceed 10 years. Dissolution is the loss of privilege to use the university’s name or represent it in any capacity. In addition, the group or organization will lose all privileges to use university equipment or facilities. At the end of the dissolution period, the organization shall contact the Dean of Students Office and be required to follow any recognition processes in place at the time. Hearing panels shall impose dissolution for time periods of years, not semesters.

D. Disciplinary Termination. Termination is the permanent loss of university recognition. Termination includes the loss of privilege to use the university’s name or represent it in any capacity. The group or organization also loses all privileges to use university equipment or facilities. The hearing body shall make
a recommendation for termination to the Vice-Provost for Student Affairs, who will normally implement the recommendation. If the Vice Provost for Student Affairs decides not to terminate the group or organization, the organization shall be dissolved for 10 years.

V. Secondary Sanctions for Organizations. Sanctions in addition to the primary sanctions may be imposed to educate the accused student and/or protest and educate the Lehigh University Community as a whole.

A. Social Probation. Social Probation is the loss of the organization’s privileges to host social events with alcohol.

B. Alcohol-Free Housing. The organization loses the right to have any alcohol present in the facility including in individual bedrooms/living areas.

C. Loss of University Housing. The organization loses the right to organizational housing. An organization that has lost its right to University housing must follow any processes in place to reacquire group living rights.

D. Removal of specific Members or Officers.

E. Other Sanctions. The following are specific examples, but bearing panels are not limited to these:
   1. Restitution or replacement of lost, damaged, or stolen property.
   2. Suspension of privileges to participate in any activity sponsored by the university.
   3. Suspension of privileges to use or occupy certain facilities.
   4. Suspension of rights to represent the university.
   5. Requirement to hold educational programs for members.

Sanctions that suspend organizational privileges shall have a set time of duration indicating when and under what conditions students may regain the privilege.

VI. Sanctioning guidelines of specific types of cases.
A. The Lehigh University Community has devised sanctioning guidelines for hearing panels in cases involving sexual assault or harassment, hazing, violence, and academic dishonesty. These guidelines can be found in Appendix A of the Code of Conduct.

ARTICLE VII – THE ROLE OF THE CONDUCT OFFICER

I. The Conduct Officer. The Dean of Students, acting on behalf of the faculty, shall appoint a Conduct Officer who will be responsible for the administration of the campus conduct system.

A. Duties of the Conduct Officer. The Conduct Officer will be responsible for the following functions in addition to other duties as defined by the Dean of Students:

1. Coordinate all aspects of university disciplinary procedures, including informing students of charges lodged against them, investigating all charges, scheduling hearings, notifying all persons concerned, providing a record of all disciplinary proceedings, providing secretarial assistance, providing all necessary forms, assisting with and forwarding appeals to the University Disciplinary Appeals Committee, and undertaking such other activities as may be necessary to implement the provisions of this Student Conduct System.

2. Coordinate the gathering of all facts regarding a violation of this Code of Conduct and see that all known relevant facts are presented at a hearing.

3. Conduct pre-hearing interviews (when required) at which students charged should be (1) fully informed of the charges lodged and of their rights in the conduct system; (2) given an opportunity to discuss the matter; and (3) provided with information related to possible sanctions if the student pleads or is found responsible.
4. Maintain confidentiality of disciplinary records in accordance with the university policy on maintenance, retention, and dissemination of confidential information and with the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act and other applicable laws.

5. Provide for training of all persons serving as hearing officers, serving on hearing panels, serving on the appeals committee, or other persons involved in the student conduct system as necessary.

6. Provide for the publication of this student conduct system and for the recording of all decisions rendered and actions taken.

7. Schedule all hearings, call appropriate witnesses, and tape-record the proceedings. Any audio tape recordings of hearings are the property of Lehigh University.

8. Advise hearing panels regarding the meaning, interpretation, and application of the conduct procedures.

9. Attend all hearings (or train and designate persons to be present) to present facts and to answer questions pertaining to conduct procedures or facts in the case being considered.

10. Respond to appeals (either on the grounds that the disciplinary process was violated in a way that affected the outcome of a particular case, or for cases that were adjudicated through the disciplinary conference procedures).

11. Other duties as described in this Code of Conduct or as assigned by the Dean of Students.

ARTICLE VIII – PROCEEDINGS AND PROCESS

I. General Information

A. Any group within the university, any individual member of the university community, or the Dean of Students acting for Lehigh University may report violations of the University Code of Conduct to the Office of Student Conduct. The complaint must be submitted in writing to the Conduct Officer.

B. Proceedings related to non-academic violations may be initiated at any point during a student's career, which includes undergraduates and graduate careers. In cases in which the offense is alleged to have occurred during the final semester of matriculation, the Conduct Officer may file charges in non-academic cases up to six months after graduation. There is no time limitation on proceedings related to academic dishonesty.

C. In cases where multiple charges and/or multiple accused students arise out of the same event or series of related events, the Conduct Officer shall have the discretion to direct that a single hearing be conducted with respect to the multiple charges/students. Each accused student shall be entitled to be present for the testimony of all witnesses and shall be entitled to question each witness. Any opening or closing statements shall be made to the hearing body by the accused student alone, outside the presence of any other accused student, unless the student waives this right.

D. Any student organization involved in an academic dishonesty violation will have the case resolved by the University Committee on Discipline.

II. Process for Non-Academic Integrity Violations

A. After a review of the report and if necessary, a preliminary investigation, the Conduct Officer determines if there is sufficient information to bring charges against a student or a student organization.
Disciplinary proceedings are then initiated by the Conduct Officer sending a formal charge letter to the student or group. It shall be considered proper notice if the notice is sent to the student's local address as maintained by the University, or if the notice is sent to the student's campus mailbox or the last known local address maintained by the University.

Students or organizations shall be contacted and asked to meet with a case officer to discuss charges.

1. If the charges in question do not involve serious offenses, the student or organization (at the discretion of the Conduct Officer) may take responsibility for the listed charges and sanctions can be assigned by the case officer. Students who choose to accept responsibility for violations shall retain their right to appeal via the process listed below.

2. If the student or organization chooses not to accept responsibility (or the Conduct Officer chooses to have the case resolved via a hearing), the Conduct Officer shall set a date for a disciplinary conference or formal hearing before the University Committee on Discipline. In the case of student organizations, a hearing before a subsidiary conduct board shall also be an option. Subsidiary boards may not hear charges against individuals. The method of resolution shall be decided upon by the Conduct Officer.

Students/organizations who fail to make or keep an initial meeting shall be assigned a hearing date at the discretion of the Conduct Officer.

Disciplinary Conferences are meetings between a student or organization and a case officer in which an alleged violation of the Code of Conduct is resolved in a less formal manner than a hearing.

1. During a disciplinary conference, the student or organization shall retain all applicable rights as listed above.

2. All hearing procedures shall be developed by the Conduct Officer. The student or organization shall be informed of these procedures when they receive the notification of the time, date, and location of the hearing. These processes will also be available online.

3. Students/organizations who have cases resolved via a disciplinary conference shall retain their right to appeal as listed below.

The University Committee on Discipline

1. Role. The University Committee on Discipline is responsible for hearing cases to determine student or organization accountability for violations of this Code of Conduct in a manner that insures fundamental fairness, and to assign sanctions in cases where responsibility is determined.

2. Composition. The committee shall be composed of fifteen undergraduate students, (chosen by the Dean of Students Office in consultation with the current student members of the University Committee on Discipline and the faculty chairperson of the University Committee on Discipline), three graduate students (chosen by the Dean of Students Office in consultation with the Graduate Student Senate and the faculty chairperson of the University Committee on Discipline), twelve members of the faculty (four elected by the university faculty at large and two from each of the college faculties), and seven administrators (appointed by the Vice Provost for Student Affairs from the student affairs professional staff). Faculty shall be elected for three-year staggered terms. Students shall be selected for one-year renewable terms. Administrators shall be appointed for three-year renewable terms. The Conduct Officer shall have the authority to appoint alternate members for student and administrative representatives to ensure the committee's ability to function.

3. Chairperson, The chairperson of the Committee on Discipline shall be a faculty member elected by the committee for a one-year term.
4. Hearing panels. A Committee on Discipline hearing panel shall consist of two students, two members of the faculty, and an administrator. Undergraduate students shall sit on the panel when an undergraduate student is charged with a violation of this code, and graduate students shall sit on the panel when a graduate student is charged. Hearing panels shall be appointed from the committee by the Conduct Officer. The chairperson of a hearing panel shall be chosen from the two faculty members on the panel. A quorum of a hearing panel shall be any four members. The decision of a hearing panel shall be based on a preponderance of evidence as presented at the hearing.

5. All hearing procedures shall be developed by the Conduct Officer. The accused student or organization shall be informed of those procedures when they receive the notification of the time, date, and location of the hearing and reviewed at the pre-hearing interview. These processes will also be available online.

III. Process for Academic Integrity Violations

A. General Process for Handling Academic Integrity Violations

1. Students have the right to have any alleged academic integrity violation heard by the University Committee on Discipline.

2. Cases in which the student accepts responsibility for the violation may be handled by an Academic Integrity Conference. A student may refuse this conference and ask for a hearing before the University Committee on Discipline.

3. Academic Integrity Conferences

a. Composition. An Academic Integrity Conference Panel shall consist of the Conduct Officer, one faculty representative of the University Committee on Discipline (generally the chairperson), and one student representative of the University Committee on Discipline.

b. Attendance and process. The accused student, the course instructor bringing the allegation, and any witnesses may be in attendance. The Conduct Officer may have other persons not directly involved in a case present for training and educational purposes.

c. Authority. The Academic Integrity Conference shall have the authority, in a particular case, to:

i. affirm or deny the student's claim of responsibility,

ii. determine appropriate sanctions for the student involved.

iii. educate the student on issues related to academic integrity.

d. A student appearing before an Academic Integrity Conference shall retain the right to appeal as outlined below.

IV. Subsidiary Conduct Boards

A. The Dean of Students in conjunction with the Conduct Officer may, on a year-to-year basis, establish subsidiary conduct boards made up of students to provide assistance and advice in handling organization or corporate discipline. These boards include, but are not limited to: The Interfraternity Conduct Council, The Panhellenic Conduct Council, and The Student Senate Conduct Council.

B. These boards shall be constituted to hear cases involving their member organizations, or in the case of the Student Senate Conduct Board, student organizations that are recognized by the University and do not come under another subsidiary conduct board.
C. The Conduct Officer in conjunction with the leaders of the parent organizations (IFC, Panhellenic, or Student Senate as examples) will determine the composition and selection for members of these subsidiary boards.

D. The Conduct Officer shall be responsible for determining which cases are referred to these boards based on time constraints, the severity of the alleged violation, and the ability of the subsidiary board to handle a particular case.

E. In cases in which these subsidiary boards are resolving alleged violations of the Code of Conduct, their role shall be to make recommendations to the Conduct Officer in both the determination of responsibility and the sanctions of a particular case. When the case involves internal rules of the parent organization, the decision of the subsidiary board shall be final, pending an appeal.

F. The Conduct Officer shall be responsible for developing process and procedures related to these panels and for providing training to the members.

ARTICLE IX – APPEALS

I. The right to appeal. Any student found responsible for a violation of the Code of Conduct shall have the right to appeal his/her case (based on the grounds below) to the Disciplinary Appeals Committee.

II. Grounds for appeals. Students who have been found responsible for a violation of the Code of Conduct may request an appeal on the grounds that: (1) information was not available at the time of the hearing, is now available, and could reasonably be expected to have altered the outcome of the case; (2) the university disciplinary procedures were violated in a way that probably adversely affected the outcome of the case; or (3) the sanction was unduly harsh and not justifiable. In cases involving sexual harassment the victim is granted the right to appeal. These cases are covered in a separate section of this Code of Conduct.

III. Disciplinary Appeals Committee. The University disciplinary appeals committee is a faculty committee set up to consider written appeals by students found responsible by any hearing panel.

A. Composition. The Disciplinary Appeals Committee shall consist of five faculty members, two undergraduate students, and two graduate students. The undergraduate student members will hear appeals submitted by undergraduate students and the graduate student members will hear appeals submitted by graduate students. The students shall be chosen by the Dean of Students Office in consultation with the Student Senate and the Graduate Student Senate. Faculty shall be elected, one from each college and one at large. The faculty shall serve staggered three-year terms, and students shall be appointed for one-year terms. At the discretion of the Conduct Officer additional student members may be selected to serve as alternates.

B. Chairperson. The Disciplinary Appeals Committee shall elect its own chairperson from the faculty members. The chairperson of this committee shall also serve on the Disciplinary Review Committee.

C. Role. The Disciplinary Appeals Committee is responsible for reviewing any appeals by students or organizations that are properly submitted. It is also responsible for reviewing all cases involving disciplinary expulsion as described in Article VII Sec. 1A.1.

D. Process

1. Submission of Appeal. Students shall have seven days from the date of their outcome letter to submit, in writing, an appeal on one or more of the three grounds as listed in Art. IX, Sec. II. This letter should include specific details as to why an appeal should be granted. This letter is to be submitted to the Conduct Officer. The Conduct Officer is permitted to assist students in preparing appeals.
2. **Response to Appeal.** The Conduct Officer shall present a copy of this appeal to the chairperson of the hearing panel or hearing officer that made the determination in the case in question. This person shall submit a written response to the appeal to the Conduct Officer in a timely manner. In cases that involve a violation of the conduct procedures, the Conduct Officer shall write the response. The Conduct Officer is permitted to assist in the preparation of all responses.

3. **Disciplinary Appeals Hearing.** The Conduct Officer shall send copies of both the appeal and the response, as well as the contents of the case file to the members of the disciplinary appeals committee and schedule a meeting. The committee shall also have access to the recording of the hearing if requested. The Disciplinary Appeals Committee shall base its decision only on the materials presented during a closed hearing. The Conduct Officer may be present to assist the committee.

   i. **Quorum.** Any five members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

   ii. **Options.** The Disciplinary Appeals Committee may grant an appeal and refer the case back to the Office of Student Conduct for re-adjudication, or they may deny an appeal and uphold the original findings and sanctions.

   iii. **Decision.** A simple majority of the committee is required to grant an appeal.

   iv. **Process.** The Conduct Officer shall develop any internal script or processes for the operations of the Disciplinary Appeals Committee.

   v. **Notification.** The decision of the Disciplinary Appeals Committee, along with an explanation of their rationale, shall be given to the Conduct Officer who shall notify the student within three days and implement the decision. The decision of the committee shall be final.

E. **Sexual Misconduct and Harassment Cases.** In cases involving Sexual Misconduct or Sexual Harassment, either the complainant or the accused can appeal a decision. The appeal will be filed as above for either party.

1. **Grounds for appeals.** In those specific cases, the following are grounds for appeal by either party:
   (1) information is available that was not available at the time of the investigation; (2) the University disciplinary procedures were violated in a way that may have adversely affected the outcome of the case; or (3) the sanction is inappropriate (i.e., unduly lenient or harsh) and not justifiable.

**ARTICLE X—REVIEW AND REVISION**

**I. On-going Review.** The Lehigh University Code of Conduct shall be reviewed on an on-going basis by the Office of Student Conduct.

**II. Disciplinary Review Panel.** The Disciplinary Review Panel is charged with maintaining and preserving the integrity of the conduct system through the review of the processes, actions, and cases adjudicated through the university conduct system.

   A. **Composition.** The review panel consists of the Conduct Officer, the Dean of Students and the faculty chairpersons of the University Committees on Discipline and the Disciplinary Appeals Committee.

   B. **Chairperson.** The chairperson of the Disciplinary Appeals Committee shall serve as the chairperson of the Disciplinary Review Panel.

   C. **Reporting.** Each year the chairperson of the Disciplinary Review Panel will present an update on the state of the university conduct system to the faculty.
D. Modification. The chairperson in conjunction with the Conduct Officer shall present any changes to the Code of Conduct to the appropriate persons or bodies for approval prior to implementation.

E. Report by the Conduct Officer. Each year the Conduct Officer shall present to the Disciplinary Review Panel a summary of all cases handled by the Office of Student Conduct, a review of all training sessions, and recommendations for modifications to the Code of Conduct. The Disciplinary Review Panel shall offer advice and guidance to the Conduct Officer on these matters.

III. Code of Conduct Review. Every 4 years the Office of Student Conduct shall develop and execute procedures to review and if necessary revise the Code of Conduct.
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**APPENDIX A – SANCTIONING GUIDELINES**

A. **Guidelines for sanctions in cases dealing with sexual assault or sexual harassment**

The following represents guidelines for sanctions in cases where a student is found responsible for sexual misconduct or sexual harassment. The sanctions demonstrate the seriousness with which Lehigh University considers these violations. Hearing panels are not limited to these guidelines in determining an appropriate sanction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offenses</th>
<th>1st Offense</th>
<th>2nd Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Misconduct (rape or assault)</td>
<td>Expulsion</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Misconduct/other</td>
<td>Suspension of at least two semesters</td>
<td>Expulsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>Suspension of one semester or two semesters of disciplinary probation and mandatory counseling</td>
<td>Expulsion or at least two semesters of suspension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. **Guidelines for sanctions in cases involving Physical assault**

The following represents recommendations for sanctions in cases where students are found responsible for violations of the Code of Conduct involving physical attacks. The sanctions demonstrate the seriousness that Lehigh University attaches to these violations. Hearing panels are not limited to these guidelines in determining an appropriate sanction. Hearing panels may determine that a greater or lesser sanction is appropriate depending upon the individual circumstances of each case. Hearing panels may supplement the sanctions below with other appropriate mandates including, but not limited to, referral for counseling, educational workshops, written apologies, restitution for medical bills, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offenses</th>
<th>1st Offense</th>
<th>2nd Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical attack characterized by</td>
<td>Expulsion</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least two of the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) resulted in serious injury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) was unprovoked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) involved the use of weapon(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attack resulting in serious injuries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attack which involved the use of a weapon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprovoked physical attack, and/or attack with no resulting serious injuries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attack or threat of violence in response to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provocation, but disproportionate or excessive in degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.
Guidelines for sanctions in cases involving hazing.

The following represents recommendations for sanctions in cases where students or student organizations are found responsible for violations of the Code of Conduct involving hazing. The sanctions demonstrate the seriousness that Lehigh University attaches to these violations. Hearing panels are not limited to these guidelines in determining an appropriate sanction. Hearing panels may determine that a greater or lesser sanction is appropriate depending upon the circumstances of each case. Hearing panels may supplement the sanctions below with other appropriate mandates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>1st Offense</th>
<th>2nd Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical harm to student(s) as a result of hazing</td>
<td>Termination of the organization and/or expulsion of individuals</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causing reasonable apprehension of physical harm (or creating a situation in which physical harm is likely to occur) or causing actual emotional distress (or creating a situation in which emotional distress is likely to occur)</td>
<td>Dissolution of the organization for no fewer than four years and/or suspension of the individual for no fewer than four years</td>
<td>Termination of the organization and/or expulsion of individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectionable Behavior&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Disciplinary probation for no fewer than 2 semesters, removal of officers, chapter review (with input from Lehigh University, the national organization, alumni, governing body or other outside advisory committee); loss of one week of new member education (for no fewer than 2 years)</td>
<td>Dissolution of the organization for no fewer than two years and/or suspension of the individual for no fewer than two semesters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples (not exhaustive)

1. Paddling, whipping, beating, branding, forced calisthenics, exposure to the elements, forced consumption of any food, liquor, drug or other substance, attempts to control body weight and or appearance or any other forced physical activity that would subject the individual to physical harm.

2. Fear of those listed above, abandonment, restricting personal conduct, restricting hygiene, forced or coerced consumption of alcohol or other drugs, forced or coerced illegal acts, forced or coerced acts of a sexual nature, line-ups, insulting or derogatory comments, interruption of academic pursuits (i.e., restriction of adequate time to study, restriction of sleep, restriction of access to academic resources, forced or coerced missing of classes or other academic deadlines).

3. Public buffoonery, other membership requirements that are in violation of the definition of hazing (i.e., requirements to carry objects, wear certain clothing, address members in a subservient manner, scavenger hunts, personal servitude). A non-exhaustive test to see if an activity is to be considered objectionable behavior would be to examine the goals and/or outcomes of the activity. If the primary goal or outcome of the activity is to cause public ridicule, embarrassment, disruption of normal activities, harassment by others or the denunciation of a student in an objectionable manner, then it would meet the definition of this category. Additionally, if a reasonable person would consider the event to be objectionable, it would fall into this category.
April 30, 2006

Proposal on Extension of Tenure Clock for Untenured Faculty who become the Parent of a Child

Rationale:

Lehigh's current policy regarding tenure-clock extension for an untenured faculty member who becomes the parent of a child by birth or adoption links a one-semester extension of the probationary period to a Family and Medical Leave for the care of a newborn or adopted child. This proposal to add a new section to R&P follows on the model of Princeton University, which initiated a new policy in May 2005 that grants automatically to male and female faculty an additional probationary year for each newborn or adopted child. The Provost's Office has already changed its policy (which was not mandated by R&P) so that faculty who become parents and take a Family and Medical Leave to care for the child do not need to request the one-semester extension as formerly required. However, the change to a full-year extension requires revision of R&P approved by the faculty and Board of Trustees.

This proposed change to R&P affects only the length of the tenure-clock extension for faculty who become the parent of a child by birth or adoption. It does not affect the length of the paid Family and Medical Leave for faculty, which remains twelve weeks.

As in the current policy stated in R&P 2.2.2.4, under the new policy faculty will be able to request tenure review prior to the scheduled date.

Proposal

Draft addition to R&P:

2.2.5.7 Extension of probationary period for parenthood

An untenured faculty member (assistant, associate, or full professor) who becomes the parent of a child by birth or adoption will automatically receive a one-year extension of his/her their appointment by the provost. The faculty member's service will be extended by one year for each child, by birth or adoption, with a limit of two one-year extensions of the probationary period. This provision will be retroactive to include untenured faculty who have become the parent of a child or children since starting their tenure-track position at Lehigh. Each extension will stop the tenure clock; tenure candidates who receive extensions will be evaluated with the same academic standards as candidates who do not receive extensions. See 2.2.2.4 for the provision that tenure may be granted at any time prior to the terminal date of a faculty member's probationary period.
Notification of such extension must be made by the faculty member's department in writing to the provost as soon as possible after the childbirth or adoption. Notification must be received by the provost prior to the date on which the faculty member's tenure package is required to be sent to external reviewers (i.e., on or about August 1 for Fall Cycle tenure review; January 2 for Spring Cycle tenure review). In response, the provost will send a letter informing the faculty member of his or her revised reappointment and tenure review schedule. The faculty member will confirm acceptance of the new dates or decline to have his/her probationary period extended. During tenure review, the department chair will inform internal and external evaluators that the candidate must be evaluated with the same academic standards as candidates who have received no extension.

Revisions to provide cross-references from relevant R&P sections (additions are in bold):

R&P 2.2.2.4 Probationary Period
The period between an initial appointment at Lehigh and the granting or denial of tenure is a probationary period. This period shall not exceed six years. All initial contract letters for tenurable appointments shall identify the terminal date of the probationary period. Tenure may be granted at any time prior to this date, following the procedures in section 2.2.6. For extension of the probationary period for parenthood, see 2.2.5.7.

***

R&P 2.2.5.6 Time not included in probationary period

2.2.5.6.2 Certain Leaves of Absence

Semesters on leave of absence granted due to disability, family and medical leave, or personal reasons. The letter granting the leave must state that the time on leave is not included within the probationary period. See 2.2.5.7 on extension of probationary period for parenthood.
Proposal on Extension of Tenure Clock
for Untenured Faculty who become the Parent of a Child:
An Amendment

Submitted by: Kenneth P. Sinclair, Professor of Accounting and Chair

Rationale:

Given the importance of (1) recognizing the challenges of having children and (2) providing fair tenure evaluations, it is clear that the tenure clock extensions should be available to all untenured faculty who have yet to be notified of a final tenure decision by the Board of Trustees. The current proposal does not treat all untenured faculty members equally. Specifically, although the document states that "this provision will be retroactive to include untenured faculty who have become the parent of a child or children since starting their tenure-track position at Lehigh," the deadlines proposed in the document effectively exclude the small number of untenured faculty who currently are in the tenure process. This inequity applies only to the year of adoption.

The most salient argument against any amendment that addresses this problem is that it might inconvenience a small number of tenured faculty and administrators by requiring them to repeat aspects of the tenure process at the end of the revised probationary period. Clearly, the importance of providing fair evaluations and potentially avoiding the needless termination of valuable junior faculty outweigh the cost of requiring some additional effort.

The proposed amendment would add language (in bold italics below) to the current proposal:

...Notification of such extension must be made by the faculty member’s department in writing to the provost as soon as possible after the childbirth or adoption. Notification must be received by the provost prior to the date on which the faculty member’s tenure package is required to be sent to external reviewers (i.e., on or about August 1 for Fall Cycle tenure review; January 2 for Spring Cycle tenure review.

(If the faculty member’s tenure package was sent to external reviewers prior to the adoption of this provision, an exception to the notification deadline applies. Specifically, in such cases, the provost must receive notification on or before the date that the Board of Trustees makes the tenure decision. Notification in such cases means that the faculty member is withdrawing from the tenure process without prejudice to his/her ability to reinitiate the process at the end of the revised probationary period.)