Lehigh University

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

4 May 2006

Presiding: Mohamed El-Aasser (Sinclair Auditorium)

Provost El-Aasser called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM.

1. Minutes. Professor Rosemary Mundhenk MOVED to waive the reading of the minutes of the May 1, 2006 faculty meeting. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

2. New Business. Professor Bob Folk MOVED to Reinstate the Independence of the Secretary [see Attachment 1]. The motion was SECONDED.

Professor Mary Beth Daily suggested adding the Secretary to the Faculty to the BlackBoard site for Faculty Governance.

Professor Mundhenk, on behalf of the Faculty Steering Committee, said the Secretary to the Faculty would be an invited visitor to all Faculty Steering Committee meetings until such time as the faculty may consider a change to R&P to make the Secretary to the Faculty a voting member of the Faculty Steering Committee.

The motion PASSED.

3. Committee Reports. Professor Mundhenk presented the annual report of the Faculty Steering Committee [see Attachment 2].

Professor John Smith presented the annual report of the Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee [see Attachment 3].

Professor Elizabeth Fifer stated she would provide the annual report of the Faculty Compensation Committee at a later time.

Professor Ed Kay presented the annual report of the Disciplinary Appeals Committee [see Attachment 4].

Professor Jacob Kazakia presented the annual report of the Personnel Committee [see Attachment 5].

Professor Keith Gardiner presented the annual report of the Educational
Policy Committee [see Attachment 6].

Professor Mary Beth Deily presented the annual report of the Graduate and Research Committee [see Attachment 7].

4. **Provost’s Report.** Provost El-Aasser summarized faculty recruiting for the past year. 23 open positions were recruited; 15 offers were accepted; 3 other offers are pending. The provost expects approximately 18 new faculty hires

The university has received 1,274 deposits for the Class of 2010. The class is 41.8% women; there are a total of 51 African-Americans, 84 Hispanics/Latinos, 89 Asian-Americans; and, 40 international students. The total minority/international representation in the Class of 2010 represents a doubling over the Class of 2009.

The provost reported that three graduate students (from Turkey, Mongolia and China) were denied visas by the State Department. No faculty or staff were denied visas. No faculty reported any suppression of their research under the Patriot Act.

5. **Shino Forever Update.** Vice President Bonnie Devlin gave an update on the progress of the capital campaign [see Attachment 8].

The meeting stood adjourned at 5:27 PM

______________________________
Stephen F. Thode
Secretary to the Faculty
304 Rauch Business Center
(610) 758-4557
FAX: (610) 882-9415
E-mail: sft6
Motion to Reinstate the Independence of the Secretary

For many decades, the secretary of the faculty could communicate directly with the faculty. Previous secretaries had a budget and access to the mailing list of the faculty through the mailroom. Later, this access was expanded to include e-mail.

However, two provosts ago, the provost revoked the secretary's access to the mailing lists. The minutes and the agenda of our meetings now come from the administration. Furthermore, the secretary is no longer listed in the front pages of our phone book, and so we have trouble communicating with him.

In the good old days, the secretary helped in setting the agenda for our meetings. We contacted the secretary to add items to the agenda. I suggest that you talk to Dave Amidon, who was our secretary for many years, if you doubt my words. Earlier, Ralph Van Arram dominated faculty meetings during the many years he was secretary (I have copies of the minutes of his last meeting.)

As a first step in reinstating the role of the secretary, I move that

"The faculty urges the president and the provost

1. to reinstate the secretary's access to the mailing addresses of the faculty for e-mail and for campus mail for faculty business

and

2. to include the secretary's name, address, phone number, and e-mail address in the front section of Lehigh's phone book."

Bob Folk
Physics Department
2005-2006 ANNUAL REPORT of THE FACULTY STEERING COMMITTEE

Composed of the chairs or past chairs of the major faculty standing committees, four elected faculty representatives (one from each college), the president, and the provost, the Faculty Steering Committee advises the president and the provost, channels faculty initiatives to the appropriate committees or offices and monitors their progress, responds to problems identified by the faculty and/or the administration, and establishes the agenda for faculty meetings. At each monthly meeting, FSC members report on the activities of their committees or responsibilities—in an effort to promote communication and to avoid duplication of effort. But the main job of the FSC is to channel or steer, to steer motions, problems, concerns from anyone on the faculty to the appropriate committees or offices for consideration and future action:

1. Following the passage of the new Tenure and Promotion proposal last spring, the FSC asked each College to revise the membership and processes of its Tenure/Promotion Committee(s) in light of the new all-university policy. These revisions are in progress.

2. The FSC requested that the Personnel Committee to revise the old section of R&P regarding “Dismissal for Cause.” Revision may be ready next year.

3. We steered the new Code of Conduct, which the faculty will be considering May 1, to EdPol and to the GRC and made suggestions about ways to promote university-wide discussion of it.

4. In response to a request from a faculty member, we asked the academic deans to consult with appropriate faculty and come up with a proposal for revisions to R&P regarding “Joint Appointments.” That proposal will be considered by the Personnel Committee and eventually by the entire faculty.

5. We also steered the recommendation of a Faculty Senate, suggested by the Task Force on Governance, to a faculty vote in April 2006. We created a subcommittee of the FSC for this task and we directed that this “New Governance Subcommittee” include a member from each standing faculty committee (to insure the participation of current elected faculty leaders), as well as faculty from all four colleges and some members of the former task force (for continuity). After several open meetings and after circulation of drafts and amendments, the proposal for a senate was voted on electronically and just failed to receive the required 2/3 majority (Vote: For: 181; Against: 88; Abstaining: 14). In an April 10 email to the entire faculty (available at this meeting), I explained the circumstances of this vote. Despite the defeat, the members of the “New Governance Subcommittee deserve our thanks for their scores of hours of work researching, writing, and consulting about the proposal and our congratulations for their creation of a proposal that the consulting AAUP lawyer considers a model of a senate. Because Lehigh too often does not reward the faculty who perform this sort of work. I now thank and congratulate them individually: Mike
Kolchin(chair), Slade Carrell, Art King, Alastair McAulay, Mike Gill, John Pettigrew, Barbara Traister, Jean Soderlund, and George White. Recently asked if the FSC has any plans to revive the motion, given the closeness of the vote. I would say that I think we, as a committee, prefer not to. Other groups and individual faculty certainly can do so.

In addition to steering, the FSC—in its attempt to increase communication among faculty, administrators, and the Board of Trustees—has acted on the following issues:

1. We wrote to the Chair of the Presidential Search Committee, the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board of Trustees, and the Chair of the Board’s Academic Affairs Committee to express our disappointment that FSC was not consulted about the make-up of the Presidential Search Committee and more generally, to ask for a more systematic, less haphazard way for the Board to consult Faculty and vice versa.

2. We decided that the Accreditation Steering Committee should include an elected faculty member as well as appointed faculty. That election will occur on May 1.

3. We established a University Faculty Blackboard account, where committee chairs now post important documents and communicate easily with the entire faculty.

Finally, members of the FSC are currently working on or planning to work on the following issues:

1. A new statement on "Academic Freedom." The R&P Subcommittee of the FSC will soon be discussing with the Provost and the President a draft by Alwyn Eades and Rick Matthews.

2. The development of a consistent set of procedures for future electronic voting.

3. Reconsideration of the inclusion of the section of Athletics in R&P 5.

4. Remaining recommendations from the Governance Task Force (other than the proposed senate).

My thanks go to the members of the FSC—Mary Beth Deily, Stephen Thode, Jeff Sands, David Small, Elizabeth Fifer, Alwyn Eades, Ed Shapiro, Mike Kolchin, Mohamed El-Aasser, Greg Farrington, our frequent visitors Carl Moses and Jean Soderlund—and our secretary Amy Fantasia for their work and their efforts to make Lehigh a better place and to foster productive working relationships among faculty and administration.

Respectfully submitted,
Rosemary Mundhenk
June 5, 2006
John K. Smith, chair

FFPOC Report for 2005-6

This year the committee focused on three items:

1) the future composition and role of the FFPOC committee. In the
defeated senate proposal, the FFPOC would have become the Financial
Resources Committee which would include staff and students, and the
Vice President for Finance and Administration. Reconfiguring the
committee in this fashion could still be done and is an issue the FFPOC
should address.

2) interviews with deans of four colleges about the resource needs to
accomplish goals stated in their respective college plans

3) According to R&I, the primary purpose of the committee is to ensure
that the long-range academic concerns of the faculty are represented in the
financial operations of the university. One of the key goals of Lehigh is
to improve our academic standing amongst the elite universities. The
question that our committee has considered is does Lehigh have the
financial resources to continue to invest significant resources into the
academic programs of the university.

In the past few years the committee has been working closely with Vice President
for Finance and Administration Peggy Plympton on understanding the various
components of the university budget and also to better understand the strategic plans of
the Colleges, as they lay out the future direction for the academic areas of the university.
It has been the goal of the committee to find our how much discretionary money—that
money that is not required to meet normal financial obligations—and what additional
revenues, might be available in the future for such investments. In recent years the 2020
initiative and funding of other programs such as ArtsLehigh and the Minors in Business
and Engineering have demonstrated that Lehigh can marshal significant resources while
working within the constraints of the budget. Additional resources will be made
available through the successful progress of the Shine Forever campaign, tuition
increases, and revenue streams (graduate tuition, summer school, distance learning, and
indirect cost recovery). In addition, the Board of Trustees could decide to increase the
level of spending of endowment earnings.

2020 Investments

As Provost El-Aasser reported in his state of the university talk, from fiscal year
2001 to 2008, the university has committed $44 million to 2020 projects. The fact that
this is considerably less than the originally planned $65 to $75 million is actually less
important than how the university has funded the projects to date. At least three-quarters
of the money has come from reallocation of money within the university budget. About $12 million has come from discretionary funds in the President’s and Provost’s budgets, and $20 million has come from “Reallocation of University funds.” It seems reasonable that the university could continue to allocate between $5 and $10 million per year for investment in the academic programs. Of course, it is possible that President Gast will have some initiatives that she is interested in advancing as well.

Tuition Increases

Next year’s 7% increase in tuition fees will bring in about $7 million in net tuition revenues after all financial aid need it met. It seems unlikely that we will be able to increase our tuition at this rate indefinitely although our price is still comparable to our benchmark peers.

Revenue Streams

The revenue stream incentives have added $3.5 million to the college budgets over the past five years. While this additional revenue has been welcomed by the Deans, it is uncertain whether two of the components of the revenue streams—adding more paying graduate students and increasing summer school offerings—have contributed directly to improving the academic stature of Lehigh. On the other hand, indirect cost recovery, which is directly related to increases in research funding, has increased by about $3 million over the past five years. Since much of the new hiring has been in the sciences and engineering, indirect cost recovery funds should increase significantly as the new researchers become established at Lehigh. The REAS has made forty two new hires in the past several years.

Endowment Spending

The current capital campaign will add $500 million to the endowment which will provide $15 million dollars in additional resources, though the campaign is currently anticipated to continue through at least 2009, and pledge periods for the receipt of gifts will run past that date. At this juncture the university has raised over $250 million toward the $500 million total goal, in cash and pledges.

While acknowledging that Lehigh’s endowment per student is low for a university of our standing, we believe that in determining the use of endowment Lehigh needs to balance the short and long term needs of the university. Currently, Lehigh spends about 5% of the endowment each year. Over the past ten years, however, the total gross return has been 11.4% per year. Thus, Lehigh has been able to “reinvest” endowment growth into the endowment. This policy helps the endowment keep pace with inflation and achieve some growth in the past when annual gifts to endowment represented only about 2% of the total market value. During the current fund-raising campaign, Lehigh would like to raise the giving rate to 4%, more typical of our benchmark institutions. Given the significant growth of the endowment, it seems reasonable that in the future the board might consider raising the spending level from 5% to 6% if the additional spending would significantly improve Lehigh’s stature. With an endowment approaching $1 billion, this would generate an additional $10 million annually for investment in academic programs. However, the Investment Subcommittee of the Board projects future
returns of 8% on average, so in order to keep pace with inflation (projected to be 3%-4%), spending should not go beyond 4%-5%, and believes we should not overspend on the current generation relative to the needs of future generations.

Faculty Compensation
It is probably accurate to state that faculty generally have not been happy with the roughly 4% total compensation (salary and benefits) increases of recent years. However, increases of this magnitude have been a source of funds for the university. Had compensation increases been pegged at 6%, it would have cost the university an extra $1 million per year. The cumulative cost of these increases over seven years would have been $28 million. Thus, it can be said that two-thirds of the funds for the 2020 initiative came from our austere compensation policy. The June 2005 report to the Board of Trustees stated that salaries and employee benefits as a percentage of expenditures has declined from 49.2% to 45.7% since the mid-1990s.

Size of Faculty
The 2020 initiative has increased the size of the faculty by about 10%. At present this increase is considered to be temporary. The eventual reduction of the number of faculty apparently will be done for strategic and not financial purposes. The cost of the additional faculty are mostly being covered in the university budget. In our meetings with the deans, two of them explicitly stated that additional faculty were necessary to achieve their college's plans. CBS would like 14 new faculty, in part to lower the college's high student to faculty ratio. The College of Education would like to add five faculty members. The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences has asked departments to consider initiating or expanding graduate programs. If this happens, some additional faculty will be needed. Though some realignment of faculty slots across colleges appears to be required, keeping the current number of faculty would help the colleges achieve their goals. However, if the number of faculty returns to the 400 level this will generate several million dollars per year for other uses.

Conclusion
Lehigh has a solid base on which to build. It provides outstanding undergraduate education in a wide variety of fields. Half of our income is derived from undergraduate tuition. In recent years Lehigh has developed innovative programs such as the Integrated Business and Engineering program which have attracted higher quality students. In the future it appears that more programs of this type will be developed. For example, the CAS is currently developing a 2020 initiative in Global Studies. Some modest amounts of new money will be needed to support these programs.

Lehigh is also a research university, although not all departments have graduate programs. The 2020 initiative has reinforced Lehigh's traditional strength in the engineering and related-science fields. It is expected that these new researchers will bring in substantial new money for research and graduate training. Currently, though, Lehigh has not been able to attract a sufficient number of high quality graduate students. The special University Fellowships offered to the top applicants have had rather low acceptance rates. To support an expanded and improved research enterprise Lehigh will
need to invest significant new resources to recruit excellent graduate students. Eventually, if Lehigh's research grants and reputation rise this funding might be decreased.

Lehigh aims to constantly improve in all its core activities, but to some extent that improvement will depend on the resources that the university can make available. It appears that Lehigh can provide modest increases in resources to support its strategic goals across the board. In the short to medium term, more dramatic changes would probably require the university to make some difficult choices.
As chair of the Disciplinary Appeals Committee, I also chair the Judicial Review Panel. In that capacity I am charged with reviewing the judicial process, including reporting its actions and recommending changes to the code of conduct. Today I am moving substantial changes to the code that are intended to improve the code. Below I summarize the results of various hearings that are part of the discipline system. These hearings are of the following types: (1) Formal hearing before a 5-member panel drawn from members of the University Committee on Discipline (UCOD). These panels consist of two faculty, two students, and an administrator; these panels hear all cases of academic dishonesty; (2) An administrative hearing before a member of the dean of students office; and (3) An informal hearing before a member of the Office of Campus Living staff. I list four kinds of sanctions: (1) expulsion; (2) suspension; (3) disciplinary probation; and (4) disciplinary warning. The UCOD and administrative hearings may be appealed to the Disciplinary Appeals Committee. As noted below, each semester two case were appealed, and all appeals were denied.

**FALL, 2005 SEMESTER**

**Total UCOD Hearings**: 6  
- Number of students: 8  
- Number of Academic Dishonesty Cases: 2  
  
  Students found responsible: 7  
  Suspended: 1  
  Probation: 5  
  Warning: 1  
  Students found not responsible: 1  

**Total Administrative Hearings**: 10  
  
  Students found responsible: 8  
  Suspended: 2  
  Probation: 5  
  Warning: 1  
  Students found not responsible: 2  

**Appeals**: 2 (Both Denied)

**Informal Conduct Cases**: 556  
  Students found responsible: 339  
  Probation: 100  
  Warning: 239

**SPRING, 2006 SEMESTER** (Through April 18, 2006)

**Total UCOD Hearings**: 11  
  - Number of Students involved: 18  
  - Number of Academic Dishonesty Cases: 10
Students found responsible = 17
   Expelled: 1 (pending appeal)
   Probation: 10
   Suspended: 1
   Warning: 5
Students found not responsible = 1

Total Administrative Hearings: 7
   Corporate found responsible: 1
   Probation: 1
   Students found responsible: 5
      Suspended: 1
      Probation: 2
      Warning: 2
   Student found not responsible: 1

Appeals: 2 (Both Denied)

Informal Conduct Cases: 294
   Students found responsible: 136
      Probation: 58
      Warning: 68
The membership of the Faculty Personnel Committee consists of four full professors, one elected from each college, and one university-wide elected member who must be an associate professor at the time of election. All members serve for five years. The current membership is Jennifer Swann from the College of Business and Economics, Ward Cates from Education, and Jacob Kazakia from Engineering and Applied Sciences. Jeff Sands served as our representative to the Faculty Steering Committee this year and Jennifer Swann served as our representative to the University Diversity Leadership Committee (UDLC).

During the year, we dealt with one case of appeal for denial of tenure and we completed the case. We also initiated discussion of a second case of appeal alleging violations of procedure. In addition we dealt with some confidential matters that can not be discussed publicly.

There were also other matters.

1. Input to the Presidential Search Committee: The FPC identified the issue of faculty and student diversity as a very important factor in the selection process as early as November 05. We wrote an email to the chair of the search committee and we recommended that the views of candidates on diversity be a factor in the selection process. Later during the open forum for faculty and staff we reiterated this statement. Much later we were able to meet with the representative of the firm assisting the search committee and we expressed the views of FPC on a variety of issues relating to the selection of a president for our university.

2. Proposed Change to R&P 1.2.2.6: We worked on a new extended language of this section which defines the composition, scope, and activities of the Faculty Personnel Committee. The new language was incorporated at article 1.10 (1.10.1 through 1.10.7) of the new Faculty Governance document introducing the Faculty Senate. The original language of the proposal was modified after we realized that a large segment of the faculty prefer to leave unspecified the exact timing of the start of FPC investigations into appeals relating to tenure or promotion.

3. Guidelines on Leave of Absence: The FPC had several discussions with faculty as well as with the provost and deputy provost Prof. Soderlind on the issue of the newly introduced guidelines on the frequency of Academic Leaves. FPC was not able to satisfactorily resolve this issue during this academic year. We intend to look further into it and come up with a recommendation in the year ahead.

4. Dismissal for cause (article 2.2.11 of current R&P): During the year, FPC worked intermittently on formulating a better description of the conditions and process relating to dismissal for cause. We are still working on this issue and we hope to finalize our proposal by next fall.

5. Tenure Clock. Extension of probationary period for parenthood: Our committee studied extensively the proposal brought to FPC by the office of the provost and provided considerable feedback. In addition we conducted a survey of the faculty to assess the importance of an associated issue. The proposal was brought to the faculty with our very strong endorsement. The proposal was first amended by the faculty on the floor of the May 1st meeting and then passed. Our committee thinks that this last amendment may significantly hinder the acceptance of the whole proposal by the BOT. The amended motion is posted in the FPC folder of the LU FACULTY Web site.

6. Omissions of R&P procedures during tenure probationary period: The Faculty Personnel Committee during its investigation of a tenure denial case found that some departments and possibly colleges were not following R&P in certain topics relating to tenure preparation and evaluation. We would like to bring these to the attention of the President and the Provost to ensure appropriate corrections.
• Not having yearly evaluation of untenured faculty by the tenured faculty of the department and presentation of a written evaluation by the chair to each of the untenured faculty. (Section 2.2.4.1 of R&P Faculty review – Unemployed faculty)

• Ambiguity on the timing and way of an untenured faculty contacting potential external evaluators. The relevant section of R&P is not clear on this issue. In addition, the College Guidelines for Tenure are not clear either. The university guidelines indicate “The evaluators should be selected and letters requested without any prior solicitation by the faculty or administration”. We believe this issue has to be clarified (can, for example, a candidate contact potential evaluators two years, or one year, before the tenure evaluation and provide them with information about his/her current research?). (Section 2.2.5.2 of R&P External evaluation, also Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Portfolio Guidelines)

• Reluctance of faculty to be candid in their written evaluations of junior faculty during the probationary period.

• Insufficient mentoring of untenured faculty and lack of explicit and long-lived goals set by the departments and the deans. The issue of transitional periods (new chairs, new provosts, new expectations of faculty) should also be considered in connection to mentoring. FPC believes that untenured faculty must be provided with clear expectations of what constitutes excellence in scholarship, teaching, and service.

The membership of the Faculty Personnel Committee will change next year by the replacement of both Jeff Sands (CAS representative) and Jennifer Swann (at large member). The new chair of the committee will be Mike Kolobin and Jacob Kazakia will represent FPC to the University Steering Committee. One of the members will be selected to represent FPC to University Diversity Leadership Committee (UDLC).

On behalf of FPC

Jacob Y. Kazakia, chair
Report of the University Educational Policy Committee
David Small
Chair
May 4, 2006

The Ed Pol committee applied itself to the usual university affairs. These included approving curriculum changes in the colleges of Business and Economics, Arts and Sciences, and Engineering.

We also looked at issues that concern R and P, especially the issue of displaying an F/D on the transcript, to indicate that the student failed the course, because of disciplinary reasons.

One issue that we found surprisingly contentious was that of extending the number of 1 hour and 15 minute classes. Many in the college of Arts and Sciences have asked the university to give them more longer classes, but longer classes do adversely impact important majors such as music. We have advised next year's Ed Pol to institute a group of concerned departments to look into the full feasibility of this request.

Some free time in the fall did allow us to speculate on how the Ed Pol committee might become more proactive as a player in the setting of Education Policy, rather than a committee which reacts to proposed university changes. It was suggested that the Ed Pol committee in the future look into the overall quality of the educational product at Lehigh. For example, as Lehigh is moving toward a more research oriented institution, what does it mean when more and more faculty are focusing on research? Is there a noticeable tradeoff in their application to teaching?

A second important issue was that of attendance at the Ed Pol meetings. Frequently we had less than sufficient representation from the different colleges. We are requesting that the respective deans, who are voting members of the committee, encourage faculty from their colleges to attend the meetings.
April 25, 2006; Amended May 12, 2006

To: Lehigh University Faculty
From: Graduate & Research Committee
Re: Annual Report

The GRC completed a number of different tasks this year, each of which can be roughly categorized as one of the following:

1. reviewing and approving curriculum proposals,
2. reviewing and approving graduate student petitions,
3. recommending University Fellowship recipients,
4. reviewing and approving center or institute proposals,
5. continuing an in-depth study of graduate student life,
6. developing and approving proposals to change R&P,
7. responding to reports or proposals from other university bodies,
8. developing proposals for consideration by the Provost and Deans,
9. requesting tasks from the Deputy Provost and the Associate Deans,
10. beginning an in-depth review of graduate student scholastic standards or
11. beginning a review of policy for awarding University Fellowships.

1. Curriculum
The Curriculum Subcommittee, chaired by Hugo Caram, reviewed a number of proposals from all four colleges for both course changes and for new certificate and degree programs. Most proposals required at most small changes; all curriculum proposals were subsequently approved by the full committee. Forms for curriculum proposals are now posted on the LU Faculty Blackboard site in the GRC folder.

2. Petitions
The Petitions Subcommittee, chaired by Dawn Keetley, met regularly to review all petitions from graduate students. Petitions were referred to the full committee in only two cases. Our experience with these cases led to the proposal to create a graduate SCS committee (see item 6).

3. University Fellowships
The Fellowship Subcommittee, chaired by Sibel Pamukcu, reviewed applications from each college for fellowships for top students, and chose which should be offered University Fellowships. They also received a request from the RCEAS to alter the fellowship policy as applied to candidates from RCEAS. The subcommittee recommended approving the request to the full committee, which agreed. The discussion led to the recommendation that the subcommittee reconsider the entire fellowship policy (see item 11).
4. **Center or Institute Proposals**
The Research Subcommittee, chaired by George DuPaul, conducted an initial review of a proposal for a new center. The proposal was subsequently withdrawn for additional development before reaching the full committee. Forms for Center or Institute proposals are now posted on the ORSP website and on the IU Faculty Blackboard site in the GRC folder.

5. **Study of Graduate Student Life**
The Task Force on Graduate Student Life, chaired by Jill Schneider, was appointed by the GRC at the end of the 2004-2005 academic year to study different aspects of graduate student life. They reported to the GRC on May 9, 2006, on their efforts to identify appropriate universities for purposes of benchmarking and projections regarding graduate student housing, transportation, aid, etc. This process is continuing (see item 9 below, first bullet, below).

6. **Proposals to change R&P**
The GRC referred, or will refer, four proposals to change R&P to the faculty for approval. These are:

   • Proposal to change the Ph.D./Ed.D. residency requirement to a "concentrated learning requirement." This proposal was approved by the faculty on October 17, 2005.

   • Proposal to bring various statements on graduate scholastic standards into agreement with each other and into agreement with the standards as approved by the faculty in November 1998. This proposal was approved by the faculty on March 20, 2006.

   • Proposal to change R&P language on the curriculum approval process so as to reflect current practice and to allow non-substantive changes in graduate courses to be approved by the college. This proposal, in amended form, was approved by the faculty at the May 1, 2006 meeting.

   • Proposal to create a graduate student SGS committee. This proposal was approved by the faculty at the May 1, 2006 meeting.

7. **Reports to GRC**
The committee received and discussed reports on several different items. These included:

   • two reports on the proposed changes to the University Code of Conduct

   • a report from the GRC Research Subcommittee on the proposal from the University Research Council for formal descriptions for short- and long-term research positions. The descriptions were subsequently presented to the faculty on March 20. The University Research Council is going to hold an open meeting for more consideration of these descriptions.
8. **Proposals for the Provost and Deans**
The GRC has considered draft versions of the following two items:

- A proposal for a 1-credit course on teaching for Teaching Assistants
- Amended Guidelines for Leave of Absence for Graduate and Research Assistants

Both items, attached below, have been sent to the Provost and Deans for consideration.

9. **Tasks assumed by the Deputy Provost and the Associate Deans**
The Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs and the Associate Deans agreed to assume two tasks at the request of the GRC. These tasks are:

- to develop a mechanism for collecting, at a minimum, social security and/or birth date information from all admitted graduate students, so that we can use national databases to track where those who decline our offers eventually matriculate, and,
- to develop a statement of uniform expectations on behavior in the classroom for graduate students.

10. **Review of Graduate Student Scholastic Standards**
Committee members raised a number of substantive issues regarding scholastic standards for graduate students during discussions of other matters this year. These issues were collected and summarized as Talking Points in March (see attached), and the committee has begun a systematic review. Two initial draft proposals for changes in graduate grading policy were developed at the May 9, 2006 meeting (attached below). The committee anticipates that this review will continue into the next academic year.

11. **Review of policy for awarding University Fellowships**
The request from RCEAS for a change in the University Fellowship policy for their candidates caused the committee to request that the Fellowship Subcommittee review the current policy. The committee anticipates that the subcommittee will report back early in the next academic year.

Items 9, 10, and 11, are ongoing. The GRC also continued to keep itself updated on the status of the National Research Council survey (as of October 19, 2005, the process had started again) and on the implementation of the new TOEFL test and standards (still rather early to evaluate effect of changes—see attached interim report). GRC members also participated in the University Research Council, the Faculty Steering Committee, a new committee formed by the Provost to oversee re-writing of the current policy on conflicts of interest, a new committee formed by the
Vice Provost for Research on Research & Infrastructure, and the panels on co-authorship issues for graduate students arranged by the Director of Graduate Student Life.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary E. Deily,
Chair, GRC. 2005-2006

Attachments:

Lehigh Enhancement to Graduate Teacher Development Proposal
Leave of Absence Guidelines, Revised
Summary of Grading Issues
Draft Proposals for two changes in grade policy
TOEFL Report
Traditional approaches to teaching undergraduates do not work effectively with many of today's students (Green, 1989). Helping students to understand important ideas in content disciplines is a complex task. For instructors to do it well takes significant pedagogical knowledge and skills in addition to content knowledge and understandings. However, most graduate teaching assistants (TAs) have little, if any, professional training in teaching. Effective undergraduate education teaching involves (a) purposeful, research-informed development of innovative lessons with effective teaching strategies that actively involve students in learning; and (b) use of effective strategies of student assessment and feedback (Sunal, Wright, & Day, 2004).

Current graduate training for many Lehigh graduate TAs consists of a four and a half-hour training session coordinated by the Graduate Life Office. This training consists of four topic-oriented sessions currently conducted by Lehigh faculty and staff. These include the following topics:

1. Case-based scenarios of student needs – panelists from student support services discuss how to address student needs.
2. Overview on how to use Blackboard for course instruction – Blackboard features.
3. A session on effective teaching strategies.
4. A session on attitudes and behaviors that primarily focuses on harassment training.

Graduate training at Lehigh for TAs can be significantly enhanced by augmenting what is currently done with additional professional development that focuses on important pedagogical topics that are central for promoting meaningful learning. Such professional development sessions would include the following topics:

- **Classroom management and organization.** Effective classroom management strategies, motivating students, group management strategies, dealing with difficult students, structuring role-playing, debate simulations, and organizing laboratories.
- **Presenting yourself in the classroom.** Setting the tone for instruction. Dress guidelines. Effective communication strategies.
- **Use of technology to enhance learning.** Instructional uses of Blackboard (i.e., structuring asynchronous discussion to promote learning and class preparedness, designing collaborative group tasks). Design strategies for presentation tool software. Use of mind tool software (i.e., Inspiration) for semantic mapping use for representing concepts.
- **Pedagogical frameworks to produce meaningful learning.** Overview of instructional learning models and learning theories to promote effective teaching and learning.
- **Assessment.** Formative and summative assessment strategies, assessment types, criterion-based assessment use, assessing prior knowledge, use of assessment data to modify instruction.
- **Inquiry strategies.** Overview of the processes of inquiry; data management, use and meaning of evidence, critical analysis of data and ideas, alternatives explanations, and

- **Cognitive diversity.** Overview of the role of cognition in student learning.
- **Academic integrity issues.** Cheating - prevention and intervention. Plagiarism - issues, and tools for identification. Lehigh policies and reporting processes.

Sustainability would require a faculty honorarium, to provide Lehigh faculty or staff TA professional development sessions that would contain the topics described above. We recommend that the professional development series be coordinated by the Graduate Life Office in partnership with Greg Reitman, Lehigh’s Director of Faculty Development.

**Professional development experience offering:**

- Offer topics in seminar sessions throughout the year. *Classroom management and organization, Presenting yourself in the classroom,* and *Use of technology to enhance learning* would be offered weekly during the first three weeks of the beginning of the Fall semester and again at the beginning of the Spring semester. The other five seminar topics would be offered during the academic year.
- Seminar sessions would last 2 hours.
- Provide TAs with lunch.
- A Web site of materials and resources would be created and available online.
- Offer students 1 credit for attending the professional seminar series or notation on the transcript.

This professional development seminar series structure models the *Preparing the Professariat* model from North Carolina State University (http://www.fis.ncsu.edu/grad/ptp/).

**References:**


LEAVE OF ABSENCE POLICY
Graduate and Research Assistantships
Leave of Absence Guidelines
Revised, May 2006

For the purposes of these guidelines, an Assistantship is defined as an award given in conjunction with graduate study; it is not a job. Typically,

- Assistantships are given to students in recognition of academic record/relevant experience;
- The continuation of an assistantship is contingent upon satisfactory academic progress.

These are guidelines only, not promises or guarantees. Similarly, nonattendance for regularly scheduled duties does not constitute an official leave of absence. Deans have the final say in implementing these guidelines.

Short Term Absences

During each 12 month period, a GA/RA may take the following short term absences, during which time the assistantship will continue:

- Up to five weekdays for sickness or injury
  - Injuries incurred while performing assistantship duties are covered by Workers' Compensation
- Up to three weekdays for illness of an immediate family member
- Up to three weekdays for death of an immediate family member
- Up to fifteen weekdays for military duty (including travel time)
- Paid leave of absence to serve on jury duty required by a court
  - The student shall provide a copy of the court notice to the supervisor and the graduate program director. The student shall return to the assistantship duties immediately upon release from jury duty by the court administrator.

For short term absences, the expectation is that the students will make up the work upon their return.

Long-term Leave of Absences (for Students in Good Academic Standing Only)

During a 12 month period, a GA/RA who must cease assistantship duties due to personal or medical reasons (e.g., illness, injury, etc.):

- Should inform the following people of his/her departure date and expected date of return
  - His/her faculty advisor (hereafter, the word ‘advisor’ will also mean ‘research project supervisor’ where applicable)
  - The department chairperson
  - The Graduate program director
• Must obtain written approval for the leave of absence from the advisor, department chairperson, or graduate program coordinator who controls funding for the position.

In instances where the leave is less than one month the stipend will not cease if the GA/RA

• Makes up the work or performs the work offsite in a reasonable timeframe. The details must be worked out with the advisor in advance. OR
• Carries out newly assigned duties instead of the ones originally assigned (e.g., developing the department website instead of conducting laboratory experiments).

Graduate students supported by assistantships who have a child (through birth or adoption) will be excused from their regular research duties for a period of six weeks during which they will continue to receive support.

If the student files for academic withdrawal, the department will report the student’s enrollment status:

• To the Graduate Program Director
• To the Registrar’s office, for notation on the student’s transcript; and
• To the Financial Aid office, which may begin the Federal Stafford Loan grace period and/or the repayment of the Federal Supplemental Loan for Students.

Upon return, the student may need to complete new loan applications and a deferment loan with lenders.

In instances where the leave is more than one month but less than six months, and the student’s duties cannot be made up at a later time, the stipend will be suspended (except in the case of the birth or adoption of a child). Upon the student’s return, the advisor, graduate program director, and the department will give the GA/RA preference over other unfunded students in an effort to re-appoint the GA/RA to an assistantship. This is contingent upon

• The student’s resumption of full-time study, and
• Resource availability.

All military leaves of absence will be handled according to existing Lehigh policies and government regulations.
Draft for Comment

TALKING POINTS: GRADING ISSUES IN GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Jim Largay. March 30, 2006

The extended discussion around the language relating to the narrow issues of B-, C- in lieu of B and C elicited many comments. That procedural issue opened the door to possible consideration of substantive issues that could lead to revised grade requirements for graduate degrees.

Current Provisions for Masters Programs in R&P 3.22.1

- No grades lower than C- can count towards a graduate degree
- Students receiving more than four grades below B- in courses numbered 200 or higher will be dropped from their degree program
- Pass-fail grading is not allowed and no grades are given for dissertation research

Issues to be Considered

Surprisingly—to me at least—is that there is no minimum GPA required for graduate degrees and that 200-level courses can count toward a masters degree. And in our earlier discussion about the merits of the Environmental Initiative certificate program in environmental law we encountered the apparently common practice of registering both graduate and undergraduate students in the same course. Although there could be different course requirements for the two groups, the EI program also contemplated registering graduate student practitioners and non-practitioners (some of whom might be undergraduates) in the same course. Lastly, Bruce Correll indicated that he uses an hoc policy of averaging the grades when graduate students retake a course; e.g., retaking when receiving a C- or below in a required course. From all of this these issues emerge:

1. Should there be a minimum GPA requirement for graduate programs?
2. Is allowing four grades below B- too lenient? A related question is whether a student who receives the fifth such grade in the final semester is dropped or receives the degree if other requirements are met.
3. Should 200-level courses count toward graduate program requirements? (It appears that 200-level courses are allowed for some degrees, but that those courses are outside the college or department awarding the degree.)
4. What should be our formal grading policy when graduate students repeat a course?
5. Should there be a University policy on registering graduate and undergraduate students in the same graduate course?
6. Should any concern be expressed about registering practitioners and non-practitioners in the same graduate course?

I characterize Issues 1. – 4. as technical performance issues. Assuming a 30-credit program, GRC's proposed technical revisions mean that a student could obtain a Lehigh graduate degree with a 2.3 GPA (= [(12 X 1.7) + (18 X 2.7)]/30). If you believe, as I do, that graduate school grading is at least .5 higher than UG grading, this result implies a GPA that would not meet general graduation requirements. Moreover, although it is common to allow about six credits of a thirty-credit program to be 300-level UG courses, I was not aware that some programs count 200-level courses toward a masters degree. We need more information on why such courses are not treated as required background courses.
In contrast, Issues 5. and 6. are educational policy issues. One question involves the extent to which a true graduate experience can be achieved in courses with mixed enrollments. Another question—that I know well from working in professional masters programs—is the extent to which those students with work experience receive a lesser educational experience when combined with students that lack the real-world experience and context. Such questions are not amenable to quantitative solutions but warrant some thoughtful discussion.
May 12, 2006

To: GRC, 2006-2007
From: GRC, 2005-2006
Re: Drafts of two proposals on graduate student grades

Below are two draft proposals for changes in graduate student grade policies that reflect discussions in the May 9, 2006 GRC meeting. I have not looked in R&P to see if any changes are necessary there, but the page references for the Catalog are included.

Proposal for Repeating Courses:

Insert on page 54 of the catalog, between the paragraph on University Withdrawal and the material on Graduate Student Scholastic Requirements:

Repeating of courses. A graduate student may repeat a course for a higher grade, unless otherwise specified by program or college requirements. If a course is repeated, the final grade received upon repetition of the course is counted in the cumulative average. The original grade and credit hours received will be dropped from the cumulative average. However, the original grade is not erased for the purposes of maintaining good scholastic standing (see below). A student who fails a repeated course after receiving a passing grade the first time will have the original grade deleted from his or her average, but will retain credit for the course toward graduation.

For deletion of a grade from the cumulative average after repeating a course, a student must (a) file the deletion form with the Registrar's Office; and (b) repeat the identical course with a final grade at Lehigh.

Rationale:

There is no policy on how to handle repeated courses on graduate transcripts. Adopting the undergraduate policy insures that the cumulative average reflects the highest level of achievement reached by the student. On the other hand, maintaining consideration of all grades received for purposes of evaluating scholastic standing will help identify students unsuited to graduate work.
Draft Proposal for Incompletes:

Current language (page 54 of catalog):

The N grade is defined as for undergraduates except that graduate students have a calendar year to remove course incomplete grades unless an earlier deadline is specified by the instructor. Graduate student incomplete course grades that are not removed remain as N grades on the student's record. Thesis or research project N grades may remain beyond one year until the work is completed.

Proposed language:

The N grade is defined as for undergraduates except that graduate students have a calendar year to remove course incomplete grades unless an earlier deadline is specified by the instructor. The N grade will be converted into the parenthetical grade after one calendar year following receipt of the N grade unless the instructor has previously changed the grade using the removal-of incomplete procedure. The parenthetical grade will be dropped from the transcript after the assignment of the course grade. Thesis or research project N grades may remain beyond one year until the work is completed.

Rationale:

This proposal clarifies what happens to incompletes assigned to graduate students, and gives them an incentive to clear them up.
April 21, 2006

There are three things to note in the ORC meeting:

1) Because the release of the new iBT (Internet Based Test) TOEFL will not be completed until August 2006 throughout the world, and the old TOEFL scores (CBT and Paper/Pencil) are valid for two years, many new international students for the 2006 admissions cycle have been admitted with the old TOEFL scores. As a result, we have only seen two new TOEFL score reports at Lehigh and do not have enough data to make any determination about the new scores that were set this past year. See attached file for the updated release schedule for the new test.

2) Because this new TOEFL test will include a speaking section, ETS is phasing out the TSE (Test of Spoken English) used to assess the spoken English of international teaching assistants and will be relying on the new TOEFL to provide this measure of spoken fluency. However, ESL does not yet feel completely confident that ONLY the new speaking section should be used as a judgment of spoken fluency for international teaching assistants at Lehigh because this TOEFL test is so new. Thus, ESL will retain the use of the SPEAK test as the required spoken English assessment for international TAs until such time that sufficient data from the speaking and listening sections of the new test can be compared to the SPEAK scores of incoming students who have the new TOEFL scores. Once performance on the SPEAK is compared to students' performance on the speaking and listening sections of this new TOEFL (probably through 2008), ESL will discuss with the faculty and admissions committees whether it may be possible to eliminate the SPEAK test at Lehigh.

3) All of the current approved iBT TOEFL scores and policies are now available on ESL's website under the 'Guide for Staff and Faculty' link: <http://www.lehigh.edu/~inesl/Guide/newTOEFL.htm>. This page provides the target scores and the use of these scores for admission by college and, in some cases, by department. For those departments who wish to raise their scores and have yet to discuss the increase in the scores for their department should contact ESL right away to set a time to meet.

Timothy Bonner
Director of English as a Second Language
Lehigh University
Coxe Hall
610-758-6412
Campaign Progress
To Date

- $264M committed (53% goal)
- $48M/23 endowed chairs (39%)
- $59M endowed scholarships (58%)
- $23M facilities (35% goal)
- $65M Lehigh Fund (65%)
- Top 10 gifts: $69 million
- Trustee giving: $65 million

FY06 Progress
As of 4/28/06

Cash Receipts: $132M
New Pledges: $7.2M
Scholarships: $11.0M
- High Gifts: $5M (Althouse '28)
  Endowed Chairs: $3.5M (2 new)
- Goldmann '96: Choral Arts
- Apter '61: Holocaust Studies
- Lindeman: $3.5M

Lehigh Fund:
- $7.6M total (84% of $9M goal)
- $3.0M unrestricted (73% of $4M goal)

Campaign Cash Receipts FY01-06

Campaign Vital Signs

- Prospect Pool: 7,593
- "Asks" made: $170 million
- Verbal pledges: $17 million
- Bequest Expectancies:
  - $74 million during campaign
  - $175 million overall
- 150 campaign volunteers