Lehigh University

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

1 December 1997

Presiding:  William Hittinger (Sinclair Lab Auditorium)

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

1. Memorial Resolution. A tribute to Jonathan Burke Severs, late Professor Emeritus of English, was read by Professor Peter Beidler who 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 Jonathan Burke Severs.

2. Minutes. The minutes of the October, 1997 faculty meeting were APPROVED with one correction. FFPOC refers to the Faculty FINANCIAL Planning and Operations Committee. The secretary regrets the error.

3. Graduation Motions. Vice Provost Patti Ota MOVED approval of the three customary graduation motions for January [see Attachment 2]. The motions were SECONDED and PASSED.

4. New Business. President Hittinger announced that Eugene Mercy, '59 will be the commencement speaker in January.

5. Faculty Steering Committee. Professor Frank Gunter brought forward three motions on the ground rules for the Faculty Senate proposal [see Attachment 3]. He provided background on the development of the ground rules.

Professor Gunter noted that the constitutional convention would meet on January 8, 1998, but would not vote on adoption of the Faculty Senate proposal at that date. A second faculty meeting will be held subsequent, followed by a paper ballot by mail. The ballots would be mailed to the faculty secretary and counted by one faculty representative from each college.
If the proposal receives the required 2/3rds majority vote, the Faculty Senate Task Group would work to get the governing rules to the Board of Trustees by July, 1998.

The constitutional convention would act as “a committee of the whole” in which the discussion would not be recorded. Only the votes would be recorded.

A discussion of the three motions followed. President Hittinger yielded the chair to Professor John Chen, who is not a member of the Faculty Senate Task Group. He noted a schedule of amendments to the proposal would be published.

Professor Chen then MOVED that the ground rules be adopted. The motion was SECONDED.

Professor Cliff Queen asked for a vote on whether the faculty wants a senate, stating this was only fair.

Professor Bob Folk MOVED to divide MOTION 3 from MOTIONS 1 and 2. This was SECONDED.

Professor Arnold Kritz questioned why the three motions were packaged together. Professor Gunter indicated that was the most appropriate way to go.

Professor Peter Beidler called the question. Professor Ted Morgan asked for potential amendments to Motion 3. Professor Beidler withdrew his call of the question.

Professor Folk’s motion to divide FAILED.

Professor Folk raised several issues about the constitutional convention, stating that he believed it would be most appropriate to vote on the proposal at a faculty meeting.

Professor Thornton offered a friendly amendment to change the 5-day period for voting in Motion 3 to “a reasonable period of time not to exceed 30 calendar days.”

Professor Arnold Kritz offered a friendly amendment requiring that, for the paper ballot to be binding, at least a quorum of the voting faculty (1/3 of the faculty) must return a usable paper ballot to the secretary.

The motion PASSED.
6. **Nominations Committee** Professor Maria Santore noted that ERAC should have two faculty representatives who have not been replaced in recent years. Faculty will be asked to vote for two reps; the top vote-getter receives a three-year term; the second-place vote-getter gets a two-year term. The voting will be conducted by paper ballot.

7. **Personnel Committee** Professor Colleen Callahan MOVED to remove from the table the previous motion on the Policy on Sexual Harassment. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

She then MOVED to substitute the previous version of the policy with the policy dated November 13, 1997 [see Attachment 4]. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

She then MOVED adoption of the policy. The motion was SECONDED.

Professor Callahan gave a review of the evolution of the policy, emphasizing the need to make clear the faculty is committed to an appropriate process for dealing with sexual harassment. She also summarized the revisions contained in the November 13 document.

Professor Terry Delph MOVED six proposed amendments to the policy [see Attachment 5]. The motion was SECONDED. Professor Callahan noted the first five amendments would be accepted as “friendly” amendments by the committee. She did argue against Amendment 6 for a variety of reasons.

A faculty member asked that Professor Callahan relinquish the chair. Parliamentarian Professor Frank Colon noted that Professor Callahan does not have to relinquish the chair.

A number of faculty raised concerns about the conduct of hearings, particularly the taking of secret testimony. Professor Mary Beth Deily offered a friendly amendment that “testimony in transcript will be anonymous.” The amendment was accepted by Professor Delph.

Professor Folk questioned the idea of “anonymous” accusers.

Professor Delph withdrew his acceptance of Professor Deily’s friendly amendment.

The question was called. Professor Delph’s amendments were PASSED.

Professor John Ochs made a slide presentation urging the faculty to vote
"no" on the policy and send it back to the Personnel Committee.

The question was called.

A quorum call was made.

Lacking a quorum, the meeting was recessed at 5:57 PM.

The meeting was reconvened on December 8, 1997 in the University Center, Room 303 with President Hitinger presiding.

President Hitinger called the meeting to order at 4:27 PM.

A quorum call was made.

President Hitinger read the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty with respect to the definition of a "voting faculty member."

Professors Gunter and Moe performed a head count of voting faculty present. It was determined that a quorum was present.

President Hitinger asked the faculty's forbearance to defer discussion of the sexual harassment policy to permit Professor Jim Gunton to present proposed course changes from the Graduate and Research Committee.

Professor Gunton MOVED approval of the attached course changes [see Attachment 6]. The motion was SECONDED.

The motion PASSED.

The discussion of the policy on sexual harassment continued.

President Hitinger excused himself as chair and deferred to Professor George Nation, chair of the Faculty Steering Committee.

President Hitinger addressed the faculty. He stated that he had conferred with university counsel on the proposed sexual harassment policy who had indicated to him that it was his opinion that this was not a "good" policy, citing concerns about tying the university's hands, lacking the concept of good faith, and lacking appropriate discretion. Counsel does not believe the currently proposed policy is workable.

Professor Nation relinquished the chair.

Professor Callahan returned to the podium with a revision of the November 13, 1997 proposal now called "11/12/97 Revision with
amendments of 12/1/97 incorporated (and underlined).” See Attachment 7.

She repeated the need for the faculty to adopt a policy and detailed the changes incorporated into the latest revision, especially in the areas of due process.

Professor Ochs repeated a number of concerns, especially the lack of a right to an informal hearing, the absence of a right to comment on an ad hoc committee’s report, and the composition of the ad hoc hearing committee(s).

Professor David Johnson asked President Hittinger if the latest revisions had made the policy more workable in the eyes of university counsel.

President Hittinger indicated he had not discussed the latest revision with counsel, but noted that counsel felt earlier drafts were more flexible.

Professor Callahan noted she had Faxed the most recent revisions to counsel, but had not discussed them with counsel.

Professor Nation offered some friendly amendments. First, on page 3, substitute “an intimate body area” for “personal anatomy.” Second, on page 8, substitute “Panel will make a reasonable attempt to interview” for “Panel will interview.”

The committee accepted the amendments as friendly.

Professor Bruce Smackey MOVED three proposed amendments [see Attachment 8].

Vice Provost/Dean Ota noted that the motions implied a change in staff policy. Professor Smackey amended Motion C to include faculty only.

Professor Thornton was bothered by Motion A, worrying about setting a precedent.

Professor Ward Cates made a point of order, asking Motion C to be read.

Professor Gunter made a point of order, i.e., Professor Smackey’s motion needed a SECOND.

The motion was SECONDED.

A number of faculty raised concerns, questions, and “what-ifs” about Professor Smackey’s motion. After a time, a request was made to CALL THE QUESTION.
The CALL was SECONDED.

The faculty voted to end debate on Professor Smackey’s amendments.

The Smackey amendments motion FAILED.

Professor Queen urged the faculty to vote for the proposed policy as currently amended.

Professor David Pankinier questioned the provisions for constituting investigative panels.

Professor Ochs MOVED to TABLE the proposed policy to the second faculty meeting of the spring 1998 semester.

The motion was SECONDED.

The motion FAILED.

A request was made to CALL the QUESTION.

The CALL was SECONDED.

By a show of hands (66 “aye”; 27 “nay”) the motion to call the question PASSED.

By a show of hands (82 “aye”; 32 “nay”) the motion to APPROVE the proposed policy (as amended) PASSED.

The meeting recessed at 5:36 PM.

The meeting was reconvened on January 8, 1998 in the Neville Hall Auditorium 1 with President Hittinger presiding.

President Hittinger called the meeting to order at 9:15 AM

8. Constitutional Convention on Faculty Senate

President Hittinger opened the meeting, noting this was a meeting of “the committee of the whole.” Minutes of the discussions will not be kept, only the recording of votes.

Professor Folk made two points. First, that this constituted a special meeting of the faculty. Second, only 40 faculty are present.

President Hittinger yielded the chair to Professor John Chen.
Professor Chen repeated the ground rules for the convention, principally that the committee of the whole can only make motions to amend or adopt, it cannot make new motions; and, second, the convention will "stand and report" to the faculty - there can be no tabling.

Please see Attachment 9 - Memorandum, dated December 19, 1997 from Professor Hannah Stewart-Gambino, as a guide for the following tabulation of recorded votes. In particular, refer to page 2 - Amendments to Faculty Senate Proposal.

Motions A and B refer to the "Friendly & Acceptable" column on page 2:

A) It was MOVED and SECONDED to accept all amendments except the Thomas amendment to Section 11.5. The motion PASSED;

B) It was MOVED and SECONDED to accept the Thomas amendment to Section 11.5. The motion FAILED.

Motions C, D, E, F, G, and H refer to the "Structural Changes" column on page 2:

C) It was MOVED and SECONDED to accept the Gatewood amendment to Section 4.1.2. Professor Judy Lasker MOVED to amend the Gatewood proposal to "16 elected senators, with distribution to be twice the original proposal." This amendment was SECONDED. Professor Jim Hobbs asked a friendly amendment to the Lasker amendment to make the composition of elected faculty senators as Arts & Science, 8; Business & Economics, 2; Education, 1; and, Engineering & Applied Science, 5. Professor Lasker and the second accepted the amendment. The amendment PASSED. The amended Gatewood amendment PASSED;

D) It was MOVED and SECONDED that the Cates amendment to Section 1.1 be accepted. The motion FAILED;

E) It was MOVED and SECONDED to accept the Ed Pol (Professor Hartranft) amendments to Sections 11.5; 11.5.1; and, 11.5.2. The motion PASSED;

F) It was MOVED and SECONDED to accept the GRC (Professor Cates) amendments to insert the new Sections 11.5; 11.5.1; and, 11.5.2. The motion PASSED;

G) It was MOVED and SECONDED to accept Professor Morgan's amendments to Sections 7.1.2 and 13.3.2 with the following change
"Senate shall hire a part-time Director of Institutional Research for a renewable three-year contract." The motion FAILED;

H) It was MOVED and SECONDED to accept Professor Morgan’s amendment to Section 13.3 with minor grammatical changes as suggested by Professors Gerry Lennon, Ward Cates, and Ted Morgan; and, with deletion of reference to Director of Institutional Research. The motion PASSED.

Motions I, J, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, T, U, and V refer to the “Specific Changes” column on page 2:

I) It was MOVED and SECONDED that Professor Morgan’s amendment to Section 3.1 be accepted with the following change: insert the wording “The Senate shall create and maintain an electronic communications means for voluntary faculty discussion of Senate business.” The motion PASSED;

J) It was MOVED and SECONDED to accept Professor Bob Thornton’s amendment to Section 3.2 as amended to read “33 faculty.” The motion PASSED;

K) It was MOVED and SECONDED to accept Professor Bob Thornton’s amendment to Section 3.4.1 as amended to read “33 faculty.” The motion FAILED;

L) Professor Cates’ amendment to Section 7.5 was WITHDRAWN;

M) It was MOVED and SECONDED to accept Professor Cates’ amendment to add Section 7.5.2 as amended to end sentence after the word “Parliamentarian.” The motion PASSED;

N) It was MOVED and SECONDED to accept the Ed Pol (Professor Hartranft) amendment to Section 11.2. The motion PASSED;

O) It was MOVED and SECONDED to accept the GRC (Professor Cates) amendments to Sections 11.3 and 11.3.1. The motion PASSED;

P) The Ed Pol (Professor Hartranft) amendment to Section 11.3 was WITHDRAWN;

Q) It was MOVED and SECONDED to accept the FCC (Professor Gunter) amendment to Section 13.2.2. The motion FAILED;

R) It was MOVED and SECONDED to accept the Library User’s
Committee (Professor Cates) Change #2 (page 20). The motion PASSED;

S) It was MOVED and SECONDED to accept the Library User's Committee (Professor Cates) amendment to Section 13.4 and make it Section 11.7. The motion FAILED;

T) It was MOVED and SECONDED to accept the Library User's Committee (Professor Cates) amendment to Section 13.4.1 and make it Section 11.7.1. The motion FAILED;

U) The Library User's Committee (Professor Cates) amendment to Section 13.4.1 and make it Section 11.7.2 was WITHDRAWN;

V) The Library User's Committee (Professor Cates) amendment to Section 8.1 was WITHDRAWN.

Motion W refers Professor Morgan's Alternative Model at the bottom of page 2:

W) It was MOVED and SECONDED to accept Professor Morgan's Alternative Model amendments as a whole. The motion FAILED.

There being no additional amendments, Professor Chen MOVED that the constitutional convention STAND and REPORT to the faculty. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

Professor Chen STOOD and REPORTED. He then relinquished the chair.

Provost Nelson Markley assumed the chair. He MOVED to adjourn.

After 37 days, 23 hours and 30 minutes; after 2 recesses; after 3 different meeting locations; after 4 different presiding chairs; and, after a phenomenal amount of work by an incredible number of different faculty, the meeting stood adjourned at 3:40 PM.
Memorial Resolution
for Dr. J. Burke Severs

Lehigh University
December 1, 1997

The Lehigh community notes with sorrow the death of Jonathan Burke Severs, Professor Emeritus of English, less than three weeks ago, just four days after his 94th birthday. Because he retired more than a quarter-century ago, not many in this room will remember Burke, but he has left a most impressive mark on the university where he spent almost all of his professional career. He served Lehigh for 42 years, almost half of those years as chair of our Department of English, which then included the divisions of journalism and speech and theater.

Burke was born on November 9, 1903, in Trenton, New Jersey. He showed early scholastic promise in his work toward the bachelors at Rutgers, where he graduated with the highest average in his class. He did his masters work at Princeton and his doctorate at Yale. He not only rose up through the ranks at Lehigh but set standards of excellence in scholarship that his successors in Lehigh’s Department of English are still striving to meet in their own work. Burke was one of the foundational scholars in the literature of the Middle English period, particularly the fourteenth century, and his work is still cited with great respect internationally.

The basis of Burke’s towering scholarly reputation was his book on one of Geoffrey Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales, the Clerk’s Tale. For that project Burke consulted the manuscripts of virtually all of the possible literary sources--more than 30 of them--of Chaucer’s Clerk’s Tale. These manuscripts were in crabbled and often faded or smeared 600-year-old handwriting in three languages--Old French, Medieval Italian, and Medieval Latin. He compared every line in every manuscript with corresponding lines in Chaucer’s version of the tale--no mean task in the early 1930s before the advent of microfilm, Xerox machines, and computers made this kind of study somewhat easier.

By means of his line-by-line, word-by-word, four-language comparisons, Burke was able to add to the world’s fund of knowledge about Chaucer: what languages Chaucer was most comfortable with, how he worked, and what distinctive changes he made in character, plot, and theme as he transformed Continental versions of the story of patient Griselda into a distinctively English tale. From that research Burke Severs wrote his most important book, The Literary Relationships of Chaucer’s Clerk’s Tale, first published in 1942. That book won several important awards--one from the Scroll and Key Society of Yale, another from
the Carnegie Corporation of New York through the American Council of Learned Societies and the Modern Language Association, and most importantly, the Haskins Medal from the Medieval Academy of America. Through this work the name of J. Burke Severs is known and respected by virtually every medievalist in the world.

Burke served as general editor of the monumental multivolume *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English* from its inception in 1956 thorough 1970. In this project he guided more than 30 scholars in compiling and analyzing every scrap of writing in Middle English. He saw the project through the publication of the first two volumes and then, on his retirement, handed the editorship over to his student and colleague, Albert E. Hartung, himself now recently retired from Lehigh, who has shepherded into print some ten more volumes.

If I had to select one word that summarized the most important of the qualities of this distinguished humanist, it would be the word dignity. Burke exemplified dignity in all that he did. When I visited him in the retirement home where he lived for the last decade of his life in Doylestown, he typically greeted me, even when I did not call ahead, in a suit and tie, with his Phi Beta Kappa tie clasp carefully in place. In surroundings where most of the people dressed more casually and where few could have appreciated what a Phi Beta Kappa key stood for, Burke’s sense of decorum fortified him in a life that can sometimes seem, in one’s nineties, somewhat undignified.

It is to the credit of Lehigh University that it early recognized the importance of a scholar like J. Burke Severs. Burke’s tenure at Lehigh coincided with the last four decades of all-male education at Lehigh. Although the Lehigh he came to saw its Department of English as a place to serve the needs of engineers who needed to know how to write, that same Lehigh had the vision to recognize the importance even to an engineering school of a distinguished faculty in all areas of human knowledge. Despite its deep and important roots in technical education, Lehigh named as its first distinguished professor in 1959 and its first Macebearer in 1965 a man in the humanities. That man was J. Burke Severs.

Burke was a true humanist in every important way. He loved his wife and children; he loved the life of the mind; he was deeply committed to the need to understand and learn from past human experience; he honored the expression of the human condition by the greatest men and women who came before us; he held himself, his colleagues, and his students to the highest standards of originality of thought and rigor of proof; he loved not only his fellow humans but also the natural world around him—the world of flowers and birds, sunsets and land forms and seasons and fall foliage.
He served Lehigh not merely because it gave him a paycheck but because he believed in it as an institution that helped to make civilization and human growth possible; he respected clarity of thought and grace of expression as the strongest bastions against chaos; he had a genial sense of humor that made his classes as engaging as they were rigorous; he showed an interest in his students and his colleagues that extended far beyond the work that they did in the classroom or on the printed page; and he loved language so much that he refused to burden the world with too much of it.

Burke Severs was, in short, committed to the very qualities that have made Chaucer's Clerk famous. In Burke's honor I want read a brief passage from the prologue to the Canterbury Tales in Chaucer's own Middle English. You will be able to follow me if I gloss just two phrases: in the context of this passage the words *hy sentence* mean "noble insight" and the words *sownynge in moral vertue* mean "steeped in moral virtues." In these six lines Chaucer describes his studious and book-loving Clerk and, without knowing it, J. Burke Severs:

Of studie took he moost care and moost hede.  
Noght o word spak he moore than was nede,  
And that was seyd in forme and reverence,  
And short and quyk and ful of hy sentence;  
Sownynge in moral vertue was his speche,  
And gladly wolde he lerne and gladly teche.  
---Canterbury Tales, I 303-08

Mr. President, I move that these remarks, respectfully submitted on behalf of my colleagues in the Department of English, be placed in the minutes of this faculty and that copies be sent to members of J. Burke Severs’s family.

Peter G. Beidler for the Department of English
December 1, 1997

GRADUATION MOTIONS

That, with the approbation and consent of the Board of Trustees, signified by their mandamus, the appropriate academic degrees be conferred at the end of the current semester on those individuals who shall have completed all requirements for graduation no later than Wednesday, January 7, 1998, 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 for the last four semesters, 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 1997 edition of the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty;

That the Committee on Standing of Students be empowered to act for the Faculty on any special cases involving candidates for bachelor's degrees which may arise between now and January 7 and that the Graduate Committee be empowered to so act in cases involving candidates for graduate degrees.
PROTOCOL to CONSIDER the FACULTY SENATE PROPOSAL
at the UNIVERSITY FACULTY MEETING on 1 DEC 97

The Constitutional Task Force, created by the University Faculty at its 28 APR 97 meeting, and the Faculty Steering Committee request that the University Faculty become a Committee of the Whole and convene as a Constitutional Convention on 8 JAN 98, to be chaired by Professor John C. Chen, to consider and amend where appropriate the Faculty Senate Proposal that has been submitted to each member of the voting faculty. The following three motions require passage to enable the 8 JAN 98 University Faculty meeting to become a Committee of the Whole.

[References noted below are: R & P = Rules & Procedures of the Faculty; and R & R Q = Roberts Rules of Order - Revised]

* At the 28 APR 97 Faculty meeting, a motion was passed authorizing the Faculty Steering Committee to appoint a Constitutional Task Force charged with drafting a Faculty Senate Constitution and its bylaws, to be subsequently presented to the Faculty at a specially convened Constitutional Convention. [*"The Faculty may delegate any of its responsibilities to a committee, or to any other group" R & P 1.1.6.]*

MOTION 1

That the University Faculty shall become a Committee of the Whole and convene as a Constitutional Convention on 8 JAN 98 to consider and only amend as appropriate the Faculty Senate Proposal. This means that the 1 DEC 97 faculty meeting shall not be adjourned, but shall be reconvened on 8 JAN 98 as a Committee of the Whole. At the close of the 8 JAN 98 meeting, the Committee of the Whole shall "rise and report," which is equivalent to a motion to adjourn.

Rationale

R & R Q discusses the Committee of the Whole at §55 pp. 229-33, the major points of which are:

(1) The Committee of the Whole may discuss a matter "where the subject matter is not well digested and put it into proper form for definite action" (p.229).

(2) "The only motions that are in order are 'to amend' and 'to adopt'; and that the Committee of the Whole 'rise and report,' since it cannot adjourn nor can it order the 'yeas and nays'" other than for amendments (p. 230).

MOTION 2

That the following rules be adopted for use at the Constitutional Convention of the Lehigh University Faculty on 8 JAN 98 where amendments to the Faculty Senate proposal will be debated and accepted or rejected:

(1) The meeting will be held on Thursday, 8 JAN 98 from 9:00AM until no later than 4:00PM.

(2) Since all proposed amendments to the Faculty Senate Proposal must be sent to the Constitutional Task Force by 15 DEC 97 (c/o Linda A. Mery, the President's Office, Alumni Bldg. #27, or e-mail: lam5), the following time limits for debate are established:

(a) That any person who presents an amendment be given five minutes to explain her/his rationale for it;

(b) That others who wish to speak about the amendment be limited to five minutes each;

(c) That no one may speak twice until all who wish to speak have spoken; and

(d) That the person who presented the amendment be given a final five-minutes to speak to any comments previously made concerning the amendment before it is voted on.

(continued)
**Rationale**

(1) "The only way to close or limit debate in the Committee of the Whole is for the [University Faculty], before sitting as the Committee of the Whole, to vote that debate in the Committee shall cease at a certain time, and then in some way to regulate the time for that debate" (RRO §55, p.230).

(2) "Debate having been closed at a particular time by order of the [University Faculty], the Committee of the Whole has no power, even by unanimous consent to extend the time" (RRO §55, p. 231).

(3) Minor detailed provisions are noted in RRO §55, pp. 230-3.

**MOTION 3**

That after the Faculty Senate Proposal is discussed and amended at the Constitutional Convention on 8 JAN 98, the University Faculty be convened in a special meeting to discuss (but not vote on) the document. After this special meeting, the voting members of the Faculty shall vote by mail, sending their vote to Professor Stephen F. Thode, Secretary of the Faculty, 304 Rauch Business Center #37, no later than five (5) working days after the close of the special meeting. The votes will be counted by a four-member panel appointed by the Faculty Steering Committee. A two-thirds majority of all ballots cast shall be necessary for the Faculty Senate Proposal as amended to pass.

**Rationale**

(1) "Voting by mail is used for amendments . . . to the constitution or bylaws, and for such other important matters as the [University Faculty] may order to be voted on in this way" (RRO §46, p. 199).

(2) "Motions requiring a two-thirds vote include amending any part of the Constitution, bylaws, or rules of order previously adopted" (RRO §48, p.205).

(3) "A two-thirds vote means two-thirds of the votes cast" (RRO §48, p. 204).
November 13, 1997

MEMORANDUM

TO: Lehigh University Faculty

FROM: The Personnel Committee (Colleen Callahan, Chair)

RE: Revised Policy On Sexual Harassment

At the December 1 university faculty meeting, we will ask for approval of the attached revision of the Lehigh University Policy on Sexual Harassment. We believe the revised policy represents a significant improvement over the original policy which was tabled at the April 1997 faculty meeting. The revised policy was developed in response to comments and suggestions made at last spring’s meeting, the written comments we received from faculty and the discussion at the open hearing held by the committee in early October.

The proposed policy, if approved, will establish a written, university-wide policy on sexual harassment. Currently, there is no written policy or procedure for faculty beyond what is contained in the Student Handbook; the vote on this proposal is an opportunity for the faculty to define the policy for itself. The university must have a policy on sexual harassment and will continue to rely on the existing ad hoc procedure if a policy is not adopted by a faculty vote.

REVISIONS TO THE POLICY

Many of the comments we received centered on the due process rights of individuals accused of sexual harassment. We have incorporated an expansion of those rights for faculty members while preserving the non-adversarial nature of the formal hearing. This is in keeping with the tradition of the Lehigh process which recognizes the difference between a hearing before a faculty panel and a legal proceeding.

Changes to the original policy are printed in bold italics throughout the attached document. Substantial revisions to the original policy are discussed below, with a reference to the relevant page number of the complete document included for each change:

1. An extended statement on Lehigh University’s commitment to academic freedom, adding language recommended by the AAUP on the definition of sexual harassment which takes place in the classroom. The new statement makes clear that “for speech or conduct that takes place in a teaching context to be considered sexual harassment, such speech or conduct must also be persistent, pervasive, and not germane to the subject matter.” (p. 1)

2. All charges made by the complainant must be described in detail in a written complaint. The accused is given a copy of this written complaint by the sexual harassment advisor. The process continues with either informal or formal resolution, as in the original proposal (p. 5).

3. Complaints against the Provost or other university vice president should be filed with the President. This change clarifies the formal resolution procedure for officers of the university. (p. 7)
Both the complainant and the accused may be accompanied by a lawyer as their one advisor during their testimony in a formal hearing. The attorney or advisor may provide advice to his or her client but may not directly address the panel or question witnesses or be present during any proceedings besides the client's testimony. It has been the tradition at Lehigh for all parties in an hearing to appear without legal counsel, although an advisor has been permitted. However, the Policy on Ethical Conduct in Academic Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities adopted in 1995 allows the accused to appear with a lawyer and it is appropriate to extend this opportunity to faculty involved in a sexual harassment proceeding. (p 7)

The attorney or advisor may not cross examine any witnesses The hearing before the ad hoc faculty panel is not an adversarial proceeding; rather, it is a fact-finding hearing conducted by a faculty member's peers, not a mock trial (p 7)

The ad hoc panel has the right to have a university attorney present during any proceedings. The attorney would serve only in the capacity of a consultant to the committee and would not participate directly in the proceedings. The decision to have an attorney present is left to the discretion of the ad hoc panel (p 8)

If the accused or complainant plans to bring an attorney, advanced notice must be given to the chair of the hearing panel. If one party plans to bring an attorney, the chair will inform the other party of this intent. The sharing of information in this respect will promote the fair treatment of both the complainant and the accused (p 8)

No witnesses may be accompanied in the hearing by an attorney (p 8)

Both the complainant and the accused may submit a list of witnesses and questions to the panel for consideration. This provision assures the ad hoc panel is notified of all relevant witnesses and key questions that are necessary in order to conduct a fair investigation of the charges, centered on establishing the facts of the case (p 8)

The committee has the option of making a recording or transcription of the hearings, but this transcription is for the sole use of the committee (p 8)

Both the complainant and the accused will be notified in writing of the decision of the formal hearing panel. Although the ad hoc panel writes a report to the Provost, it is important for the parties to the complaint be directly notified in writing of the decision of the hearing panel. The Provost determines the final actions to be taken (p 8)

An accused faculty member who wishes to appeal a decision files a written appeal with the Personnel Committee, which considers the appeal and makes a recommendation to the President (pp 9-10)

The written appeal must be made within 15 working days of receiving written notice of disciplinary action (p 9)
Lehigh University
Policy on Sexual Harassment

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THIS POLICY

Lehigh University strives to provide an educational, working, social, or living environment for all faculty, staff, students, and guests that is free from sexual harassment. Sexual harassment in any form is unacceptable behavior and will not be tolerated. This policy is designed to:

- notify all members of the university community of what conduct is prohibited;
- inform members of the university community about the procedures available within the university for addressing and resolving sexual harassment complaints;
- ensure that all victims and potential victims of sexual harassment are aware of their rights;
- ensure that the due process rights of individuals accused of sexual harassment are protected.

This policy is university-wide. Procedures are described for faculty, staff, and student complaints.

Lehigh University continues to uphold principles of academic freedom and free speech. The free discussion of ideas can be achieved without intimidating or humiliating others because of their gender and without coercing sexual favors. For speech or conduct that takes place in a teaching context to be considered sexual harassment, such speech or conduct must also be persistent, pervasive, and not germane to the subject matter.

DEFINITION OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

There are two primary forms of sexual harassment:

1. **Quid Pro Quo Sexual Harassment** occurs when a supervisor or faculty member explicitly, or implicitly, promises or withholds job-related or education-related benefits based upon the employee’s or student’s acquiescence to the supervisor or faculty’s sexual advances or behavior. The job related benefit could be a promised raise, promotion, preferable assignment, or other benefit. The education-related benefit could be a grade, opportunities for mentoring and advising, or a letter of recommendation.
2. **Sexually Hostile Work, Learning, Social or Living Environment** occurs when an employee, student, or colleague is subjected to sexually offensive, demeaning, harassing or intimidating statements, jokes, gestures, pictures, touching, or other conduct which is sufficiently severe and pervasive to create a hostile work environment. The violating conduct may involve only one or a few very serious and offensive events, or may involve a pattern of harassing behaviors. A sexually hostile environment can be created by supervisors, co-workers, faculty, fellow students, or any other member of the university community.

**Examples of Sexual Harassment**

Sexual harassment can take different forms and the determination of what constitutes sexual harassment will vary according to the particular circumstances. Sexual harassment may involve behavior by a person of either sex against a person of the same or opposite sex.

Examples of sexual harassment may include but are not limited to:

- seeking sexual favors or relationships in return for the promise of a favorable grade or other academic opportunity
- basing an employment-related action (e.g., hiring, salary increase, performance appraisal, termination) on a sexual favor or relationship
- intentional and undesired physical contact, sexually explicit language or writing, lewd pictures or notes that create a work, educational, social or living environment that a reasonable person would find hostile or abusive.

**Behavior That Can Lead to a Sexually Hostile Environment**

◊ **Supervisory Conflict of Interest** A supervisor and employee, or faculty and student, sometimes develop a consensual romantic or sexual relationship. While this policy does not prohibit such relationships, it is a conflict of interest for one party to continue in any type of supervisory role. It is expected that the supervisor (e.g., graduate advisor, instructor, teaching assistant) will help the employee or student make other arrangements for the employee or student to receive the supervision he or she requires. For example, a doctoral advisor should confer with the student and the faculty of their department to identify and recruit another doctoral advisor. A supervisor and employee should work with their department and Human Resources for reassignment to another department or a change in the supervisory relationship. In resolving this conflict of interest, the following policy applies:

- It is the responsibility of the person in the supervisory role to resolve the conflict of interest
- If the conflict of interest is not resolved, the supervised person has the right to complain of sexual harassment even if the relationship was at one time consensual
- Failure to resolve a conflict of interest puts the supervisor at risk for charges of sexual harassment.

◊ **Repeated Offensive Behavior.** An isolated comment or incident does not usually create a sexually hostile work environment. The exception is if the incident is a serious act (e.g., An employee sexually assaults another employee. Or, a faculty member humiliates a student in class with references to his or her personal anatomy.) What also constitutes a sexually hostile work or educational environment is failure to honor requests to stop a behavior that a reasonable person would find hostile or abusive. For example, students in a class ask the faculty member not to tell lewd jokes, but he or she continues to do so. An employee asks her supervisor not to touch her, but he or she continues to do so.

◊ **Gender Stereotypes.** Although not specifically sexual, gender-related comments can also contribute to a sexually hostile work environment. These include statements which stereotype or demean women or men. For example, it would be a gender stereotype to say to a woman “You are going to get pregnant, stay home, and not return to work.” This isolated statement is not by itself sexual harassment, but could be used as evidence of a sexually hostile workplace.

**Responsibility of Supervisors**

It is the responsibility of supervisors (faculty and staff), deans, and department chairs to:

- inform employees under their direction or supervision of these sexual harassment procedures,
- notify the appropriate contact person when they receive reports or complaints of sexual harassment (See next section);
- confront employees engaged in incidents of sexual harassment that they witness; and
- implement any corrective actions that are imposed as a result of findings of sexual harassment.
WAYS TO DEAL WITH SEXUAL HARASSMENT

The following guidelines are recommended for individuals who perceive that they may be victims of sexual harassment. These steps may resolve the situation (the harassment stops) or may provide evidence to strengthen a complaint. Whether or not these steps are taken, individuals have the right to file a complaint.

1. **Be assertive and speak up.** Ignoring the situation will not make it go away. Be honest and direct about your opinion of the behavior as soon as it is detected. Be polite, but firm. Don't apologize or smile when you confront the harasser.

2. **Write a letter to the harasser** If verbally confronting the harasser is not possible, write a note. Be honest and direct about your disapproval of the actions. State clearly that you want the harassment to stop. Keep a copy.

3. **Keep a diary.** Keep clear and detailed accounts of the behavior and your feelings surrounding the events. Make sure you include the date, time, setting, and any witnesses.

4. **Seek support from others** *Confide in trusted people* when harassment occurs. It is important for other people to know that these incidents are occurring.

5. **Seek counseling** You are faced with a crisis that can damage your health, career, and confidence. Don’t keep the problem to yourself.

**Report the harassment** In taking these steps, individuals may decide to report the harassment. The information that follows describes how to file a complaint.

COMPLAINT REPORTING

Any member of the university community who believes that he or she has been a victim of sexual harassment is encouraged to promptly confer with one of the following sexual harassment advisors. Supervisors who are concerned with the behavior of staff or students may also confer with these advisors.

**Sexual Harassment Advisors:**

- **Faculty:** Vice Provost 758-3165
- **Staff:** Manager Employee Relations and Training 758-3897
- **Students:** Associate Dean of Students 758-4157
INITIAL CONSULTATION  These Sexual Harassment Advisors have been specially trained to explain the definition of sexual harassment, offer guidance on filing a complaint, and provide information about psychological counseling and support services. If after the initial consultation the complainant does not wish to pursue the matter, this conversation will be confidential and "off the record." The advisor will not contact the accused and no formal records will be kept that identify the complainant or the accused. However, if the complainant wishes to pursue the matter further, he or she must file a written complaint.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT COMPLAINT  To make a complaint of sexual harassment, the complainant must describe the act or acts in writing, naming the accused and submit this dated, signed written complaint to the sexual harassment advisor  All charges must be described in detail in this written complaint. The accused is given a copy of this written complaint by the sexual harassment advisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaints Accusing</th>
<th>Are Made in Writing to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Vice Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Manager Employee Relations and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Associate Dean of Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some cases, the complainant may begin the initial consultation with one advisor (e.g., student goes to the Associate Dean of Students), then make the formal written complaint to another (e.g., the complaint is against faculty and is given to the Vice Provost). Complaints are shared with the accused and informal resolution is initiated by the Sexual Harassment Advisor unless one of the parties requests a formal resolution (See Investigation Procedures).

Time Period to File a Complaint

Prompt reporting of a complaint is strongly encouraged, as it allows for rapid response to, and resolution of, objectionable behavior. Complaints should be filed in writing within six months after the last act occurred. The student judicial code allows for students to file a complaint at any time during their academic career, but prompt reporting is encouraged so that the situation can be resolved in a timely manner.

Unless extenuating circumstances precluded filing within six months, failure to file a complaint within this time period will result in dismissal of the complaint.
Filing Internally versus Externally

The complainant may elect to have a complaint handled internally (within the university) in accordance with the procedures described here; or may elect to file a formal charge with a federal or state agency authorized by law to investigate such claims. If a formal external procedure is used, or a lawsuit is filed, the university will proceed in the manner it believes appropriate under the circumstances.

Protection from Retaliation

Any form of retaliation against a person who files a charge of sexual harassment is prohibited and may be subject to disciplinary action. This protection from retaliation also applies to anyone who appears as a witness in the proceedings.

Charged Party: Protection from Bad Faith Complaints

If the sexual harassment advisor, the university judicial office (student cases) or the investigation panel, determines that the complaint is malicious, or knowingly false, or fundamentally frivolous, such charges will be dismissed and the investigation will be promptly terminated.

Confidentiality

All individuals who are involved in the complaint reporting and investigation are obliged to maintain confidentiality of the proceedings. The Sexual Harassment Advisors will underscore the need for confidentiality when the investigation panels are formed. Notwithstanding these precautions, the university cannot and does not guarantee that confidentiality will be maintained by all parties involved. Confidentiality also does not mean withholding details of the complaint from the accused.

INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES

Level One: Informal Resolution

In many instances, the written complaint of sexual harassment can be resolved by the Sexual Harassment Advisor through informal discussion and mediation without the use of a formal, investigation panel. The goal of this informal resolution process is to rectify the problem. No formal finding of guilt is obtained and no disciplinary penalty is imposed. Typically, the informal resolution process will involve separate discussions with the complainant and the accused, negotiation for changes in behavior through separate or joint discussions, and a written understanding signed by both parties. Because informal resolution follows a formal written complaint, the Sexual Harassment Advisor will keep this written understanding in a confidential file. This written understanding can be shared with the investigation panel if a formal investigation follows related to the same incidents.
Level Two: Formal Resolution with Investigation

A formal complaint will be resolved by an investigation when:
- it is referred by the Sexual Harassment Advisor; or
- the complainant requests formal resolution; or
- the accused requests formal resolution

Complaints Against Faculty. Complaints for formal resolution against faculty are referred to the Provost who appoints a special Ad Hoc Panel of five faculty members. The Panel elects a Chair who handles procedural and administrative aspects of the investigation. This procedure applies to all full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty.

Complaints Against Staff. Complaints against staff that are referred for formal resolution are given to the appropriate Vice President. This Vice President will charge the Manager of Employee Relations and Training to conduct a thorough investigation of the situation. The investigation typically includes an interview with the complainant, the accused and witnesses or reference people requested by the complainant or the accused. This procedure applies to all staff including those who are enrolled as students or who work on research grants.

Complaints Against Students. Complaints against students are referred to the Dean of Students Office and will be processed through the University Student Judicial System Code of Conduct. For complaints of sexual harassment, students include all undergraduate and graduate students and those who are functioning as TAs, RAs, and GAs.

Complaints Against University Administrators. If the sexual harassment complaint is against the Provost or other Vice President, it should be filed with the President. A sexual harassment complaint against the President should be filed with the Board of Trustees.

Formal Faculty Hearings. The investigation for faculty will take the following steps. First, the panel will have a training session with one of the Sexual Harassment Advisors who will review the university’s policy on Sexual Harassment and emphasize the need for confidentiality. Then the panel will receive copies of the written complaint and any other relevant material (e.g., written rebuttal from the accused). The panel will hold closed hearings to interview the complainant, the accused, and witnesses or reference people requested by the complainant or the accused. The complainant and the accused can each bring one advisor to the hearing.

The complainant and the accused each have the right to be accompanied by an attorney as their one advisor during their testimony. The attorney or advisor may provide advice to his or her client, but may not directly address the panel or be present during any proceedings besides the client’s testimony. The attorney or advisor may not cross examine any witnesses. The ad hoc panel has
the right to have a university attorney present during any proceedings. If the accused or complainant plans to bring an attorney, advanced notice must be given to the chair of the hearing panel. If one party plans to bring an attorney, the chair will inform the other party of this intent. No witnesses may be accompanied in the hearing by an attorney. The panel reserves the right to determine whom to interview and will interview the complainant, the accused, and witnesses in separate, private sessions.

Both the complainant and the accused may submit a list of witnesses and questions to the panel for consideration. The committee has the option of making a recording or transcription of the hearings, but this transcription is for the sole use of the committee.

Both the complainant and the accused will be notified in writing of the decision of the formal hearing panel.

**Student Formal Hearings.** Procedures for the adjudication of student cases are detailed in the University Student Judicial System Code of Conduct.

**Staff Formal Hearings.** Similarly for staff, the Manager of Employee Relations and Training has the right to determine whom to interview and has the right to interview the complainant, the accused, and witnesses in separate, private sessions. The complainant and accused can each bring one informal advisor to the meeting who is not a relative or person with formal legal training.

**Reports of the Hearing Panels.**

When the investigation has been completed, a written report of findings and disciplinary actions is given as follows:

**Faculty:** The investigation panel’s written report is given directly to the Provost in confidence with any recommendations for disciplinary action. The Provost determines the final actions to be taken and communicates these directly to the accused and the complainant. In the case of a finding of guilt and disciplinary action, the faculty member’s Chair, Dean, and the President are also informed of the outcome.

**Staff:** The Manager of Employee Relations and Training will prepare a written report and present it to the Vice President confidentially. The Vice President will determine the appropriate actions to be taken and communicate these directly to the accused and the complainant. In the case of findings of guilt and disciplinary action, the employee’s Supervisor and/or Manager and the President are also informed of the outcome.

**Student:** The Student Judicial System has been authorized to impose disciplinary sanctions directly. The procedures described in the [Student Handbook](#) for disciplinary action will be followed.
Disciplinary Action

Sexual harassment is a serious offense that cannot be tolerated in a work, living, or learning environment. Disciplinary action may include, but is not limited to:

- Corrective action or restitution
- Written reprimand
- Requirement to attend training
- Work restrictions
- Suspension
- Demotion with reduction in pay
- Student expulsion

Student expulsion requires a special procedure involving the Board of Trustees as described in the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty and therefore calls for the automatic implementation of the Appeals Process.

- Termination of employment

A move for dismissal of a tenured member of the faculty requires a special procedure involving the Board of Trustees, as per the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty and therefore calls for the automatic implementation of the Appeals Process.

Right of Appeal

The accused may write a written appeal to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accused Who Is Making Appeal</th>
<th>Appeal Is Made To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Personnel Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This written appeal must be made within 15 working days of receiving written notice of disciplinary action.

Grounds for appeal include: (1) information is available that was not available at the time of the hearing, (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.
For students, these appeals go to the University Discipline Appeals Committee for procedural review as described in the Student Handbook. For faculty, the *Personnel Committee considers the appeal and makes a recommendation to the President*. For staff, the appeal goes to the President who will determine how to respond to the appeal. The President has the option of using a three member Problem Solving Committee to review the case as described in step four of the *Problem Solving Process for Staff* while retaining the authority to determine the final outcome of the appeal.

**Time-frame for Investigations**

The person or investigation panel who receive a complaint of sexual harassment will make every effort to respond to complaints in a timely manner.

**DEVELOPMENT OF THE SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY**

This Sexual Harassment Policy was developed by the Personnel Committee. It was adopted by the faculty for its *Rules and Procedures* on (date) and by the Board of Trustees on (date).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEPS</th>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step One: Initial Consultation</strong></td>
<td>Associate Dean of Students</td>
<td>Manager Employee Relations and Training (MERT)</td>
<td>Vice Provost</td>
<td>“Off the Record” process ends OR go to Step 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step Two: Written Complaint</strong></td>
<td>Associate Dean of Students</td>
<td>MERT</td>
<td>Vice Provost</td>
<td>Step 3 begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step Three: Informal Resolution</strong></td>
<td>Associate Dean of Students</td>
<td>MERT</td>
<td>Vice Provost</td>
<td>Written understanding between parties OR Step 4 begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step Four: Formal Resolution</strong></td>
<td>University Student Judicial System</td>
<td>Vice President reviews and refers to MERT.</td>
<td>Provost reviews and forms Ad Hoc panel of faculty.</td>
<td>Not guilty and no further action OR finding of guilt goes to Step 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step Five: Finding of Guilt</strong></td>
<td>Student Judicial System has authority to impose sanctions. Communicated to Dean of Students for action.</td>
<td>MERT makes recommendations to Vice President who determines outcome.</td>
<td>Panel makes recommendations to Provost who determines outcome.</td>
<td>Accused accepts outcome OR goes to Step 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step Six: Appeal</strong></td>
<td>University Discipline Appeals Committee</td>
<td>Appeal to President who has option of using a Problem Solving Committee.</td>
<td>Appeal to Personnel Committee.</td>
<td>Personnel Committee recommends to President who determines final outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Amendments to Sexual Harassment Policy

1. On p. 1 of the proposed policy, replace the wording “Ensure that all victims and potential victims of sexual harassment are aware of their rights” with “ensure that all members of the University community are aware of their rights.” In addition, on p. 6, replace the wording “No formal finding of guilt is obtained…” with the wording “No formal finding of guilt or innocence is obtained.”

Rationale – The proposed policy should be free of any wording that might indicate a presumption towards the guilt or innocence of any party.

2. On p. 9 of the proposed policy, after the sentence “A move for dismissal of a tenured member of the faculty requires a special procedure involving the Board of Trustees, as per the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty and therefore calls for the automatic implementation of the Appeals Process,” add the sentence “If the accused is a nontenured faculty member, and if the Provost moves for dismissal of the accused, then the accused faculty member has the right to an automatic appeal to the Personnel Committee.”

Rationale – It should be made clear that nontenured faculty members have the same right to appeal as do tenured faculty members.

3. On p. 8 of the proposed policy, after the sentence “In the case of a finding of guilt and disciplinary action, the faculty member’s Chair, Dean, and the President are also informed of the outcome,” add the following: “In no case shall any disciplinary action be taken until all appeals to the Personnel Committee, if any, have been exhausted. However, the Provost may, at his/her discretion, impose at any point in the proceedings temporary work restrictions designed to separate the accused and the accuser.”

Rationale – It seems self-evident that punishment should not be exacted until the appeals process has come to an end. However in severe cases, there may exist circumstances in which prudence requires that the two parties to the dispute be kept separate prior to the end of the proceedings.

4. On p. 1, following the title “Definition of Sexual Harassment”, insert the following:
   “This document defines sexual harassment as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature where:
   - submission to the conduct is made a term or condition of employment
   - submission to or rejection of such conduct is used as a basis for employment decisions
   - the conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work performance; or
   - the conduct has the purpose or effect of creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.”

Rationale – This amendment simply inserts a direct quote from the Federal EEOC Guidelines into the proposed policy, so as to further clarify the nature and definition of sexual harassment.
5. On p. 8 of the proposed policy, replace the sentence “Both the complainant and the accused may submit a list of witnesses and questions to the panel for consideration” with the following: “Both the complainant and the accused may submit a list of witnesses to the panel. The panel will interview all witnesses submitted by both parties. Both the complainant and the accused may additionally submit a list of questions to be addressed to various witnesses. Unless these questions are obviously of an improper or irrelevant nature, the committee will pose them to the indicated witness or witnesses.”

Rationale – It is a basic right of parties in a legal, or quasi-legal, proceeding to interview, or have interviewed, such witnesses as may help their cause. The present wording seems to make optional whether or not the committee must interview such witnesses; the proposed amendment makes this obligatory. Likewise, both parties should have the right to pose such questions to witnesses as may help their cause. Once again, unless these questions are either improper or irrelevant, the committee should be obliged to pose them.

6. On p. 8 of the proposed policy, replace the wording “The committee has the option of making a recording or transcription of the hearings, but this transcription is for the sole use of the committee” with the following: “The committee may, at its discretion, bar the accused, the accuser, or any other interested parties from hearing the direct testimony of any witness. However all testimony shall be recorded, or otherwise transcribed. Moreover all recordings, transcriptions, written statements or any other evidence pertaining to the case will be made available in their entirety to both accuser and accused. Both the accuser and the accused have the right to communicate to the committee, either orally or in writing, any comments they may have regarding the testimony of other parties, or any of the other evidence pertinent to the case.”

Rationale – The proposed amendment does nothing more than guarantee to both parties the basic due process rights that normally obtain in legal, or quasi-legal, proceedings in this country. As the proposed policy is now written, neither party to the dispute would have the opportunity to refute any adverse testimony, nor would they even have knowledge of such testimony. It is quite obvious that such a system could very easily lead to severe abuses.
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TO: Jim Gunton, Chair/Subcommittee of Graduate & Research Committee

FROM: Roland K. Yoshida

SUBJECT: Proposed Course Changes for the College of Education

The attached course changes, additions and deletions were approved by the faculty in the Department of Education and Human Services during a meeting on October 10, 1997. It would be appreciated if these changes would be placed on the agenda for the next meeting of the Graduate and Research Committee.
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To: Dean Ron Yoshida

From: Linda Bambara, Program Coordinator

Re: Approved program and course changes in Special Education

Date: Oct. 10, 1997

Attached are the program and course changes for the Special Education Masters' Programs approved at the Oct. 10, 1997 departmental meeting. I believe the next step is to forward these changes for approval by the Graduate Research Committee. Let me know if additional information is needed.

Thank You
Overview of Program Changes in Special Education

M.Ed. in Special Education with Comprehensive Certification (36 credits)
Several changes in course requirements and course sequences were made in this 36 credit program to a) update the curriculum, particularly emphasize the inclusion of students with disabilities in general educational settings, and b) provide more options for electives in teacher education and special education. Specifically, the changes include:

1. **Dropping Specially Designed Instruction as a requirement** (offered under SpEd 330, Topics in Special Education). This course was outdated and redundant with other course offerings.

2. **Dropping 424 Developmental Reading as a requirement**. Students may now take another teacher education elective with their advisor's approval.

3. **Replacing the assessment requirement (SpEd 405 Assessment of Individuals with Mild Disabilities or SpEd 424 Assessment of Individuals with Severe Disabilities) with a new course SpEd 4xx Assessment and Planning with Individuals with Disabilities**. This will allow prospective teachers to be familiar with a wider scope of assessment methods for all students with disabilities.


5. Providing more varied electives during the summers in special education and teacher education.

*For more specific information, see the course sequence for this program.*

**M.Ed. in Special Education (30 credits), for students with a B.S. Degree in Special Education.**
This program was revamped to provide more flexibility and variety for students who are already certified in special education. By providing more flexibility in course work, we hope to make the program more attractive to local area teachers. Teachers may choose to concentrate in particular areas of interest, while at the same time, update their knowledge in inclusion for all students with disabilities.

The program requires 15 credits in Special Education Core Courses, 3 credits in multicultural awareness, and a remaining 12 credits in electives that may be selected from special education, school psychology, teacher education, educational leadership, and educational technology. *For more information, see the course offerings and sequence for this program.*

### Impact on Courses
See attached information on course changes. Basically, we have dropped several outdated courses, added two new courses, and changed the names, descriptions, and requirements for several courses to reflect best practices in the field.
Resource Implications
There are no foreseeable resource implications for these program and course changes. All program changes can be handled within the faculty’s typical load and do not require additional computing or library resources.

Academic Implications
The program and course changes have been reviewed by other graduate programs in the College of Education, and by the College as a whole. The changes have been approved by the College (and various programs). The course/program changes are not likely to affect other programs in the University because no other students, outside of the College, take the courses.
Special Education Course Changes

All courses involved in the program change are lecture type and offered at 3 credits.

Courses to be Dropped
SpEd 322 Integration (3)
SpEd 323 Introduction to Mild Disabilities* (3)
SpEd 324 Introduction to Severe Disabilities* (3)
SpEd 425 Specialization Internship (3)
Specially Designed Instructionb, offered under SpEd 330 (Special Topics in Special Education) will no longer be offered, but SpEd 330 will not be dropped as it is a topical course in which course content varies.

*These courses appear in the catalogue, but were dropped from our program several years ago.

b This course was never given a course number for some reason

Courses to Be Added

SpEd 4XX Assessment and Planning with Individuals with Disabilities (3)

Educational assessment procedures for individuals with special needs. Includes both academic and life skills assessment. Utilization of curriculum based assessment. Involvement of the student and family in educational planning. Understanding and applying formal assessment and interviews.

Note: This course will replace SpEd 405 Assessment of Individuals with Mild Disabilities or SpEd 424 Assessment of Individuals with Severe Disabilities as a core requirement. SpEd 405 and SpEd 424 will continue to be offered as electives.

SpEd 4XX Advanced Methods for Inclusion (3)

Advanced techniques for educating students with disabilities in general education based on current research and practice. Accommodations and planning for physical inclusion. Instructional inclusion through embedded instruction, adaptations, and curriculum overlapping. Decision hierarchies for level of instructional adaptation. Social inclusion methods through methods of social facilitation. Taught from a noncategorical perspective and addresses students with all levels of disability (e.g., mild and severe). Prerequisite: SpEd 332 Education and Inclusion of Individuals with Special Needs.
Change in Title, Description, Prerequisite

From:
SpEd 428 Advanced Behavior Management for Individuals with Severe Disabilities (3)

This course will develop skills in long-term remediation of problem behaviors characteristic of persons with severe disabilities through functional assessment, positive procedures, and lifestyle interventions.

To:
SpEd 428 Positive Behavior Support (3)

The design of comprehensive, multicomponent behavior support plans for individuals with disabilities who engage in challenging behaviors. Topics include functional assessment strategies, antecedent and setting event interventions, alternative skill training, consequence strategies, lifestyle interventions, and teaming strategies. Taught from a noncategorical perspective. Prerequisite: SpEd 402 Applied Behavior Analysis or permission of the instructor.

Change in Title and Description

From:
SpEd 332 Education of Individuals with Special Needs (3)

Legal, educational, and social issues related to the special education of individuals with mental retardation, physical handicaps, emotional/behavior disorders, learning disabilities, visual and hearing impairments, health impairments, and those who are intellectually gifted.

To:
SpEd 332 Education and Inclusion of Individuals with Special Needs (3)

Legal, educational, and social issues related to the special education of individuals with mental retardation, physical disabilities, emotional/behavior disorders, learning disabilities, visual and hearing impairments, health impairments, and those who are intellectually gifted. Emphasis will be on meeting the diverse needs of students in general education classrooms and settings.
From:
SpEd 339 Learning Disabilities (3)

Definition, classification, etiology, treatment, and historical perspectives of individuals with learning disabilities.

To:
SpEd 339 Design of Instruction of Individuals with Learning Disabilities (3)

Issues related to the definition, etiology, assessment and service delivery in the field of learning disabilities. Characteristics and historical perspectives of individuals with learning disabilities. Remediation of learning and social problems through effective design of instruction.

From:
SpEd 418 Teaching Individuals with Severe Disabilities (3)

Curriculum and methods for life skills instruction—self-care, daily living, community based instruction, communication, social integration, vocational training, functional academics.

To:
SpEd 418 Life Skills and Transition Strategies (3)

Curriculum and methods for teaching skills of daily living and preparing students with disabilities for transition to adult living. Includes vocational training, community skills, home and daily living, self-care, leisure, communication, and functional academics. Emphasis on transition planning for students with physical disabilities, emotional disturbance, learning disabilities, developmental disabilities, traumatic brain injury, autism, severe disabilities, and related challenges.

From:
SpEd 419 Teaching Individuals with Mild Disabilities (3)
Emphasis on effective teaching techniques for academic and social skills. Emphasis on curriculum development and instructional strategies in language arts, math, and other academic content areas.

To:
SpEd 419 Academic and Curricular Strategies for Individuals with Disabilities (3)

Methods course designed to increase knowledge of instruction of reading, language arts, mathematics, and content area skills. Emphasis on instructional design and strategies, evaluation of commercial textbooks, and possible modifications needed for use with individuals with disabilities.
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M.ED. DEGREE WITH COMPREHENSIVE SPECIAL EDUCATION CERTIFICATION
36 CREDIT - BACHELOR'S DEGREE NOT IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

Name: ____________________________ First Semester ____________

Prerequisites: Education foundations. 30 hours of experience with each type of disability - mental retardation, learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, physical disabilities, severe disabilities (Do not count towards M.Ed.).

FIRST YEAR

Summer II

*SpEd 332 Education and Inclusion of Individuals with Special Needs

Fall
SpEd 402 Applied Behavior Analysis
SpEd 418 Life Skills and Transition Strategies OR SpEd 419 Academic and Curricular Strategies for Individuals with Disabilities

Spring
SpEd 4XX Assessment and Planning with Individuals with Disabilities
SpEd 4XX Advanced Methods of Inclusion

Summer
Special Education Elective OR School Psychology Elective OR Teacher Education Elective

SECOND YEAR

Fall
SpEd 428 Positive Behavior Support OR SchP 412 Consultation Procedures
SpEd 418 Life Skills and Transition Strategies OR SpEd 419 Academic and Curricular Strategies for Individuals with Disabilities

Spring
SpEd 429 Professional Seminar in Special Education (Comprehensive Exam)
SpEd 420 Internship: Certification

Summer
CPsy 471 Multicultural Issues
Special Education Elective OR School Psychology Elective OR Teacher Education Elective

STUDENT NOW QUALIFIES FOR M.ED. IN SPECIAL EDUCATION. STUDENTS MAY NOW APPLY FOR LEVEL 1 CERTIFICATION: TEACHER OF THE MENTALLY AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED.

I have reviewed these course requirements and understand that these must be met to receive the M.Ed. degree and certification.

______________________________ (Advisor) ______________________________ (Student) ______________________________ (Date)

* Teachers with Elementary Certification who have this course only need 33 credits. Students who do not enter with certification must take 36 credits; a Enrollment in Special Education or SpEd 332; b SpEd/SchP 402 is a prerequisite; c Internship requires recommendation from your site supervisor. Internship may be postponed if more experience is needed prior to this commitment.
# 30 CREDITS - M.ED. DEGREE IN SPECIAL EDUCATION
(Bachelor's Degree in Special Education)

## Core - Special Education Courses (15 credits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SpEd 428  Positive Behavior Support OR SchP 412 Consultation Procedures OR SchP 426 Advanced School and Family Intervention</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd 418  Life Skills and Transition Strategies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd 419  Academic and Curricular Strategies for Individuals with Disabilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd 4XXX  Advanced Methods of Inclusion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd 429  Professional Seminar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Multicultural Awareness (3 credits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educ 471  Multicultural Issues</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Educational Technology/Educational Leadership/Teacher Educ (Electives 6 credits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EdT 477  Research Topics in Educational Technology: Technology in School Settings (or equivalent offering)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdTL 470  Special Education Law</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdL 479  School Law</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ 321  Writing Process</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ 418  Science in Elementary Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ 419  Mathematics in Elementary Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ 421  Materials in Reading</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ 424  Development Reading</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ 428  Reading in the content areas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Other courses in Teacher Education, Education Technology, or Educational Leadership may be taken in consultation with the advisor (e.g., Language Development of Children, Curriculum Construction)]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SpEd 330 Special Topics in Special Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd 331 Emotional and Behavior Disorders in Children</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd 333 Physical Handicaps and Developmental Disabilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd 339 Design of Instruction for Individuals with Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd 405 Assessment of Individuals with Mild Disabilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpEd 424 Assessment of Individuals with Severe Disabilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SchP 423 Behavioral Assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SchP 429 Special Topics in School Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Students may also take alternate special education or school psychology core courses as electives (e.g., SpEd 428 Positive Behavior Support, SpEd 426 Advanced School and Family interventions)
M.Ed. Degree in Special Education
30 Credit - Bachelor's Degree in Special Education or Post-Baccalaureate Requiring 24 Credits

Name: ____________________________ First Semester ____________________

FIRST YEAR

Fall
SpEd 428 Positive Behavior Support OR SchP 412 Consultation Procedures
SpEd 418 Life Skills and Transition Strategies OR SpEd 419 Academic and Curricular Strategies for Individuals with Disabilities

Spring
Teacher Education/School Psychology Elective (e.g., Advanced School and Family Interventions)
SpEd 4XX Advanced Methods of Inclusion

Summer
Educ 471 Multicultural Issues OR Special Education Elective OR Teacher Education Elective

SECOND YEAR

Fall
Special Education Elective
Teacher Education Elective OR Educ 471 Multicultural Issues

Spring
SpEd 429 Professional Seminar
Teacher Education Elective OR Educ 471 Multicultural Issues

Summer
Special Education Elective OR Educ 471 Multicultural Issues

STUDENT NOW QUALIFIES FOR M.ED. IN SPECIAL EDUCATION.

I have reviewed these course requirements and understand that these must be met to receive the M.Ed. degree.

________________________   __________________________
(Advisor)                      (Student)

________________________
(Date)
DATE: October 23, 1997

TO: Jim Gunton, Chair/Subcommittee of Graduate & Research Committee

FROM: Roland K. Yoshida

SUBJECT: Proposed Course Changes for the College of Education

The attached course changes, additions and deletions were approved by the faculty in the Department of Education and Human Services during a meeting on September 5, 1997. It would be appreciated if these changes would be placed on the agenda for the next meeting of the Graduate and Research Committee.

Attachments
October 21, 1997

To: Jim Gunton

From: Ed Shapiro

Re: Form for New Courses

Thanks for getting me a copy of the form for new courses. As I looked at the form, I noted that it seems to cover only new courses not changes in existing courses (like title, description, etc.). I, therefore, responded to the questions for the new courses only. I have also attached another copy of the changes that were approved by the College of Education faculty. There is no specific library impact statement included, only my statement related to the request for additional periodical purchases. I hope this is sufficient. If not, you may want to contact Christie Roysdon or Dean Yoshida. Please let me know if the GRC needs any additional information or my attendance at a meeting when these are discussed.

cc: Dean Ron Yoshida
PROPOSED NEW COURSES IN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM

Instructional Mode: What is the mode(s) of instruction for the course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Instructor (faculty/other)</th>
<th>Contact (hrs./wk)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educ 4XX (Doc. Qual. Res.)</td>
<td>Indep. Study</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SchP 43X (Health/Pediatric Psych.)</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3 hrs./week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SchP 43X (Comp. School Health Programs)</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3 hrs/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ 3XX (Superv. Research in Applied Psych)</td>
<td>Indep. Study</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Implications

1. Are there any known effects of the proposed changes on other programs at the University?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educ 4XX (Doc. Qual. Res.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course will cut across programs in College that require a qualifying research project (Master’s thesis equivalent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SchP 43X (Health/Pediatric Psych.)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Specific to doctoral curriculum in school psychology, but certainly open to graduate students from other parts of university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SchP 43X (Comp. School Health Programs)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Specific to doctoral curriculum in school psychology, but certainly open to graduate students from other parts of university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ 3XX (Superv. Research in Applied Psych)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course that will be used by undergraduate psychology majors working with education faculty in school or counseling psychology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. If there are known effects, have the people in charge of the affected programs been consulted about the changes?
   a) Who was consulted?
   b) Are the proposed changes acceptable?
   c) Will concomitant changes be required in the affected programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Part a)</th>
<th>Part b)</th>
<th>Part c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educ 4XX (Doc. Qual. Res.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>College faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ 3XX (Superv. Research in Applied Psych)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Psych. Dept Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Indicate any of these course that are crosslisted.

None are cross listed.

Resource Implications

1. Identify Resource Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Library Impact</th>
<th>Computer Impact</th>
<th>Faculty Impact</th>
<th>Facilities Impact</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educ 4XX (Doc. Qual. Res.)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Already exists as requirement in some programs, being added as specific course for recognition on student transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SchP 43X (Health/Pediatric Psych.)</td>
<td>Request for additional periodical purchases has been made to library to support course and curriculum changes.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None, will be taught by existing faculty</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Has been offered twice already as experimental course. Request is to place course in catalogue as regular listing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Library Resources</td>
<td>Faculty Resources</td>
<td>Program Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SchP 43X</td>
<td>Comp. School Health Programs</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Has been added to program curriculum in school psychology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ 3XX</td>
<td>Superv Research in Applied Psych</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Provides formal credit for existing supervision of undergraduates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Are the resources required above available from the departmental budget?

Library acquisitions are not available from departmental budget and have been requested against College allocation.

3. If non-budgeted resources are required, please indicate the magnitude and availability (source, timing, terms, etc.) of these resources.

The requested sources are important but not critical for the implementation of the requested courses. Access through interlibrary loan is available. It is anticipated that the requested periodicals can be obtained within the next two months.
Proposed Course Changes

New Courses to be Added:

**Educ 4XX**
Doctoral Qualifying Research Project (1-3)
Design and implement research project under faculty supervision to meet requirements for doctoral programs. May be repeated for credit.

**SchP 43X (suggest SchP 438)**
Health/Pediatric Psychology (3)
Introduction to training in the definition, etiology, and behavioral/academic characteristics of children and adolescents with medical disorders. Emphasis is placed on the assessment and treatment of educational and behavioral sequelae of medical disorders in both school and health settings. Prerequisites: admission to doctoral program in school psychology or permission of instructor.

**SchP 43X (suggest SchP 439)**
Comprehensive School Health Programs (3)
Examination of school-wide programs designed to address health care needs of children and adolescents in school settings. Focus is on development of primary prevention and integration of educational, medical, social, and community resources. Permission of instructor required.

**Educ 3XX**
(Suggest Educ 395)
Supervised Research in Applied Psychology (1-3)
Provides undergraduate junior and senior psychology majors a formal supervised research experience in applied psychology. Students are assigned for the semester to a research team led by a participating faculty member in the Counseling Psychology or School Psychology programs in the College of Education. (Repeatable up to 6 credits)
Change in Title and Description

SchP 436  From:  Practicum in Interventions for Students with Behavior Disorders (1-3)

To:  Specialized Practicum in School Psychology (with subtitle) (1-3)

Supervised field experience in school psychology with a specific population or setting. May be repeated for credit. Permission of instructor required.

SchP 426  From:  Advanced Child Behavior Therapy

Techniques of child behavior therapy applied in classrooms and clinical settings. Particular emphasis on self-control procedures, such as social skills training, self-instruction training, and cognitive behavior therapy. Course covers both the theoretical and practical components of procedures.

To:  Advanced School and Family Interventions

Overview of school-based and family-based intervention strategies for children and adolescents presenting interpersonal, emotional, developmental, or behavioral challenges. Examples of topics covered include crisis intervention, peer-mediated interventions, self-management interventions, behavioral parent training, interventions for child abuse/neglect, and computer-assisted instruction. Prerequisite: SchP 402 or permission of instructor.

CPsy 473  From:  Research Seminar in Counseling (1-3)

For doctoral students in counseling psychology. Issues and methods in research design, data collection, and data analysis, criticism and evaluation of student proposals. Admission to the Ph.D. program in counseling psychology or permission of the counseling psychology program coordinator.

To:  Advanced Research Methods in Applied Psychology (1-3)

For doctoral students in applied psychology. Issues and methods of research design, data collection, and data analysis. Advanced discussion of quantitative, qualitative, and single-case research design. Admission to the Ph.D. program in counseling psychology or school psychology or permission of the instructor.

CROSS LIST AS SchP 4XX (suggest SchP 452)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SchP 413</td>
<td>Advanced Research Methodology Seminar -I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SchP 414</td>
<td>Advanced Research Methodology Seminar -II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPLIED MECHANICS/APPLIED MATHEMATICS MERGED PROGRAM

The Department of Mechanical Engineering and Mechanics wishes to merge the graduate programs in Applied Mechanics and Applied Mathematics (MEM) under the new title:

COMPUTATIONAL AND ENGINEERING MECHANICS

This suggested merger was approved unanimously by MEM on February 20, 1997. Subsequent discussions were held with Professor Davis, Chair of the Department of Mathematics, who indicated that his faculty had no objection to the merger.

Intent

- To promote and foster the continuing growth of a strong program in analytical, computational, and experimental mechanics, reinforced by expertise in the application of mathematics to the solution of problems in the engineering and physical sciences

Rationale

- Merger strengthens both of the existing programs

- The merged program should attract a broader-based student population

- The new title is a more accurate description of the current principal activities of the combined faculty
Administration

The program will be administered by a Computational and Engineering Mechanics graduate committee appointed by the Chair of Mechanical Engineering & Mechanics

Admission

Applicants must satisfy admission requirements of both the College of Engineering & Applied Science and of the Department of Mechanical Engineering & Mechanics

Resource impact

Since the merger involves existing faculty, programs, and research interests, there should be little impact on computing and library facilities

M.S. & Ph.D programs

Program requirements for these degrees are listed on the attached sheets
MASTER OF SCIENCE DEGREE

All students pursuing a master's degree in Computational and Engineering Mechanics must take a minimum of thirty credit hours of graduate level work, with not less than twenty-four of these hours being at the 400 level. Their program must include the following three required courses:

Analytical Methods I & II

Phys 428 & 429

or

ME 442 & 443

Numerical Methods

ME 413

In addition, they must take two of the four MEM core courses:

Heat and Mass Transfer

ME 423

Advanced Fluid Mechanics

ME 430

Introduction to Elasticity

Mech 408

Analyt Meth in Dynamics & Vibs

Mech 425

The remaining fifteen credits can be taken from any of the graduate courses in MEM and other approved electives.

Both thesis and non-thesis options will be available.
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DEGREE

Qualifying procedure

Students wishing to pursue a Ph.D. in Computational and Engineering Mechanics must take the required core courses:

Analytical Methods I & II

Phys 428 & 429
or
ME 442 & 443

Numerical Methods

ME 413

They must also take two core courses from the supplemental list given below:

Asymptotic Methods
Integral Equations
Finite Element Methods
Non-deterministic Models in Engng
Mechanical Reliability
Heat and Mass Transfer
Advanced Fluid Mechanics
Introduction to Elasticity
Analyt Meth in Dynamics & Vibs

Mech 419
EMA 450
Mech 418
Mech 445
ME 446
ME 423*
ME 430*
Mech 408*
Mech 425*

A student must attain a GPA of 3.35 for the five required courses taken. All students who satisfy the GPA requirement will be required to take a three hour written examination in an area (special topic) of the student’s choice. This topic is subject to approval by the Computational and Engineering Mechanics graduate committee. For students who start in the program following their Bachelor’s degree, the written examination must be taken no later than the beginning of the fourth semester after entry. A student who fails the written examination will be allowed a single retake. The retake examination will be given at the end of the semester in which the examination was first attempted.

In addition, before completion of the degree, a student must have received graduate credit for at least two of the four MEM core courses which are designated by * in the above list. If desired, these starred courses may be used as part of the Computational and Engineering Mechanics core, and hence count towards the core GPA requirement.
Lehigh University
Policy on Sexual Harassment

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THIS POLICY

Lehigh University strives to provide an educational, working, social, or living environment for all faculty, staff, students, and guests that is free from sexual harassment. Sexual harassment in any form is unacceptable behavior and will not be tolerated. This policy is designed to:

- notify all members of the university community of what conduct is prohibited;
- inform members of the university community about the procedures available within the university for addressing and resolving sexual harassment complaints;
- ensure that all members of the university community are aware of their rights;
- ensure that the due process rights of individuals accused of sexual harassment are protected.

This policy is university-wide. Procedures are described for faculty, staff, and student complaints.

Lehigh University continues to uphold principles of academic freedom and free speech. The free discussion of ideas can be achieved without intimidating or humiliating others because of their gender and without coercing sexual favors. For speech or conduct that takes place in a teaching context to be considered sexual harassment, such speech or conduct must also be persistent, pervasive, and not germane to the subject matter.

DEFINITION OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

This document defines sexual harassment as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature where:

- submission to the conduct is made a term or condition of employment;
- submission to or rejection of such conduct is used as a basis for employment decisions;
- the conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work performance; or
- the conduct has the purpose or effect of creating an intimidating, hostile or offensive working environment.
There are two primary forms of sexual harassment-

1. **Quid Pro Quo Sexual Harassment** occurs when a supervisor or faculty member explicitly, or implicitly, promises or withholds job-related or education-related benefits based upon the employee's or student's acquiescence to the supervisor or faculty's sexual advances or behavior. The job-related benefit could be a promised raise, promotion, preferable assignment, or other benefit. The education-related benefit could be a grade, opportunities for mentoring and advising, or a letter of recommendation.

2. **Sexually Hostile Work, Learning, Social or Living Environment** occurs when an employee, student, or colleague is subjected to sexually offensive, demeaning, harassing or intimidating statements, jokes, gestures, pictures, touching, or other conduct which is sufficiently severe and pervasive to create a hostile work environment. The violating conduct may involve only one or a few very serious and offensive events, or may involve a pattern of harassing behaviors. A sexually hostile environment can be created by supervisors, co-workers, faculty, fellow students, or any other member of the university community.

**Examples of Sexual Harassment**

Sexual harassment can take different forms and the determination of what constitutes sexual harassment will vary according to the particular circumstances. Sexual harassment may involve behavior by a person of either sex against a person of the same or opposite sex.

Examples of sexual harassment may include but are not limited to:

- seeking sexual favors or relationships in return for the promise of a favorable grade or other academic opportunity
- basing an employment-related action (e.g., hiring, salary increase, performance appraisal, termination) on a sexual favor or relationship
- intentional and undesired physical contact, sexually explicit language or writing, lewd pictures or notes that create a work, educational, social or living environment that a reasonable person would find hostile or abusive.

**Behavior That Can Lead to a Sexually Hostile Environment**

- **Supervisory Conflict of Interest.** A supervisor and employee, or faculty and student, sometimes develop a consensual romantic or sexual relationship. While this policy does not prohibit such relationships, it is a conflict of interest for one party to continue in any type of supervisory role. It is expected that the supervisor (e.g., graduate advisor, instructor, teaching assistant) will help the employee or student make other arrangements for the employee or student to
receive the supervision he or she requires. For example, a doctoral advisor should confer with the student and the faculty of their department to identify and recruit another doctoral advisor. A supervisor and employee should work with their department and Human Resources for reassignment to another department or a change in the supervisory relationship. In resolving this conflict of interest, the following policy applies:

- It is the responsibility of the person in the supervisory role to resolve the conflict of interest.
- If the conflict of interest is not resolved, the supervised person has the right to complain of sexual harassment even if the relationship was at one time consensual.
- Failure to resolve a conflict of interest puts the supervisor at risk for charges of sexual harassment.

- **Repeated Offensive Behavior.** An isolated comment or incident does not usually create a sexually hostile work environment. The exception is if the incident is a serious act (e.g., an employee sexually assaults another employee, or a faculty member humiliates a student in class with references to his or her personal anatomy.) What also constitutes a sexually hostile work or educational environment is failure to honor requests to stop a behavior that a reasonable person would find hostile or abusive. For example, students in a class ask the faculty member not to tell lewd jokes, but he or she continues to do so. An employee asks her supervisor not to touch her, but he or she continues to do so.

- **Gender Stereotypes.** Although not specifically sexual, gender-related comments can also contribute to a sexually hostile work environment. These include statements which stereotype or demean women or men. For example, it would be a gender stereotype to say to a woman “You are going to get pregnant, stay home, and not return to work.” This isolated statement is not by itself sexual harassment, but could be used as evidence of a sexually hostile workplace.

**Responsibility of Supervisors**

It is the responsibility of supervisors (faculty and staff), deans, and department chairs to:

- inform employees under their direction or supervision of these sexual harassment procedures;
- notify the appropriate contact person when they receive reports or complaints of sexual harassment (See next section);
- confront employees engaged in incidents of sexual harassment that they witness; and
- implement any corrective actions that are imposed as a result of findings of sexual harassment.
WAYS TO DEAL WITH SEXUAL HARASSMENT

The following guidelines are recommended for individuals who perceive that they may be victims of sexual harassment. These steps may resolve the situation (the harassment stops) or may provide evidence to strengthen a complaint. **Whether or not these steps are taken, individuals have the right to file a complaint.**

1. **Be assertive and speak up.** Ignoring the situation will not make it go away. Be honest and direct about your opinion of the behavior as soon as it is detected. Be polite, but firm. Don’t apologize or smile when you confront the harasser.

2. **Write a letter to the harasser.** If verbally confronting the harasser is not possible, write a note. Be honest and direct about your disapproval of the actions. State clearly that you want the harassment to stop. Keep a copy.

3. **Keep a diary.** Keep clear and detailed accounts of the behavior and your feelings surrounding the events. Make sure you include the date, time, setting, and any witnesses.

4. **Seek support from others.** **Confide in trusted people** when harassment occurs. It is important for other people to know that these incidents are occurring.

5. **Seek counseling.** You are faced with a crisis that can damage your health, career, and confidence. Don’t keep the problem to yourself.

**Report the harassment.** In taking these steps, individuals may decide to report the harassment. The information that follows describes how to file a complaint.

**COMPLAINT REPORTING**

Any member of the university community who believes that he or she has been a victim of sexual harassment is encouraged to promptly confer with one of the following sexual harassment advisors. Supervisors who are concerned with the behavior of staff or students may also confer with these advisors.

**Sexual Harassment Advisors:**

**Faculty:** Vice Provost  
758-3165  

**Staff:** Manager Employee Relations and Training  
758-3897  

**Students:** Associate Dean of Students  
758-4157
INITIAL CONSULTATION These Sexual Harassment Advisors have been specially trained to explain the definition of sexual harassment, offer guidance on filing a complaint, and provide information about psychological counseling and support services. If after the initial consultation the complainant does not wish to pursue the matter, this conversation will be confidential and “off the record.” The advisor will not contact the accused and no formal records will be kept that identify the complainant or the accused. However, if the complainant wishes to pursue the matter further, he or she must file a written complaint.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT COMPLAINT To make a complaint of sexual harassment, the complainant must describe the act or acts in writing, naming the accused and submit this dated, signed written complaint to the sexual harassment advisor. All charges must be described in detail in this written complaint. The accused is given a copy of this written complaint by the sexual harassment advisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaints Accusing:</th>
<th>Are Made in Writing to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Vice Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Manager Employee Relations and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Associate Dean of Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some cases, the complainant may begin the initial consultation with one advisor (e.g., student goes to the Associate Dean of Students), then make the formal written complaint to another (e.g., the complaint is against faculty and is given to the Vice Provost). Complaints are shared with the accused and informal resolution is initiated by the Sexual Harassment Advisor unless one of the parties requests a formal resolution (See Investigation Procedures).

Time Period to File a Complaint

Prompt reporting of a complaint is strongly encouraged, as it allows for rapid response to, and resolution of, objectionable behavior. Complaints should be filed in writing within six months after the last act occurred. The student judicial code allows for students to file a complaint at any time during their academic career, but prompt reporting is encouraged so that the situation can be resolved in a timely manner.

Unless extenuating circumstances precluded filing within six months, failure to file a complaint within this time period will result in dismissal of the complaint.
Filing Internally versus Externally

The complainant may elect to have a complaint handled internally (within the university) in accordance with the procedures described here; or may elect to file a formal charge with a federal or state agency authorized by law to investigate such claims. If a formal external procedure is used, or a lawsuit is filed, the university will proceed in the manner it believes appropriate under the circumstances.

Protection from Retaliation

Any form of retaliation against a person who files a charge of sexual harassment is prohibited and may be subject to disciplinary action. This protection from retaliation also applies to anyone who appears as a witness in the proceedings.

Charged Party: Protection from Bad Faith Complaints

If the sexual harassment advisor, the university judicial office (student cases) or the investigation panel, determines that the complaint is malicious, or knowingly false, or fundamentally frivolous, such charges will be dismissed and the investigation will be promptly terminated.

Confidentiality

All individuals who are involved in the complaint reporting and investigation are obliged to maintain confidentiality of the proceedings. The Sexual Harassment Advisors will underscore the need for confidentiality when the investigation panels are formed. Notwithstanding these precautions, the university cannot and does not guarantee that confidentiality will be maintained by all parties involved. Confidentiality also does not mean withholding details of the complaint from the accused.

INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES

Level One: Informal Resolution

In many instances, the written complaint of sexual harassment can be resolved by the Sexual Harassment Advisor through informal discussion and mediation without the use of a formal, investigation panel. The goal of this informal resolution process is to rectify the problem. No formal finding of guilt or innocence is obtained and no disciplinary penalty is imposed. Typically, the informal resolution process will involve separate discussions with the complainant and the accused, negotiation for changes in behavior through separate or joint discussions, and a written understanding signed by both parties. Because informal resolution follows a formal written complaint, the Sexual Harassment Advisor will keep this written understanding in a confidential file.
This written understanding can be shared with the investigation panel if a formal investigation follows related to the same incidents.

**Level Two: Formal Resolution with Investigation**

A formal complaint will be resolved by an investigation when:
- it is referred by the Sexual Harassment Advisor; or
- the complainant requests formal resolution; or
- the accused requests formal resolution.

**Complaints Against Faculty** Complaints for formal resolution against faculty are referred to the Provost who appoints a special Ad Hoc Panel of five faculty members. The Panel elects a Chair who handles procedural and administrative aspects of the investigation. This procedure applies to all full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty.

**Complaints Against Staff** Complaints against staff that are referred for formal resolution are given to the appropriate Vice President. This Vice President will charge the Manager of Employee Relations and Training to conduct a thorough investigation of the situation. The investigation typically includes an interview with the complainant, the accused and witnesses or reference people requested by the complainant or the accused. This procedure applies to all staff, including those who are enrolled as students or who work on research grants.

**Complaints Against Students** Complaints against students are referred to the Dean of Students Office and will be processed through the University Student Judicial System Code of Conduct. For complaints of sexual harassment, students include all undergraduate and graduate students and those who are functioning as TAs, RAs, and GAs.

**Complaints Against University Administrators**. If the sexual harassment complaint is against the Provost or other Vice President, it should be filed with the President. A sexual harassment complaint against the President should be filed with the Board of Trustees.

**Formal Faculty Hearings**. The investigation for faculty will take the following steps. First, the panel will have a training session with one of the Sexual Harassment Advisors who will review the university’s policy on Sexual Harassment and emphasize the need for confidentiality. Then the panel will receive copies of the written complaint and any other relevant material (e.g., written rebuttal from the accused). The panel will hold closed hearings to interview the complainant, the accused, and witnesses or reference people requested by the complainant or the accused. The complainant and the accused can each bring one advisor to the hearing.

*The complainant and the accused each have the right to be accompanied by an attorney as their one advisor during their testimony. The attorney or advisor*
may provide advice to his or her client, but may not directly address the panel or be present during any proceedings besides the client's testimony. The attorney or advisor may not cross examine any witnesses. The ad hoc panel has the right to have a university attorney present during any proceedings. If the accused or complainant plans to bring an attorney, advanced notice must be given to the chair of the hearing panel. If one party plans to bring an attorney, the chair will inform the other party of this intent. No witnesses may be accompanied in the hearing by an attorney. The panel reserves the right to determine whom to interview and will interview the complainant, the accused, and witnesses in separate, private sessions.

Both the complainant and the accused may submit a list of witnesses to the panel. The panel will interview all witnesses submitted by both parties. Both the complainant and the accused may additionally submit a list of questions to be addressed to various witnesses. Unless these questions are obviously of an improper or irrelevant nature, the committee will pose them to the indicated witness or witnesses.

The committee may, at its discretion, bar the accused, the accuser, or any other interested parties from hearing the direct testimony of any witness. However, all testimony shall be recorded, or otherwise transcribed. Moreover, all recordings, transcriptions, written statements or any other evidence pertaining to the case will be made available in their entirety to both accuser and accused. Both the accuser and accused have the right to communicate to the committee, either orally or in writing, any comments they may have regarding the testimony of other parties, or any of the other evidence pertinent to the case.

Both the complainant and the accused will be notified in writing of the decision of the formal hearing panel.

**Student Formal Hearings.** Procedures for the adjudication of student cases are detailed in the University Student Judicial System Code of Conduct.

**Staff Formal Hearings.** Similarly for staff, the Manager of Employee Relations and Training has the right to determine whom to interview and has the right to interview the complainant, the accused, and witnesses in separate, private sessions. The complainant and accused can each bring one informal advisor to the meeting who is not a relative or person with formal legal training.

**Reports of the Hearing Panels.**

When the investigation has been completed, a written report of findings and disciplinary actions is given as follows:

**Faculty.** The investigation panel’s written report is given directly to the Provost in confidence with any recommendations for disciplinary action. The Provost determines the final actions to be taken and communicates these directly to the accused and the complainant. In the case of a finding
of guilt and disciplinary action, the faculty member’s Chair, Dean, and the President are also informed of the outcome. In no case shall any disciplinary action be taken until all appeals to the Personnel Committee, if any, have been exhausted. However, the Provost may, at his or her discretion, impose at any point in the proceedings temporary work restrictions designed to separate the accused and the accuser.

Staff: The Manager of Employee Relations and Training will prepare a written report and present it to the Vice President confidentially. The Vice President will determine the appropriate actions to be taken and communicate these directly to the accused and the complainant. In the case of findings of guilt and disciplinary action, the employee’s Supervisor and/or Manager and the President are also informed of the outcome.

Student: The Student Judicial System has been authorized to impose disciplinary sanctions directly. The procedures described in the Student Handbook for disciplinary action will be followed.

Disciplinary Action

Sexual harassment is a serious offense that cannot be tolerated in a work, living, or learning environment. Disciplinary action may include, but is not limited to:

- Corrective action or restitution
- Written reprimand
- Requirement to attend training
- Work restrictions
- Suspension
- Demotion with reduction in pay
- Student expulsion

Student expulsion requires a special procedure involving the Board of Trustees as described in the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty and therefore calls for the automatic implementation of the Appeals Process.

- Termination of employment

A move for dismissal of a tenured member of the faculty requires a special procedure involving the Board of Trustees, as per the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty and therefore calls for the automatic implementation of the Appeals Process.

If the accused is a nontenured faculty member, and if the Provost moves for dismissal of the accused, then the accused faculty member has the right to an automatic appeal to the Personnel Committee.
Right of Appeal

The accused may write a written appeal to:

Accused Who Is Making Appeal
Facility
Students
Staff

Appeal Is Made To:
Personnel Committee
Dean of Students
President

This written appeal must be made within 15 working days of receiving written notice of disciplinary action.

Grounds for appeal include: (1) information is available that was not available at the time of the hearing, (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.

For students, these appeals go to the University Discipline Appeals Committee for procedural review as described in the Student Handbook. For faculty, the Personnel Committee considers the appeal and makes a recommendation to the President. For staff, the appeal goes to the President who will determine how to respond to the appeal. The President has the option of using a three member Problem Solving Committee to review the case as described in step four of the Problem Solving Process for Staff while retaining the authority to determine the final outcome of the appeal.

Time-frame for Investigations

The person or investigation panel who receive a complaint of sexual harassment will make every effort to respond to complaints in a timely manner.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY

This Sexual Harassment Policy was developed by the Personnel Committee. It was adopted by the faculty for its Rules and Procedures on (date) and by the Board of Trustees on (date).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEPS</th>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step One: Initial Consultation</td>
<td>Associate Dean of Students</td>
<td>Manager Employee Relations and Training (MERT)</td>
<td>Vice Provost</td>
<td>&quot;Off the Record&quot; process ends OR go to Step 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Two: Written Complaint</td>
<td>Associate Dean of Students</td>
<td>MERT</td>
<td>Vice Provost</td>
<td>Step 3 begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Three: - Informal Resolution</td>
<td>Associate Dean of Students</td>
<td>MERT</td>
<td>Vice Provost</td>
<td>Written understanding between parties OR Step 4 begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Four: Formal Resolution</td>
<td>University Student Judicial System</td>
<td>Vice President reviews and refers to MERT.</td>
<td>Provost reviews and forms Ad Hoc panel of faculty.</td>
<td>Not guilty and no further action OR finding of guilt goes to Step 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Five: Finding of Guilt</td>
<td>Student Judicial System has authority to impose sanctions. Communicated to Dean of Students for action.</td>
<td>MERT makes recommendations to Vice President who determines outcome.</td>
<td>Panel makes recommendations to Provost who determines outcome.</td>
<td>Accused accepts outcome OR goes to Step 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Six: Appeal</td>
<td>University Discipline Appeals Committee</td>
<td>Appeal to President who has option of using a Problem Solving Committee.</td>
<td>Appeal to Personnel Committee.</td>
<td>Personnel Committee recommends to President who determines final outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Motion A

The University shall indemnify any employee who serves at the request of the University in an investigative capacity pertaining to a sexual harassment charge.

Motion B

It is not a condition of employment that a University employee must serve in an investigative capacity if requested to do so by the University. Furthermore, the University shall take no punitive action against an employee who refuses to serve in an investigative capacity.

Motion C

For sexual harassment charges involving only University employees, i.e., neither the complainant nor the accused are part-time or full-time undergraduate or graduate students, a preliminary and informal investigation shall be conducted prior to the process of formal investigation described in other parts of this document.

The preliminary and informal investigation shall be similar to the process used by the American Arbitration Association, whereby, the complainant shall select one representative who informs the accused of the alleged charges. The accused selects his or her own representative and the two selected representatives mutually agree upon a third representative. These three representatives investigate the alleged charges and report their non-binding findings orally to the complainant and accused separately. No written documentation is prepared and the complainant can proceed with a formal investigation irrespective of the findings of the preliminary and informal investigation.
December 19, 1997

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Lehigh Community

FROM: Hannah Stewart-Gambino, Chair of the Constitutional Task Force

SUBJECT: Amendments to the Faculty Senate Proposal

Enclosed please find a packet including the proposed amendments to the faculty senate draft. Also enclosed is a copy of the senate draft sent to the faculty in August and the supporting commentary from the Task Force sent out in October, 1997. All amendments will be voted on by the faculty on January 8, 1998 at a specially-convened constitutional convention, which begins at 9:00 AM in Neville 1.

The Task Force organized the proposed amendments into four categories that will be considered in the following order: FRIENDLY, STRUCTURAL CHANGES, SPECIFIC CHANGES, ALTERNATIVE SENATE MODELS. Within each category, amendments are listed in the order of their occurrence in the senate draft.

A. FRIENDLY AMENDMENTS: The Task Force considers these proposals to be consistent with the intent of the document. Unless challenged, they will be accepted without requiring a faculty vote.

B. STRUCTURAL CHANGES: These amendments alter the current proposed senate structure in confined ways.

C. SPECIFIC CHANGES: These amendments propose specific, but not structural, changes.

D. ALTERNATIVE MODEL: This category includes an amendment that is a proposal for an alternative senate model. For procedural reasons, this alternative model will be considered after the amendments to the current senate draft are acted upon.

The Task Force urges the faculty to review all of the amendments submitted - including the alternative model - in order to facilitate a focused and informed debate on January 8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposer</th>
<th>Friendly &amp; acceptable</th>
<th>Structural Changes</th>
<th>Specific Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gatewood</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitcomb</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL (Callahan)</td>
<td>11.6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smeaton</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCC (Gunter)</td>
<td>13.2 (two)</td>
<td>13.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC (Cates)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.5.1</td>
<td>11.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED POL (Hartranft)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.5.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB USERS (Cates)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.4  » 11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.4.1  » 11.7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.4.2  » 11.7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cates</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.1 (2.9R&amp;P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 4.1 4.1.1 8.1 9.2</td>
<td>11.1 11.2 11.2.1 11.3 11.3.1 11.4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.5.1 12.1 12.2 12.2.1 12.2.2 12.3 12.3.1 12.3.2 13.1 13.3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. FRIENDLY AMENDMENTS: The Task Force considers these proposals to be consistent with the intent of the document. Unless challenged, they will be accepted without requiring a faculty vote.

TO: Hannah Stewart-Gambino  
FROM: Ward Cates, individual faculty member  
SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Proposal Amendments

Section 2.1 (last bullet) Modify final sentence to read (changes boldfaced):
"Special sessions of the entire Faculty may be called by the Steering Committee of the Senate or by written request of at least 40 voting members of the Faculty. [See sections 3 and 5]."

Section 2.4 Substitute the following (changes boldfaced):
2.4 The President and Provost should not act on proposals within the jurisdiction of the Senate [see 2.1] without the prior approval of the Senate. The President and Provost may, however, take actions necessary for the uninterrupted continuation of university business if, for any reason, the Senate is unavailable to provide prior approval. In such cases, the President or Provost shall within three calendar days notify the Senate Steering Committee in writing of the action taken and of the reason why the Senate was not consulted. In so far as is possible, such unapproved actions may be subject to revocation if they fail to receive subsequent Senate approval.
[Rationale: The present wording looks like a prohibition that exceeds even what we provide in our own U.S. government structure. Are there NO instances where the President may act without prior Senate action? Think what this means for the summer. The intent may be good, but the effect could be periods in which nothing happens.]

Section 3.1 Substitute the following:
3.1 The Senate and Standing Committees shall use normal university communication channels to inform the Faculty, on a periodic and regular basis, about Senate and Committee actions and pending and upcoming issues. Such communications shall, as appropriate, solicit response from, and active involvement of, the Faculty.
[Rationale: The present wording is vague and should specify a procedure. Philosophy is good, but when no procedure accompanies it, philosophy usually goes unimplemented]
Section 3.2 Second sentence; change to read:
"An appeal of a Senate action must be submitted in writing to the Senate within 14 calendar days of the distribution of the Senate minutes reporting that action and such appeal must be endorsed in writing by a minimum of 40 voting Faculty members."

Section 3.4.1 Final sentence; change to read:
"Within four weeks of receipt of a duly completed application for a referendum, the Steering Committee shall schedule a Faculty meeting for the purpose of deliberating that referendum."

Section 4.1 First sentence; add after Committee:
"(see section 8 below)"
[Rationale: Since Standing Committees have not been defined yet, there should be a reference to where to find them in the document]

Section 6.3 Change the word "or" to the word "and."
[Rationale: Not all faculty use e-mail yet and making it possible to bypass them is not good]

Section 6.4 punctuation error/typo
Replace the word "or" before "Dean" with a comma.

Section 7.1 Delete the second sentence.

7.1 The Senate officers are the Chair-Elect, the Chair, the immediate past Chair, and the Secretary of the Faculty. **The Chair-Elect and the Secretary are directly elected by the Faculty.**

Howard Whitcomb

Section 7 5.1

Proposal: Add the following to 7.5.1.

Current Wording:

7.5.1 The Secretary is responsible for sending the Senate agenda and minutes to the Faculty, President, Provost, Vice Provosts, Deans of each College and the Board of Trustees, maintaining the current faculty census, supervising all votes of the Senate, updating Faculty Rules and Procedures, and monitoring the number necessary for quorum for both Faculty and Senate meetings. The Secretary, working with the Nominations Committees of each College, supervises all Senate and Standing Committee elections.

Proposed Addition:

The Secretary is responsible for maintaining on an annual basis an electronically updated version of R & P.
Section 10.1 Next-to-last sentence; punctuation error and readability problems
Substitute:
"This responsibility includes coordinating the Standing Committees of the
Senate; directing to appropriate Committees for consideration issues that arise
from either the Faculty or administration; anticipating Faculty concerns that
otherwise might not reach the Committees for consideration and assigning
them appropriately; working with the President and Board of Trustees to
resolve contentious matters; and—in consultation with Deans, Vice-Provosts,
the Provost, President, and Chairs of Standing Committees and ad hoc
committees—setting agendas for Senate and Faculty meetings."

Study Abroad Board:

Current Wording:

11.5. The Special Programs Policy Committee is responsible for oversight of academic
policy pertaining to the Office of Summer Studies, the Office of International Education,
the Iacocca Institute, Integrated Learning Experience, continuing education and distance
education, and any other nontraditional academic programs. The committee is
responsible for oversight of non-traditional programs academic policy. Policy
proposals and recommendations are referred to the Senate for approval.

Proposed Wording:

11.5. The Special Programs Policy Committee is responsible for **coordination with**
academic policy pertaining to the Office of Summer Studies, the Office of International
Education, the Iacocca Institute, Integrated Learning Experience, continuing education
and distance education, and any other nontraditional academic programs. The committee
is responsible for **coordinating with non-traditional programs on matters of academic policy**.
University-wide academic policy proposals and recommendations are referred to the Senate for approval.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate Task Force

FROM: The Personnel Committee (Profs Browder, Callahan, McNamara, Neti and Simon)

RE: Response to the Senate Proposal

In general, we do not believe the nature of the Personnel Committee should be changed in the proposal for a faculty senate.

We recommend two specific changes be made to the proposal:

Add a section under 11.6.3 which states:

“The committee normally shall report its findings in these matters directly to the president.”

Rationale: This is the current and past practice of the committee. This should be stated explicitly in the proposal.

Thank you for soliciting our opinion of the senate proposal. We are happy to provide additional information if your task force requests it.

Section 11.6.4 should be struck and replaced with the language in the current version of R&P, section 1.2.2.6:

“The committee shall report to the faculty at least once a year. It will undertake the development of general principles based on its decisions and will report in writing on those general principles to the university faculty.”

Rationale: The Personnel Committee should maintain its tradition of making a report directly to the university faculty rather than to the faculty senate, as in the senate proposal. This report can be made at the spring faculty meeting mandated in the proposal.
MEMORANDUM

To: Hannah Stewart-Gambino
From: John W. Smeaton
Subject: Faculty Senate Proposal

Below are my suggestions for modifications to the Faculty Senate Constitution:

**CURRENT**

12.2 The **Student Life Committee** is responsible for Faculty oversight of non-academically related matters of undergraduate and graduate student life including residence life, athletics, counseling, and advising. Policy proposals and recommendations are referred to the Senate for approval.

12.2.2 University ad hoc, advisory, or appointed committees dealing with related issues that include Faculty participation shall report regularly to the Student Life Committee.

**PROPOSED**

12.2 The **Student Life Committee** is responsible for Faculty consideration of non-academically related matters of undergraduate and graduate student life including residence life, athletics, **policy on both undergraduate and graduate discipline and disciplinary appeals**, counseling, and advising. Policy proposals and recommendations are referred to the Senate for approval.

12.2.2 University ad hoc, advisory, or appointed committees dealing with related issues that include Faculty participation shall report regularly to the Student Life Committee. **Academic Disciplinary and Appeals boards that include Faculty participation shall report regularly to the Student Life Committee.** In all cases, matters...

12.3 The **Student Academic Life Committee** is responsible for Faculty oversight of academically related matters of student life that include policy on admissions and financial aid, policy on both undergraduate and graduate discipline and disciplinary appeals, academic calendar, student academic awards and prizes, prestigious scholarships, visiting lecturers, and honorary degrees. Policy proposals and recommendations are referred to the Senate for approval.

12.3.2 University ad hoc, advisory or appointed boards or committees dealing with related issues that include Faculty participation shall report regularly to the Student Academic Life Committee. **Academic Disciplinary and Appeals boards that include Faculty participation shall report regularly to the Student Academic Life Committee.** In all cases, matters of policy within Faculty jurisdiction and the domain of the Student Academic Life Committee shall be referred to the Committee for consideration. [See also Section 15]
Role with Respect to the Administration:

a. Proposed Language:

"13.2. The Committee meets regularly with the administration to participate in the formulation of compensation policy including the distribution of fringe benefits drafts recommendations to the administration and represents the Faculty in any deliberations and negotiations in these areas."

b. Rationale:

The Administration often finds it awkward to deal with the FCC since this committee has a single mandate, that of faculty compensation. The clear statement in the current R&P that the FCC will meet regularly with the administration (R&P 1.2.2.4, paragraph 2) permits the FCC to make its arguments concerning compensation directly to the President, Provost and other senior member of the Administration. If the Administration is given the option to deal with the FCC at arm's length, through "...draft(ed) recommendations...", then the FCC will probably lose a great deal of its admittedly small influence on the compensation process.

Role with Respect to the Faculty:

a. Proposed language:

"13.2. The committee reports regularly to the faculty and the Senate on its findings, policy proposals and recommendations. are referred to the Senate for approval.

b. Rationale:

Reasoning is similar to that given in 3 b above. The faculty created the FCC as a single issue committee to deal directly with the Administration on compensation issues and report directly to the faculty. This decision was probably motivated by the importance of compensation to faculty morale and a concern that a multipurpose committee might make concessions in the compensation area in order to facilitate discussions and negotiations in other areas. Probably for this reason, the Administration has proposed in past years that the FCC be subordinated to other committees with broader mandates such as the FSC and FFPOC.
B. STRUCTURAL CHANGES: These amendments alter the current proposed senate structure in confined ways.

Ward-Cates

Section 1.1 Modify second sentence to read (changes boldfaced):
"Instructors and lecturers with full-time academic appointments in teaching and research are also voting members of the Faculty, providing that they are not candidates for Lehigh degrees."

Fleming-Carroll

The issue addressed by this amendment is the size of the Senate. The amendment seeks to ensure the Senate is “representative” of the faculty by increasing the number of Senators who are directly elected to their position (as opposed to Senators who become such either by indirect election or by virtue of their administrative position)

Current Proposal’s Text [where underlining indicates issues the amendment addresses]:

Section 4. Senate Membership

4 1 2. Eight senators shall be directly elected from their respective Colleges with three elected from the College of Arts and Sciences, two from the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences, two from the College of Business and Economics, and one from the College of Education. These Senators shall be elected according to the rules and procedures established by the Colleges

Amended Text:

Section 4. Senate membership

4 1 2. Twenty-four senators shall be directly elected from their respective Colleges with twelve elected from the College of Arts and Sciences, seven from the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences, three from the College of Business and economics, and two from the College of Education. These Senators shall be elected according to the rules and procedures established by the Colleges

Rationale:

Under the current proposal, there would be a maximum of 72 faculty directly involved in university-level governance and decision-making. These 72 positions are distributed in three groupings, as follows:

A. 21 Voting Senators
   4 Senate Officers (elected as Senators)
   8 College representatives (elected as Senators)
   9 Chairs of all Standing Committees except for the Personnel Committee (elected to these Committees, then selected as Chair; hence, Senator via indirect election)

B. 7 Non-Voting Senators
   1 Fifth-year member of the Personnel Committee (elected to this Committee, automatically Senator in fifth year; hence, Senator via indirect election)
   6 non-elected administrators (ex officio Senators)

C. 44 Non-Chair Members of Standing Committees (non-Senators)
With respect to official decision-making power, the “voice of the faculty” will be vested in Group A -- the 21 voting Senators. Of these, only 12 (or 57%) will have been directly elected to their position by the faculty they are supposed to represent, whereas 9 (or 43%) will become Senators without benefit of direct election to the post. This seems an appropriately small and potentially unrepresentative body to speak in behalf of the entire faculty.

The amendment increases the number of voting Senators to 37, where 28 (or 76%) will be directly elected to their position. The amendment, thus, ensures a more representative decision-making body, offsetting year-to-year changes with respect to Chairships of the Standing Committees. Also, a Senate comprised of approximately one-tenth of the faculty as voting members inspires more trust that its decisions will be based on generally persuasive arguments rather than agreements made in the small-group confines of Committees.

Respectfully submitted by
John Gatewood

P.S. The amendment’s allocation of twenty-four “College representatives” mirrors the original proposal’s proportions, i.e., each college’s numbers are simply multiplied by three. Whether these proportions among colleges achieve an appropriate representation is another matter.
Section 11.5

Rationale:

All activities for academic credit should be within the oversight of either the Committee on Educational Policy of the Graduate and Research Committee. Furthermore, issues of resource allocation should be handled as they are now with input as necessary from the Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee and the Committee on Educational Policy or the Graduate and Research Committee.

Delete paragraphs 11.5, 11.5.1, and 11.5.2 and renumber paragraphs 11.6 to 11.5 etc. In addition, Section 8 in the listing of committees in the Academic Affairs Area delete the line containing “Special Programs.”

Current Wording:

11.5. The Special Programs Policy Committee is responsible for oversight of academic policy pertaining to the Office of Summer Studies, the Office of International Education, the Iacocca Institute, Integrated Learning Experience, continuing education and distance education, and any other nontraditional academic programs. The Committee is responsible for oversight of nontraditional programs’ academic policy, including the integration of each program into the educational mission of the University, mechanisms for formation or termination of special, nontraditional or alternative educational programs, and coordination with all advisory boards of University special programs. Policy proposals and recommendations are referred to the Senate for approval.

11.5.1. The Committee consists of five elected Faculty members and five ex officio members. The Faculty members are elected to three-year, staggered terms with two elected from the College of Arts and Sciences and one from each of the remaining three Colleges. The ex officio voting members are the Vice Provost for Academic Administration, Director of Summer Studies and Distance Education, the Director of the Office of International Education, and the Executive Director of the Iacocca Institute. The Registrar is a non-voting ex officio member. The Chair serves as a Senator.

11.5.2. University ad hoc, advisory, or appointed committees dealing with related issues that include Faculty participation shall report regularly to the Special Programs Policy Committee. In all cases, matters of policy within Faculty jurisdiction and the domain of the Special Programs Policy Committee shall be referred to the Committee for consideration. [See also Section 15]
Substitute for the present sections 11.5 - 11.5.2, the following:

11.5 The Academic Affairs Executive consists of the chairs of the Graduate Policy, Research, and Undergraduate Policy committees. The Executive is responsible for coordinating the activities of the three committees to ensure that each is aware of the work of the others and that the committees work cooperatively. In addition, the Executive is responsible for seeing that findings, recommendations, and proposed actions are directed for consideration by the appropriate committee(s).

11.5.1 Proposed actions from the Office of Summer Studies, the Office of International Education, the Iacocca Institute, the Integrated Learning Experience, Continuing Education, Distance Education, and any other non-traditional academic program are directed to the Academic Affairs Executive for appropriate coordination, if any proposed action (1) affects either academic policy or the granting of academic credit, (2) has direct implications for research at Lehigh, or (3) materially affects the portion of the budget available for, or dedicated to, support of academic programs.

11.5.2 When university-level task forces are formed (under provisions of section 15) to address issues related to Undergraduate Policy, Graduate Policy, or Research, and such task forces’ findings or recommendations are germane to the responsibilities of one of more of the three committees, such recommendations are submitted to the Academic Affairs Executive. The Executive, in turn, decides how best to coordinate the appropriate consideration of such findings and recommendations and has the authority to convene joint meetings of their committees as appropriate.
AMENDMENT I. Budget: Position of Director of Institutional Research. This amendment addresses the issue of effective faculty input into institutional planning and financial operations. It creates a position of Director of Institutional Research accountable directly to the Faculty Senate. The primary responsibility of the Director is to maintain continuous contact with appropriate administrative units throughout the budget-building and planning process in order to keep the faculty knowledgeable of the budget and institutional trends. The Director does not negotiate for the faculty, but assists the faculty in their discussions and negotiations. In addition, the Director oversees data collection and analysis designed to assist faculty input on matters of planning, budget, and salaries and benefits.

The Current proposal reads as follows:

13.3.2 The [Univ. Planning and Operations] Committee represents the concerns and priorities of the Faculty regarding the budget and long-range financial planning of the University throughout the budgetary and planning processes. To this end, the Committee may appoint liaisons, from its own members or the Faculty, in consultation with the Steering Committee, to the appropriate administrative committees, councils, task forces, or working groups.

The Amended proposal would read (italics = new language):

[7 1.2 Following appropriate University procedures, the Senate shall hire a full-time Director of Institutional Research to serve at the behest of the Senate as a whole. The Director of Institutional Research will oversee and direct institutional data collection and analysis to assist the work of Senate Committees, particularly in the area of University planning and financial operations. The Director is directly responsible to the Senate Chair who will work with the University Planning and Operations Committee and other committee chairs. In addition to a salaried Director position, the Senate may seek up to two Graduate Assistantships to help facilitate data analysis request by the Senate.]

13.3.2 The Committee represents the concerns and priorities of the Faculty regarding the budget and long-range planning of the University throughout the budgetary and planning processes. In this regard, the Senate's Director of Institutional Research will be in continuous communication with appropriate administrative committees, councils, task forces, or working groups in order to facilitate the work of the Committee. The Director will accompany the Committee chair, or any appointed faculty liaisons to meetings of these groups, and will report to the University Planning and Operations Committee and the Senate as a whole. The Director will also assist the Committee in reporting to the faculty at large on budgetary concerns.
Rationale:

Much attention has been given to the inadequate faculty role in university planning and financial operations over the years. Most recently, new faculty "input" has been solicited by the Provost and Deans. However, absent a clear understanding of budget figures and trends, faculty are unable to do more than suggest general recommendations for "directions" the budget should emphasize -- recommendations that are easily lost in the day-to-day process of budget-building. While continuing as full-time faculty, past chairs of the Financial Planning and Operations Committee have devoted enormous time and energy to this effort; yet without being able to devote the bulk of their time to the budget and planning process, their impact on the process has been limited. Most of the faculty are left to grumble about the "inappropriate" budgetary priorities of the university. The position of the Director of Institutional Research would facilitate the education of faculty on budgetary and planning matters, helping to fill in past trends, current details and nuances of budget recommendations developing within the administrative branch. The Director would, in effect, be an advisor to the Senate, and thus to the faculty as a whole -- directly accountable to the Senate.

Some will object to anyone new being hired in a non-faculty position. However, by comparison with the recent growth in the public/community relations area, this relatively modest budgetary increment would seem to be well-justified by the potential and unique contribution it can make to the faculty's collective voice in university governance.

AMENDMENT II. Budget: Faculty Partnership on the Budget: This amendment aims at providing the faculty with a degree of leverage in discussing budgetary priorities with the administration by empowering the Senate to submit its own independent Budget Report -- affirmation of, comment on, or dissent from the administration's Budget to the Board of Trustees. Nothing in this proposal changes the actual authority the administration has in bringing its University budget to the Board of Trustees. A primary aim of the independent report is to provide a political incentive for the administration to work more closely with the Senate during budget-building and financial planning -- i.e., to heed the institutional concerns of faculty in the course of planning and budget-building. With good faith on both sides, this incentive should help to produce a true budget partnership.

The Current proposal reads as follows:

[10.3. The Steering Committee coordinates the Senate's and its standing committee's review of the annual University Operating Plan and Budget. The Senate may submit written comments to the administration and the Board of Trustees. The Steering Committee relies on the Administration for timely access to draft versions of the Plan and Budget, including projected budgets, to allow meaningful consideration (this remains in the new proposal).]

13.3 The University Planning and Operations Committee represents the concerns of the faculty regarding the annual budget and long-range financial planning to the President, Provost, and Vice President for finance and administration. 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. To this end, the Committee works in direct and active partnership with the administration to define and achieve budgetary goals that reflect the educational mission of the University, establish development priorities, and foster improvements in the relationship between the University and its developing priorities, and foster improvements in the relationship between the University and its surrounding communities. Policy proposals and recommendations are referred to the Senate for approval.

At the end of 13.3, the following would be added:

In the course of each budget year and with the advice of the Director of Institutional Research, the Senate would respond to the developing budget, informing the administration of its objections and recommendations for changes. Prior to the annual Board meeting devoted to the budget, the Senate would consider a written report on the proposed administration budget. This report could take the form of an affirmation or approval of the budget, a commentary on points of difference, or a dissent from the proposed budget. This report would be submitted in writing to the Board for its consideration, with appropriate explanation and documentation. The Senate may seek to send a delegation to explain its report to the Board.
Rationale: To place the faculty in a true "partnership" position vis a vis the Administration requires not only faculty understanding of the budget and budgetary process, but an opportunity for the faculty to exercise its "voice" on budget and planning specifics before the Board. The aim of institutionalizing this voice is two-fold: (1) to provide the faculty with a degree of leverage vis a vis the administration --which would continue to hold full budget-building authority as delegated by the Board, and (2) to provide the Board with a broader base of information on budget needs and stresses in the University.
C. SPECIFIC CHANGES: These amendments propose specific, but not structural, changes.

AMENDMENT Faculty Deliberation and Senate Accountability This amendment calls for the Senate to develop electronic media that will enable the faculty voluntarily to become more engaged in issues of faculty policy and university governance.

The current proposal reads as follows:

3.1 The Senate and the Standing Committees shall actively solicit diverse Faculty opinion and knowledge.

Add to this:

The Senate shall develop network media for both communicating information effectively to the faculty and providing a forum for voluntary faculty discussion of on-going policy and governance issues. The latter may include creating conference boards or listserves.

Rationale: With the reduction in the numbers of faculty actively participating in policy-making at any given time, it becomes even more imperative that there be media for the faculty to converse with each other and their Senate representatives about matters of import.

To: Faculty Steering Committee
From: Bob Thornton

I would like to suggest two revisions to the draft constitution of the proposed faculty senate. In sections 3.2 and 3.4.1 I would like to see the minima for both an appeal and a faculty initiation of a referendum reduced to 25 voting faculty members, rather than the 40 currently proposed. By making both avenues somewhat less burdensome to initiate, I believe these changes would effectively increase potential faculty "voice."

Section 7.5 Delete the third sentence and change the wording of the last sentence.

Current Wording:

7.5 The Secretary of the Senate is elected directly by the Faculty and serves a term of three years. In the first year the Secretary serves as secretary-elect, working directly with the Secretary, attending all Senate meetings. The Secretary-Elect is not a voting member of the Senate. At the end of the one year term, the Secretary-elect becomes the Secretary and a voting member of the Senate for the remaining two years of the term.

Proposed Wording:

7.5 The Secretary of the Senate is elected directly by the Faculty and serves a term of three years. In the first year of that term, the Secretary serves as Secretary-Elect, working directly with the previously elected Secretary, attending all Senate meetings. At the end of that first year, the previously elected Secretary's term ends and the Secretary-Elect become the Secretary. At the end of the Secretary's second year, a new Secretary-Elect shall be elected.
Section 7.5.2 Add new section:
7.5.2 The Chair shall appoint a Senate Parliamentarian from among the elected members of the Senate.

Ronald J. Hartranft for Education Policy Committee

Section 11.2

Proposal is to delete the penultimate sentence and change the wording of the last 3 sentences.

Rationale: All activities for academic credit should be within the oversight of either the Committee on Educational Policy or the Graduate and Research Committee. The formal amendments to implement this involve two motions (11.2 and 11.3):

Current Wording:

The Undergraduate Educational Policy Committee is responsible for oversight of undergraduate academic policy and initiation of policies concerning the undergraduate educational mission of the University, the University undergraduate curriculum and long-range academic planning, and maintenance of the undergraduate academic rules and regulations. The Committee also is responsible for review of new undergraduate programs and program changes. Programs approved by this Committee shall be referred to the Senate for a vote. Approval of course changes is delegated to each College, with appropriate consultation with other colleges. Policy proposals and recommendations are referred to the Senate for approval.

Proposed Wording:

11.2 The Undergraduate Educational Policy Committee is responsible for oversight of undergraduate academic policy and initiation of policies concerning the undergraduate educational mission of the University, the University undergraduate curriculum and long-range academic planning, and maintenance of the undergraduate academic rules and regulations. The Committee also is responsible for review of new undergraduate programs and courses and program and course changes. Programs and courses approved by this Committee shall be referred to the Senate for a vote. Policy proposals and recommendations are referred to the Senate for approval.
11.3 Substitute for the present 11.3 & 11.3.1, the following (changes boldfaced):

11.3. The Graduate Policy Committee is responsible for oversight of graduate academic policy, including the graduate educational mission of the university. The responsibilities of the Committee include: developing general policies and regulations on graduate education and admissions; evaluating graduate programs and recommending mechanisms for formation and termination of graduate programs; reviewing new graduate programs and program changes submitted by the Colleges; maintaining graduate academic rules and regulations concerning degrees, student petitions, and appeals; and establishing policies for awarding fellowships and scholarships to graduate departments and programs. Approval of course changes is delegated to each College, with the understanding that such changes shall employ a commonly accepted form created by the Graduate Policy Committee and that Colleges shall consult one another when such course changes may affect programs in more than one College. The secretary of the Graduate Policy Committee shall distribute a copy of the common course change form to each program coordinator and department chair at the beginning of each academic year. Policy proposals and recommendations, including programs and program changes approved by the Committee, are referred to the Senate for approval.

11.3.1 The Committee consists of 12 elected faculty members and 7 ex officio members. The faculty from the Colleges are elected by their Colleges to three-year staggered terms with three representatives from each of the four Colleges. Ex officio voting members are the Provost and the Dean of the four Colleges. The Registrar and one graduate student selected by the Graduate Student Council are non-voting ex officio members. The Chair serves as a Senator.

Ronald J. Hartman for Education Policy Committee

Rationale: Proposal is to delete the penultimate sentence beginning with “Approval of course changes is delegated ...” and change the wording of the last 2 sentences.

Current Wording:

11.3. The Graduate Policy Committee is responsible for oversight of graduate academic policy, including the graduate educational mission of the University. The responsibilities of the Committee include developing general policies and regulations on graduate education, evaluating graduate programs and recommending mechanisms for formation or termination of graduate programs, reviewing new graduate programs and program changes submitted by the Colleges, maintaining graduate academic rules and regulations concerning degrees, student petitions, and appeals, and establishing policies for awarding fellowships and scholarships to graduate departments and programs. Approval of course changes is delegated to each College, with appropriate consultation with other colleges. Policy proposals and recommendations, including programs and program changes approved by the Committee are referred to the Senate for approval.

Proposed Wording:

11.3. The Graduate Policy Committee is responsible for oversight of graduate academic policy, including the graduate educational mission of the University. The responsibilities of the Committee include developing general policies and regulations on graduate education, evaluating graduate programs and recommending mechanisms for formation or termination of graduate programs, reviewing new graduate programs and courses and program and course changes submitted by the Colleges, maintaining graduate academic rules and regulations concerning degrees, student petitions, and appeals, and establishing policies for awarding fellowships and scholarships to graduate departments and programs. Policy proposals and recommendations, including programs and courses approved by the Committee are referred to the Senate for approval.
Size of FCC

a. Proposed language:

"13.2.2. The Committee consists of nine six Faculty members elected to three-year, staggered terms with two elected from the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Engineering and Applied Science, and Business and Economics; one from the College of Education each of the other three Colleges; and two one at-large members elected by the entire Faculty. At least one of the at-large members will be an who holds the rank of assistant professor at the time of election. The Chair is a senator."

b. Rationale:

There are several reasons that the FCC should maintain its current size. First, the FCC has a large workload because of the many different components of compensation. Second, the diversity of interests that accompanies a larger committee ensures that we consider the views of all the faculty. Third, the FCC is usually engaged in long-term discussions with the Administration on several issues at the same time. A smaller committee would force us to have only a single representative representing the faculty interests during some of these discussions. This would reduce the continuity and momentum of the FCC consultations with the Administration when there is the annual change in FCC membership. Finally, there is the issue of critical mass. When the FCC wants to bring an issue of importance to the faculty, having more FCC representatives seems to reduce the chances that the FCC will be viewed by the Faculty as another group engaged in special pleading.
LIBRARY USERS COMMITTEE
MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 1, 1997
TO: Hannah Stewart-Gambino
FROM: Ward Cates, Chair Library Users Committee (LUC)
RE: Modifications to proposed faculty senate proposal sections dealing with Information Resources Committee (presently listed as "Library, Computing, and Network Committee")
CC: Arnold Hirshon, Vice-Provost for Information Resources

In keeping with your requests to faculty committees, the LUC is submitting the following changes to the Faculty Senate Proposal. Once again, the dynamic tension between the need for representative membership and small size continues. After much discussion, the LUC voted for the membership described below, thus endorsing larger membership.

=====================
Change # 1: Rename the proposed "Library, Computing, and Network Committee" to the "Information Resources Committee"

Change # 2: Reassign the committee from the "Committees of the Financial Affairs Area" (which is referred to elsewhere in the document as the "Committees of the Planning and Budget Area") to the "Committees of the Academic Affairs Area."

Renumber the section from 13.4 (etc.), which was appropriate to the "Financial Affairs" committees to become a new section 11.7 (etc.) [immediately following the "Faculty Personnel Committee] so it becomes part of the "Committees of the Academic Affairs Area."

Change # 3: Substitute the following in their entirety for the current sections 13.4, 13.4.1, and 13.4.2

11.7.1 [replaces 13.4.1] The Information Resources Committee (IRC) represents faculty concerns in the development of the university's information resources (libraries, computing, telecommunications, media services) as a resource of the academic community. The committee recommends ways and means by which Information Resources may serve the needs of the students and faculty. The committee may establish ad hoc task forces and subgroups as it deems appropriate. Policy proposals and recommendations are referred to the Senate for approval.

11.7.1.1 [replaces 13.4.1] The Committee consists of eight faculty (two per college, one chosen for interest and experience in library matters, the other for interest and experience in computing and technology), and three ex-officio members. The Vice Provost for Information Resources serves as an ex-officio voting member of the committee. Non-voting ex-officio members include two students (one graduate appointed by the Graduate Student Council and one undergraduate appointed by the Student Senate). Faculty members are elected to three-year, staggered terms, and are ineligible for re-election until after a full academic year's absence. Student members serve one-year terms. The chair, who will serve as a Senator, is elected from among the committee's faculty members by vote of the voting members.

11.7.2 [replaces 13.4.2] Proposals developed by faculty ad hoc, advisory, or appointed committees that relate to information resources shall be submitted to the Information Resources Committee for consideration.
D. ALTERNATIVE MODEL

AMENDMENT III. Senate Size and Membership. This amendment reflects the view that the proposed Senate is too small and essentially delegates the Faculty's legislative authority over to a somewhat enlarged Faculty Steering Committee. The amendment shares John Gatewood's rationale for a larger Senate, but provides an alternative structural model for faculty governance. It is offered in the hope that the three models--Draft Constitution, the Gatewood proposal, and this proposal--can be considered "side-by-side" by the Committee of the Whole. Whereas the Gatewood proposal gives and enlarged Senate a kind of "jury" function—elected Senators consider all legislation brought to them as "stand-ins" for the faculty-at-large, this proposal enlarges the Senate by transforming its (larger) membership into a legislative body with an appropriate committee structure.

Summary: The proposal tries to distinguish structurally and procedurally between legislative, "partnership", and advisory functions of the faculty. Specifically, it incorporates the primary legislative and policy-partnership committees into the Senate, while leaving other special-function committees (Personnel and FCC) as largely autonomous faculty committees that report to the Senate. Second, it deletes the Student Life committees created in the proposed Senate, leaving the ad hoc and advisory committees reporting to the Senate as a whole.

This proposal makes the following changes in the proposed R&P text:

The Current proposal reads as follows:

1.2 The Faculty has primary responsibility for all matters concerning academic, educational, and research policy as well as academic freedom. Exercise of this responsibility requires active participation in institutional planning and financial management.

The new proposal reads as follows (italics = new language):

1.2 The Faculty has primary legislative responsibility for all matters concerning academic, educational, and research policy as well as academic freedom. These functions are designated as the faculty's jurisdiction, subject to approval by the Board of Trustees. Effective exercise of this responsibility requires that the faculty participate as active partners with the appropriate administrative entities in matters of institutional planning and financial management. These functions are designated as the Administration's jurisdiction, subject to approval by the Board of Trustees.

4.1 The Senate shall consist of a representative from each Standing Committee, directly elected College representatives, and four Senate officers. The President, Provost, and the Deans of each College are ex officio non-voting members. Terms begin July 1.

4.1.1 The Chair of each Senate Standing Committee shall serve as a senator in the Senate unless otherwise provided in the Committee descriptions.

4.1 The Senate shall consist of the elected members of the following committees: Undergraduate Educational Policy, Graduate Policy, University Operations and Planning, Information Resources [different title], Research Oversight, and Special Programs, directly elected College representatives; four Senate officers; the fifth-year member of the Faculty Personnel Committee; and the chairperson of the Faculty Compensation Committee. The President, Provost, and the Deans of each College are ex officio non-voting members. Terms begin July 1.

4.1.1 eliminated
8.1 The Committees of the Senate shall be a Steering Committee and the following Standing Committees grouped into Areas: Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Planning and Budget.

Committees of the Academic Affairs Area:
Undergraduate Educational Policy
Graduate Policy
Research Oversight
Special Programs
Faculty Personnel

Committees of the Student Affairs Area:
Student Life
Student Academic Life

Committees of the Planning and Budget Area:
Faculty Compensation
University Operations and Planning
Library, Computing, and Network

9.2 Senate Areas are designed to facilitate greater coordination among the Standing Committees with related or sometimes overlapping charges. To this end, the Chairs of the Standing Committees within each Area are expected to meet periodically as needed.

11.1 The Committees of Academic Affairs....

11.2.1; 11.3.1; 11.4.1; 11.5.1

Section 13 Planning and Budget Area
13.1 The Committees of Planning and Budget are responsible for coordinating information and recommendations concerning the Faculty participation in budgetary and financial planning, reporting the financial and budgetary concerns of the University to the Senate and Faculty at large, and presenting Faculty proposals and recommendations to the administration.

13.3.1; 13.4.1

Section 12 Planning and Budget Area
13.1 The Committees of Planning and Budget are responsible for coordinating information and recommendations concerning the Faculty participation in budgetary and financial planning (including admissions and financial aid), reporting the financial and budgetary concerns of the University to the Senate and Faculty at large, and presenting Faculty proposals and recommendations to the administration.

eliminate the phrase "The Chair is a Senator."

eliminate this provision

eliminate this section

eliminate "The Chair serves as Senator."

8.1 The Senate will organize itself into a Steering Committee, Standing Policy Committees, and ad hoc Committees as deemed appropriate by the Senate membership or the faculty at large. The Standing Policy Committees are grouped as: Legislative and Policy-Partnership Committees. The Faculty Personnel Committee and the Faculty Compensation Committees will continue to exist as independent entities, reporting regularly to the Senate (and Faculty) through their Senate representatives.

Legislative Committees:
Undergraduate Educational Policy
Graduate Policy

Policy-Partnership Committees:
University Operations and Planning
Library, Computing, and Network
Research Oversight
Special Programs
Section 12 Student Affairs Area

Section 13 Student Life [This entire section is changed to:

12.1 All matters of student life concerned with academic, residential, and extracurricular activities shall be accessible to Senate input. University ad hoc, advisory, or appointed committees dealing with related issues that include Faculty participation shall report regularly to the Senate. Non-academic disciplinary and appeals boards shall report regularly to the Senate. In all cases, matters of policy within Faculty jurisdiction shall be referred to the appropriate Senate committees for consideration.

12.2 The Faculty are responsible for oversight of academically related matters of student life that include policy on both undergraduate and disciplinary appeals, academic calendar, student academic awards and prizes, prestigious scholarships, visiting lecturers, and honorary degrees. Policy proposals and recommendations are referred to the Senate for approval.

12.2.1 University ad hoc, advisory or appointed committees dealing with related issues that include Faculty participation shall report regularly to the Senate. Academic Disciplinary and Appeals boards that include Faculty participation shall report regularly to the Senate. In all cases, matters of policy within Faculty jurisdiction shall be referred to the Senate for consideration.

Rationale:

This change represents an effort to develop a Faculty Senate more coherently organized around the principal areas of faculty governance and policy input. It re-organizes areas of jurisdiction in a way that (a) distinguishes more sharply among legislative, policy-partnership, and advisory functions, (b) emphasizes the most important policy and planning areas of the university as a whole by incorporating these into the Faculty Senate. By conceptualizing the primary policy-related committees as the Senate (along with the four faculty-elected officers, and the eight college representatives), this proposed structure reflects the reality that academic policy, university planning, and budgetary concerns are significantly inter-related. With the assistance of a Director of Institutional Research (Amendment #1 above), the Senate would be positioned to assert a more effective voice in the overall governance of the University, instead of the current balkanization of policy-making and the too-often ineffective reaction to planning and policy decisions that are virtually final.

Clearly, such a change requires a larger Senate, reflecting the diverse constituencies of the University.
However, it should be noted that the fewer total faculty members are involved in the relevant decision-making committees (including the Senate) in this proposal, as compared to either the Draft constitution or the Gatewood proposal—as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Draft</th>
<th>Morgan</th>
<th>Gatewood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate Officers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected College Senators</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Committees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Senator Standing Committees</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FACULTY</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These changes underscore the importance of improved representation and deliberation—better accountability of elected representatives to the faculty as a whole and more fruitful faculty-wide discussion of significant concerns (see Amendment #4).

***************
Proposed Revision Of Faculty Governance  
Draft of 2 July 1997  

Preamble  
The Faculty has authority and responsibility for policies affecting the academic life of the University and shares with the University administration the task of formulating policies and procedures that govern the present and future operation of the institution. To exercise its authority and responsibilities effectively and efficiently, the Faculty hereby creates a Senate to accomplish the following specific ends:

- To speak with a coherent, although not necessarily unanimous, voice on all matters germane to its role in the shared governance of the institution;
- To represent Faculty opinion on matters affecting the academic process and governance of the University, the welfare of the Faculty, financial planning, and student life;
- To preserve academic freedom in academic and instructional matters;
- To preserve the Faculty’s rights to participate in policy-making and other institutional decision-making processes;
- To initiate proposals for University policy, procedures, and development;
- To consider proposals, initiated by administrative officers and other groups within the University, that require Faculty advice and consent, or other appropriate actions.

In discharging these responsibilities, the Senate pledges itself to reach conclusions based on responsible research and open discussion, to represent the diversity of Faculty knowledge and opinion, and to participate with good faith and cooperation in the shared governance of the University.

Section 1. Faculty  
1.1. The voting members of the Lehigh Faculty (hereafter the Faculty) are those with the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. Instructors with full-time academic appointments in teaching and research are also voting members of the Faculty, provided that they are not candidates for Lehigh degrees. Also included as voting Faculty members are the President, Provost, and the Deans of each College. Adjunct, part-time (unless tenured), lecturers, and visiting members of the instructional or research staff are not voting members of the Faculty.

1.2. The Faculty has primary responsibility for all matters concerning academic, educational, and research policy as well as academic freedom. Exercise of this responsibility requires active participation in institutional planning and financial management.

Section 2. Faculty Senate  
2.1. Jurisdiction: The Faculty delegates its legislative authority and responsibilities to a representative body called the Lehigh Faculty Senate (hereafter the Senate), with the following qualifications:

- Faculty representatives to the Senate and members of the Standing Committees are elected by the Faculty, normally in the Spring of each year.
- The Faculty at any time may redefine the powers of the Senate by a majority vote. (See sections 3 and 18)
• The Faculty may review and reverse by a majority vote any action of the Senate. [See Section 3]

• Regular meetings of the entire Faculty will be held at least once a semester. Special sessions of the entire Faculty may be called by the Steering Committee of the Senate or by request of at least 40 of the Faculty. [See Section 5]

With these limitations, the Senate exercises the powers vested in the Faculty concerning all matters of academic, educational, and research policy, including instruction, student affairs and discipline, degree requirements, admission, registration, awarding of degrees, catalogue changes, academic calendar, Faculty personnel policy, and academic freedom. The Senate receives and acts upon reports and proposals of Faculty Standing, ad hoc, and advisory committees. It may also conduct studies and investigations, appoint ad hoc committees, request reports from administrative officers, initiate legislation, and act on recommendations made to it by other groups within the University.

2.2 All legislation of the Faculty and its Senate is subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees as prescribed in section 6.1 of Regulations & Procedures (hereafter R & P).

2.3 The President or Provost shall act on any Senate recommendations to the President within a reasonable time. If the President dissents from a Senate recommendation, such disagreement normally is communicated to the Senate at the Senate meeting following the recommendation.

2.3.1 If disagreement about a Senate’s recommendation arises, the Senate Steering Committee and the appropriate committee Chair meet with the President or Provost to resolve the disagreement. In the case of an unresolved disagreement between the President and the Senate, the issue or action may be referred to the Board of Trustees by either party or both parties acting in concert. Any such referral to the Board of Trustees is accompanied by reports of the interested parties and, upon request, by a meeting of Senate representatives with any committee of the Board of Trustees that grants such a request.

2.4. The President or Provost may not act on proposals within the jurisdiction of the Senate [see 2.1.] without the approval of the Senate.

2.4.1 If disagreement about the Senate’s or the administration’s jurisdiction arises, the Senate Steering Committee and the appropriate committee Chair shall meet with the President or Provost to resolve the disagreement. In the case of an unresolved disagreement between the President and the Senate, the issue may be referred to the Board of Trustees by either party or by both parties acting in concert. Any such referral to the Board of Trustees is accompanied by reports of the interested parties and, upon request, by a meeting of Senate representatives with any committee of the Board of Trustees that grants such a request.

Section 3. Accountability to the Faculty
3.1 The Senate and the Standing Committees shall actively solicit diverse Faculty opinion and knowledge.

3.2 The Faculty may appeal any action of the Senate to the Faculty as a whole. An appeal must be submitted in writing to the Senate within 14 calendar days of the distribution of the Senate minutes reporting the Senate action and must be endorsed by a minimum of 40 voting Faculty members. The Senate shall schedule a Faculty meeting for the purpose of deliberating and voting on the appeal within four weeks of receipt of the appeal. A majority vote of the Faculty present can approve, amend, or rescind the Senate action. A quorum consists of the voting members of the Faculty present unless challenged, whereupon a quorum shall consist, during the remainder of the meeting, of one-third of the total voting members of the Faculty (not including those on leave).

3.3. The Faculty may at any time redefine the powers of the Senate [see Section 18]
3.4. On issues of broad University concern, the Senate may initiate a referendum. The Faculty may also initiate a referendum to bring issues to the attention of the Senate.

3.4.1. The Senate initiates a referendum by a majority vote. The Faculty initiates a referendum by a letter to the Steering Committee bearing the signatures of 40 or more voting Faculty members. Upon receipt of an application for a referendum, the Steering Committee shall schedule a Faculty meeting for the purpose of deliberating the referendum within four weeks of receipt of the referendum.

3.4.2. A referendum submitted to the Faculty takes the form of a resolution to be approved or rejected and contains the exact wording of the resolution that is to be put to a vote.

3.4.3. Each referendum is conducted by written ballot after a Faculty meeting is called to discuss the referendum. Ballots are distributed to all members of the Faculty at least fifteen days before the date set for returning them to the Secretary of the Senate. [see Section 7.1.1]

3.4.4. A resolution submitted to a referendum is approved if it receives the affirmative votes of a majority of those voting, provided that the total votes constitute no less than one half of the membership of the Faculty not including those on leave.

Section 4. Senate Membership
4.1. The Senate shall consist of a representative from each Standing Committee, directly elected College representatives, and four Senate officers. The President, Provost, and the Dean of each College are ex officio non-voting members. Terms begin July 1.

4.1.1. The Chair of each Senate Standing Committee shall serve as a senator in the Senate unless otherwise provided in the Committee descriptions.

4.1.2. Eight senators shall be directly elected from their respective Colleges with three elected from the College of Arts and Sciences, two from the College of Engineering and Applied Science, two from the College of Business and Economics, and one from the College of Education. These Senators shall be elected according to rules and procedures established by the Colleges.

4.1.2.1. Senators directly elected by the Colleges shall serve three-year staggered terms, unless otherwise noted in the Constitution. Any senator who has served a full three-year term is ineligible for re-election until after a full academic year’s absence from the Senate.

4.1.2.2. A vacancy occurs when any Senate member misses three consecutive meetings. That person’s constituency shall replace the former senator with a new election during the Spring University elections. Until that time, the Senate Chair appoints a faculty member to fill the vacancy in consultation with the appropriate constituency.

4.2. Senators elected from the Colleges may be appointed to Standing, ad hoc, or advisory committees by the Chair of the Senate.

Section 5. Faculty Meetings
5.1. The Senate shall call at least one general Faculty meeting each semester. The parliamentary authority for the Lehigh University Faculty meetings is Robert’s Rules of Order, Revised.

5.1.1. The agenda of the Faculty Meeting, set by the Senate Steering Committee, shall include reports from the Senate Standing Committees and any resolutions that the Steering Committee brings to the Faculty for a
vote. The President, Provost and the Dean of each College may request that items be placed on the agenda of the Faculty meetings.

5.2. The President, Provost and the Dean of each College are expected to participate in all general Faculty meetings. The President, Provost and the Dean of each College may be asked to make reports to the Faculty.

5.2.1. The Chair of the Senate shall chair Faculty meetings called by the Senate. In the case of the Chair of the Senate’s absence, the past-Chair of the Senate shall preside. In the event of the past-Chair’s absence, the chair-elect shall preside.

5.2.2. At Faculty meetings, Faculty members may refer issues to the Senate for consideration, make recommendations to the Senate, or vote to initiate an appeal, a referendum, or an amendment to the Senate Constitution (see Section 3).

Section 6. Senate Meetings
6.1. The Senate shall meet monthly during the academic year. Special meetings may also be called. The parliamentary authority for the Lehigh University Senate meetings is Robert’s Rules of Order revised.

6.2. Meetings shall be open, with all Faculty (see Section 1) who are not senators having full voice, but no vote.

6.3. A notice of meetings and the agenda shall be sent by the Faculty Secretary by letter or electronic mail to all Faculty ten calendar days before the scheduled Senate meeting.

6.4. The Steering Committee of the Senate shall set the agenda, which may include items referred from the Standing Committees, Faculty, the President, Provost or Dean of each College, the corporate secretary of the Board of Trustees, or other University groups.

6.5. A quorum of seventy-five percent of the voting membership of the Senate is required for a vote to be taken on any resolution.

6.6. The Secretary of the Senate is responsible for reporting the minutes of Senate meeting to all Faculty, the President, Provost, Deans of Colleges and The Board of Trustees in writing within ten working days (see Section 7.5.1).

Section 7. Officers of the Senate
7.1. The Senate officers are the Chair-Elect, the Chair, the immediate past Chair, and the Secretary of the Faculty. The Chair-Elect and the Secretary are directly elected by the Faculty.

7.2. The Chair-Elect shall be elected directly by the Faculty and serves a term of one year as chair-elect.

7.2.1. The responsibilities of the Chair-Elect include representing the Senate Chair as a liaison to Standing Committees of the Senate as the Chair may direct. The Chair-Elect is also responsible for maintaining and moderating electronic means for Faculty discussion of issues before the Senate and communication with the Senate, Steering Committee, or Standing Committees.

7.3. At the end of the one-year term, the Chair-Elect becomes the Senate Chair and serves as Chair for one year.

7.3.1. The responsibilities of the Chair include chairing meetings of the Steering Committee, Senate, and
Faculty. The Chair serves as the chief liaison between the Faculty and the administration and between the Standing Committees and the Senate. The Chair also represents the Faculty at meetings of the Board of Trustees.

7.4. At the end of the one-year term, the Chair becomes the past Chair and serves as such for one year.

7.4.1. The responsibilities of the past Chair include chairing meetings of the Steering Committee, Senate, or Faculty in the absence of the Chair. The past Chair may also act as liaison between the Faculty and the administration and between the Standing Committees and the Senate as the Chair may direct. The past Chair also represents the Faculty at meetings of the Board of Trustees.

7.4.2. At the end of the one-year term, the past Chair is ineligible for re-election to the Senate or Senate office for a period of one year.

7.5. The Secretary of the Senate is elected directly by the Faculty and serves a term of three years. In the first year the Secretary serves as secretary-elect, working directly with the Secretary, attending all Senate meetings. The Secretary-Elect is not a voting member of the Senate. At the end of the one-year term, the Secretary-elect becomes the Secretary and a voting member of the Senate for the remaining two years of the term.

7.5.1. The Secretary is responsible for sending the Senate agenda and minutes to the Faculty, President, Provost, Vice Provosts, Deans of each College and the Board of Trustees, maintaining the current faculty census, supervising all votes of the Senate, updating Faculty Rules and Procedures, and monitoring the number necessary for quorum for both Faculty and Senate meetings. The Secretary, working with the Nominations Committees of each College, supervises all Senate and Standing Committee elections.

Section 8. Senate Committees

8.1. The Committees of the Senate shall be a Steering Committee and the following Standing Committees grouped into Areas: Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Planning and Budget.

Committees of the Academic Affairs Area:
Undergraduate Educational Policy
Graduate Policy
Research Oversight
Special Programs
Faculty Personnel

Committees of the Student Affairs Area:
Student Life
Student Academic Life

Committees of the Planning and Budget Area:
Faculty Compensation
University Operations and Planning
Library, Computing and Network

Section 9. Membership of Standing Committees

9.1. Members of the Standing Committees shall include voting Faculty elected by Colleges or University Faculty as specified below, and in some cases selected members of the University administration, staff, and student body.
9.2 Senate Areas are designed to facilitate greater coordination among the Standing Committees with related or sometimes overlapping charges. To this end, the Chairs of the Standing Committees within each Area are expected to meet periodically as needed.

Section 10. Steering Committee

10.1. The Steering Committee is responsible for administering the business and activities of the Senate. This responsibility includes coordinating the Standing Committees of the Senate, steering issues that arise from either the Faculty or administration to the appropriate committee for consideration, anticipating Faculty concerns that otherwise might not reach the committees for consideration, working with the President and the Board of Trustees to resolve contentious issues and disagreements, and in consultation with the Standing Committee Chairs, Chairs of Senate ad hoc committees, Deans, Provost, Vice Provosts, and President, setting the agenda for Senate meetings and the Faculty meetings. The Steering Committee calls votes on Referenda. [See Section 3.4]

10.2. The steering committee consists of the Chair, Chair-Elect, Past-Chair of the Senate, and Secretary of the Senate.

10.3 The Steering Committee coordinates the Senate's and its standing committees' review of the annual University Operating Plan and Budget. The Senate may submit written comments to the administration and the Board of Trustees. The Steering Committee relies on the Administration for timely access to draft versions of the Plan and Budget, including projected budgets, to allow meaningful consideration.

10.4. The President, Provost, Vice Provosts, and the Dean of each College may make recommendations to the Steering Committee concerning matters within the jurisdiction of the Senate.

Section 11. Academic Affairs Area

11.1. The Committees of Academic Affairs are responsible for oversight of the educational mission of the University. Their responsibilities include oversight and coordination of long-range educational and academic planning and policy, oversight of University policies which affect the research activities of the University, and oversight of faculty personnel policy.

11.2. The Undergraduate Educational Policy Committee is responsible for oversight of undergraduate academic policy and initiation of policies concerning the undergraduate educational mission of the University, the University undergraduate curriculum and long-range academic planning, and maintenance of the undergraduate academic rules and regulations. The Committee also is responsible for review of new undergraduate programs and program changes. Programs approved by this Committee shall be referred to the Senate for a vote. Approval of course changes is delegated to each College, with appropriate consultation with other colleges. Policy proposals and recommendations are referred to the Senate for approval.

11.2.1. The Committee consists of seven members of the Faculty and eight ex officio members. The seven Faculty members shall be elected to three year staggered terms by their respective Colleges with two elected from the College of Arts and Sciences, two from the College of Engineering and Applied Science, two from the College of Business and Economics, and one from the College of Education. Ex officio voting members are the Provost and the Dean of each College. The Registrar and two undergraduates selected by the Student Senate are ex officio non-voting members. The Chair serves as a Senator.

11.2.2. University ad hoc, advisory, or appointed committees dealing with related issues that include Faculty participation, such as the Standing of Students committee, shall report regularly to the Undergraduate Educational Policy Committee. In all cases, matters of policy within faculty jurisdiction and the domain of the Undergraduate Educational Policy Committee shall be referred to the Committee for
11.3. The **Graduate Policy Committee** is responsible for oversight of graduate academic policy, including the graduate educational mission of the University. The responsibilities of the Committee include developing general policies and regulations on graduate education, evaluating graduate programs and recommending mechanisms for formation or termination of graduate programs, reviewing new graduate programs and program changes submitted by the Colleges, maintaining graduate academic rules and regulations concerning degrees, student petitions, and appeals, and establishing policies for awarding fellowships and scholarships to graduate departments and programs. Approval of course changes is delegated to each College, with appropriate consultation with other colleges. Policy proposals and recommendations, including programs and program changes approved by the Committee, are referred to the Senate for approval.

11.3.1. The committee consists of six elected Faculty members, six *ex officio* members, and one student member. The Faculty shall be elected by their Colleges to three-year, staggered terms with two each elected from the College of Arts and Sciences and College of Engineering and Applied Science and one from each of the other two Colleges. *Ex officio* voting members are the Provost and the Dean of each College. The Registrar and one graduate student selected by the Graduate Student Council are non-voting *ex officio* members. The Chair serves as Senator.

11.3.2. University *ad hoc*, advisory, or appointed committees dealing with related issues that include Faculty participation shall report regularly to the Graduate Policy Committee. In all cases, matters of policy within Faculty jurisdiction and the domain of the Graduate Policy Committee shall be referred to the Committee for consideration. [See also Section 15]

11.4. The **Research Committee** is responsible for oversight of all University policies that affect Faculty research activities. The Committee's responsibility includes oversight of University policies concerning sponsored and unsponsored research, long-range planning, recommending approval for formation or termination of research centers and institutes, recommending policies and procedures for coordinating research-related activities, and recommending policies and procedures to stimulate and satisfy research aspirations of the Faculty. Policy proposals and recommendations are referred to the Senate for approval.

11.4.1. The Committee consists of six elected Faculty members and six *ex officio* members. The Faculty are elected to three-year, staggered terms, with two elected from each of the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Engineering and Applied Science and one from each of the other two Colleges. The *ex officio* voting members are the Provost, the Dean of each College, and the Assistant Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs. The director of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs is a non-voting *ex officio* member. The Chair serves as a Senator.

11.4.2. University *ad hoc*, advisory, or appointed committees dealing with related issues that include Faculty participation shall report regularly to the Research Committee. In all cases, matters of policy within Faculty jurisdiction and the domain of the Research Committee shall be referred to the Committee for consideration. [See also Section 15]

11.5. The **Special Programs Policy Committee** is responsible for oversight of academic policy pertaining to the Office of Summer Studies, the Office of International Education, the Iacocca Institute, Integrated Learning Experience, continuing education and distance education, and any other nontraditional academic programs. The Committee is responsible for oversight of nontraditional programs' academic policy, including the integration of each program into the educational mission of the University, mechanisms for formation or termination of special, nontraditional or alternative educational programs, and coordination with all advisory boards of University special programs. Policy proposals and recommendations are
referred to the Senate for approval.

11.5.1 The Committee consists of five elected Faculty members and five \textit{ex officio} members. The Faculty members are elected to three-year, staggered terms with two elected from the College of Arts and Sciences and one from each of the remaining three Colleges. The \textit{ex officio} voting members are the Vice Provost for Academic Administration, Director of Summer Studies and Distance Education, the Director of the Office of International Education, and the Executive Director of the Iacocca Institute. The Registrar is a non-voting \textit{ex officio} member. The Chair serves as a Senator.

11.5.2 University \textit{ad hoc}, advisory, or appointed committees dealing with related issues that include Faculty participation shall report regularly to the Special Programs Policy Committee. In all cases, matters of policy within Faculty jurisdiction and the domain of the Special Programs Policy Committee shall be referred to the Committee for consideration. [See also Section 15]

11.6. The Faculty Personnel Committee The Personnel Committee serves both adjudicative and legislative roles. In its adjudicative role, the committee conducts hearings and investigations related to faculty personnel matters, including appeals of decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion; charges of improper conduct; and complaints about violations of academic freedom or improper procedures related to faculty conditions of employment. In its legislative or governance role, the Personnel Committee is responsible primarily for oversight of University policies and procedures pertaining to appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion; academic freedom; affirmative action; and sexual harassment.

11.6.1 The Committee is composed of five tenured faculty members, each serving a five-year term on a staggered basis, and each elected by the university faculty. Four members are elected to represent the four colleges; these members must be at the rank of professor. The fifth member, elected at-large by the university faculty, must be an associate professor at the time of his/her election to the committee. A faculty member may not be re-elected to a second full term. The fourth-year member of the committee normally serves as chair of the committee. The fifth-year member of the committee normally serves as a \textit{ex officio} Senator in the Faculty Senate.

11.6.2 In its legislative or governance role, the Faculty Personnel Committee is responsible primarily for oversight of policies and procedures pertaining to faculty appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, academic freedom, affirmative action, and sexual harassment.

11.6.2.1 The Committee always advises the Board of Trustees on an appointment to the office of President and the office of Vice President and Provost.

11.6.2.2. Whenever an appointment is to be made to an academic or research position at the rank of the Dean of each college or above without advertising the vacancy and/or without using a search committee, the Committee will render advice to the President. Such positions include but are not limited to the Dean of each college, Vice Provosts, Assistant and Associate Provosts; because titles and responsibilities may change, this list is meant to be representative rather than exhaustive.

11.6.2.3. The Committee is authorized to make inquiries which are necessary in order to carry out all of the duties described above.

11.6.3. In its adjudicative role, the Committee conducts hearings and investigations related to faculty personnel matters, including appeals of decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion; charges of improper conduct; complaints about violations of academic freedom or improper procedures related to faculty conditions of employment.
11.6.3.1 In matters pertaining to appeals and individual personnel decisions, the Committee shall maintain complete confidentiality.

11.6.3.2 In the event that the Personnel Committee decides that any current member should not participate in hearing a particular case because of a conflict of interest, the committee will designate as his/her substitute for that case the former member of the committee who most recently represented the college of the temporarily disqualified member. If no former committee member of that college is available, the committee will select the most recent former member of the personnel committee who is available to hear the case. As used above, “availability” implies that the individual is willing to serve and is not disqualified because of a conflict of interest.

11.6.3.3 In considering any appeal the Faculty Personnel Committee is empowered to examine all letters and other documents it deems relevant and to question members of the faculty and the administration for the purpose of establishing the facts in the case. The personnel committee may, at its option, petition the provost, the president, or the Board of Trustees for reconsideration of the decision that caused the appeal [See R&P 2216 and 23]. Representatives of the administration, the personnel committee, and the appealing party may participate in any hearing before the Board of Trustees or its designated committee.

11.6.3.4 When the Committee considers the appeal of a member of an under-represented minority group (as currently defined by U.S. government guidelines for eliminating discrimination in employment), the president will appoint a tenured member of the university’s affirmative action/equal opportunity commission to serve as a pro tem voting member of the committee for the duration of that specific case, unless the appealing individual declines such an appointment in advance, or unless his/her group is already represented on the committee.

11.6.4 The Committee shall report in writing to the faculty senate at least once a year. Its report shall cover general principles based on both its decisions and its oversight of faculty personnel policy and procedures in general.

Section 12: Student Affairs Area
12.1 The Committees of Student Affairs shall consider all matters of student life concerned with both academic, residential, and extracurricular activities, including coordinating their efforts with other administrative offices whose interests fall in related areas.

12.2 The Student Life Committee is responsible for Faculty oversight of non-academically related matters of undergraduate and graduate student life including residence life, athletics, counseling, and advising. Policy proposals and recommendations are referred to the Senate for approval.

12.2.1 The Committee consists of four elected Faculty, three ex officio members, and two students. The Faculty members are elected to three-year, staggered terms with two elected from the College of Arts and Sciences, one from the College of Engineering and Applied Science, and one from the College of Business and Economics. Ex officio voting members are the Vice Provost for Student Affairs, the Dean of Students, and the Executive Director of Athletics. One undergraduate selected by the Student Senate and one graduate student selected by the Graduate Student Council are non-voting members. The Chair serves as a Senator.

12.2.2 University ad hoc, advisory, or appointed committees dealing with related issues that include Faculty participation shall report regularly to the Student Life Committee. Non-academic disciplinary and appeals boards shall report regularly to the Student Life Committee. In all cases, matters of policy within Faculty jurisdiction shall be referred to the Student Life Committee for consideration [See also Section 15].
12.3 The Student Academic Life Committee is responsible for faculty oversight of academically related matters of student life that include policy on admissions and financial aid, policy on both undergraduate and graduate discipline and disciplinary appeals, academic calendar, student academic awards and prizes, prestigious scholarships, visiting lecturers, and honorary degrees. Policy proposals and recommendations are referred to the Senate for approval.

12.3.1. The Committee consists of five faculty, three ex officio members, and two students. The faculty members are elected to three-year, staggered terms with two faculty elected from the College of Arts and Sciences and one from each of the other three colleges. The ex officio voting members are the vice provost for academic administration, dean of admissions and financial aid, and dean of students. One undergraduate selected by the student senate and one graduate student selected by the graduate student council are non-voting members. The chair serves as a senator.

12.3.2. University ad hoc, advisory or appointed boards or committees dealing with related issues that include faculty participation shall report regularly to the Student Academic Life Committee. Academic Disciplinary and Appeals boards that include faculty participation shall report regularly to the Student Academic Life Committee. In all cases, matters of policy within faculty jurisdiction and the domain of the Student Academic Life Committee shall be referred to the committee for consideration. [See also Section 15]

Section 13. Planning and Budget Area

13.1 The committees of planning and budget are responsible for coordinating information and recommendations concerning the faculty participation in budgetary and financial planning, reporting the financial and budgetary concerns of the university to the senate and the faculty at large, and presenting faculty proposals and recommendations to the administration.

13.2. The Faculty Compensation Committee is responsible for ongoing examination of faculty compensation and benefits relative to market conditions, rank, discipline, peer institutions, university priorities, and faculty well-being. The committee drafts recommendations to the administration and represents the faculty in any deliberations and negotiations in these areas. Policy proposals and recommendations are referred to the senate for approval.

13.2.2. The committee consists of six faculty members elected to three-year, staggered terms with two elected from the College of Arts and Sciences, one from each of the other three colleges, and one at-large member elected by the entire faculty who holds the rank of assistant professor rank at the time of election. The chair is a senator.

13.2.3. Ad hoc, advisory, or appointed committees dealing with related issues that include faculty participation shall report regularly to the Faculty Compensation Committee. In all cases, matters of policy within faculty jurisdiction and the domain of the Faculty Compensation Committee shall be referred to the committee for consideration. [See also Section 15]

13.3. The University Planning and Operations Committee represents the concerns of the Faculty regarding the annual budget and long-range financial planning to the President, Provost, and Vice President for finance and administration. 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. To this end, the committee works in direct and active partnership with the administration to define and achieve budgetary goals that reflect the educational mission of the University, establish development priorities, and foster improvements in the relationship between the University and its surrounding communities. Policy proposals and recommendations are referred to the Senate for approval.
13.3.1 The Committee consists of five Faculty members elected to three-year, staggered terms. One member is elected by each College for a four-year term. The fifth, an at-large member elected by the entire Faculty, must hold the rank of either assistant or associate professor at the time of the election and serves a two-year term. The Chair serves as Senator.

13.3.2 The Committee represents the concerns and priorities of the Faculty regarding the budget and long-range financial planning of the University throughout the budgetary and planning processes. To this end, the Committee may appoint liaisons, from its own members or the Faculty, in consultation with the Steering Committee, to the appropriate administrative committees, councils, task forces, or working groups.

13.3.3 University ad hoc, advisory, or appointed committees dealing with related issues that include Faculty participation shall report regularly to the Planning and Operations Committee. In cases, matters of policy within Faculty jurisdiction and the domain of the Planning and Operations Committee shall be referred to the Committee for consideration. [See also Section 15]

13.4 The Library, Computing, and Network Committee represents Faculty concerns in the areas of library, computing, and network services. The Committee is responsible for oversight in areas including general parameters of resource allocation in the maintenance and planning of library, computing, and network facilities and resources (both hardware and software), the integration of library, computing, and network planning and the educational mission of the University, and insuring mechanisms for Faculty participation in the drafting of library, computing, and network policy relating to the academic responsibilities of the Faculty. Policy proposals and recommendations are referred to the Senate for approval.

13.4.1 The Committee consists of five elected Faculty members and one ex officio member. The Faculty members are elected to three-year, staggered terms with two elected from the College of Arts and Sciences and one from each of the other three Colleges. The ex officio voting member is the Vice-Provost for Information Resources. The Chair serves as Senator.

13.4.2 University ad hoc, advisory, or appointed committees dealing with related areas that include Faculty participation shall report at least twice a year to the Library, Computing, and Network Committee. Matters of library, computing, or network policy that affect the responsibility of the Faculty shall be referred to the Library, Computing and Network Committee for consideration. [See also Section 15]

Section 14. Chairs of Standing Committees
14.1 Each Standing Committee's Chair is responsible, in consultation with the Committee members, for establishing the agenda and scheduling meetings of the Committee.

14.2 The Chair of each Standing Committee, with the approval of the Steering Committee, is empowered to appoint from the membership of the full Senate or from the Faculty at large any ad hoc committees that are necessary to conduct the business of that Standing Committee.

14.3 Chairs of the Standing Committees shall submit resolutions to Chair of the Senate for placement on the Senate agenda or for other appropriate action.

Section 15. Ad hoc and Advisory Committees
15.1 The creation of all non-Senate University ad hoc and advisory committees that include Faculty representation shall be made in consultation with the Steering Committee of the Senate. In all cases, matters of policy shall be referred to the appropriate Senate committee for consideration.
Section 16 Ad hoc Faculty Governance Advisory Committee
16.1 An ad hoc Faculty Governance Advisory Committee, chaired by the Senate Secretary, is constituted for a renewable three-year period.

16.1.1 This Committee shall examine the effectiveness of the Senate and its Constitution and advise the Chair of the Senate in proposing amendments to R & P. In all cases, matters of policy or Standing Committee jurisdiction shall be referred to the appropriate Committee for consideration. Any changes recommended by the Committee must be approved as provided in Section 18.

16.2. Once every five years, the Senate shall form an ad hoc Census Committee with a maximum one-year term whose purpose shall be to review the numbers of voting Faculty in each College. The Committee’s membership will be established at the time it is formed with representation from each College. The Committee will report to the Senate whether the total number or the distribution of Faculty by College or rank serving on the Senate or the Standing Committees should be changed. The Committee will also consider whether current terms of service and term limits are appropriate to the most effective operation of the Senate. Any changes recommended by the Committee must be approved as provided in Section 18.

Section 17 Senate Representation to the Board of Trustees
17.1 The Senate is responsible for representing the Faculty to the Board of Trustees.

17.2. The Chair and Past-Chair of the Senate are the Faculty representatives proposed to the Board of Trustees for participation in all meetings of the full Board of Trustees.

17.3. A faculty member from each of the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Planning and Budget Areas, selected by the Chair of the Senate, is proposed to the Board of Trustees for participation in the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Physical Plant and Planning, and Finance Committees of the Board of Trustees.

Section 18 Changes to R & P
18.1 Changes to R & P may be proposed by the Senate or the Faculty at any University or Senate meeting. These changes are approved or denied following regular Senate voting procedures [see R & P 1.1.2].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Voting Faculty</th>
<th>Grades AY 96-97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts &amp; Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Architecture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Foreign Languages</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion Studies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humanities Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(30% of CAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism &amp; Communication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology &amp; Anthropology</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Sciences Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(27% of CAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth &amp; Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Sciences Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>(43% of CAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAS Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>208</td>
<td>(52% of Lehigh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business &amp; Economics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBB Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(13% of Lehigh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CE Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(7% of Lehigh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering &amp; Applied Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil &amp; Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial &amp; Manufacturing Systems Engineering</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Science and Engineering</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering &amp; Mechanics</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEAS Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>(29% of Lehigh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Lehigh Faculty</strong></td>
<td>403</td>
<td>50,979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*faculty includes instructors and lecturers
## Senate representation by College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Proposed senators</th>
<th>Proposed ratio (1:x)</th>
<th>Number of senators per college based on ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>3 69</td>
<td>7 11 14 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Economics</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2 26</td>
<td>2 3 4 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1 27</td>
<td>1 2 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Applied Science</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2 59</td>
<td>4 6 8 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14 22 28 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*elected senators only; representation from committees will vary*
Commentary on the Faculty Senate Proposal  
September 1997

Need for a Senate

The current faculty governance system does not appear to work very well; the proposed senate is an attempt to reach the following goals:

- greater efficiency, with less duplicative or irrelevant work,
- clearer lines of authority and accountability,
- an enhanced possibility for building consensus, and
- a stronger, clearer faculty voice in relation to the administration and the Board of Trustees.

To remedy perceived weaknesses, the proposal suggests that the faculty delegate a portion of their voting authority to senate members – a delegation that is protected by provisions in Sections 3 and 5 below, along with recommended sweeping changes in committees.

Preamble

The preamble serves several purposes, among them striking a cooperative note (among faculty and administration), and specifying the role of a faculty senate in general.

Section 1. Faculty

This section states the primary responsibilities of the faculty, repeating much of what R&P already lists, but also acknowledges the increased role of the faculty in the financial aspects of the university recently instituted by the administration. The "voting faculty" is as defined currently in R&P.

Section 2. Faculty Senate

These sections describe the jurisdiction of the senate and the procedures to be followed in cases of conflict between the administration and the senate. The procedures provide mechanisms for faculty and administration to work together to resolve conflict, with the desired end of making any appeal to the Trustees a rare event.

Section 3. Accountability to the Faculty

These sections clarify the senate's accountability to the faculty, with a call to the senate to be inclusive in its deliberations, and with procedures unhappy faculty members may follow to appeal senate decisions. It also allows the senate to call on all faculty to vote on issues deemed of fundamental importance to the university. Additional efforts to increase accountability, such as requirements that senate meetings be open and that a general faculty meeting be held at least once each semester, are addressed below.
Section 4. Senate Membership

The structure of the senate became linked in our minds to the committee structure, because of our goals of a) efficiency, b) clearer lines of authority and c) accountability, and a stronger faculty voice.

The proposed senate membership represents a compromise between efficiency and representation. We wanted the faculty to be well represented. We started with a fairly large senate, but we moved in the direction of a considerably smaller body so as to minimize the workload on the faculty as a whole, although not on the individuals involved, and to increase the likelihood of creating a powerful voice. In the end, we settled on a senate that will mix directly elected faculty, committee chairs, four officers, and six administrators.

The same considerations influenced us when considering the relationship of the senate to the university standing committees. Much of the work on specific policy issues should be done in committee; to better coordinate this activity, and to make senate debate informed by the knowledge of faculty currently working on policy issues, the proposal merges the committee structure and the senate to some extent.

We concluded that the president, provost, and deans should be nonvoting senate members, because of the small size of the senate itself and also because in many cases administrators are voting members of the standing committees.

We decided on term limits for senators so as to encourage wider participation over time and to emphasize that faculty governance, while important, should not be the main focus of anyone's career for extended periods.

Section 5. Faculty Meetings

The senate is required to call a general meeting of the faculty at least once each semester. We have added a statement that we expect the president, provost and deans to attend both faculty meetings and senate meetings, but we feel that such meetings should be chaired by faculty leaders. We hope that the business done in both venues will become important enough so that administrators (and senators) will consider it necessary to attend.

Section 6. Senate Meetings

We propose that these meetings be open, with the agendas set by the steering committee, and with minutes reported to the faculty in a timely manner. Because of the senate's small size, we propose a strict quorum requirement for any vote.

Section 7. Officers of the Senate

These are time-consuming jobs that will require, in at least two cases, staff support, as well as a fixed central office. We are very conscious of the burden involved, and feel it should not fall on an individual department to fund the release time that will be necessary. There must be a clear understanding of the value of these services to Lehigh and a commitment by the Provost to provide the necessary resources.
Sections 8-13. Senate Committees

In our pursuit of clearer lines of authority, and of efficiency, we include, a suggested reform of the standing committees. We grouped committees into areas, hoping to increase coordination and communication between those committees likely to be dealing with issues that lie in more than one committee domain.

We also propose changes in the permanent members of each committee. In general we worked to maintain representation, but to make committees smaller so as to reduce the number of faculty involved at any one time in service at the university level. We also considered voting majorities. Additional specialists from the faculty or the administration may be called on by these committees for information about particular topics, but the voting membership remains relatively small in most cases.

In the list of committees, two main themes recur: First, we emphasize that policy decisions should be made by the committee; if anyone is in doubt about which committee is responsible, he or she can ask a senate officer. Second, we emphasize that ad hoc or appointed committees involving faculty should report to the relevant standing committee. Our goals are to re-emphasize the policy-making responsibility of the standing committees and to make sure that ad hoc or appointed committees do not act as substitutes for standing committees.

The steering committee takes responsibility for the senate agenda. It will review the two main administrative documents, the budget and the operating plan, each year.

In the Academic Affairs Area, we suggest splitting graduate studies and research into two committees. While we are aware that these two areas are deeply interrelated, we are concerned that graduate issues have crowded out serious concentration on issues that are more purely research-oriented. We would suggest creating this separate committee as a watchdog and advocate of research at LU.

The membership and duties of the personnel committee are considered a special case, because the committee has both legislative and adjudicative roles. We considered the possibility of splitting these roles into two committees, but rejected it because the people hearing the current cases are most likely to be sensitive to issues of language in formation of new legislation in this area. Members of the personnel committee will continue to be elected by the entire faculty.

In the Student Affairs Area, the student academic life committee folds together the responsibilities of several existing specialist committees. It also becomes the home for two stepchildren, the academic calendar and efforts to win prestigious scholarships of all kinds.

Although it may seem more appropriately located in the Academic Affairs Area, we placed the library, computing and network committee in the Planning and Budget Area because of the serious budget issues likely to arise in the near future.

Section 17. Senate Representation to the Board

Two officers are designated as liaisons to the Board of Trustees. This does not mean that the current faculty invitees to board meetings would no longer attend. We propose, however, that someone who represents the faculty as a whole attend as a resource for the Board.