Lehigh University

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

27 April 1998

Presiding: William Hitfinger (Sinclair Lab Auditorium)

President Hitfinger called the meeting to order at 4:15 PM.

1. Memorial Resolution. A tribute to Edward F. Assmus, Jr., late Professor Emeritus of Mathematics, was read by Professor Everett Pitcher 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 Edward F. Assmus, Jr.

2. Memorial Resolution. A tribute to Leslie Guy McCracken, late Professor Emeritus of Electrical Engineering, was read by Professor Emeritus Don Talhelm who then MOVED that his remarks be incorporated in these minutes [see Attachment 2] 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 Leslie Guy McCracken.

3. Minutes. The minutes of the March 23, 1998 faculty meeting were APPROVED without corrections.

4. Graduation Motions. Registrar Bruce Correll presented the usual and customary graduation motions for the May commencement [see Attachment 3]. Registrar Correll MOVED for their approval. The motion was SECONDED and PASSED.

4. Committee Motions. Professor Maria Santore of the Nominations Committee presented the slate of candidates for committee positions. Professor Aronson asked for additional nominations from the floor. There being none, the election proceeded by paper ballot.

Professor Ron Hartranft of the Educational Policy Committee presented a proposed change in the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty regarding apprentice teaching [see Attachment 4]. Professor Hartranft then MOVED
a waiver of the '10-day Rule' for just this legislation. The motion to waive was **SECONDED** and **PASSED**. Professor Hartranft then **MOVED** the change to R&P on apprentice teaching. The motion was **SECONDED**.

Professor Collins then presented a friendly amendment to the motion [see Attachment 5]. After some discussion, the Ed Pol Committee ruled that the amendment was not "friendly." Procedurally, this then required a second to the amendment and a separate vote on the amendment. The amendment was **MOVED** and **SECONDED** but **FAILED**.

The original motion then **PASSED**.

Professor George Nation, on behalf of the Faculty Steering Committee **MOVED** to amend the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty to resolve some inconsistencies [see Attachment 6]. The motion was **SECONDED**.

Professor Amidon asked for the rationale of assigning to the University Parliamentarian the authority to resolve an inconsistency in R&P. Professor Nation replied that precedent established this. Professor Bainbridge noted that the change would require University Trustee approval.

The motion **PASSED**.

Professor Neal Simon, chair of the Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee, **MOVED** a change to the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty, Section 1.2.2.5 [see Attachment 7]. The motion was **SECONDED**.

Professor Folk suggested that the sections regarding representation on the University Council be deleted. He cautioned FFPOC not to speak for the faculty unless the faculty is consulted first.

The motion **PASSED**.

5. **Unfinished Business.** None.

6. **New Business.** None.

7. **Committee Reports.** Professor Colleen Callahan, on behalf of the Personnel Committee, made the committee's annual report [see Attachment 8]. She pointed to some particular concerns as: the lack of faculty input in high-level administrative appointments; and the absence
of action by the University Trustees on the faculty-approved policy on sexual harassment.

President Hitfinger acknowledged that the Personnel Committee had made an accurate representation of the facts.

Professor Folk requested some changes in R&P to permit the accused access to written communications, especially in sexual harassment cases. Professor Callahan noted this is now being done informally and appears to be working well.

Professor Beidler inquired whether the lack of faculty consultation on administrative appointments would happen again. President Hitfinger apologized for flaws in the process and noted some extenuating circumstances, but stated that these circumstances still did not justify “short-circuiting” the faculty.

President Hitfinger also noted that the names of candidates for the presidency were being held confidential and that the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees next week would review the sexual harassment policy.

Professor Frank Gunter, on behalf of the Faculty Compensation Committee, presented the FCC's annual report [see Attachment 9]. Professor Gunter noted a continuing deterioration of faculty compensation relative to other universities. He noted that Lehigh's 'merely excellent' faculty members were getting salary increases that, in many cases, did not even keep pace with inflation. He also wondered aloud how much longer the compensation crisis could continue without serious consequences.

Professor Neal Simon, chair of the FFPOC, gave the FFPOC's final report [see Attachment 10].

Professor Ward Cates, of the Graduate and Research Committee, noted that the report on the field test would be circulated shortly. He also noted that GRC has received 29 heavy dossiers.

President's Report: President Hitfinger began with a news update. The Middle States Evaluation Committee has issued a verbal interim report on Lehigh's reaccreditation. The report is now being written. The president said he believed the assessment was very fairly done. Lehigh will have the opportunity to provide corrections to the report, after which the Evaluation Committee will submit it to the Commissioner of Higher
Education.

The president also addressed the issue of intercollegiate basketball scholarships for men and women [see Attachment 11]. He suggested that interested faculty should call the athletic director, Joe Sierrett, for additional information. A report on the scholarship proposal will be made to the Board of Trustees at their June meeting.

The meeting stood adjourned at 6:03 PM.

________________________________________
Stephen F. Thode
Secretary to the Faculty
304 Rauch Business Center
758-4557
FAX: 832-9415
E-mail: sft@
Edward F. Assmus, Jr. (1931–1998)

Edward Ferdinand Assmus Jr. was born in Nutley, N.J. on 19 April 1931. His father was Edward F. Assmus and his mother was Josephine Miriam Assmus (née Ciardi). Each predeceased him.

Ed Assmus earned his B.A. degree from Oberlin College in 1953 and his A.M. from Harvard University in 1955. His Ph.D. in mathematics was from Harvard in 1958, with thesis under the supervision of John Tate.

Following his Ph.D., Assmus held a succession of positions. One being Ritt Instructor at Columbia. The latest before coming to Lehigh was lecturer at Wesleyan University in the interval 1962–65.

Assmus was appointed to the rank of associate professor at Lehigh in 1966. He became professor in 1970 and distinguished professor in 1993. He took early retirement in 1994.

His field of research was algebra, particularly the parts known as combinatorial algebra and coding theory. He wrote more than fifty papers. Substantial portions of his work were carried out in two separate collaborations. One was with H.F. Mattson, Jr. of Syracuse University. The best known product of this collaboration goes under the name of the Assmus-Mattson Theorem. The other was with Jennifer D. Key of Clemson University. It resulted in the book 'Designs and Their Codes', published in 1992 as vol. 103 of the series Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics.
Professor Assmus was popular as an advisor of graduate students. A total of eleven students wrote Ph.D. theses with his advice and supervision.

His retirement from his professorship was not withdrawal from research mathematics. He became if anything more active with more available time. His death occurred on 18 March 1998 while he was attending the Mathematische Forschungsinstitut in Oberwolfach, Germany, where he had just delivered a paper.

Ed Assmus' first marriage was to Merolla Assmus. They had one daughter Alexi, who took her Ph.D. at Harvard, did postdoctoral work at Berkeley and taught in the history department at Princeton. She is now pursuing her career in the history of science and technology. His second marriage was to Susan Assmus. They had one son, Richard who is about to graduate from the University of Michigan Law School, will take the Illinois Bar Examination, and will have a position with Mayer, Brown and Platt in Chicago.

The faculty of Lehigh University extends their deepest sympathy to Susan Assmus in the loss of her husband and to Alexi and Richard in the loss of their father.

I move that this memorial resolution be spread on the minutes of the faculty and that a copy be sent to Susan, Alexi and Richard.

Respectfully submitted

Everett Pitcher
Memorial Resolution for Dr. Leslie Guy McCracken
Presented to University Faculty  April 27  1998

The Faculty of Lehigh University mourns the death of Professor Emeritus Leslie Guy McCracken and offers its deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

Dr. McCracken was born in Philadelphia in 1916 and educated in the public schools there. He entered the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and earned the bachelor's degree in Electrical Engineering in 1945. As a participant in the Navy's V7 program he received a commission in the U.S. Naval Reserve and served on active duty until 1946. He attended Lehigh University and received a master's degree in 1947. In 1952 he was awarded a Doctor of Philosophy in Electrical Engineering by the Pennsylvania State University.

While at Penn State, McCracken was a research assistant in the Ordnance Research Laboratory and an instructor in electrical engineering. After receiving the Ph.D. Dr. McCracken joined the National Bureau of Standards, in Washington, D.C. In 1954 he came to Lehigh University as an Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering.

Dr. McCracken taught at both the undergraduate and graduate level. At the undergraduate level he taught senior year courses in electronic circuits. At the graduate level he taught two course sequences in Automatic Control Theory and Communication Theory.

His academic contributions were in the then emerging field of information theory with its ramifications in communications and computers. He followed developments here and abroad. His colleagues recall Professor McCracken bringing to their attention material presented in symposia in England, Czechoslovakia, Australia and elsewhere.

Many of his students remember him for the precise analytical formulations he brought to the classroom which went far beyond the standard textbook material. His mastery of mathematical analysis was extraordinary.

He carried on research in the theory of Adaptive Control in a contract
sponsored by the Naval Research Laboratories and participated in campus research sponsored by the U.S. Air Force. He was invited for summer work at the Bell Telephone Laboratories in Allentown.

Professor McCracken was a Life Senior Member of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, a member of the Research Society of America, Society of Engineering Scientists, Academy of Sciences of New York, American Society of Engineering Education, American Association of University Professors, Tau Beta Pi and Alpha Pi Omega. He was a Registered Professional Engineer in Pennsylvania since 1958. He served as Chairman of the Lehigh Valley Subsection of the Institute of Radio Engineers, the IRE, a precursor society of the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers. For several years he was the faculty advisor to the Lehigh University Student Chapter of the IRE.

Professor McCracken retired in 1972, after several years on medical disability.

He was married to the former Lucille Herbert of Bethlehem. In June they celebrated their 50th anniversary. In addition to his wife he is survived by one daughter, LuAnn McCracken Fletcher, a Lehigh alumna class of 1983.

Dr. McCracken was an active member of the Salem Lutheran Church, Bethlehem, PA. He sang in the church choir for over 40 years and was a performer with the handbell choir.

Dr. McCracken died March 22, 1998 after a stroke. Until this time he was in excellent health.

Mr. President, I move that this memorial resolution be included in the minutes of this meeting and that copies be forwarded to his family.

Respectfully submitted,

Don Talhelm, Emeritus Professor of Electrical Engineering
John Karakash, Emeritus Dean of Engineering and Applied Science
Bruce Fritchman, Professor of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
April 27, 1998

GRADUATION MOTIONS

I. That, with the approbation and consent of the Board of Trustees signified by their mandamus, the appropriate academic degrees be conferred at the end of the current semester on those individuals who shall have completed all requirements for graduation no later than 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday May 27, 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 those individuals;

II. That the appropriate graduation honors be awarded to those individuals whose averages as computed by the Office of the Registrar shall entitle them to be graduated with honors, high honors, or highest honors, according to regulation 3.11.1 of the 1997 edition of the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty.

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

IV. That prizes awarded to the appropriate individuals and that the announcement be made in the commencement program.
April 10 1998

MEMORANDUM

To: Voting Faculty

From: University Committee on Educational Policy
      Ron Hartranft, Chair

Subject: Change in R&P on Apprentice Teaching

At the university faculty meeting on April 27, I will recommend, on behalf of the University Committee on Educational Policy, approval of the following change in R&P section 3.14.5.1 on the policy on apprentice teaching.

In the paragraph immediately following item 3 of R&P section 3.14.5.1 (quoted on the following page), replace 'a three-hour course' by 'a one-to-three-hour course' (as shown on the same page).

The corresponding section on 'Apprentice Teaching' in the course catalog (p. 38 of the 1997-98 edition) should be changed (see bottom of following page) to reflect the range of credit available. Other places in the catalog which refer to this 300 course, Apprentice Teaching, should also be changed.

The rationale, prepared by the original proposer, Prof. Karin Collins, is attached. Note that both Prof. Collins and the members of Ed. Pol. reaffirm the use of R&P section 3.1.3 in determining the amount of credit appropriate for each apprentice teacher.
3.14.5 Special undergraduate course opportunities

3.14.5.1 Apprentice teaching

The apprentice teaching program is limited to juniors and seniors who wish an opportunity to learn about teaching to do so under the guidance of an experienced professor. Typically, apprentices are associated with a freshman- or sophomore-level course, do a limited amount of lecturing and leading of discussion, assist in making up and evaluating written assignments, and are available for individual consultation with students. The regular or "master" teacher is responsible for assigning all grades given in the course. The duties performed by undergraduate apprentice teachers must in no way be confused with those performed by graduate teaching assistants.

To participate in the apprentice teaching program a student:

1. must have a cumulative grade-point average of 2.80, and

2. must have a cumulative grade average of 3.32 and must have completed at least two courses in the major field in which the apprentice teaching is done, and

3. must have previously taken for credit a course equivalent to the course in which the apprentice teaching will be done.

A student may roster for apprentice teaching only once each semester, only once for a given course, and only twice in their college career. Students register for apprentice teaching by signing up for course number 300 (a number set aside in all departments for a three-hour course called "Apprentice Teaching").

Master teachers and apprentices must—normally, before preregistration time—submit a written "contract" or agreement describing the duties the apprentices will perform and method of evaluation. Forms are available for this agreement in department offices and associate deans' offices of the college. These forms must be signed by both the apprentice and the master teacher, then submitted for approval to both the chairperson of the department in which the apprentice teaching will be done and to the associate dean of the student's college and attached to the registration form.

The provost shall appoint a central coordinator of apprentice teaching who, with a committee of representatives of the three undergraduate colleges will oversee, evaluate, and report on the program periodically.

Statement in Course Catalog under "Apprentice Teaching"

Current: A student may register for apprentice teaching only once each semester, only once in a given course and only twice during a college career.

Proposed: A student may register for apprentice teaching only once each semester, only once in a given course, and only twice during a college career. Students enroll in apprentice teaching by registering for course number 300 (a number set aside in all departments for a one-to-three-hour course called "Apprentice Teaching").
PROPOSED CHANGE IN CREDITS FOR APPRENTICE TEACHING

PROPOSED CHANGE IN CREDITS

Undergraduate students who roster for apprentice teaching are required to sign up for a three-credit course called “Apprentice Teaching.” I propose that the number of credits designated for “Apprentice Teaching” be changed from the current three credits to a variable number of credits (based on expected effort), not to exceed three credits.

RATIONALE

The experience derived by undergraduates given the opportunity to participate in the apprentice teaching program is extremely valuable. As is detailed in both the University Catalogue (page 38 attached) and Rules and Procedures of the Faculty (section 3.14.5.1, attached) the apprentice teaching program is designed to benefit juniors and seniors who wish to learn about teaching under the guidance of an experienced teacher. The apprentice teaching program, which is available to only juniors and seniors with outstanding academic credentials, is a formalized program in which a student-teacher partnership agreement is written that details the duties and obligations required of the teaching apprentice. The terms of the “contract” require approval of both the department head and dean of the student’s college in which the course is taken. To complete the course, the student must submit a written report of his or her experience to the supervising teaching, who will forward it to the Provost.

There are occasions when an opportunity is available for a student to serve as an apprentice teacher, but the amount of effort to be exerted is not sufficient to justify awarding three credits. As stated in the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty (section 3.1.3, attached) “credit is reckoned in hours of effort per week. A credit hour is a course unit normally involving three to four hours of effort per week on the part of the student.” Thus, a three-credit course, which is the current number of credits associated with Apprentice Teaching, requires a weekly effort of from nine to twelve hours. Changing the number of credits associated with apprentice teaching - from three credits to a variable number of credits, not to exceed three credits - will provide opportunities for students to engage in apprentice teaching experiences associated with a lesser weekly commitment than the currently required nine to twelve hours. The proposed change would provide flexibility to the supervising teaching to offer selected students course credit that is commensurate with the expected effort to be exerted (i.e. if the expected effort is three to four hours per week, the student will sign up for one-credit of apprentice teaching).

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

None

IMPLEMENTATION

Fall 1998
Current statement in R&F

3.14.5 Special undergraduate course opportunities

3.14.5.1 Apprentice teaching

The apprentice teaching program is limited to juniors and seniors who wish an opportunity to learn about teaching to do so under the guidance of an experienced professor. Typically apprentices are associated with a freshman- or sophomore-level course, do a limited amount of lecturing and leading of discussion, assist in making up and evaluating written assignments, and are available for individual consultation with students. The regular or "master teacher" is responsible for assigning all grades given in the course. The duties performed by undergraduate apprentice teachers must in no way be confused with those performed by graduate teaching assistants.

To participate in the apprentice teaching program a student must:

1. have a cumulative grade-point average of 2.80, and
2. have a cumulative grade average of 3.32 and must have completed at least two courses in the major field in which the apprentice teaching is done.

3. have previously taken for credit a course equivalent to the course in which the apprentice teaching will be done.

A student may roster for apprentice teaching only once each semester, only once for a given course, and only twice in their college career. Students register for apprentice teaching by signing up for course number 300 (a number set aside in all departments for a three-hour course called "Apprentice Teaching").

Master teachers and apprentices must, normally, before preregistration time--submit a written "contract" or agreement describing the duties the apprentices will perform and method of evaluation. Forms are available for this agreement in department offices and associate deans' offices of the college. These forms must be signed by both the apprentice and the master teacher, then submitted for approval to both the chairperson of the department in which the apprentice teaching will be done and to the associate dean of the student's college and attached to the registration form.

The provost shall appoint a central coordinator of apprentice teaching who with a committee of representatives of the three undergraduate colleges, will oversee, evaluate, and report on the program periodically.

I propose:

A student may roster for apprentice teaching only once each semester, only once for a given course, and only twice in their college career. Students register for apprentice teaching by signing up for course number 300 (a number set aside in all departments for a one-to-three-hour course called "Apprentice Teaching").

Alternate:

A student may roster for apprentice teaching only once each semester, and in their college career for no more than three credits for a given course and for no more than six credits in all. Students register for apprentice teaching by signing up for course number 300 (a number set aside in all departments for a one-to-three-hour course called "Apprentice Teaching").
April 15, 1998

TO: University Faculty

FROM: George A. Nation, Chair, Faculty Steering Committee

RE: Resolution of Inconsistencies in R&P

The FSC recommends the following amendment to R&P in order to ensure that any inconsistencies that do occur in R&P will be resolved in a timely manner. The FSC will ask for approval of the amendment at the University faculty meeting on April 27, 1998.
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AMENDING PROCEDURES

6 Amendment process & Resolution of Inconsistencies

6.1 Changes in rules and regulations of the faculty

6.1.1 Any change in Parts 1 (except 1.3), 2 and 4 requires university faculty and trustee approval. Any change in Part 1.3 requires the approval of the appropriate college faculty and the trustees. Any change in Part 3 requires only university faculty approval. Whenever trustee approval is required, faculty action may be taken only after the appropriate faculty committee has secured the advice of the administration.

6.1.2 Any amendment of R&P that has been properly approved shall be deemed to have amended R&P contemporaneously with its proper approval notwithstanding the fact that the amendment is not reflected in the official R&P document until a later date.

6.2 Changes in informational material

Part 5.1 is to be revised periodically by the administration to reflect changes made by the trustees in their by-laws. Parts 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 are to be revised periodically by the administration to reflect changes previously made by the administration but the administration shall, prior to making any such change, secure the advice of (1) the research council in matters covered by Part 5.3, (2) the faculty steering committee to the extent that the change constitutes a major structural change within the university and (3) the faculty of any college or colleges, of any academic department or departments or of any academic division or divisions that would be directly affected by such change.

6.3 Resolution of Inconsistencies

1. Rules & Procedures in the Superior Document

To the extent possible the University Catalog and the Student Handbook shall be interpreted to avoid conflict and inconsistency with R&P. Whenever there is a conflict or inconsistency between R&P and either the University Catalog or Student Handbook or both, the provisions of the R&P shall control and the inconsistent or conflicting language in the other document shall automatically and retroactively be deemed to have been revised to reflect terms or provisions consistent with R&P.

2. To the extent possible R&P shall be interpreted to avoid internal inconsistency. Whenever there is an inconsistency within R&P the Provost shall decide within a reasonable time whether the resolution of inconsistencies within R&P as may occur from time to time require a faculty vote or may be resolved by the University Parliamentarian alone.
3. If no faculty vote is required to resolve an inconsistency within R&P, the University Parliamentarian shall within a reasonable time resolve the matter upon request from the Provost with any study or consultation the University Parliamentarian deems appropriate.

4. If a faculty vote is required to resolve an inconsistency within R&P, the University Parliamentarian shall issue a temporary decision resolving the inconsistency and the Provost shall simultaneously arrange for the inconsistency to be presented to faculty for a vote at the next appropriate faculty meeting. Until such vote the decision made by the University Parliamentarian shall control the matter.

Appendices

University Charter

Board of Trustees By-Laws

Forum Constitution

Lehigh University Organization Chart
April 17, 1998

To: Voting Faculty

From: Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee

J. Richard Aronson George White
J. Richard Decker Neal Simon, Chair
Bruce Hargreaves

Re: Proposed Change to R&P Section 1.2.2.5, Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee

The Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee will bring the proposed change to R&P to the floor at the April 27 Faculty Meeting. We distributed the proposal electronically in order to meet the 10 day rule.

Existing:

1.2.2.5 Faculty financial planning and operations committee

The faculty committee on financial planning and operations consists of five faculty members elected to staggered terms. One at large member, at the rank of either assistant or associate professor at the time of election, is elected by the university faculty for a two-year term. One member is elected by each of the college faculties for a four-year term. The committee will be chaired by the college representative who is in his or her third year of service on the committee.

The committee represents the concerns of the faculty in advising the president, provost, and vice president for finance and administration regarding financial planning. 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 shall receive appropriate information and make timely recommendations in the financial planning process. The committee reports regularly to the faculty.

The committee chairperson represents the faculty planning and operations advisory committee as a member of the faculty steering committee. In addition, the current chairperson, the previous year's chairperson, and the at-large member will represent the committee on the University Council.
Proposed Changes (Bold):

Paragraph 3 line 1

The **past-Chair** represents the faculty planning and operations advisory committee as a member of the faculty steering committee.

Paragraph 3, last sentence: **Delete**

In addition, the current chairperson, the previous year's chairperson, and the at-large member will represent the committee on the University Council.

Also, Section 1.2.2.1, Faculty Steering Committee, would have to be changed if the proposed revision is approved.

Rationale: The FFPOC Chair currently serves on the Faculty Steering Committee, the Planning and Budgeting Working Group, as the faculty representative to the Trustee Finance Committee and, in some instances, its Investment Subcommittee. The opportunity for other members of FFPOC, including the Chair-elect and past-Chair, to serve in one or more of these capacities would provide a broader interface between the Committee and various constituencies. It is our belief that this would improve the function of FFPOC by i) having better informed members and ii) more evenly distributing the workload.
REPORT OF THE FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
April 27, 1998

As required by section 1.2.2.6 of the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty, the Personnel Committee is making its annual report to the faculty. We have three responsibilities under R&P: to advise the administration on high-level appointments; to hear cases brought by faculty alleging arbitrary or capricious action in promotion and tenure decisions; and to bring to the faculty legislation regarding personnel issues. We discuss the recent developments in each of these areas.

ADVICE ON HIGH-LEVEL APPOINTMENTS
Unfortunately, a pattern has emerged in the past year in which the Personnel Committee has not been consulted at all, or the consultation has been conducted in such a manner as to undercut the opportunity for the committee to effectively discharge its responsibilities. We recognize that not all of these appointments have occurred during the tenure of the present administration; nonetheless, a distressing pattern, apparent last year, has continued into this year.

Over the past summer three high level appointments were made: Dean of the College of Arts and Science, Dean of the College of Business and Economics, and Interim President. In all three of these cases the committee was given only one or two days in which to convene and make a response. (In the case of the Interim President, a weekend did intervene.) In none of those cases was there such urgency that required this pressure except that the then-President and the Chairperson of the Board of Trustees were eager to make a public announcement by a date that they had arbitrarily set.

Again this year, two critical appointments have been made without appropriate consultation by the committee. The first instance was the appointment of the Vice President of Public Affairs, in which case the committee was completely ignored. The second was the appointment of the Director of the Zoellner Arts Center. In this case, having been able to assemble four members on 24 hours notice, the committee met with the candidate for a total of twenty minutes. Although it can be correctly pointed out that appointments can be made without a national search, that is precisely where the role of the Personnel Committee becomes essential. The faculty needs some assurance that the candidate is exceptionally well-qualified and that there is a good and sufficient reason for not conducting a national search. The faculty has charged the Personnel Committee with that oversight responsibility.

The fact that a search was conducted last year for a Director of Zoellner does not indicate that a candidate is uniquely qualified for the post. The committee was particularly distressed that no supporting information whatsoever was available to supplement the candidate's vita, such as confidential letters of recommendation or names of references that could be followed up. When there is no search committee, it is essential that some of these steps be taken.

Candidly, we cannot understand why the university would want to hire people by a tainted process. The appointments of both the Vice President of Public Affairs and the Director of the Zoellner Arts Center have been compromised at the outset by the flawed process.

Over the past few weeks, we have been able to interview the potential candidates for the position of President in a timely and deliberate manner. We are hoping for and looking forward to a continuation of our more cooperative relationship with the administration which follows both the letter and the spirit of R&P.

APPEALS BY FACULTY
Although the committee averages about one case per year brought by a faculty member alleging arbitrary or capricious action by the administration, we have had no case so far this academic year.

LEGISLATION
The policy on sexual harassment has been submitted for approval by the Board of Trustees. We await the outcome of their decision.

Respectfully submitted,
Colleen M. Callahan, Chair
For the Committee
To: Lehigh University Faculty

From: Frank R. Gunter, FCC Chair 1997-1998 (fig2)
       Ed Shapiro, FCC Chair 1998-1999 (ess2)

Subject: Initial 1997/98 Faculty Compensation Data

1. The AAUP annual report on faculty compensation was published last week. The attached tables and charts have been revised to reflect the availability of 1997-1998 data.

2. Compensation for Full Professors Table: Lehigh is now 73rd on the list compared to a ranking of 64th in 1996-97. As noted, there have been several changes in the coverage of this table. Of the seventy-three schools that have a higher average compensation for their full professors, eleven are institutions that offer post-baccalaureate degrees but not the Ph.D., eleven offer only the baccalaureate, and one, Nassau Community College, is a two-year community college.

3. Percentage change in salary levels for continuing faculty: The average salary raise for continuing faculty in 1997-1998 was a surprising 4.6% for both "All U.S. Ph.D." and "All Private Ph.D." institutions. Since Lehigh's average increase for the same year was 3.3%, the gap in compensation between Lehigh and our peer groups has widened. Also, it appears more likely that the 1998-1999 increase at our competitive schools will be 4.5% to 5.0%. Since Lehigh announced that the average salary increase will be 3.5% next year (before slippage), we can expect that the faculty compensation gap will be even wider in 1998-1999.

4. Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors Compensation Comparisons Charts: The compensation gap for full professors widened in 1997-1998 to $13,400 compared to the average of "All Private Ph.D." institutions, to $6,900 compared to "All Mid-Atlantic Ph.D." schools, and to $5,200 compared to "Pence's Picks." Our advantage over the average compensation at "All U.S. Ph.D." institutions continues to narrow, falling to $6,400 in 1997-1998 from $13,600 in 1992-1993.
As in previous years, the gap between the average compensation of Lehigh Associate and Assistant Professors and the various comparison groups remains relatively smaller than at the Full Professor level. This occurs, in part, because of the conscious decision by many of the departments and some of the colleges to maintain competitive compensation for the younger faculty at the cost of reducing the salary pool available for raises for the senior faculty.

Another way of presenting these large and growing discrepancies is to sum up the shortages over a period of time. Over the last five years, the average Lehigh Full Professor received about $53,700 less than the average Full Professor at “All Private Ph.D.” universities in the U.S. ($53,700 will purchase four years of tuition, room and board at Penn State or pay for over one-third of the average home in the Lehigh Valley!). The equivalent sums over five years for Lehigh Associate and Assistant Professors are $26,900 and $11,100 respectively.

Of course, the comparisons on the table and the three charts ignore the differences in fields between different universities. Lehigh, for example, has a disproportionate number of engineering and business faculty compared to the typical school in any of these groups. As a result, after adjusting for field, Lehigh falls even further behind. Adjustments for these field differences are made in the annual comparison with the “fourteen school” group. The administration is waiting for the necessary data to make these field adjustments and will provide the estimates to the FCC as soon as possible.

5. Implications for the budget: Since the financial crisis was announced in 1992-1993, total University expenditures have increased by 12.2% (approximately $22 million) to about $205 million in 1997-1998. If total faculty compensation had grown at half this rate, 6.1%, over the last five years (about 1.2% a year) then our faculty would currently be at parity with the average school in Penrose’s Picks. However, total University expenditures for faculty compensation as reported to the AAUP rose 2.6% (approximately $900 thousand) over the last five years to $34 million. As a result, faculty compensation, which accounted for 18.2% of total University expenditures in 1992-1993, fell to 16.7% in 1997-1998.

Total University expenditures for faculty salary as reported to the AAUP were $27.2 million in 1997-1998. Because certain benefits (TIAA-CREF, social security contributions, etc.) are a function of the size of a faculty member’s salary, it would now cost Lehigh approximately $330,000 to provide an average salary raise of 1% to the current faculty.

6. Summary: The competitiveness of Lehigh’s faculty compensation deteriorated in 1997-1998 and is expected to deteriorate even further next year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1987-88</th>
<th>1988-89</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Prof Corp</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rockefell U.</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$189,900</td>
<td>Cat. I = Doctoral Level Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Harvard U.</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$141,700</td>
<td>Cat. IA = Postbaccalaureate, but not Doctoral Level Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$136,900</td>
<td>Cat. IB = Bachelor's Level Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>University of California - Berkeley</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$134,100</td>
<td>Cat. IIA = Master's Level Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>John Marshall Law School</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$127,100</td>
<td>Cat. III = Two-Year Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Princeton U.</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$124,100</td>
<td>School's dropped since 1999-00:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>U. of Colorado Health Sciences Center</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>$124,100</td>
<td>Albany Law School ($122,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$131,700</td>
<td>New England Law School ($118,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>U. of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$119,800</td>
<td>St. John's University ($114,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yale U.</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$120,100</td>
<td>New School of Social Research ($107,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$129,300</td>
<td>SUNY at Buffalo (formerly SFB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>U. of Chicago</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$127,100</td>
<td>(1986-87) - $102,600, 1987-88 - $123,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Columbia U.</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$125,700</td>
<td>SUNY at Stony Brook (formerly 6th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Emory U.</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$153,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$122,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Georgetown U.</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$121,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Academic Med/April 1988
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The FFPOC focused its efforts on four areas during the past year. The first was advocating for increased investment in academic infrastructure as the most important budgetary priority for 1998-99 and subsequent years. Second, the committee paid close attention to the emerging priority for the Development Office to raise funds for academic programs in the near-term and during the next campaign. Third, FFPOC continued to express its concerns about the financial impact of the "Related Enterprises" on the University. And fourth, as part of the budget process, we looked for ways to improve budgetary information and to better understand "off-budget commitments," which should be avoided in future years.

At year end, we can report modest financial progress in relation to academic infrastructure investment. Another positive development was administrative and Trustee recognition of the seriousness of the problems facing the faculty and the University in this area. Regarding the next development campaign, academic needs will be the center of fund-raising efforts, but priorities have not yet been finalized. As for the "Related Enterprises," it has been a year of significant change that FFPOC believes is for the better. The University has evaluated these functions to insure that they are financially sound and that they contribute directly to the academic mission of the institution. Finally, the approach to the budget process and prioritization were changed this year by President Hittinger and Provost Markley. A new Planning and Budgeting (P&B) Working Group was convened, community input was an integral part of the process, and, for the longer term, efforts will now be directed toward maximizing the linkage between planning priorities, and budget development.

In the sections below, more detailed information pertaining to the four areas is presented as well as related considerations that emerged over the course of the year. This is followed by longer-term issues that the Committee believes should be brought to the attention of the faculty.

**Academic Infrastructure**

The FFPOC views academic infrastructure as a broad umbrella encompassing operating budgets, support for research and scholarship, equipment acquisition and maintenance, faculty salaries, support staff for academic programs, academic facilities including libraries, computing, and classrooms, and graduate student support. The priority assigned to this area by FFPOC was the result of internal committee deliberations and faculty input during budget process. Overall, we saw modest progress. The most tangible improvement came in operating budgets, where a 25% increase, $200,000, was allocated to the Deans specifically for academic departments. Less obvious but constructive changes were made by regularizing a number of commitments to the academic wing that had been handled for several years on an *ad hoc* basis. This step should provide corollary benefits because year-end surpluses will be available for investment rather than as stop-gap funding. Lastly, the FFPOC was pleased to see clear recognition on the part of the Administration and Board of Trustees (particularly the Academic Affairs Committee) as to the seriousness of our resource problems. However, we remain cautious because while recognition
and statements about priorities are necessary steps, we have not yet seen the financial commitment required to address the fiscal, physical, and human resource needs of the academic wing. This will, in fact, require several years of sustained additional investment within the annual budget.

The mechanism for funding research and scholarly activity also needs serious attention. This view also was shared by the P&B Group and a committee, headed by Harvey Stenger, will study the issue and report next year. We are looking for significant changes in return on indirect costs investors and departments as a stronger incentive and support mechanism. An informal survey of other schools showed much larger returns than the present Research Incentive Fund provides. Professor J. Richard Decker will represent FFPOC on this group. Our objective is to help develop policies that allow strongly contributing units to prosper and that also provide the Deans with significant resources to support scholarship in general.

**Development**

There is a clear institutional commitment to raising money for academic needs in the next campaign, which will have a goal of $500,000,000. The Provost, in consultation with a “priorities advisory group” comprised of the Deans plus five faculty, is utilizing input from the academic units to define a set of institutional priorities. The FFPOC requested the opportunity to review these and provide input before they are finalized and the Provost has agreed.

The Development office has received a $1,100,000 commitment to support Phase I of its expansion. The FFPOC was given the funding plan in advance as well as the projected returns on this investment. The increased expenditure seems appropriate given the stated fund raising goals. However, the Committee took a very strong position on the funding mechanism, specifically that it could not come from the operating budget. This view was put forward both in P&B and with the Trustee Finance Committee. Currently, funding through 2004 does not directly involve the operating budget but, as Professor J. R. Aronson noted in a previous report, there is creative “off-budget” financing involved. It is, however, better than a direct hit on the operating budget, which we cannot afford. The FFPOC believes that careful monitoring of these activities will be necessary and is encouraged that a plan mandating accountability on a quarterly basis is an integral part of the expansion.

**Related Enterprises**

The past year saw substantive changes in the status and evaluation of entities subsumed under “Related Enterprises.” These included the Agility Forum, the Iacocca Institute, the Discovery Center, Ben Franklin, and the Manufacturing Resources Center. The FFPOC and its predecessors had been concerned about the financing of these operations and their relationship to the University. Interim President Hittinger, VP Finance Rhonda Gross, and an oversight subcommittee of the Trustee Finance Committee led evaluations of the financial health and contribution to the core academic mission of these units. The Agility Forum has been severed from the University, the Discovery Center now must be financially self-sustaining and reports to the College of Education, and the Iacocca Institute has been assigned to the College of Business.
It also is the case that the Iacocca Institute (and other institutes) will pay administrative fees to the University for services. The FFPOC applauds these changes and recognizes the leadership of the aforementioned individuals and groups in this area.

**Budget Process**

With the end of University Council, a new structure for developing the University budget was put into place. Titled the Planning and Budgeting Working Group, it consisted of the President, Provosts, VPs for Finance, Development, and Public Affairs, the four Deans, the FFPOC Chair, and a representative from the Faculty Steering Committee. The FFPOC as a whole was provided opportunities for input and regularly engaged in discussions about the budget with senior administrative personnel. In addition, a process that sought and incorporated community input prior to developing the budget was implemented. This process shaped priorities for 1998-99 and helped establish the definitive need for investment in the academic wing and salaries. There were tangible positive effects of this process, although they clearly represent only a small step in addressing academic needs. The first budget model in Fall 1997 had only $700,000 available for investment with increases limited to a handful of categories. Given community input, the final budget added about $3,200,000 more for salaries, a targeted academic operating budget enhancement, and to regularize prior commitments to existing faculty and staff slots and departments. The result is a budget with a better base. The effect should be fewer “surprises” and a decreased need for stop-gap funding. One potential benefit of these improvements is that year-end surpluses should be available for investment rather than as a source for meeting unbudgeted commitments.

In addition, there is a need to strongly link planning and budgeting. This theme has been emphasized by FFPOC and also in the P&B group. The changes in the budget process represent a shift toward this goal. The FFPOC believes that continued monitoring of the budget for coherence between priorities, planning, and resource allocation is essential if we are to insure best use of University resources.

In the course of the Committee’s work this year, a broader issue directly related to the budget process was raised, specifically the depth and detail of financial information contained in the “Budget Book.” The way information currently is presented, it is hard to determine how funds are used within a particular area. More detailed information is needed if we are to shift from a historical to a rational resource allocation model, an approach the Committee believes is important in the contemporary financial environment. Bruce Hargreaves, a FFPOC member, is working with Jim Tiefenbrunn on this issue.

Lastly, the FFPOC recognizes two potential problem areas. One is that FFPOC membership on P&B is not formalized (neither is the seat for a FSC representative). Although faculty representation at the budget table has been the practice for several years, we believe it should be policy. Second, community input as part of the budget process clearly had an effect on how dollars were allocated. This opportunity also is not a given and FFPOC believes an administrative commitment to soliciting this input as part of the budget process is appropriate. The Committee notes these concerns because of the pending change in the presidency.
OTHER ISSUES

Budgetary Pressures and Needs

The factors that have pressured the University budget this year and throughout the 1990s have been presented by Jim Tiefenbrun and other administrators on several occasions (see Fig. 1 for net E&G). Prominent among these are financial aid (Fig. 2), graduate tuition revenue and indirect cost recovery. Improvement in enrollment management seems to be helping with the financial aid issue, but this commitment, while necessary, is a serious drain on unrestricted revenues. In the other two areas, improved performance represents opportunities for increasing the amount of available unrestricted funds. The FFPOC and faculty have heard this message repeatedly and the Committee understands this is not something new or unrecognized.

The FFPOC is interested in policies that provide greater incentives and support for research and graduate activities. In the area of graduate tuition, an incentive plan is in place and the Committee will be monitoring this area (as will the Graduate and Research Committee). Budgeted amounts for graduate tuition have been reduced and a safety factor has been included. This should at least minimize the likelihood of shortfalls, which would also have some overall benefit. The Committee hopes that next year will bring substantive policy changes that more strongly support research and scholarship.

In the area of budgetary needs, the Committee was pleased to note the recognition of the serious funding problems confronting the academic core. However, we remain cautious based on recent experience and actions. Specifically, the FFPOC noted the following this year and in the recent past: i) the need to increase financial aid generated rapid annual increases in allocations from unrestricted (and other) sources (see Fig. 2), ii) the Development Office made a case for more operational and personnel support, $1,100,000 was identified for investment in Phase I, more is likely forthcoming, iii) the Admissions Office is finalizing a plan that requires additional funds and President Hititinger has indicated it will be supported, and iv) administrative positions have been added in the past year that were funded only in part by reallocation. These actions demonstrate that a rapid financial response to identified needs is possible in many instances. Yet to address pressing academic needs, the answer principally involves “the next development campaign.” Because current trends in giving largely involve bequests, it will take many years before significant resources can be realized. Thus, while FFPOC applauds the commitment, we are concerned about the seeming contrast in approaches to solving academic vs. other problems.

Two examples are academic operating budgets (see Fig. 3) and the salary shortfall. From 1992-93 to this year, unrestricted funds for operating budgets decreased 5.5%. The special $200,000 allocation was enough to add 25% to operating expenses. While a welcome improvement, it also demonstrates how poorly departments are funded. An allocation comparable to that given to Development would double the E&G budget commitment to academic departments. The FFPOC would like to see the same energy and financial creativity applied to remedying academic needs that seems to be present in other cases.
As for the salary issue, the FFPOC shares the FCC concern about the continued erosion of our relative position. The Committee sees this continuing problem as counter to the University's best interests and a risk to our future. Present Hittinger is attempting to develop a mechanism to remedy this issue and the Committee hopes he is successful.

The FFPOC recognizes that it has an obligation to try to identify sources of funds that can be used to meet the prioritized academic needs. At this point in time, the early retirement payoff represents a $2,000,000 pool that will be available beginning in 2001-02 and 2002-03. Second, there have been annual surpluses (better net: undergraduate tuition revenue gains from debt refinancing and short-term investment management, budgetary safety nets, non-recurring negative such as the Presidential transition). The Committee believes a portion of this amount could be put into the regular budget. Some of this was done for 1998-99 and it is unclear if more is possible. However, these all pale in comparison to endowment spending (Fig. 4), which has now dropped to 3.9% vs. the 5.25% target rate because of the spending cap. As shown in Fig. 5 and 6, the value of the endowment has grown by twice the return to the unrestricted budget. For example, a spending rate of 4.5% would yield over $3,200,000 in additional funds per year. Currently, this would put $2,100,000 into the unrestricted budget, although the full amount could be "designated" for academic use. While this is clearly the purview of the Trustees, the FFPOC believes that these sources alone represent the means to meet academic priorities and that they are in keeping with sound fiscal management.

Impact of Addressing Academic Needs

The FFPOC position is that a vigorous investment in academic needs that combines significant near-term investment and longer-term funds from the development campaign is necessary. If both are implemented, the committee sees an arrest of the erosion of program quality and, as a corollary, a renewal of faculty commitment to institutional goals. The Committee believes a near-term funding increase should be seen as part of the development strategy, specifically in relation to building a future donor base. Beyond this strategic consideration, the FFPOC is concerned about the breach of the ethical compact between the University and the Faculty that the salary issue represents. The Committee believes that the University can prosper only if a sense of fairness is restored between employees and management. Our poor competitive position, combined with an inadequate resource base, is not an effective strategy for raising the quality of the educational experience or the University's national ranking. The Committee acknowledges that President Hittinger, Provost Markley, and the Vice-Presidents are working diligently on these issues, but we await concrete results.

This report closes with an interesting opportunity for the University that would accompany an aggressive investment in the academic wing. Enhancing Lehigh's national ranking and reputation is an institutional goal. Using the U.S. News and World report ranking system (Fig. 7), the most direct and fastest means for raising Lehigh's ranking would be through a significant infusion of funds into academic infrastructure, particularly faculty salaries and
operating budgets. This could substantially raise our "Faculty Resources" rating, which is 20% of the overall score. There is a confluence of interests in this instance, but it requires definitive administrative and Trustee actions to accomplish. The FFPOC will continue to advocate for such changes with the goal of producing a better educational environment.

Respectfully submitted.

J. Richard Aronson
J. Richard Decker
Bruce Hargreaves
George White
J. Gary Lutz (Fall 1997 only)
Neal G. Simon, Chair
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Reputation (1-4) (25%)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation and Retention Rank (20%)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Resources (20%)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Selectivity (15%)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Resources (10%)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Satisfaction (5%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Added (5%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(graduation rate - predicted rate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1998 METHODOLOGY

This year's methodology rounded compiled statistics to the nearest whole number and also permitted "ties" therefore resulting in some unusual configurations (i.e. there are 14 institutions ranked in the top 10).

Academic Reputation (25%) College presidents, deans and admissions directors (of the 229 National Universities) were asked to rank schools—placing each school into one of four quartiles. Each time a school was placed in the top quartile, it received four points; second quartile, three points, etc. A school's total points were then divided by the number of survey participants.

Retention Rate (23%) There are two components to retention: graduation rates (80 percent) and freshman retention (20%). The graduation rate is based on the proportion of a class that graduates in six years or less utilizing an average of the graduating classes that started as freshman between 1987 and 1990. Freshman retention is based on the average proportion of freshman entering between 1992 and 1995 who returned the next fall.

Faculty Resources (20%) Represents the resources the schools devote to instruction and faculty. Comprised of five components: class size (40 percent), faculty salaries (35 percent); faculty degrees (15 percent); student-to-faculty ratio (5 percent), and the proportion of full-time faculty (5 percent).

Student Selectivity (15%) Consists of four components: test scores (40 percent), high school class standing (35 percent), acceptance rate (15 percent), and yield (10 percent). The data are for the fall 1996 entering class.

Financial Resources (10%) It has two components: average of fiscal 1995 and 1996 expenditures on instruction, administration, student services and academic support (including libraries and computers) divided by total full-time enrollment (80 percent); all other spending - research, scholarships, public service, operations and maintenance - per full-time enrollment (20 percent).

Alumni Satisfaction (5%) Average percentage of undergraduate alumni who gave to their school during the 1995 and 1996 academic years.

Value Added (5%)—Difference between school's predicted graduation rate—based on the median entrance exam scores of '90 entering freshmen and its educational expenditures per student in relation to its graduation rate. It is a measure of the school's role in the academic success of students.
BASKETBALL SCHOLARSHIP EVALUATION

A study is underway, as part of the NCAA certification cycle involving a number of campus committees, to evaluate the merits of providing financial aid above demonstrated financial need in the sports of men's and women's basketball.

   - League of institutions of like standards at critical mass
   - Holy Cross has instituted basketball scholarship program
   - Loss of Holy Cross, if unsatisfied with Patriot League competitiveness, could lead to loss of Army and Navy.
   - League would fail to meet NCAA requirements should members fall below 6
   - No other league with Patriot League standards is available
- Current League members are:
  Army (except football)
  Bucknell
  Colgate
  Holy Cross
  Lafayette
  Lehigh
  Navy (except football, m.lacrosse, m.swimming, m.x-c)
- "Associate" members:
  Fordham - football
  Towson - football
  Fairfield - field hockey
  Ursinus - field hockey
- Long list of historic membership considerations leads to conclusion that we cannot find any new members.

2. Academic integrity can be maintained and expended by management.
3. Costs can be kept to present levels by management.

4. Merit scholarships can, by management, be limited to wrestling and basketball.

5. Improved competitiveness may contribute to gate revenues, increased student and alumni interest, and increased institutional visibility.

6. By offering more scholarships for women than men, with NCAA limits, we can better balance our Title IX gender requirements.

7. We are moving to seek approval to offer a capped maximum of 13 full equivalencies for men and 15 for women. Will seek Board approval in June. Will offer scholarships beginning in FY2000.