Lehigh University

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING

26 April 1999

Presiding: Gregory Farrington (University Center 308)

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

1. **Memorial Resolution.** A tribute to Wendell Trumbull, late Professor Emeritus of Accounting, was read by Professor Kenneth Sinclair, who MOVED that his remarks be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and that copies be forwarded to members of the family [see Attachment 1]. President Farrington declared the motion PASSED by acclamation and the faculty STOOD to observe a moment of silence in memory of Professor Trumbull.

2. **Minutes.** The minutes of the faculty meeting of February 1st, 1999 were approved. (The President read this faithfully from the printed agenda, which must have been erroneous since the minutes of 1 February 1999 were approved at the March meeting [see Attachment 2]. Presumably the approval was intended to refer to the minutes of 22 March 1999.)

3. **Graduation Motions.** Registrar Bruce Correll MOVED approval of the four customary resolutions enabling appropriate degrees, honors, and prizes to be awarded to students who shall have completed all requirements no later than 8:30 AM on Wednesday, May 26, 1999 [see Attachment 3]. The faculty AGREED by unanimous voice vote.

4. **Elections.** Professor McIntosh and his colleagues from the Nominations Committee conducted the annual balloting to fill offices in the gift of the University Faculty. There were no nominations from the floor. [Results in contested races were subsequently reported to the faculty by e-mail.] [Attachment 4]

5. **Discipline.** Professor Roslyn Weiss brought forward proposals detailed in a mailing to all faculty with a cover letter from Dean Basso to the Registrar dated 12 April 1999 [see Attachment 5]. The University Judicial Review Panel recommended two changes to R&P 4.2 ('University Student Judicial System'). Firstly, a new section, 4.2.4.6 ('Sanction guidelines for offenses involving physical violence'), would be added to R&P. Professor Weiss observed that the guidelines would not be mandatory. The hearing bodies would remain free to impose lesser or greater penalties as circumstances might dictate in their judgment. Her committee believed nevertheless that it would be useful to give students faced with judicial proceedings, as well as their parents, some idea of what to expect. She also asserted that violence on campus has increased in recent years, lending urgency to the issue. Secondly, the Committee on Discipline sought faculty acceptance of a change in R&P 4.2.4.5 ('Other Sanctions'): the hearing body's option of imposing a course grade of WF in
cases of academic dishonesty would be replaced by the option of imposing a
course grade of F “to make it clear on the transcript that it was not voluntary.”

Professor Weiss: ‘Any discussion of the motions?’ [No motions had actually
been formally offered, but the faculty proceeded as if they were on the floor.]

Professor Gunter MOVED TO DIVIDE THE QUESTION. The AYES probably
had it, although the nays were never called for.

Professor Weiss responded to questions about the proposed sanction guidelines.
President Farrington wondered aloud whether legal counsel had been sought. A
voice from the floor assured him that, since disciplinary changes required
consent of the Board of Trustees, lawyers would be consulted. Professor Folk
MOVED TO AMEND the initial phase in Offense C, “Unprovoked physical
attack.” to read “Unprovoked serious physical attack,” but his initiative DIED FOR
LACK OF A SECOND after Professor Weiss expressed confidence that the
discretion of the hearing bodies would prove a sufficient guarantee of
reasonableness. The [implied] motion was PASSED by voice vote with but a
single nay audible to the Secretary.

The faculty now turned to the second [implied] motion, for which a second was
solicited and received. Professor Aronson wanted to know how a transcript
reader would discern that an F was “involuntary” or imposed for disciplinary
reasons; he wondered if we needed a special new kind of F. (LAUGHTER)
Professor Weiss: “I have myself no objection to having some sort of new
designation...” Discussion continued for some time in interesting veins not
directly related to the difference between WF and F grades. Professor
Szczepanski engaged the Registrar in an illuminating exchange on the grading
consequences of expulsions via the “Section 3” process. Professor Gunter
expressed eloquent opposition to having his judgment about a student’s grade
superseded by that of a committee, especially one including student members.
That arrangement, however, was already a part of R&P and was not the issue
presently on the floor. Various weighty colleagues, among them Professors Kay
and Beidler, spoke in favor of the motion, which ultimately CARRIED by a voice
vote with one resounding nay.

7. Provost. Dr. Markley commented with enthusiasm on L.E.-W.I.S., son of
Y2K.” Our substantial investment in Y2K preparedness has precipitated a large-
scale effort to overcome “data disconnects” and other information system
shortcomings. A contract with SCT was signed ‘a few days ago’ to link the entire
campus through a web system. The time line is ‘very aggressive’: completion in
two years. Student applications such as on-line registration and records access
are the highest priority: many of our competitors already offer such capabilities.
The Provost introduced Manny Pena, who is directing Y2K readiness for the
University. Rhonda Gross, Don Belle, and the Provost are serving as the
executive committee for the L.E.-W.I.S. project. Dr. Markley thanked a large
number of committees and offices for past and anticipated help. Among other
points he said we would need to “minimize customization” to expedite installation.
This prompted a comment by Professor Folk, who recalled that a previous outside vendor had disrupted the equalization of section size in Physics and English. The Provost allowed that a limited amount of customization might be tolerated to head off major problems, but insisted that some irritations would need to be borne until the basic system was up and running. As to outside vendors, both he and the President said that it would be great to make some Lehigh department(s) rich by doing the project in-house, but much larger campuses than ours are turning to commercial sources.

8. **Faculty Compensation Committee.** Dr. Shapiro read the FCC’s “End of Year Report,” a three-page document circulated at the meeting and incorporating salary data which had become available just days earlier [see Attachment 6]. The tone was pessimistic: “Lehigh lags behind its competition in faculty compensation and the gap continues to widen.”

9. **Faculty Financial Planning & Operations Committee.** Professor Hargreaves, standing in for Professor George White, delivered a brief report making two principal points. Firstly, the FFPOC is hopeful that LE-WIS will resolve information problems which have plagued both the FFPOC and the Administration, “our rapport with the Administration has helped to make the right decisions.” Secondly, the committee shares the view that the compensation issue is a grave one but believes that it is now a budget priority; “we have the President to thank for that.” He announced that Professor Decker would chair FFPOC in the coming year. He claimed some credit on behalf of his committee for the recent modest expansion of departmental budgets “a priority throughout my years on the committee.”

10. **Graduate and Research Committee.** Professor Szczepanski read highlights of a three-page report dated 25 April 1999 and distributed at the meeting [see Attachment 7]. She reviewed the past year, emphasizing program evaluations, responses to Middle States comments, “changes in the nature and administration of graduate fellowships funded by the University,” and distance learning, among other topics. There were no questions or comments.

11. **Personnel.** Professor Neti read the one-page annual report of his committee, which was distributed at the meeting [see Attachment 8]. Only one appeal from a tenure decision had reached the committee, but considerable time was invested in “informal advice to both faculty and administration on various personnel matters.” Professor Neti saw a connection, thinking it likely that the informal advising had helped to reduce the incidence of formal confrontations. “Lastly, we have been working with President Farrington to try to get him to memorize all of R&P. [APPLAUSE, LAUGHTER] He is putting up quite a resistance…”

12. **President.** Dr. Farrington had kind words for the faculty committee with which he has worked. He said the forthcoming version of the Stillwater Report will incorporate many changes from the original draft. The implementation of Project IMPACT promises to go more smoothly at Lehigh than similar measures at Penn, where there have been numerous student demonstrations and even attempts to
persuade prospective freshmen not to enroll. He credited the efforts of John Smeaton and his colleagues for Lehigh’s relative peace to date.

Addressing the salary question, he said that, “Lehigh should pay its faculty fairly in comparison to the true competition.” He discussed the situation at Penn, relating higher compensation to higher ‘productivity’ as reflected in research grants. His point was that Penn was not Lehigh’s “true competition.” He was cautious about the financial future. “We have been living off the stock market. Absent rising tuition or research income, either salaries will be stagnant or faculty size must fall or donors must be more generous. “I must be honest with you.”

Professor Gunter remarked that the President had argued credibly why Lehigh doesn’t belong in the top 30 institutions, but our relative position is deteriorating within the group to which we do belong. President Farrington conceded that he had a good point and that such matters as below-average salaries for Assistant Professors deserved a good look.

13. **Adjournment.** The meeting stood adjourned at 5:50 PM.

---

Dave Amidon  
Acting Secretary  
For Stephen F. Thode  
Secretary to the Faculty  
304 Rauch Business Center  
(610) 758-4557  
FAX: (610) 882-9415  
E-mail: sft@
Memorial resolution for Wendell Trumbull:

Wendell Trumbull, professor emeritus of accounting, died Tuesday, April 20, 1999.

Wendell was born July 18, 1909, in Butler, Missouri. He was the son of the late Robert S. and Mattie (Figgott) Trumbull. He graduated from high school in El Paso, Texas. He earned a bachelor’s degree at the University of Illinois and Masters and Ph.D. degrees at the University of Michigan. While in high school he built and operated a ham radio transmitter with SALE as the licensed call. At college he played in a traveling band to help pay his way.

Wendell was an Army veteran of World War II, serving first with the U.S. Signal Corps 3104th Signal Service Battalion in Paris and after V-Day as a staff analyst with our Military Government in Frankfurt and Berlin. He returned to civilian life with the rank of captain.

From 1937 to 1954 Wendell was on the accounting faculty of the University of Mississippi and later at New York University. In 1957 he came to Lehigh University, where he was appointed professor of accounting. Wendell Trumbull was the first Ph.D. hired into the Accounting Department. He served as department head for nine years until 1967.

Wendell was a CPA. On academic leave, he worked one year as an auditor for Arthur Andersen & Co., one of the then Big 8 international accounting firms. He was also a scholar who wrote numerous articles appearing in highly regarded journals. He was editor of the prestigious academic journal “The Accounting Review,” from 1965 through 1967. Although his field was accounting, Wendell was appreciated by other members of the college for his intensive scholarship and knowledge in related fields of economics and finance.

His colleagues describe him as a Victorian gentleman, distinguished, always above reproach with impeccable integrity—a class act. His word was his bond. He had the highest standards for both students and faculty. Although he had strong convictions, he was polite and courteous. One recollection of his wry sense of humor was the time in class when a student seemed to fall asleep. Wendell picked up a piece of chalk, threw it into a metal wastebasket and observed the student come to life.

In the late 1960s Wendell was asked by then president Deming Lewis to chair a campus-wide computer committee which recommended and led to a very important upgrading of the Lehigh computer systems.

Shortly after retirement in 1974, Wendell continued his love of music by taking up the violin. He also negotiated the sale of his extensive collection of annual reports by American corporations to a Japanese university. Comprised of more than 5,000 permanently bound reports, the collection reflected not only the progress of U.S. accounting over time but also the busy life of American corporations over a 40 year period.

Wendell Trumbull is survived by his wife, Lillian (Dooley) Trumbull; a son, John of New Tripoli, PA; two daughters, Dr. Blise Trumbull, wife of Jerry Salzman of Oakland, CA and Ruth, wife of Lawrence Morris of New Tripoli, PA; three sisters, Roberta Newion of Butler, MO, Anelie O’Neil of Winfield, KS, and Mattie Grace Nemeth of Tampa, FL and four grandchildren. He was pre-deceased by a daughter, Jane Ellen Trumbull.

Mr. President, on behalf of the faculty of Lehigh University, I move that this memorial resolution be spread upon the minutes of this faculty meeting and that copies be distributed to his family.

Respectfully submitted by Kenneth P. Sinclair, Professor of Accounting and Chair
Subject: Revised Faculty Meeting Agenda
Date: Mon, 26 Apr 1999 09:29:13 EDT
From: mb2@lehigh.edu (Michelle Valentin)
To: Distribution List@lehigh.edu (vfaclist)

Revised Faculty Meeting Agenda
26 April 1999

Call to order at 4:10 pm

UNIVERSITY CENTER ROOM 303 - OSBOURNES ROOM
(Refreshments will be served at 3:30 pm in the Faculty Lounge)

1. Professor Kenneth Sinclair will give the memorial resolution for Professor Emeritus Wendall P. Irumbull

2. Corrections or approval of the 01 February 1999 Faculty Meeting Minutes

3. Graduation Motions - Registrar Bruce Correll

4. Committee Motions
   - Educational Policy Committee - Professor Arnold Spokane
     Endorsement of Project Impact policy revisions
   - Nominations Committee - Professor James McIntosh
     Elections for 1999-2000
   - University Committee on Discipline - Professor Roslyn Weiss
     Proposed revisions to R&P

5. Unfinished Business

6. New Business
   - Lehigh Enterprise-Wide Information System - Provost Nelson Maxley
   - Development Update - Vice President Jill Sherman

7. Committee Reports
   - Faculty Compensation Committee Report - Professor Edward Shapiro
   - Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee Report - Professor George White
   - Graduate and Research Committee Report - Professor Susan Szczepanski
   - Personnel Committee Annual Report - Professor Sudakar Neti

8. President's Report

9. Adjournment

Michelle Valentin
Senior Personnel Assistant
Office of the President & Provost
April 26, 1999

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 26, 1999, 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 1999 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.
Subject: Election Results
Date: Tue, 04 May 1999 15:28:32 EDT
From: mnb2@Lehigh.EDU (Michelle Valentin)
To: Distribution List@lehigh.edu (vfaclist)

To: The Lehigh Faculty

From: Jim McIntosh, chair of the University Nominating Committee
Re: Results of the contested elections from Monday, April 26

Faculty Financial Planning & Operations Committee - Bruce Hargeaves
Personnel Committee - Joan Spade
Nominations Committee - Beall Fowler
Faculty Compensation Committee - Raymond Bell
Honorary Degrees Committee - Jack Iaul
Library Users Committee - Scott Gordon

Michelle Valentin
Senior Personnel Assistant
Office of the President & Provost
MEMORANDUM

To: Bruce Correll
    Registrar

From: Sharon K. Basso
    Associate Dean of Students

Re: Proposed Changes in R&P

Attached are proposed changes in the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty pertaining to Section 4.2 University Student Judicial System. These changes have been reviewed and approved by the University Committee on Discipline and the University Disciplinary Appeals Committee. The University Judicial Review Panel, comprised of the faculty chairperson of the Committee on Discipline, the faculty chairperson of the Disciplinary Appeals Committee, and the Dean of Students, bring these recommendations forward to the faculty for vote. The 1999-2001 edition of the Lehigh University Student Handbook is being published this summer and I will be able to make any changes in that publication as a result of the faculty vote in April.
I. Proposed addition to R&P to appear as section 4.2.4.6 Sanction guidelines for offenses involving physical violence

Violent physical attacks are a violation of the University Code of Conduct; specifically, Offenses against another person; (1) intentionally or recklessly causing physical harm to any person on or near the Lehigh campus or at activities sponsored by or affiliated with Lehigh, or causing reasonable apprehension of such harm.

The following represents recommendations for sanctions in cases where students are found guilty of violations of the code of conduct involving physical attacks. The sanctions demonstrate the seriousness with which Lehigh University considers these violations. The formal hearing bodies are not limited to these guidelines in determining an appropriate sanction. Hearing bodies may determine a greater or lesser sanction to be appropriate depending upon the individual circumstances of each case. Hearing bodies may supplement the sanctions below with other appropriate mandates including, but not limited to, referral for counseling, educational workshops, written apologies, restitution for medical bills, etc. (See page 63 in the Student Handbook and Section 4.2.4.5 "Other sanctions").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offenses</th>
<th>1st Offense</th>
<th>2nd Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Physical attack which is characterized by any two of the following:</td>
<td>Expulsion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) resulted in serious injury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) was unprovoked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) involved the use of weapon(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Physical attack which resulted in serious injuries</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expulsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Suspension of two semesters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attack which involved the use of a weapon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Unprovoked physical attack, and/or attack with no resulting serious injures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Suspension of one semester</td>
<td>Suspension of two semesters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attack or threat of violence disproportionate (excessive) in response to provocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rationale: This proposed set of guidelines is consistent with the format currently published in the Student Handbook pertaining to sanction guidelines for offenses involving sexual harassment or assault. The university community has seen an increase over the past few years in the frequency and severity of incidents involving students physically attacking one another, sometimes causing serious injuries. Over the past 1 ½ years, the University Committee on Discipline, the University Disciplinary Appeals Committee, and the Judicial Review panel have all developed and approved these proposed guidelines in an effort to respond appropriately and consistently to such egregious offenses. In addition, the faculty, students, and administrators of these three groups believe that once students and parents are informed of the proposed guidelines, they will serve as a deterrent for future violent behavior. Lehigh experienced much success with the deterrent value of stated sanctions when such an initiative was undertaken regarding student behavior at the traditional Lehigh vs. Lafayette football game. Once students and parents were informed that anyone involved in destructive/violent behavior at the game would be suspended from the university, the actual sanctions have yet to be levied because there have been no such incidents at the game since the time such a stance was taken.

II. Current
4.2.4.5 Other Sanctions
Additional sanctions may be applied to cover specific conditions or situations. The following are specific examples, but hearing bodies are not limited to these: restitution or replacement of lost, damaged, or stolen property; payment for damage or personal injury; suspension of privileges to participate in any activity sponsored by the university; suspension of privileges to use certain facilities; suspension of rights to represent the university; suspension of rights to occupy a position or office in a group or organization officially recognized by Lehigh University; community service work to be assigned by the office of the dean of students; referral for alcohol or drug abuse counseling; mandatory periodic meetings with a dean or counselor. Sanctions that suspend students' privileges shall have a set time of duration indicating when and under what conditions students may regain the privilege. Note: students found guilty of academic dishonesty shall be given a sanction of disciplinary expulsion, suspension, probation, or warning. In addition, other sanctions may be given, such as being dropped from the course with a grade of WF. If the committee on discipline hearing panel does not drop the student from the course with a grade of WF, then the grading of all exercises and the determination of the course grade are left to the discretion of the course instructor.

Proposed
4.2.4.5 Other Sanctions
Additional sanctions may be applied to cover specific conditions or situations. The following are specific examples, but hearing bodies are not limited to these: restitution or replacement of lost, damaged, or stolen property; payment for damage or personal injury; suspension of privileges to participate in any activity sponsored by the university; suspension of privileges to use certain facilities; suspension of rights to represent the university; suspension of rights to occupy a position or office in a group or organization officially recognized by Lehigh University; community service work to be assigned by the office of the dean of students; referral for alcohol or drug abuse counseling; mandatory periodic meetings with a dean or counselor. Sanctions that suspend
students' privileges shall have a set time of duration indicating when and under what conditions students may regain the privilege. Note: students found guilty of academic dishonesty shall be given a sanction of disciplinary expulsion, suspension, probation, or warning. In addition, other sanctions may be given, such as being assigned a grade of F in the course. This grade of F in the course would replace a W on the student's official transcript in the event that the student had already voluntarily withdrawn from the course in question. If the committee on discipline hearing panel does not assign a grade of F in the course, then the grading of all exercises and the determination of the course grade are left to the discretion of the course instructor.

**Rationale:** A grade of WF insinuates that a student voluntarily withdrew from a course after the deadline to drop with a W. An assigned grade of F more accurately reflects that the course requirements were not met by the student. This is more reflective of a finding of academic dishonesty.
April 23, 1999

To: Members of the Voting Faculty

From: Ed Shapiro, Chairperson, FCC

End of Year Report

During the current academic year, the FCC maintained focus on one primary issue—faculty compensation. Beginning with the arrival of President Farrington in August, we made substantial efforts to present the outcomes of many years of demonstrating that Lehigh faculty were under compensated relative to all and any peer groups that had been selected now or in the past. Although the exact amount of the discrepancy was debated, the administration appeared to agree that faculty compensation lagged substantially behind our competition. As a function of these efforts, President Farrington set 5.5% as a target for faculty compensation for the 1999-2000 academic year. The FCC reported in the February faculty meeting that although the announced increase was far below the FCC recommended levels to begin the process of closing the compensation gap, the committee was encouraged that the efforts of the administration were a move in the right direction.

The FCC recommended levels of compensation needed to close the gap between Lehigh and its benchmarked institutions (9.5% in year one, 7.5% in year two, 5.5% in year 3) given what was anticipated from the 1998-99 increase. For this current academic year, the average faculty increase was 3.5%. It was anticipated that peer institutions would most likely award increases around that level and we would at least remain at status quo related to the compensation gap.

On Friday, AAUP announced the salary data for peer institutions. The data were worse news for Lehigh than we anticipated. Data reflected an average salary increase across ALL institutions of 3.6% (before adjusting for inflation). However, among doctoral institutions, the average faculty increase was 4.8% (before adjusting for inflation). Thus, Lehigh faculty lost ground again during the 1998-99 academic year.

The attached table demonstrates the difference between Lehigh and its benchmarked institutions even clearer. Although these data are not yet official nor verified from the treasurer, they are taken directly from the published data that appeared in the Chronicles of Higher Education on April 23. The institutions listed are the exact set of institutions that Provost Markley has selected for the purposes of broad benchmarking across multiple indicators, including compensation. As one can see, compared to the mean of the Research II institutions, Lehigh is $2,300 behind for Full Professors, $300 behind for Associate Professors, and $3,700 behind for Assistant Professors. Against the average of all institutions listed, we remain $5,300 behind the Full Professor rank, $2,100 behind at Associate, and $4,100 behind at Assistant.
Comparing against Research I institutions (the group that represents those schools we will need to pass if we are to become one of the top 25 institutions in the United States), we are $15,400 behind at Full Professor, $6,000 behind at Associate, and $7400 behind at Assistant. Lehigh’s compensation exceeds the average of doctoral I and doctoral II institutions on the list. Lehigh is slightly less behind if one uses median rather than means to represent averages. Regardless, the message is the same—Lehigh lags behind its competition in faculty compensation and the gap continues to widen.

The loss for this current year appears to be as large as it has been for many previous years. As such, it is highly unlikely that the level of announced increase for the upcoming academic year (5.5%) will substantially close the compensation gap. The FCC must express its great disappointment in this likely outcome and calls for the administration to take far more aggressive actions in closing the compensation gap as we begin looking at the 2000-2001 budget.

At the same time, the FCC expressed concerns previously and now that the mechanism selected by the administration to meet these compensation targets were placing extreme hardship on various segments of the University. In particular, the administration’s failure to fully fund the compensation increases forced Deans to make very difficult decisions to leave some faculty slots unfilled or to cancel some faculty searches that had already been approved. The FCC does not believe nor condone this mechanism for solving the compensation problem. At a meeting originally scheduled for April 16 and rescheduled for May 5, the FCC plans to meet with the President, Provost, and Deans to discuss these concerns.

The FCC plans to campaign aggressively again that the administration seriously address the continuing and widening gap between Lehigh and its benchmarked institutions. We reiterate that it does not appear to matter which group of schools are selected for purposes of comparisons. If the comments of the President and Provost that we strive to better those schools ahead of us, then Lehigh must look at the Research I and Research II schools for purposes of comparison. Doing so, places Lehigh at a level with only Tulane, Brandeis, and St. Louis University below us in compensation.

During the upcoming months, the FCC plans to maintain our commitment to our colleagues that Lehigh has an obligation to seriously and significantly impact the compensation gap for faculty, while at the same time strive for the mechanism to achieve this objective without impacting the number of faculty positions. Colleges cannot be asked to pay for a salary problem that has developed and compounded over the past 10 years.

The FCC hopes to work in concert with the administration in the upcoming months to find a workable solution to a long-term problem.
### 1989-99 Salary Using Lehigh Peer Institutions
*(Markoey's Marks)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research I</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Asso</th>
<th>Asst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMU</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>109.2</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>100.3</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>114.9</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufts</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>113.1</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIAN</strong></td>
<td>98.45</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>53.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research II</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Asso</th>
<th>Asst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWU</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPI</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis-Main</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIAN</strong></td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral I</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Asso</th>
<th>Asst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola-Chicago</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMU</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Denver</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIAN</strong></td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral II</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Asso</th>
<th>Asst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkson</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duquesne</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepperdine</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCU</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIAN</strong></td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Asso</th>
<th>Asst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIAN</strong></td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Asso</th>
<th>Asst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIAN</strong></td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: Faculty

From: Susen Szczepanski, Chair Graduate and Research Committee

Re: Report to the faculty, 1998-99

Date: April 25, 1999

A SUMMARY OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE GRADUATE AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE
1998-99 ACADEMIC YEAR.

Evaluation of Graduate Programs

The process of evaluation of graduate programs developed over the past two years was officially implemented during this academic year. Procedures and forms were revised based upon the knowledge gained from the Field Test conducted during the 1997-98 academic year. The process was presented to department chairs, program coordinators and the faculty. Changes to relevant portions of R&P were proposed to the faculty and approved at the 30 November 1998 meeting of the faculty.

As part of the Field Test a schedule for review of programs was established. Seven graduate programs were slated for review during the current year. One program opted to make substantial changes, in effect, developing a “new” master’s program in Sociology to replace the program in Social Relations. The new program will be assessed during academic year 2002-3. The other six programs are currently under review. Reports will be prepared, shared with department chairs and program coordinators and then forwarded to the Deans and Provost by the end of June.

At the end of the current semester, information and forms will be distributed to coordinators of graduate programs scheduled for review during the next academic year. Programs will submit materials for review by the GRC at the end of the Fall 1999 semester.

Course and program changes

Proposals for new programs were reviewed and presented to the faculty, resulting in the approval
of a new M.A. program in Sociology replacing the MA in Social Relations (approved by faculty 30 November 1998), a ME program in Polymer Science (approved by faculty 22 March 1999), and a Ph.D. program in Integrative Biology combining programs in Behavioral Neuroscience and Behavioral and Evolutionary Biology (approved by faculty 22 March 1999).

Course changes were also reviewed and presented to the faculty. Details are contained in the minutes of the 22 March 1999 faculty meeting.

**Clarification of grade requirements for graduate students**

At the request of the Physics Department, the GRC reviewed the various portions of R&P (including 3.21.1, 3.22.1, 3.27.1), that refer to grade requirements for graduate students. A proposal to change R&P to remove inconsistencies was presented to the faculty and approved at the 30 November 1999 faculty meeting. Briefly, the changes establish grades of B= and above as acceptable in graduate courses, and grades of C+ and lower as counting towards probation.

**Review of Middle States Association Report**

The Middle States Association's review of Lehigh prepared in spring 1998 contained several comments pertinent to graduate education at Lehigh. In particular, two issues related to the "decentralization" of graduate education at Lehigh were raised: (1) uniformity in appearance and adequacy of the presentation of promotional materials, and (2) the adequacy of orientation information presented to new and current graduate students. Materials from all four colleges were reviewed. Recommendations were incorporated into the GRC's response to the Stillwater report and included a call for a consistent recruiting strategy with a common University graduate studies brochure and web-based presence supported and complemented by individual college and program brochures and web pages.

**University Fellowships**

The Provost sought the advice of the GRC concerning proposed changes in the nature and administration of graduate fellowships funded by the university. The stated goal was to revitalize this program and to amplify its function as a recruitment tool. To ensure that the revised program be competitive and effective, the GRC recommended that the number of fellowships be adequate number, stipends be increased in amount and duration (e.g., number of years and summer support), and that the fellowship program allow for the differing recruitment needs of the various programs at Lehigh. Administrative efficiency was viewed as crucial if the fellowship program is to be an effective recruitment tool; coordination with award procedures for fellowships awarded through the colleges is critical. The GRC advocated for some dissertation fellowships in addition to "recruitment" fellowships.

Members of the GRC served as a review committee for the nominations submitted to the Provost's revised fellowship program. This group is preparing a follow up report to be submitted to the Provost and reflecting upon the process and its outcome this year.
Distance Learning/Education

The GRC began a discussion of distance learning graduate programs currently offered by Lehigh and the potential expansion of such opportunities using new technologies. The GRC will continue to monitor the quality of existing and proposed programs offered via satellite and other means to off-campus students and has concluded that the formation of a partnership between faculty and administration is needed to oversee the coordination of long term and short term efforts in this area, and especially to coordination of faculty development and investment in and management of facilities. The latter suggestion was incorporated into the GRC response to the recommendations in the Stillwater Report and was forwarded to the President and Provost.

In order to better assess the quality of these distance programs, to identify actions that will enhance them and to gain insight into the faculty’s experience and student quality in courses delivered via technological means to off-campus students, the GRC has conducted an informal preliminary survey of faculty offering courses in the Fall 1998 semester via satellite and will compare the admission credentials and performance of students enrolled in courses offered in off-campus and on-campus format.

The GRC has taken note of different policies governing the tuition revenues generated by on-campus and off-campus courses and has requested that this be reviewed by the Provost and appropriate faculty committees.

Response to Stillwater recommendations

The GRC reviewed the recommendation to establish an office for research and graduate studies under Academic Affairs and related matters mentioned in the report prepared by Stillwater Associates. The GRC endorsed the proposal to establish an administrative position with the individual serving as external advocate and internal coordinator for research and graduate studies at Lehigh but cautioned against establishment of an administrative structure that impedes the efficiency of procedures (e.g., recruitment, application, financial aid, etc.) in place at the college level.

Next Year

During the next academic year, GRC will engage in further refinement of the program evaluation process, discussions related to improving the quality and visibility of graduate education at Lehigh both on and off-campus, and looks forward to developing a working relationship with the new leadership in the areas of research and graduate education.

The committee thanks Professors Jim Guenten (Physics), Tony O’Brien (Economics), Chris Cole (Education and Human Services), Tony Liakopoulos (Mechanical Engineering and Mechanics), Dave Williams (Materials Science) and graduate students Michael Fisher (Mathematics) and Reeti Katosh Rouse (Chemistry) whose terms on this committee will expire shortly and look forward to a productive next year under the chairmanship of Professor Nick Odrey (Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering).
REPORT OF THE FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
April 26, 1999

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 bring to the faculty legislation regarding personnel issues. We discuss briefly recent developments in these areas.

Since our April 1993 annual report, the Board of Trustees has approved the policy on sexual harassment. This policy has been turned over to the R&P subcommittee for it to be included into the R&P.

We met with the Deans and the Provost to discuss the merits and dangers of increasing the total number of lectureships that the university can have. As we understand it, there are considerable financial pressures for considering such a change. We recommended against any increase in the number of lectureships, which currently stands at ten.

The committee met several times with the President and Provost regarding procedures for tenure. These meetings were at the request of the President and Provost in light of the resolutions of the Board of Trustees that tenure and promotion procedures at Lehigh ought to be reviewed.

We did hear a case appealing a tenure decision during the Spring of 1998, and reported our findings to the Interim President.

We have continued our dialog with the Provost regarding the role of the Personnel Committee with respect to high-level appointments. We are pleased to report that we have met with the candidates for the Dean of the College of Business and Economics. We look forward to such involvement if other high-level positions come to be filled.

As always, through out the year, we have rendered informal advice to both faculty and administration on various personnel matters.