Lehigh University  
(Sinclair Auditorium)  
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETING  
April 30, 2007

Presiding: Alice Gast

President Gast called the meeting to order at 3:12 PM.

1. Minutes: The minutes of the March 19, 2007, meeting were corrected by Prof. and Associate Provost Carl Moses. (See accompanying pdf for these corrections.) The Faculty then approved them.

2. Memorial Resolution: (See end materials included with these minutes.) Professor Marvin White delivered the Memorial Resolution for Daniel Leenov, Professor Emeritus of Electrical Engineering and the faculty observed a moment of silence. The Faculty approved this motion by acclamation and requested that a copy of it be sent to his wife and daughters. (Secretary’s note: This was done on May 15, 2007)

2a. Amended Agenda item added for the Nominations Committee: Prof. Theresa McCarthy presented the slate of candidates for various committee positions and opened the floor for nominations. Prof. Sivakumar volunteered to be nominated for the CBE Rep to FCC and was added to the slate. Nominations from the floor closed and ballots were distributed for faculty vote. Ballots were collected to be counted so that the results could be reported later in the meeting.

3. Graduation Motions: (See end materials included with these minutes.)

The Registrar brought the usual and customary May Graduation Motions to the attention of the Faculty. Prof. Frank Gunter moved that these be approved (seconded by another faculty member). Faculty needed no discussion and they were approved unanimously. The September Graduation Motions, following the identical procedure to those for May, were approved unanimously.

4. Committee Motions:

Graduate and Research Committee – Professor Hugo Caram
a. Motion to change R&P 3.27.2 – Incomplete (N grade)  
(See end materials included with these minutes.)

To adopt the policy for an N grade for graduate courses, first proposed at the Feb. 19, 2007, faculty meeting and subsequently discussed at the March 12 meeting, having been re-considered and modified by the GRC to allow a one-year extension of an N grade, which will have no effect on the continued existence of the N grade.

Prof. Caram proposed that this proposal be approved.

Prof. Shapiro objected that once the faculty member has assigned a grade of N without parentheses, the proposal is equivalent to the University overriding the instructor’s evaluation with an automatic replacement by an F grade. An instructor should be able to set the grade without having it automatically changed by the University at a later date.
Prof. Caram replied that if the instructor wants to preserve a non-F grade, then s/he should include a parenthetical grade with the N. There was a strong consensus by the committee that there should be a finite and established end or resolution to the tasks required in the course.

Prof. Giambatista asked, what would happen to if the instructor left the University, before exercising the option of a one-year extension?

Prof. Caram said that the course’s home department faculty would handle such a situation.

The motion passed.

b. Motion for the establishment of a Masters in Environmental Policy (CAS) (See end materials included with these minutes.)

Prof. Caram moved that this proposal be approved.

Prof. Aronson asked about the methodological techniques that will be included in the curriculum, for example, Cost-Benefit Analyses (CBA) or statistical and mathematical modeling, which seem to be de-emphasized. If not these types of analytical techniques, what will be included?

Prof. Caram replied that the program has a quantitative methods requirement, but the emphasis will be multi-sided with respect to societal impacts, not just a simple, single a quantitative measure.

Prof. Sahagian added that, for example, CBA is a necessary tool but not sufficient in itself to design appropriate policies. Other economic and political factors and considerations must be involved. Currently, the program is looking for a CBA course and suggested that other quantitative methods instruction would be welcome for this program. The coverage of environmental factors from the more traditional engineering, and sciences approaches are too narrow.

Prof. Aronson questioned whether it would be possible for program students to graduate without any CBA training.

Prof. Gilroy answered that it would be impossible to graduate without some CBA, but probably it would be less than in other disciplines.

Prof. Gunter asked about the prospects for program graduates for either jobs or further grad education.

Prof. Caram interjected that the graduates have possible jobs in government and foundations.

Prof. Sahagian also suggested that this was possible as a terminal degree to go directly to a job. Or, potential students could come from government agencies on temporary leave, returning to their jobs. Other areas likely to be interested would be businesses with law or policy branches.

Prof. Caram added that environmental policy today is largely driven by regulations, so study of this process should be included in the curriculum along with market and other forces that are not identifiable with purely quantitative tests.

Prof. Munley asked about the preamble and structure of this curriculum that is very different from existing and competing programs such as UCSB or the Kennedy School where CBA methods and
quantitative analyses of empirical data predominate. Since the 1970’s, most policy analysts have needed what these other programs include. Thus, what is the purpose of this program? Perhaps a few grad students in new methods of analysis may be able to find teaching jobs, but not do hard-core policy analysis because they will have missed the tools of CBA, empirical and quantitative methods.

Prof. Caram commented that the GRC had not discussed the program along these lines in this detail. CBA is not as strongly rational as might be desired. Political decisions in real life may not follow a strictly logical and good policy formulation.

Prof. Dearden said that if decisions are not rational, then we need to know how the process works, perhaps through game theory-type analyses, or the formal modeling needed by companies such as RFI or other government research operations.

Prof. Gilroy asked if the Eco Dept. will offer courses without pre-requisites in econometrics, economic policy, etc? (Laughter from the assembled colleagues) There are new ways of thinking about social science or humanities components of environmental policy in addition to the current engineering and science methods. Graduates should be just as employable, but not in the most quantitative jobs such as the Census Bureau.

Prof. Caram called the question and the motion passed.

c. Motion for the establishment of the Urban Leadership Center (COE), a cross-college, integrative new research center in the urban community environment, initially funded by 20/20 initiatives and the “Shine Forever” campaign. (See end materials included with these minutes.)

Prof. Caram introduced this proposal for its first reading by the faculty; it will return for a vote in the September meeting.

d. Motion to approve the following graduate course changes: (See end materials included with these minutes.)
   CAS – Environmental Initiative ES 402  
   Women’s Studies Graduate Certificate  
   CBE – Dept. of Accounting MACC 401, 402, 403

Prof. Caram moved that all three courses be approved, as recommended by the committee. The motion passed.

R&P Subcommittee – Professor Edward Shapiro
   Motion to establish procedures for electronic voting. (See end materials included with these minutes.)

Prof. Shapiro moved that this motion be approved.

Prof. Shapiro spoke in favor of the motion for the committee. They had consulted with the Parliamentarian, Prof. Kay, so that the motion was consistent with the correct, current version of Roberts Rules; the committee wanted to have explicit faculty approval for this addition to the usual voting procedures. They hoped that more use of e-voting would increase consensus across the University.
Prof. April Meltzer asked if e-voting could be used in the summer term when faculty were not physically present (or at least scheduled to be) on campus, or only in the fall and spring terms when they were?

Prof. Shapiro explained that an e-vote would be initiated at a regular University faculty meeting for later vote, thereby avoiding possible problems.

The motion passed.

5. Unfinished Business:

Annual Report of the Disciplinary Review Panel – Professor Ed Kay (See end materials included with these minutes.)

a. The Panel has continued to communicate with the Student Senate officers on the Senate’s reaction to the new University Student Conduct Code. Their objection raised in fall, ’06, to the new regulation requiring an answer from any witness being questioned by the Discipline Committee, has been returned to the Senate for their discussion.

b. Prof. Kay, as Panel member had objected to the new code’s process of allowing the case officer to decide whether a student infraction could be handled through a hearing or an administrative decision. Prof. Kay thought this should be the prerogative of the accused student to decide rather than the case officer. After thorough discussion with Assistant Dean of Students (and case officer), Chris Mulvihill, they reached an agreement that the case officer would always decide to offer the accused student the choice of processes.

c. Prof. Cutcliffe questioned a statistic that had been mentioned in the above discussion (b), that the overall number of cases, 564, since the new code was approved seemed quite high: nearly 1 in 8 Lehigh students have had their cases handled, either administratively or in an appearance before the UCOD.

Dean Mulvihill replied that this ratio is actually consistent with schools of our size, and, in fact, the number of panel cases has decreased this year, for which no good reason has yet been found.

6. New Business - None

7. Committee Reports were presented by the following faculty representatives:

Educational Policy Committee – Professor Keith Gardiner (Annual Report) (See end materials included with these minutes pdf.)

Faculty Compensation Committee – Professor Frank Gunter gave some brief comments (see end materials included with these minutes pdf) about the Annual Report. A formal report will not be given at this time, due to more information that will be available in the coming weeks to the committee. A report will be presented in the fall semester, 2007.

Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee – Professor April Meltzer (No copy received.)

Faculty Steering Committee – Professor Michael Kolchin (Annual Report - See end materials included with these minutes.)
Graduate and Research Committee – Professor Hugo Caram (Annual Report - See end materials included with these minutes.)

Personnel Committee – Professor Michael Kolchin (Annual Report -- See end materials included with these minutes.)
R&P Subcommittee – Professor Ed Shapiro (Annual Report -- (See end materials included with these minutes.)

7a. Amended Agenda item added for the Nominations Committee report of election results:

Prof. Theresa McCarthy announced these winners:

Secretary to the Faculty (At Large) - Art King

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEES:
Faculty Compensation (CAS Representative) - Bruce Moon
Faculty Compensation (CBE Representative) - K. Sivakumar
FFPOC (CBE Representative) - Erin Moore
Faculty Personnel (RCEAS Representative) - Roger Nagel

FACULTY ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES
University Nominations (At Large) - Nevena Koukova

ADVISORY COMMITTEES
Honorary Degrees (At Large) - Rich Aronson
Honorary Degrees (COE Representative) - Lynn Columba
Honorary Degrees (RCEAS Representative) - Keith Gardiner

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES
Board of Publications (At Large) - Kim Meltzer
Committee on Student Appraisal of Instruction (CAS Rep) - Robin Dillon
Committee on Student Appraisal of Instruction (CBE Rep) - Robert Giambatista
Visiting Lecturers (CBE Representative) - Nandu Nayar
Visiting Lecturers (RCEAS Representative) - Samir Ghadiali

OTHER
Parking Appeals - George DuPaul

8. President's Report:
a. President Gast thanked all University committee members for their service over the past year, which has been a great, and fast moving first year for her. She expressed special appreciation for all those faculty and staff involved in the inauguration celebration, for which there were many seen and unseen volunteers participating in the organization of activities. Finally, the President has enjoyed reading the first University catalog that was presented to her by the Faculty as an official welcoming gift.

b. A major lesson from the VA Tech tragedy is that we must always be prepared for emergencies of any sort. The University is updating the emergency preparedness plan and will be disseminating information, creating a website about where to go for different types of information. Plans are being
discussed for drills and simulations in the future. The Lehigh Community has the responsibility to be safe, to be able to react appropriately, and to provide awareness without undue stress.

As of today, April 30, Bruce Taggart and his staff have completed a text messaging emergency communication system for the campus. Data on 2550 campus telephones have been entered into the system which will be tested over the summer and fall.

The President has talked with the Bethlehem mayor to discuss suggestions for joint emergency preparedness and responses so that the University can be connected with both the city and state.

This coming year we will be setting priorities and working on strategic plans, emphasizing a strong involvement among the University community. We should engage in thoughtful discussions about Faculty concerns about the intellectual climate on campus. TA support, course loads and faculty size.

The President invited feedback on not only her inauguration themes, but also over a broader range of Lehigh strengths.

9. Provost’s Report: Provost Mohamed El-Asser presented brief reports on:
a. Faculty hiring – there are 26 open positions with search committees in progress.

b. CBE Dean Paul Brown will start officially on July 1, but has been quite active on campus already talking with his new college faculty and the upper administration.

c. Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid, Leon Washington will begin on June 1.

d. The VP of Research search is under way with nominations closing tomorrow, May 1. The objective is to have a person in place by July 1.

e. Reports are expected soon from the Globalization and Social Change committee headed by Prof. Jack Lule, and Global Lehigh headed by Prof. Raj Menon.

f. the annual report on the effects of the US Patriot Act over the 2006-07 AY, as required by the May 2004 Faculty Resolution. According to the records of his office, no faculty or staff were denied visas during this period. A student from Iran, who was admitted to the RCEAS for a PhD program for Spring 2007 but had deferred his admission to fall 2007, notified the University that he withdrew his application because he was twice denied a visa to enter the USA. It is important to note that the University has no way of knowing whether these denials were related to the Patriot Act or if they were for other reasons, such as lack of adequate documentation. According to our [Lehigh’s] records, no faculty or staff members were denied visas during this time period.

g. As of yesterday, April 29, there have been 988 deposits from undergraduate applicants but the target is about 1150. By 1:30 pm today we had 1058 deposits with the deadline approaching tomorrow, May 1. Thanks to all faculty who participated in recruiting activities.
10. **Other:** No items.

11. **Adjournment:** Approved by acclamation of the faculty.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Prof. Art King, Secretary of the Faculty
September 6, 2007

**NEXT MEETING:** 4:10 pm, September 24, 2007, Sinclair Auditorium
(3:15 pm Refreshments)
Memorial Resolution for Daniel Leenov
Professor Emeritus of Electrical Engineering

Daniel Leenov, Professor Emeritus of Electrical Engineering, died on April 1, 2007, after a long and greatly enjoyed retirement, during which he traveled with his wife Betty and served Lehigh through mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students and participation in post-graduation celebrations.

Daniel Leenov was born in Washington, D.C. on April 10th, 1923, son of Isadore and Rachel Leenov. He attended McKinley High School and later earned enough money during the summer – inspecting quartz crystals for radios at the National Bureau of Standards – to carry him through his senior year at George Washington University (GWU), where he received a B.S. degree in chemistry in 1943. After graduation, Dan worked at the university on a government project, funded by the Allegheny Ballistics Laboratory (ABL) to analyze military test results on bazooka rockets (ABL was responsible for the development of solid propellant rockets – forerunners of the Navy’s air defense missile boosters and engines for submarine launched missiles). During this time Dan had received a deferment from military service, but shortly after he began his work, according to Dan, “...an amusing thing happened. I received a notice to report for induction into the Army, even though my employer had asked for a deferment. I actually was inducted into the Army, then they discovered a mistake had been made and I received an honorable discharge...” (Dan’s time in the Army was less than a week.)

Dan began his graduate study in physics at the University of Chicago receiving his S.M. and Ph.D. degrees in physics in 1948 and 1951, respectively, where he had classes in nuclear physics from such luminaries, as Enrico Fermi and Edward Teller. Dan’s dissertation research1 with professor Gregor Wentzel (of WKB fame), involved the study of electromagnetic properties of ‘spin-one’ elementary particles. Dan carried out seminal research in the theory of electromagnetophoresis2 with Alexander Kolin, where forces are exerted upon particles in a conducting fluid. His research formed the basis for the use of electromagnetic filtration, where iron particles are removed from liquids, such as the treatment of radioactive contaminated water supplies. This concept has proven so effective over the years that dissolved metals in process water have been reduced to the very low ppb range.

After graduation from the University of Chicago, Dan taught at Roosevelt University, Chicago, Ill, from 1951-1952, where he met Betty who was completing her studies to be a social worker. They were married in 1954. Dan taught at the University of Chicago from 1952-1955, and the University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla., from 1955-1956. While Dan was at the University of Chicago, Dan taught courses in physics and carried out fundamental research on nuclear particle interactions3 involving cooperative efforts with the University of California’s Bevatron nuclear particle accelerator under the direction of E. O. Lawrence. Dan joined the Bell Telephone Laboratories (BTL), Murray Hill, N. J., in 1956. While at Bell, Dan became interested in the generation of microwave power4 with variable capacitance and published papers with Art Uhlir Jr. and later with J. W. Rood on the generation of harmonics and sub-harmonics at microwave frequencies with silicon p-n junction diodes5,6.

4 D. Leenov, “Gain and Noise Figure of a Variable Capacitance Up-Converter”, The Bell System Technical Journal (BSTJ), 37, 989 (1958).
In September 1963, Dan became a member of Lehigh University as an Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering and later became Professor of Electrical Engineering teaching courses in the physical electronics of solid-state semiconductor devices. He retired as Professor Emeritus in Electrical Engineering in 1988. Dan was a member of the Research Honorary, Sigma Xi, at both the University of Chicago and Lehigh University. During his tenure at Lehigh he continued his research on PIN diodes, was involved in microwave PIN diodes for switching microwave power with applications to protecting radar receivers and solar cell research for efficient energy generation. Dan was the academic advisor to numerous undergraduate and graduate students. Dan was known for his kindness, humility and sense of humor. One former student comments, “Dr. Leenov was my undergraduate advisor. In this position he really cared for the students and really 'advised' them. If I failed to know many of the details of his life, it was because he always focused our conversations on me. What interests me? What courses do I like the best? Do I have any issues with courses? Have I thought about grad school? Dan was quiet, but spoke with authority. He was accessible and approachable. He attended and enjoyed EE functions. I felt comfortable with his style, a kindred spirit. He was quiet. I was quiet. He had no ego (even with his experiences), was unassuming, and humble. I was ... well quiet. Truly. Lehigh has lost an admired and great human being.”

At Lehigh, Dan taught ECE 308 and 451 - courses pertaining to the Physics of Semiconductor Devices. In these courses, Dan would introduce the basic concepts of device operation and quantum mechanical ‘tunneling’ with the WKB approximation to model advanced solid-state devices. These courses were basic for students pursuing a career in the microelectronics industry and continuing into graduate school. A student writes, “Professor Leenov’s class notes were recopied with additions, notes and derivations. In my career these notes have become dog-eared and smudged, but they are generally my first references when I need them.” Another student says, “In his class, for the first time I sensed his great wisdom, depth of his knowledge, his patience, humanity and above all, his kindness toward new students. I knew right then and there, I had come to the right place. I did not have money to buy the textbook as it was my first semester and I had not yet been paid for my teaching assistantship. Somehow, Dan realized this and loaned me his own copy for the first few weeks. When my wife, arrived a year later to study for her Masters degree in ECE, Dan personally took interest in her and approved her teaching assistantship. We were both deeply touched by his kindness and scholarship. He taught us humility, modesty, compassion, benevolence and physics. The lessons we learned from him will never be forgotten and we have become better persons as a result of knowing him.”

Dan passed away on Sunday, April 1st, 2007 after a long illness at the Millcroft Senior Living Community in Newark, Delaware. His wife of 54 years Betty Leenov and daughters, Beth Margerison ('82, Mech) and husband Lee ('80, Mech) of Newark, Delaware, Judy Nadler and husband Carl of Washington, D.C., and Dr. Susan Peter of Hillsboro, Ohio, together with four grandchildren, Sarah and Dan Margerison and Ben and Lauren Nadler, survive him.

I request that a copy of this resolution be sent to his wife, Betty, and children, Beth, Judy and Susan.

Submitted to the Lehigh faculty for endorsement on Monday, April 30th, 2007, by Marvin H. White, Sherman Fairchild Professor of Electrical Engineering.

---

Leenov Family Addresses

1.0 Mrs. Betty Leenov
Millcroft Senior Living Community
255 Possum Park Rd.
Newark, DE 19711

2.0 Mrs. Beth Margerison
12 Stirrup Farms
Newark, DE 19711

3.0 Mrs. Judy Nadler
3710 Harrison St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20015

4.0 Dr. Susan Peter
220 S. East St.
Hillsboro, OH 45133
MAY GRADUATION MOTIONS

I. That, with the approbation and consent of the Board of Trustees signified by their mandamus, the appropriate academic degrees be conferred at the end of the current semester on those individuals who shall have completed all requirements for graduation no later than 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 16, 2007, and that the President of the University and the Secretary of the Faculty be authorized to sign, on behalf of the Faculty, diplomas issued to those individuals.

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

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

IV. That prizes awarded to the appropriate individuals and that the announcement be made in the commencement program.
April 30, 2007

SEPTEMBER GRADUATION MOTIONS

That, with the approbation and consent of the Board of Trustees
signified by their mandamus, the appropriate academic degrees be
conferred at the end of the current semester on those individuals who shall
have completed all requirements for graduation no later than Wednesday,
August 29, 2007, and that the President of the University and the Secretary of
the Faculty be authorized to sign, on behalf of the Faculty, diplomas issued to
these individuals;

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

That the Committee on Standing of Students be empowered to act for the Faculty
on any special cases involving candidates for bachelor's degrees which may
arise between now and August 29 and that the Graduate Committee be
empowered to so act in cases involving candidates for graduate degrees.
The GRC recommends that the following change be added to R&P 3.27.2 based on the discussion in the GRC on February 13, 2007, the discussion at the March Lehigh faculty meeting, and the subsequent discussion of the GRC on March 27, 2007:

Change the sentence “Graduate student incomplete course grades which are not removed remain as N grades on the student’s record” to:

Graduate student incomplete course grades that are not removed remain as N or N(grade) on the student record for one year. After one year, the N grade will be converted to an F and the N(grade) will be converted to the parenthetical letter grade. Incomplete grades may be extended an additional year with approval of the course instructor and the graduate coordinator. After two years, outstanding incomplete grades would be converted to the parenthetical mark. Past two years, students could appeal to the Committee on Standing of Graduate Students (SOGS) with a timeline and plan for completion.

Revised 3.27.2 would now read:

**3.27.2 Incomplete (N grade)**

The N grade is defined as in section 3.8.2 except that parenthetical grades are not required for thesis or research courses and graduate students have a calendar year to remove course incomplete grades unless an earlier deadline is specified by the instructor. Graduate student incomplete course grades that are not removed remain as N or N(grade) on the student record for one year. After one year, the N grade will be converted to an F and the N(grade) will be converted to the parenthetical letter grade. Incomplete grades may be extended an additional year with approval of the course instructor and the graduate coordinator. After two years, outstanding incomplete grades would be converted to the parenthetical mark. Past two years, students could appeal to the Committee on Standing of Graduate Students (SOGS) with a timeline and plan for completion. Thesis or research project N grades may remain beyond one year until the work is completed.

**Rationale:**

Numerous N grades remaining on some graduate student transcripts for many years and are never resolved. Currently, incomplete marks stay on students’ transcripts indefinitely.

Incompletes may be being used by instructors to avoid assigning failing marks to students.

Graduate course work, originally scheduled to be completed in one semester should expected to be completed in a finite amount of time. One year plus an additional year by petition was considered by the GRC to be a reasonable amount of time for completing the work originally planned for a semester period.
In graduate programs with a “4 C” rule, the meaning of a student’s record of 3 C’s and one incomplete N grade is difficult to interpret for a program director’s decision on “continuing competency,” which could result in the student’s dismissal.

Students currently with three N(F) grades on an academic transcript in a graduate program for over a year or after a sufficient amount of time to complete graduate course work are currently in good academic standing. Under the revised 3.27.2, after a sufficient amount of time has been granted to a student to complete the graduate student course work, a student with three N(F) grades would be converted to three F grades. This conversion would display a more accurate picture of the true academic standing of the student in a graduate program.

The proposed incomplete policy would go into effect Fall 2007. Past incompletes will not be affected. Thesis or research project N grades may still remain beyond one year until the work is completed. No change in this policy.
The GRC recommends that the following change be added to R&P 3.27.2 based on the discussion in the GRC on February 13, 2007, the discussion at the March Lehigh faculty meeting, and the subsequent discussion of the GRC on March 27, 2007:

Change the sentence “Graduate student incomplete course grades which are not removed remain as N grades on the student’s record” to:

Graduate student incomplete course grades that are not removed remain as N or N(grade) on the student record for one year. After one year, the N grade will be converted to an F and the N(grade) will be converted to the parenthetical letter grade. Incomplete grades may be extended an additional year with approval of the course instructor and the graduate coordinator. After two years, outstanding incomplete grades would be converted to the parenthetical mark. Past two years, students could appeal to the Committee on Standing of Graduate Students (SOGS) with a timeline and plan for completion.

Revised 3.27.2 would now read:

3.27.2 Incomplete (N grade)

The N grade is defined as in section 3.8.2 except that parenthetical grades are not required for thesis or research courses and graduate students have a calendar year to remove course incomplete grades unless an earlier deadline is specified by the instructor. Graduate student incomplete course grades that are not removed remain as N or N(grade) on the student record for one year. After one year, the N grade will be converted to an F and the N(grade) will be converted to the parenthetical letter grade. Incomplete grades may be extended an additional year with approval of the course instructor and the graduate coordinator. After two years, outstanding incomplete grades would be converted to the parenthetical mark. Past two years, students could appeal to the Committee on Standing of Graduate Students (SOGS) with a timeline and plan for completion. Thesis or research project N grades may remain beyond one year until the work is completed.

Rationale:

Numerous N grades remaining on some graduate student transcripts for many years and are never resolved. Currently, incomplete marks stay on students’ transcripts indefinitely.

Incompletes may be being used by instructors to avoid assigning failing marks to students.

Graduate course work, originally scheduled to be completed in one semester should expected to be completed in a finite amount of time. One year plus an additional year by petition was considered by the GRC to be a reasonable amount of time for completing the work originally planned for a semester period.
In graduate programs with a “4 C” rule, the meaning of a student’s record of 3 C’s and one incomplete N grade is difficult to interpret for a program director’s decision on “continuing competency,” which could result in the student’s dismissal.

Students currently with three N(F) grades on an academic transcript in a graduate program for over a year or after a sufficient amount of time to complete graduate course work are currently in good academic standing. Under the revised 3.27.2, after a sufficient amount of time has been granted to a student to complete the graduate student course work, a student with three N(F) grades would be converted to three F grades. This conversion would display a more accurate picture of the true academic standing of the student in a graduate program.

The proposed incomplete policy would go into effect Fall 2007. Past incompletes will not be affected. Thesis or research project N grades may still remain beyond one year until the work is completed. No change in this policy.
ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY DESIGN

PROPOSAL FOR AN M.A. DEGREE

Section a) Reason for offering the new program and its goals

The cumulative and intensified impact of human activities on the natural environment poses a series of challenges to contemporary society. Not only do we face a world of increasingly scarce natural resources and stressed ecological systems, we also face a world in which these problems are intricately bound up with global institutions, politics, and ethical questions of the highest order and complexity. On the domestic front, the first generation of environmental law passed in the 1970s made substantial progress in addressing important environmental problems, such as air and water pollution. However, for many, growing consumption, combined with the polluting activities of a rapidly globalizing world, diminishes the significance of these accomplishments. Domestic activities have international implications that can no longer be ignored. It is no longer enough to analyze environmental problems as a matter of local or national concern. Policy solutions must systematically and simultaneously address environmental problems at local, national, and international scales. Likewise, policy professionals must be prepared to work with physical scientists and economists, as well as with engineers, humanists, and social scientists. In short, addressing the complex physical and social dynamics that produce contemporary environmental problems will require policy practitioners who have the theoretical and applied skills necessary for bringing multiple disciplinary perspectives and scales of analysis to bear on policy solutions.

Toward this end, we propose an interdisciplinary M.A. degree program that will train scholars and practitioners alike for the demanding task of designing environmental policy that can protect or restore an increasingly degraded natural environment while sustaining the benefits of economic growth and providing for the needs of an ever more vulnerable (and growing) human population. Achieving this goal will require policy professionals to understand and analyze environmental problems amidst the progressive globalization of governance structures, institutions, and regimes. Specifically, the M.A. program seeks to prepare policy professionals to address questions that fall along two axes. First, how are legal institutions, regulations, and public management responding to the impact of globalization on political, social, and economic dynamics affecting the natural environment? Second, how should legal institutions, regulations, and public management respond to the impact of globalization in order to ensure a sustainable natural environment? By preparing students to integrate answers to the former, descriptive question, with answers to the latter, normative question, we hope to produce a generation of policy practitioners that can (1) critically assess and analyze the multiple conditions that create environmental problems, (2) arrive at novel solutions to those problems, and (3) justify those solutions.

For this purpose, we propose to build our M.A. degree program around a new approach to policy choice, an approach that can bring argument built upon many distinct philosophical and theoretical paradigms to bear on questions or dilemmas arising at the intersection of environmental degradation and the globalization of political, social, and economic institutions. The need for a new approach to policy choice is prompted by an austerity that characterizes the current state of education in policy studies. Academicians and practitioners tend to focus on a
single epistemology, that of positivism, a single theoretical paradigm, that of markets and Kaldor efficiency, a single valuation tool, that of cost-benefit analysis, and a single methodological predisposition, that of quantitative models and technical analysis.1 In this context, policy professionals are trained to carry out retrospective analysis of existing policy, which is assumed to exist in a static and pre-determined setting rather than in a dynamic environment that gives rise to various options for change in the formulation or re-formulation of law and policy. The narrowness of the current approach to public policy decision-making breeds a pedagogy and course curriculum limited to training in “Markets and Market Failure; Economic Analysis of Public Policy; Quantitative Analysis and Empirical Methods and Strategic & Financial Management of Public Organizations.”2

In contrast to this one-size-fits-all approach to policy decision-making, we suggest that Lehigh University approach the study of public regulation and the environment from the standpoint of what we shall call “Policy Design.”3 Policy Design moves past narrow reliance on market assumptions and economic/quantitative analysis as the core curriculum of policy analysis and its pedagogy. It uses scientific and technical data as evidence for an integrated policy argument, but not as the sole basis for a legitimate process of analysis. Beginning with human agency as a fundamental point of departure, Policy Design situates human agency in the context of both individual choice and collective action, while remaining sensitive to a complex and uncertain policy space that is shaped by particular circumstances. Argument rather than quantitative analysis is the core methodology of Policy Design, and persuasion is the ultimate test of policy choice that is informed by discussion of ends as well as means. Policy Design also views “value” as a critical component of policy and legal analysis. For this purpose, it integrates both intrinsic/inherent and instrumental values with scientific, economic, and socio-political facts to produce a comprehensive argument that offers reasonable choices to policy-makers and the public. Overall, Policy Design is concerned not just with what “is” but with what “ought” to be. It therefore integrates ideal-regarding concern for normative values with want-regarding concern for constructivist norms. Further, it focuses on what “can” be in the context of economic, political, and technical realities that bear on decision-making processes.

Our unique focus on “Policy Design” will encourage both the critical analysis of past and current environmental policy and constructive policy arguments for future change in how we justify and legislate the human-nature relationship. A degree program in Environmental Policy Design will be unique in combining the “Policy Design” approach to policy choice concerning the environment with an understanding of the institutions, political economy, and international theory of globalization. While the policy professionals emerging from our M.A. program will have basic skills in the traditional policy techniques, their skills in applying various philosophical, legal, economic and political models to problems at multiple scales of analysis will create a new generation of policy professionals. These professional will be capable of understanding environmental problems in the context of complex global interactions, and they will be able to identify and justify the range of policy responses that can properly address these problems at the domestic, comparative, and international levels of organization.

1 See Giandomenico Majone, Evidence, Argument & Persuasion In The Policy Process (Yale, 1989), Chapter 1.
2 This is the core curriculum of the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, but could be the basic courses in any of the prominent policy programs in the country.
3 See Davis B. Bobrow and John S. Dryzek, Policy Analysis By Design (Pittsburgh, 1987).
Section b) Need for the program in light of college/university’s other graduate programs

Lehigh has several degree programs that bear on the environment, including a B.S., B.A. M.S. and Ph.D. in Environmental Science, and Environmental Engineering, a B.A. and M.A. in Political Science, and the BA in Environmental Studies. Environmental links also exist in programs such as Science, Technology and Society (STS), Global Citizenship, and Real Estate Studies. In addition, Lehigh has a Certificate program in Environmental Law and Policy, but it is not a degree program. Both the existing B.A. in Environmental Studies and the Certificate would lead naturally into the proposed M.A., but M.A. students would be accepted (and indeed encouraged) from a wide variety of backgrounds. Of the existing graduate degree programs, none address environmental policy, and in particular, there is a lack of environmental policy design, which reflects a general lacking throughout the academic community. As such, the proposed M.A. will expand on the existing certificate program and complement existing Lehigh graduate programs, while building on existing interests in the environment and strengths in science, engineering, political science, and humanities.

Section c) Features that will make this program distinctive and attractive to prospective students (this should include benchmarking information about competing programs offering this degree)

This program will be particularly distinctive because it will be truly unique in the nation. There are no programs elsewhere that focus on the design of effective environmental policy. It will be especially attractive to students entering the job market in the policy or regulatory sectors, as it will arm them with the tools necessary to design new policy de novo as well as assess existing and proposed alterations to existing policy. There are environmental policy programs in other schools that generally bear on the subject, but do not address design, the key unique feature of the proposed Lehigh program.

The master’s program in environmental management at the University of California -Santa Barbara (Master of Environmental Science and Management (MESM)) has a focus that diverges somewhat from similar programs at other universities, but this is more a reflection of the institution than the MESM program, itself. Students must still maintain a focus on market management techniques (inherent in the title of the program), economic principles of environmental affairs, statistics and data management, financial management, and analytical methods. The environmental policy course admits in its syllabus that the "course has a quantitative orientation and draws heavily on the rational choice paradigm for analysis", which is therefore more descriptive than prescriptive, more empirical than normative and devoid of the philosophical or policy argument dimensions of policy design. One unique aspects of the program is the requisite group project, but this is likewise oriented toward analytical description and methodological techniques rather than formulation of policy change which is the core of policy design.

A less well-known MA degree program is run by Bard’s Center for Environmental Policy. Like the standard policy program in the United States, it is similarly focused on training students in descriptive, economic, and scientific analysis of public policy. Specifically, Bard offers core
courses on the scientific, economic, political, and legal foundations of environmental policy, but again, these courses train students in the scientific, econometric, and statistical techniques that are currently used in policy design and implementation, without signaling any intent to move beyond current practice in making policy more effective. To the extent political and legal dynamics are referenced, students are taught to analyze them from a descriptive rather than normative perspective.

This is also true of Columbia University and its Environmental Policy Graduate Program, as well as the University of Delaware’s Energy Program and all other policy programs in the United States. In Columbia’s case, the focus is on the integration of science and empirical social science, still with an effort to emphasize the descriptive rather than prescriptive dimensions of environmental policy. The courses are heavily weighted toward market management and mathematical social science and do not integrate the normative, philosophical or change dynamics of policy as a core (or even an elective) part of the program. Delaware is unique in that it has a focus on Energy policy, which we would not have, but its analytic format and context are traditional, focusing on market assumptions and retrospective empirical analysis.

Penn State University only has Environmental Science programs with no liberal arts foundations at all and Penn runs an environmental risk program and a policy program out of the Wharton School of Business which recognizes “the growing importance of the environment as a factor in organizational decision-making .. which will allow students both to understand the nature of environmental constraints which face organizations and individuals in the modern world, and to understand how these constraints can be effectively considered as part of the decision-making process in for-profit and nonprofit organizations.”

The University of Pennsylvania has a “Program on Law and the Environment” that is focused on existing law, and that pursues a traditional approach of policy analysis, risk assessment, and economic analysis. The program is administered by the Law School, and is based on land use law, “lawyering” and other applied studies limited to the framework of current laws and policies, rather than to the design of new and more effective laws and policies.

Given the dearth of existing programs that explore forward-looking environmental policy design, we expect that the proposed Lehigh degree program will attract the brightest and best students, and will thus serve to enhance research at Lehigh, build graduate education as a focus of a greater proportion of the existing faculty, and provide new opportunities for collaborative research projects amongst faculty. In this way, the new degree program will not only lead to a nationally and internationally recognized degree program, but it will lead to a quantum step forward in Lehigh’s ability to provide leadership in research in Environmental Policy Design.

**Section d) Number of students expected to matriculate**

We expect 15-25 students to matriculate in the M.A. program. Some of these will be continuing from the Certificate Program in Environmental Law and Policy, but most are expected to come to Lehigh specifically for the M.A. We predict that enrollments will ramp up from an initial year of 5-8 to a full complement within 5 years.
Section e) Plans to recruit those students

We will recruit top students into the program in a number of ways.
• Encourage students in the Certificate Program to continue on for the M.A.
• Send paper fliers to selected departments offering relevant undergraduate degrees to target their graduates.
• Send paper/electronic fliers to major related businesses
• Send paper/electronic fliers to government offices (state, fed congress, EPA, DEP, etc.)
• Email e-fliers to faculty from selected departments
• Run ads in appropriate journals/newsletters that post student opportunities
• Contact each related LU department to inform our own students of the M.A opportunity

The time table for recruiting is as follows: Summer/Fall 2007- send flyers nationally and internationally. Run ads in journals and newsletters. Fall 2007- Applications for admission. Spring 2008- Admissions and arrangements for financial support. Fall 2008- M.A. students in classrooms. Some courses are already offered in the contest of the Certificate program in Environmental Law and Policy, so some students involved in these will have a “head start” if they apply to and are admitted into the M.A. program. This segue will provide an additional recruiting tool for the M.A.

Section f) Form and availability of student support

Most M.A. students in the social sciences cover their own tuition and expenses (either with personal funds, loans, or support from their employers). However, in our active recruitment phase, we are pursuing avenues or obtaining student support to attract top students into the new program. We have applied for a grant from the Luce Foundation that includes student support for the next several years. There are also a few Teaching/Graduate Assistantships available through the EI that will be available to incoming M.A. students. Finally, as our interdisciplinary research programs spin up, we expect that additional LU faculty will seek and obtain extramural support for their advisees in the proposed M.A. program.

Section g) Plan for encouraging diversity among recruited students

The need for environmental policy design spans all cultures and nationalities, as environmental degradation affects everyone. However, some populations are more vulnerable than others, and as such, it will be important to consider the full range of human values, and include in the M.A. program students from the full range of cultures both within the U.S. and internationally. Environmental justice is an increasingly recognized issue, and the proposed M.A. will include an entire course on the subject (ES436). With an increasing emphasis on global programs at Lehigh, we will recruit students from as many different countries as possible, given our connections and resources internationally. Examples include ongoing contacts in China, Ecuador, Costa Rica, Turks & Caicos, Turkey, India, Kenya, Russia, Japan, Australia, Brazil, Canada, and various
countries throughout Europe. In addition, we will recruit students with a diverse set of cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds within the U.S. by sending program materials to HBCUs and colleges in a variety of geographical and cultural settings. In cases of financial need, we will seek funds to support students regardless of economic backgrounds, and have already begun with a proposal to the Luce Foundation that will include student support.

Section h) How program will be administered within department/program

The program will be administered within the office of the Environmental Initiative using existing infrastructure that was developed, in part, for that purpose. Student records will be handled in house, and the office will serve as a resource or all students to obtain information, access to resources, internship opportunities, and any other support needed for success in the program. The overall direction of the M.A. program will be managed by the faculty involved in the curriculum and in advising the students. A faculty committee will be overseen by the EI Steering Committee, and will be composed of faculty who are teaching the courses and advising the students. All faculty involved in the program will play a role in decisions and planning of strategy including admissions decisions. Of these, a single faculty member will serve as program director on a rotating basis (3 yrs) for the purpose of coordination and communications, and will interface with the EI office.

Section i) Staffing needs of new program

Staffing for the new program has been in part built into the plans for the Environmental Initiative, and in part will be provided by existing faculty within the departments involved. The program will build on existing staffing for the Certificate Program in Environmental Law and Policy. EI joint hires will teach the basic courses within the M.A. curriculum, and the richness necessary to make it a signature program will be enabled by additional courses taught by departmental faculty and will be further enhanced by planned future joint hires. The new hires planned in the EI 2020 initiative who are already in place include John Gillroy (International Environmental Policy), Breena Holland (Domestic Environmental Policy), Chad Briggs (Environmental Risk), and Dork Sahagian (Environmental Science). The MA courses are built into the teaching load plans for each of the these, including our newest addition, Chad Briggs. In his case, he arrived with considerable teaching experience, and started with a full load, which includes some of the courses to be included in the MA. The IR faculty discussed the potential impact of the new degree on their faculty and curriculum, and proposed an agreeable initial teaching distribution, and we are proceeding on that basis (see curriculum below). The other junior joint hire, Breena Holland, had an initial lightened load, and the MA courses will bring her up to a normal teaching load in 2008 as planned. Many of the MA courses will be offered on an alternating year basis, thus enhancing the richness of the curriculum, while maintaining the undergraduate curriculum for the BA in Environmental Studies without needing extra courses or overload on the part of any faculty. In part, this is enhanced by 3xx/4xx courses.

The initial suite of courses for the curriculum is indicated below. It makes a complete program and does not require additional courses nor staffing, yet we envision that it will be enhanced by any additional courses provided by departmental faculty or future joint hires. Discussions are
already underway in the Depts. of International Relations, and Political Science to consider offering additional courses that will enrich the program beyond the curriculum indicated below.

If new hires are added as planned in the EI 2020 proposal, further curricular enrichment will be possible. Adding key areas to the curriculum that include Environmental Economics, and Environmental Values and Ethics will add further depth to the program, and plans are in place to accomplish this with new joint hires. Plans are already being made for a search in conjunction with the Economics Dept., for a hire in Env. Economics, with a hold on the search for completion of the new dean search. Discussions are also underway to consider a joint hire in values and ethics with the Dept. of Religion Studies. While the success of the proposed program does not depend on any additional hires, these two hires will complete the initial EI complement of joint hires within the social sciences and humanities and further enhance the richness of the curriculum. EI faculty and staff continue to work with departments and deans to ensure that both existing faculty and new faculty will be engaged in the program.

Section j) Assessment plan for the new degree program

The new degree program will be assessed by multiple indicators.

1) Course evaluations. Graduate students have clear ideas on the quality of courses, and can assess as well as constructively criticize their classes. Feedback on the degree to which the program fulfills their anticipated needs will be both useful as a measure of success, and as a tool for refining the curriculum as the program develops.

2) Exit interviews. Graduating students will be interviewed by program faculty to obtain feedback on the overall program as well as specific courses, faculty, research projects, and effectiveness in fulfilling educational and employment goals. These students will form a growing group of alumni who will continue to be an important part of the program as their careers develop.

3) Job placement. It is anticipated that the bulk of the graduate students in the program will go into the workforce upon graduation (although some may pursue further study in Law School, Ph.D. programs, etc.). As such, a useful measure of program success will be the ability of our graduates to obtain key positions in business and government. Student employment will be tracked upon graduation, and to the extent possible, their careers will be documented over time. Program “alumni reunion symposia” will be encouraged so that graduates from this unique program can compare notes, disseminate new ideas, and continue to learn from each other while providing currently enrolled students with insights from the policy-making world.

4) Research opportunities. The program is being designed to bring together a diverse set of faculty to build a unique, interdisciplinary program. Research in policy design is envisioned as a key component of the program and of graduate education in general, so the extent to which new research activities can be facilitated within the program will provide a useful measure of success. This will be measured by publications, papers presented in conferences, and speaking invitations at other institutions.
M.A. CURRICULUM
ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY DESIGN

For completion of the M.A. degree, students must complete 30 credits as indicated below.

I. REQUIRED (2)
  - ES 401 Philosophical Politics and Environmental Policy Design (Gillroy/Staff—F)
  - ES/EES 402 Scientific Foundations for Environmental Policy Design (Sahagian—S)

II. CORE (at least 4 of 7)
  - ES 437 Environmental Risk: Decision Making and Management (Briggs—F)
  - ES/IR 333/433 International Env. Law and Policy (Gillroy—S)
  - ES/IR 343/443 Comparative Env. Law and Policy (Gillroy—S)
  - ES 331/431 U.S. Env. Law I: Pollution and Risk Abatement (Gillroy—S)
  - ES/IR 339 ES439 Global Security and the Environment (Briggs)
  - ES 355/455 Env. Justice and the Law (Holland)
  - ES 435 Env. Valuation for Policy Design and Legal Analysis (Holland—F)

III. ELECTIVES: (3) [Including at least one Foundation Course, except that one or more Core Courses May Be Substituted For Foundation or Context Courses]

FOUNDATION:
  - ES/IR/STS 395 ES/495 International Environmental and Science Policy (Briggs)
  - One of the following: EES 358 Microbial Ecology (Morris) OR EES 365 Eco-physiology (Hargreaves) OR CEE/EES 379 Environmental Case Studies (Jellison)
  - ES 432 U.S. Env. Law II: Natural Resources and Public Lands (Gillroy—S)
  - POLS 396/496 Markets, Politics and the Law (Holland)

CONTEXT
  - HIST 315 American Env. History (Cutcliffe)
  - POL 416 American Public Policy (Wurth)
  - POL 4xx Env. Politics and Collective Action (Wurth)
  - POL 475 Green Polities (Wurth)

IV. METHODS: (1)
  - POLS 421 Methods for Public Policy Analysis (Davis—F)
  - EES 325 Remote Sensing of Terrestrial and Aquatic Environments (Ramage)
  - CEE 272 Env. Risk Assessment (Brown)

  THESIS: A six credit thesis (ES 490) can be taken in lieu of two Foundation/Context Courses with the approval of the EI Graduate Curriculum Committee. The student must find a thesis supervisor and a second reader and produce a five page thesis proposal to the specifications of the program format. This proposal, signed by the student and the primary and second readers, must then be submitted to the committee six weeks before the beginning of the term in which the first thesis credit is to be taken. If the proposal fails to be approved, the student will be required to fill out his/her program with courses.
1. Proposed new course number and course description (as it will appear in course catalogue): ES 401: PHILOSOPHICAL POLITICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY DESIGN (3 credits): A basic class in the art and logic of policy design, as focused on environmental dilemmas. Rather than a retrospective, empirical-technical analysis dominated by market assumptions, Policy Design treats public decision-making as a philosophical exercise to understand the foundations of choice, the various principles that may support a policy, and the process and context in which the argument for the choice must be made. The course will also introduce the idea of Philosophical-Politics, or the utilization of philosophical paradigms that employ dialectic method to integrate the moral, political, economic, legal and social dimensions of a policy issue. Beginning with the conventional market paradigm, the course teaches students how to create their own theoretical paradigms with which to fuel the design process by presenting alternatives from, for example, the Philosophical Politics of David Hume, G.W.F. Hegel or Immanuel Kant. The final project is the application of a student designed policy paradigm to a environmental case study. (GILLROY/STAFF)

2. Instructional mode (lecture, recitation, laboratory, seminar, independent study, or other) and number of contact hours per week: Lecture, reading and discussion. Three contact hours per week

3. Rationale for proposed new course: This course will serve as one of two required courses in the M.A. curriculum for Environmental Policy Design. It will introduce students to the basic concepts and framework for the new Lehigh approach to policy design.

4. Academic impact on programs affected by new course: The newly proposed M.A. in Environmental Policy Design will depend on this course. It will also enhance the curricula of other related M.A. curricula on campus.

A. Is the proposed course to be cross-listed? No.

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

The IR faculty discussed the potential impact of the new degree on their faculty and curriculum, and proposed an agreeable initial teaching distribution, and we are proceeding on that basis.
C. If there are known effects, individuals in charge of the affected programs must be consulted about the proposed new course and the following information provided:

(1) **Who was consulted?** Raj Menon and all IR faculty

(2) **Is the proposed new course acceptable to all other programs affected?**
   YES

(3) **Will any changes be required in the affected programs? If so, please describe below:** No

D. **Does the proposed new course affect the University’s commitment to diversity in any way? If so, please describe below:** No.

### 5. Resource Impact

A. **Provide impact statements in the four areas listed below:**

(1) **Library impact statement** Covered in EI library impact statement, in which it was stated that there will need to be some increased spending on books and reference works covering environmental policy, recycling, and environmental management. No additional impact from this proposal.

(2) **Computer impact statement** None

(3) **Faculty impact statement** The course is part of the expected course load for the joint EI faculty.

(4) **Facilities impact statement** No impact.

B. **Provide a statement indicating who will assume financial responsibility for any new resources required:** EI
Proposed New Course

1. Proposed new course number and course description (as it will appear in course catalogue): ES 490: THESIS RESEARCH: (3-6 credits) This course is intended for students opting to conduct the thesis for the MA in Environmental Policy Design. The thesis requires 6 credits total which may be done over the course of a one semester or spread over two semesters by repeating the course for 3 credits each semester.

2. Instructional mode (lecture, recitation, laboratory, seminar, independent study, or other) and number of contact hours per week: Research

3. Rationale for proposed new course: This course will provide students the opportunity to include a thesis in their MA curriculum in Environmental Policy Design.

4. Academic impact on programs affected by new course: This course will enable faculty from anywhere at Lehigh, including departments with no graduate program of their own to advise graduate student theses in the new MA program in Environmental Policy Design.

A. Is the proposed course to be cross-listed? No.

B. Identify any known effects of the proposed new course on other programs at the University.
No known effects.

C. If there are known effects, individuals in charge of the affected programs must be consulted about the proposed new course and the following information provided:

(1) Who was consulted?

(2) Is the proposed new course acceptable to all other programs affected?

(3) Will any changes be required in the affected programs? If so, please describe below:

D. Does the proposed new course affect the University’s commitment to diversity in any way? If so, please describe below: No.
5. Resource Impact

A. Provide impact statements in the four areas listed below:

(1) Library impact statement Covered in EI library impact statement, in which it was stated that there will need to be some increased spending on books and reference works covering environmental policy, recycling, and environmental management. No additional impact from this proposal.

(2) Computer impact statement None

(3) Faculty impact statement Faculty can choose to advise student theses as they wish.

(4) Facilities impact statement No impact.

B. Provide a statement indicating who will assume financial responsibility for any new resources required: EI
Proposal for a New Center/Institute

1. TITLE:
   Center for Urban Leadership

2. MISSION STATEMENT:
The Center for Urban Leadership will employ a research-to-development-to-practice approach as it prepares leaders for positions in urban schools and community organizations. Its mission is to create new knowledge using a scientific process that is rigorous and systemic, information that will then be disseminated into rich and cutting-edge professional development programs focused on providing urban leaders with the knowledge and skills to build capacity for sustainable educational reform.

3. RATIONALE (Provide background on the area of research, scholarship or artistic achievement in this area.):
   A. Why is this area important, relevant, contemporary or useful? What societal problems are addressed, or what is the market for its services, products and activities?

   Large, urban communities have long faced very difficult challenges in obtaining and leveraging the resources critical to systemic educational improvement. Increased accountability pressures focused on narrowing the racial and class achievement gap in student learning have raised the stakes for urban school systems without creating more effective webs of support able to affect improved teaching and learning. For example, more than 40% of public school principals are expected to retire over the next ten years (Educational Research Service). School systems across the nation are struggling to attract, prepare, and retain a qualified pool of school leaders who may fill this void. Shortages in leadership are particularly acute in inner-city communities.

   While the recruitment and preparation of highly qualified school leaders committed to the educational needs of urban communities is a critical priority, sustainable educational reform requires a systemic approach that addresses the influences beyond the schoolyard. Because schools account for only some of the influence on the improvement of student learning, it is critical to consider the role of community organizations—such as early intervention programs, social service agencies, faith-based organizations, and other programs—that also influence children's behaviors and attitudes and, ultimately, their learning in schools.

   The center will conduct original research in the area of urban leadership that will guide the development and implementation of professional programs to educate the next
generation of urban leaders. The center will help Lehigh develop effective educational leaders, who, in turn, will promote improvements in cities nationwide. Scholars from such varied backgrounds as psychology, sociology, economics, and education will be encouraged to participate in the new center’s interdisciplinary research and education programs, helping urban leaders put tested research into practice in areas such as education and non-profit organizations.

B. How is Lehigh University poised to make exceptional contributions in this research area?

A hallmark of the Center for Urban Leadership is its unique focus on a research-and-development model to study, and at the same time, guide practice in urban educational and community settings. This work will provide new knowledge and skill development for current and future leaders of urban communities who are committed to improving education. The Center will serve as an incubator for innovative ideas and practices that will be tested and the results disseminated.

Lehigh University's College of Education, along with faculty colleagues from other departments throughout the University, is uniquely positioned and qualified to operate the Center because of:

1. The extensive work on Urban School Leadership development done over the past three years in cooperation with the School District of Philadelphia and the National Association of Elementary School Principals. The work of this project has led to a number of research projects focused on the characteristics of effective leadership-development programs.

2. The ongoing work, in cooperation with the University of Pennsylvania and the School District of Philadelphia related to the development of distributed leadership teams in selected high need schools.

3. Current research collaborations by faculty in the Colleges of Education and Arts and Sciences with regional Head Start programs that are focused on early literacy skill acquisition and family involvement in children's education.

4. The long history of professional development for school leaders (including regional urban school principals and superintendents) provided through the Lehigh University School Study Council.

5. The strong reputation and existing research of the College of Education’s Center for Promoting Research to Practice.
C. What can be achieved by the formation of this center that cannot be achieved by informal collaborations among the participating faculty?

Unique to our Center is an interdisciplinary focus involving perspectives from educational leadership, school psychology, special education, economics, developmental psychology and sociology. This synergy among disciplines will foster rich grounds for faculty and student research, training, and practice. Cross-program and discipline collaborations will expand research endeavors as well as enhance intellectual capital. In turn, this collaborative and interdisciplinary network will enrich graduate student training and professional development in the community. In addition, the Center will act as a focus for garnering grants and contracts.

4. RESEARCH DESCRIPTION (Describe the initiatives, scholarship, collaborations, services, product development and other activities that will take place within this center or institute. Is this center multidisciplinary?):

The Center for Urban Leadership will have several different research and practice foci that will evolve as the center grows and matures over the next several years.

The four areas of study that have been identified include:

1. New models of urban leadership that include principals and teachers.

2. Links between community agencies and schools as they relate to building capacity for educational reform.

3. The interplay between economic development and school reform.

4. The study of psychosocial and economic factors that influence attitudes and behaviors of children in urban schools.

5. EDUCATIONAL DESCRIPTION (Describe how the center will contribute to Lehigh’s mission to integrate teaching and research for undergraduate, graduate and continuing education students with short courses, certificate programs, seminars, workshops or other endeavors):

The Center for Urban Leadership will provide an interdisciplinary home for individuals throughout the University with interest in enhancing the quality of urban education. It will provide the opportunity to collaborate on the development of new programs, conduct research, and create new partnership with urban community leaders.

We anticipate that the research activities of the Center will:

1. Contribute to the ongoing development of the Aspiring Urban Principal certification program that extends the current work done in Philadelphia to other urban centers.
2. Result in seminars and focused workshops designed to translate research to practice for current urban leaders. These sessions will be designed to develop a broader understanding by urban educators and urban community leaders representing community action groups, parents, social service agencies and business and industry of the critical issues facing urban education.

3. Inform the creation of meaningful partnerships with regional urban educational and community agencies (The Urban Communities Educational Partners program). An expected outgrowth of these partnerships is the development of problem-based learning experiences and case studies that will be used in various courses throughout the university.

4. Provide opportunities for both undergraduate and graduate students to intern and/or conduct research through the Center’s Urban Communities Educational Partners program.

5. Guide the development of the teacher leader certificate program and a new urban community leaders certificate program.
6. DIRECTOR (S) (Name, Title, Qualifications):
Dr. Sally A. White, Interim Executive Director
Professor and Dean College of Education

7. PARTICIPANTS:
A. Colleges (Names, Rationale, Signature of Dean must appear at the end of this form)
   College of Education

A1. Primary reporting dean
   Dr. Sally A. White, COE Dean

A2. Other participating deans
   N/A

B. Departments (Names, Rationale, Signature of core department chair(s) must appear below)
   N/A

C. Specific Faculty Members (Names, Rationale, Were they consulted?)
   More university faculty will be appointed as the Center evolves. Those appointed have been consulted and would be:
   Dr. George White, Professor Educational Leadership
   Dr. Margaret Barber, Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership
   Dr. George Raesser, Professor of Practice Educational Leadership
   Mr. Tim Lucas, Professor of Practice Educational Leadership
   Dr. Patti Manz, Assistant Professor of School Psychology
   Dr. Thomas Hyclak, Professor of Economics
   Dr. Richard Aronson, Professor, Economics

D. Relationship to other initiatives (Describe how this center or institute is related to other centers or institutes at Lehigh, if any)
   N/A
8. FINANCES

(1) Initial Investments (Describe grants, endowments, gifts, seed money that will be used to start this center/institute)

The COE received a gift from a LU Alum for $2.25 million to be used to endow the Executive Director position that is also the Peter E. Bennett ’63 Chair. Some of the $2.25 million was used to provide initial funding to endow the operating costs of the Center.

To fully fund the Center for Urban Leadership a total endowment of $5 million needs to be raised for the following expenses:

- Endowed Chair and Executive Director $2 million
- Professor of Practice $1.5 million
- Endowed Doctoral-Level Scholar $500,000
- Center Operating Fund $1 million

(2) Continued Funding (How will this center/institute be sustained? Who is responsible for obtaining this funding?)

The COE is aggressively fund raising for the rest of the endowment and many of the operating costs of the center will be covered through grants and contracts that the center receives. The Center for Urban Leadership is one of five COE projects in the Shine Forever Campaign.

(3) First year budget (Describe how funds will be used during the first year of the center’s existence. For example, list staff members that will be paid, projects that will be funded, equipment that will be purchased)

It is hard to predict the budget for the first year as the personnel have not been hired as the search for the Executive Director will be approved by the University in 2007-08. However an approximation is as follows:

- Executive Director salary and benefits approx $150,000**
- Operating expenses $20,000**
- Research Scientist salary and benefits approx $75,000

**Paid out of the endowment accounts

(4) Facilities impact statement (Describe facilities and resources that this center might use and how the center’s activities will affect (improve or tax) those facilities and the user community)

The Center will require space in the College of Education that will be acquired through the reallocation of current offices and the addition of new space from the university.
9 EVALUATION (Describe the criteria for success and how success will be quantified)

1. The Executive Director will establish yearly goals for the Center that are presented to the COE Dean each August. This is a standard procedure in the College for all Directors and Chairs and has been in effective for the last five years. In addition, a mid-term progress report is submitted to the COE Dean in January and then an end-of-year report is submitted in June. The performance evaluation and merit raise of the Center Director will be determined based upon the achievement of the specified goals.

2. An Advisory Board will be established for the Center and will work with the Executive Director in creating a five-year strategic plan. Within the strategic plan there will be structured evaluations in the event that the Center does not fulfill its major goal of becoming self-sustaining within three years of its inception.

10. SIGNATURES (VP Research, Appropriate Deans, Department Chairs)

Vice Provost for Research
Name & Title

__________________________________________________________________________ Date: __________

Comments:

Appropriate Participating Deans and Core Chairs

Name & Title
Dr. Sally A. White, Dean and Professor

Signature __________________________________ Date: __________

Comments:
College of Arts and Sciences: Environmental Initiative

Proposed New Course

1. Proposed new course number and course description (as it will appear in course catalogue): ES 402: Scientific Foundations for Environmental Policy Design (3 credits): This course explores the science behind the environmental issues that bear on the policy process at local, national and global scales. Scientific concepts will be explored with the goal of understanding ways in which they can better inform the policy process at all scales. The course delves into the science of selected environmental issues that have either arisen from anthropogenic activities, or that impact social systems. (SAHAGHAN)

2. Instructional mode (lecture, recitation, laboratory, seminar, independent study, or other) and number of contact hours per week: Lecture, reading and discussion. Three contact hours per week.

3. Rationale for proposed new course: Required course for anticipated degree program, MA Environmental Policy Design, elective offering for EES graduate programs, and ES graduate certificate, developed by new faculty member Sahagian. It will delve into the scientific literature that is most relevant to policy issues so that students can better understand the scientific basis for environmental decision making.

4. Academic impact on programs affected by new course: The newly proposed M.A. in Environmental Policy Design will depend on this required course being offered. It will also enhance the curricula of other related M.A. curricula on campus. No programs will be adversely affected.

A. Is the proposed course to be cross-listed? Yes. (with EES402)

B. Identify any known effects of the proposed new course on other programs at the University. The course will provide additional electives for EES graduate students, giving policy-relevance to their course work and research.

C. If there are known effects, individuals in charge of the affected programs must be consulted about the proposed new course and the following information provided:

(1) Who was consulted? EES faculty

(2) Is the proposed new course acceptable to all other programs affected? YES

(3) Will any changes be required in the affected programs? If so, please describe below:

D. Does the proposed new course affect the University's commitment to diversity in any way? If so, please describe below: No.

5. Resource Impact

A. Provide impact statements in the four areas listed below:

Graduate & Research Committee: (Rev. 7/06/04)
(1) **Library impact statement** Covered in EI library impact statement, in which it was stated that there will need to be some increased spending on books and reference works covering environmental policy, recycling, and environmental management. No additional impact from this proposal.

(2) **Computer impact statement** None

(3) **Faculty impact statement** The course is part of the expected course load for the joint EI faculty.

(4) **Facilities impact statement** No impact.

B. **Provide a statement indicating who will assume financial responsibility for any new resources required:** EI
Proposed New Certificate Program in Women's Studies

1. Title of new certificate program
Women's Studies Graduate Certificate

2. Mission statement
This interdisciplinary graduate certificate moves Lehigh and the Women’s Studies Program in a direction that places us in line with our peer institutions. A hallmark of an excellent Women’s Studies Program is providing graduate training that is accessible by students across many disciplines. While we are not currently in a position to offer a masters program, the proposed WS Graduate Certificate does provide the opportunity for graduate students at Lehigh University to receive substantial training in women’s studies as a supplement to their departmental degree. The Certificate Program will also provide WS faculty the opportunity to work with high quality graduate students in this area and to assist in attracting high-quality graduate students to existing masters and doctoral programs. We propose a small, flexible certificate that provides students with breadth and the challenge of working outside their home discipline.

The Graduate Certificate Program was designed to be similar in nature to those offered by several peer institutions including: Columbia, Cornell, American, CUNY, and Duke in that it offers a common core course and requires work outside the home department while maintaining the flexibility students need to combine the certificate with their disciplinary program.

3. Identify the proposed market and/or clients this proposed certificate program is designed to address:
The proposed certificate is geared primarily toward Lehigh University graduate students in fields where women and gender are a sub-field of study such as sociology, English, history, political science, psychology, education, and business. We find a small but steady number of graduate students in these areas who express a need for such an opportunity. Currently there are 2-3 students each in History, English, American Studies and Sociology who have substantive interest in Women’s Studies. The proposed certificate would also be open to non-matriculating students; however, they are not our target group at this time.

4. Rationale for proposed certificate program
WS faculty have a small but steady number of graduate students who express an interest in in-depth study of Women’s Studies that they cannot gain solely within their home department. With a strong and active WS Program, we are able to offer across departments what no individual department can – concentrated study in Women’s Studies. Interested students can gain the desired experience and expertise through the development of a WS graduate certificate. A WS certificate is a recognized and respected graduate experience for those who wish to become scholars in the field. The use of combined 300-400 level courses ensure that in any given semester we will have adequate enrollment in the classes we offer. Instructors of combined 300/400-level courses develop different requirements and offer additional instructional time for graduate enrollees.

5. Description of proposed new certificate program
The WS Graduate Certificate Students requires a total of 4 courses for at least 12 credits. One course must be WS 450. One additional course must be a 400-level only course. At least two courses must be taken outside your home department. Non-matriculating students must take at least one social science and one humanities course. The list of 400-level and 300-level courses is below.

A. Admissions criteria
Students must be either:
- a graduate in good-standing in a Lehigh University graduate program or
- hold a bachelor’s degree or equivalent with a GPA of 3.0 or greater

B. Specific program requirements, including specific required and elective courses (See
Graduate certificates guidelines document for rules about number and level of courses. If new courses to be added, attach a completed new course proposal form for each.)

12 credits required, no more than 6 credits at the 300-level. All students must complete WS 450. One 400-level class must be a 400-level only class. At least two courses must be taken outside the home department. At least one social science and one humanities course are required of non-matriculating students.

I. All students must take WS 450 Seminar in Feminist Theory

II. 400-level only courses (take at least one)

WS/POLS 442 Gender and Third World Development
WS/PSYC 484 Psychology of Gender
EDUC 471 Diversity and Multicultural Perspectives
WS 495 Independent Study
WS 430 Internship in Women’s Studies

From the following categories take no more than 2 courses (6 credits) at the 300-level

III. 300/400-level courses

WS/SSP 365/465 Inequalities at Work
WS/ENGL 311/411 Literature of Women
WS/SSP 341/441 Women and Health

IV. 300-level courses

WS 330 Internship in Women’s Studies
WS/SSP 310 Gender, Race, and Sexuality: The Social Construction of Differences
WS/MLL 326 Tradition and Resistance: Women Writers of Latin America
WS/MLL 327 Women Writing in French
WS/HIST 325 History of Sexuality and the Family in the U.S.
WS/POLS 342 Gender and Third World Development
WS/SSP 351 Gender and Social Change
WS/SSP 364 Sociology of the Family
WS 373 Women’s Center Internship
6. Academic Impact

A. Is the proposed new program interdisciplinary?
Yes.

B. Identify any known effects of the proposed new program on other programs at the University.
The certificate relies on existing courses at the 300 and 400 levels. Since WS currently has no 400-level courses, we will need to cross-list existing 400-level courses in other departments taught by WS faculty. Some courses that appear as new courses are actually existing courses at the 300-level that can be combined with 400-level in one classroom with different work requirements and additional separate instruction for graduate students who desire to work in that course at the 400-level. The instructors for these courses have been consulted. Beyond this, there are no new courses and no one course is being required. Students will be provided individual advising by the Director in conjunction with their departmental advisor. The use of combined 300-400 level courses ensure that in any given semester we will have adequate enrollment in the classes we offer. The differing expectations and instructional time will ensure that the graduate students engage the material at the graduate level.

Departmental impact beyond the initial work to cross-list the courses will be minimal and limited to one or two students a semester in any given course. All CAS departments with courses included in the graduate certificate proposal have seen and support the proposal. The College of Education supports WS graduate students enrolling in EDUC 471. The proposed new program will benefit departments with graduate courses in WS by providing their students with additional training beyond what can be offered by any one department. It should also assist in attracting high quality graduate students to existing graduate programs.

C. If there are known effects, individuals in charge of the affected programs must be consulted about the proposed new program and the following information provided:

(1) Who was consulted?
All department chairs whose courses will be cross-listed with Women’s Studies. Additionally, the certificate proposal was circulated widely to departments and programs for their consultation.

Yes.

(2) Is the proposed new program acceptable to all other programs affected?

Yes.

(3) Will any changes be required in the affected programs? If so, please describe below:
No.

D. Does the proposed new program affect the University’s commitment to diversity in any way? If so, please describe below.
The proposed program supports and broadens the University’s commitment to diversity by allowing graduate students to develop expertise in an area of inquiry related to diversity (women and gender studies). In addition, many of the WS courses and faculty incorporate many dimensions of inequality (sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, global diversity, etc.) into their research and teaching.

7. Resource Impact

A. Provide impact statements in the four areas listed below:

(1) Library impact statement (attach statement if provided by LTS)
Women’s Studies already exists as a minor with significant library holdings in that area holdings in that area due to our many faculty who work in research and teaching related areas. No new courses are being
developed for this major. We do not require any new collections, databases, video, or journal acquisitions. Roseann Bowerman in the library was consulted.

(2) **Computer impact statement** (attach statement if provided by LTS)
No significant resources are expected for this certificate.

(3) **Faculty impact statement** (how proposed program affects load on existing faculty or requires new faculty)
The Women’s Studies Graduate Certificate can be implemented using existing faculty resources for AY 2007-08. WS 450 will have to be taught each year and this can be done with existing resources. Women’s Studies already offers approximately 10 courses at the 300-level and will have 8 at the 400-level once the cross-listings are completed. In any given academic year, 5-8 of these courses are offered, providing certificate students significant choice in their program. There are also a few cross-listed courses each summer. The Director, who currently serves as the minor advisor, will serve as Women’s Studies Graduate Certificate advisor.

(4) **Facilities impact statement** (how proposed program affects load on existing facilities or requires new facilities)
No significant facilities changes are expected for this certificate.

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

No new resources required.
Proposed Course Changes

1. Current course number, title, course description, and credits (from present course catalogue):

MACC 401. Professional Issues in Accounting (3)
This course consists of three modules designed to provide students with an overview of professional accounting topics. The first module introduces business case analysis. Cases will be dissected, analyzed and discussed. A range of business topics will be used to demonstrate the case method. The second module examines the behavioral foundations of the negotiation process. Topics include planning, tactics, power, integrative and distributive bargaining, behavioral styles and individual and team negotiations. The third module examines ethical issues as they relate to business. Through debate and case studies, students will be challenged to determine what are acceptable and ethical business practices, primarily in an international environment, and how these practices relate to the highly diverse elements that comprise today’s complex, global enterprises. Open only to MSAIA students.

2. Proposed course number, title, course description, and credits (as it will appear in course catalogue):

MACC 401. Professional Issues in Accounting—Negotiation (1)
This course examines the behavioral foundations of the negotiation process. Topics include planning, tactics, power, integrative and distributive bargaining, behavioral styles and individual and team negotiations. MACC 401 and MACC 402 are prerequisites to the balance of the MACC core course sequence. Open only to MSAIA students.

MACC 402. Professional Issues in Accounting—Case Analysis (1)
Introduces business case analysis. Cases will be dissected, analyzed and discussed. A range of business topics will be used to demonstrate the case method. MACC 401 and MACC 402 are prerequisites to the balance of the MACC core course sequence. Open only to MSAIA students.

MACC 403. Professional Issues in Accounting—Ethics (1)
Examines ethical issues as they relate to business. Through debate and case studies, students will be challenged to determine what are acceptable and ethical business practices, primarily in an international environment, and how these practices relate to the highly diverse elements that comprise today’s complex, global enterprises. Open only to MSAIA students.

3. Nature of proposed change(s)

A. Course title change? If so, provide rationale below:

As indicated by the foregoing descriptions, we are proposing to separate MACC 401, now a three-credit course, into three one-credit courses. We have been offering MACC 401 over three Friday/Saturdays in August, during the Summer II session, before students start the rest of the MACC core sequence. The reason for doing so was twofold: (1) to provide students with necessary skills they require to be successful in the MSAIA Program and in their careers, and (2) to reduce the students’ workload in the fall and spring semesters. We have been scheduling the MACC 401 course on Fridays and Saturdays to avoid conflicts with students’ summer internships. Unfortunately the modules scheduled earliest in August have been conflicting with internships, which are typically not completed until around August 10th to 12th. We intend to avoid this problem by scheduling two of the courses (MACC 401 and MACC 402) during the third and fourth Friday/Saturday sequences in August. We intend to schedule MACC 403 in the spring semester. We have found that the information in MACC 403 does not need to be a prerequisite for the rest of the core sequence. Hence, we intend to offer this course in the spring. It is not desirable to schedule MACC 403

Graduate & Research Committee: Course Changes (7/6/04 rev)
[This form not used to propose new courses, programs, or certificates. Each of those has its own form.]
in the fall due to a heavier workload in the fall semester as compared to the spring. Because we are thus compelled to schedule the courses over two different semesters, a reasonable solution is to split MACC 401 into three separate courses. Otherwise we would be required to keep the course grade in suspense over several semesters.

B. Course number change? If so, provide rationale below:

   Please see explanation under 3(A).

C. Change in course credits? If so, provide rationale below:

   Please see explanation under 3(A).

D. Change in course description? If so, provide rationale below:

   Please see explanation under 3(A).

E. Other change(s)? If so, please describe below and provide rationale for each change.

4. Resource Impact

A. Provide impact statements in the four areas listed below:

   (1) Library impact statement (attach statement, if provided by LTS)

      No change.

   (2) Computer impact statement (attach statement, if provided by LTS)

      No change.

   (3) Faculty impact statement (how proposed program affects load on existing faculty or requires new faculty)

      No change.

   (4) Facilities impact statement (how proposed program affects load on existing facilities or requires new facilities)

      No change.

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

   No new resources are required.
Annual Report of the Disciplinary Review Committee
30 March 2007
Edwin Kay, Chair

The Disciplinary Review Committee is comprised of the Judicial Conduct Officer (Christopher Mulvihill), the Dean of Students (Sharon Basso), the chair of the Committee on Discipline (Roger Nagel and Lynn Columba, co-chairs), and the Chair of the Disciplinary Appeals Committee (Edwin Kay). R&P charges the committee with reviewing the University Conduct System and with reporting annually to the faculty.

The faculty approved a new code of conduct last spring. The major changes included a new kind of sanction, “deferred suspension,” and a new kind of hearing an “academic integrity conference.”

In the past, cases of academic dishonesty always were adjudicated by a five-member panel drawn from the larger Discipline Committee. Under the new rules, a student planning to plead responsible of the charge can opt for a conference consisting of the Conduct Officer (or his designee), the student, the professor(s) bringing the charge(s), and a member of the Discipline Committee. There were two such cases this year. The Conduct Officer believes that these conferences worked well.

In the past, for any charge, a student could opt for a hearing before a Disciplinary Committee panel. Under the new code, for non-academic dishonesty infractions, the student has no such option. That decision is up to the Conduct Officer. While a number of members of the Disciplinary Appeals committee (and others we have informally talked with) feel that the student should always have the option for a hearing panel, we feel that we should wait before proposing changes to the code, given that it is so new. For the present, the Conduct Officer has agreed to always offer the student the option of a hearing panel.

The new code insists that witnesses in a hearing must answer all questions put to them. When the faculty voted on the new code, a group of students representing Student Senate wanted to speak, with the purpose of having the code amended so that witnesses could avoid answering self-incriminating questions. Confused by faculty procedures, they voiced their concerns after the faculty passed the code. They pursued the issue this year and sent an amendment to the code to the R&P Subcommittee of the Faculty Steering Committee, asking them to bring it to the faculty. The R&P Subcommittee sent the motion to the Disciplinary Review Committee for review. That committee met, inviting the students to the meeting. The Disciplinary Review Committee made it clear that they would certainly recommend forwarding the amendment to the faculty for a vote, but that it was likely they would argue against the motion. At the same time, it became clear to the students that the motion in its current form would not accomplish what they wanted and they withdrew the motion. Student Senate presumably will return with a similar motion next year.
Below are statistics for discipline cases heard this year and closed as of 9 April 2007. Most cases were handled with administrative hearings, two cases were handled with an academic integrity conference, and nine cases were handled with a hearing panel.

**Overall Data**
- Total number of cases: 564
- Total number of cases in which the student was found responsible: 355
- (Cases involving alcohol: 297)

**Primary Sanctions:**
- Disciplinary Warning: 231
- Disciplinary Probation: 120
- Deferred Suspension: 8
- Suspension: 2

**Secondary Sanctions:**
- Counseling: 258
- Parental Notification (alcohol offense): 280
- Educational Sanction: 191

(The data below are included in the numbers above)

**Hearing Panel for Academic Dishonesty**
- Total cases: 5
- Responsible: 5
- Sanctions:
  - Expulsion: 0
  - Suspension: 0
  - Deferred Suspension: 0
  - Probation: 3
  - Warning: 4
  - F in course: 3
  - Recommend lower grade: 2

**Hearing Panel for other cases:**
- Total cases: 4
- Responsible: 4
- Fraternity (providing alcohol): Probation and alcohol free hous
- Providing false information to a hearing panel: 2 semester suspension
- Two cases of serious alcohol offense: Deferred suspension

**Academic Integrity Conferences:**
- Total cases: 2
- Total responsible: 2
- Case 1: Deferred Suspension, F in course
- Case 2: Probation, recommended lower grade
Tuesday-Thursday
The issue of Tuesday-Thursday class schedule extension opened the year as a possible way of addressing classroom capacity and scheduling problems. After much fervent discussion and lobbying it became apparent that there were possibilities for other solutions, such as utilizing all the earlier slots available with some timing adjustments for Mondays and Wednesdays. It was agreed that this was an administrative matter that was beyond the purview of the committee and no further committee motions were required for implementation.

Inauguration
Another issue that activated many e-mails and occupied much discussion related to how to handle the matter of attendance at classes during the Inauguration events. Ultimately after interaction with GRC a suitable statement was developed and issued recommending that faculty treat the occasion as requiring “accommodations” in a similar mode to religious holidays.

Grading Practices / Study Abroad
Sub-committees were charged to examine grading practices, and also qualification of Study Abroad courses, admissions standards and to monitor the quality of the non-Lehigh offerings.

Provisional Course Numbers / Catalog Changes
Through the year many minor catalog changes were approved. Two relatively new programs, IBE and Global Citizenship, were charged to cease using provisional course numbers to cross list with other departments’ real courses. The provisional courses in regular use were approved.

“F” Grade with Disciplinary Cause
A motion developed by the committee to identify “F’s” resulting from disciplinary action for cheating, plagiarism etc. on transcripts failed when presented to the faculty.

South Mountain College
A CAS proposal for a special South Mountain College program was approved after appreciable discussion; some modifications in grading language were required before this was fully acceptable to the faculty.

CBE Course Numbering
Course changes from CBE to re-number some 200-level course as 100-level to facilitate students securing relevant internships before their senior years were approved after commitments from the dean to provide adequate resources for delivery and support.

IDEAS
A “shell” proposal embracing an Integrated Degree in Engineering, Arts and Science (IDEAS) program was approved and certain portions, using existing or provisional courses, will be available to students in fall. RCEAS and CAS deans agreed to make necessary resource commitments and appoint directors.

Course Evaluations
Finally, the matter of course evaluations was discussed. Inquiries are to be made of the Committee on Student Appraisal of Instruction; they have responsibility to report findings through this committee.

Acknowledgements
I would like to thank everyone on the committee and congratulate them for diligent attendance and handling a load of occasionally fractious business with excellence. It has been my pleasure to chair the proceedings for this year.

Keith Gardiner, kg03@Lehigh.edu x85070
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2006 – 2007 Annual Report of the Faculty Steering Committee

In reporting to the faculty for the academic year 2006/2007, I thought I’d begin by describing what exactly the Faculty Steering Committee is and what its role is in faculty governance at Lehigh University.

Composition of the Faculty Steering Committee

“The faculty steering committee consists of twelve members: the president, the vice president and provost, the chairperson of the educational policy committee, the chairperson of the graduate and research committee, the chairperson of the faculty compensation committee, the past-chairperson of the financial planning and operations committee, the senior (fifth-year) member of the faculty personnel committee, secretary to the faculty, and four faculty, one elected by each college faculty.” (R&P, section 1.2.2.1)

In addition to these standing members of the committee, the Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs, the Deputy Provost for Faculty Affairs, and the Director of the President’s office also attend meetings of the Faculty Steering Committee as guests.

Responsibilities of the Faculty Steering Committee

“The committee will meet on a monthly basis to: (1) advise the president and provost on any proposed major structural changes within the university, (2) respond in a preliminary manner to ideas and initiatives emanating from the administration but with no formal powers of substantive review, (3) advise the president and provost of appropriate faculty committees for substantive review of administration initiatives, (4) share information about present and proposed committee activities, (5) channel faculty initiatives to the appropriate committees, (6) monitor the progress of faculty initiatives directed to the administration, (7) establish the agenda for university faculty meetings, and (8) report at least once a semester to the university faculty on issues relating to university governance.” (R&P, section 1.2.2.1)

In short, the Faculty Steering serves the purpose of providing a communication link between the standing faculty governance committees and the administration with the aim of more effectively governing Lehigh University. It is not a legislative body; rather it is committee that steers issues of importance to the appropriate faculty committee or administrative office for consideration. These committees may then bring forward motions to be voted on by the Lehigh University faculty. These issues can be brought to the committee from any member of the Lehigh University community.

On occasion, the Faculty Steering Committee may create an ad hoc subcommittee to study significant matters before bringing them to the faculty. An example of this was the creation of the Faculty Governance Subcommittee last year, which brought a motion to the faculty to establish a Faculty Senate at Lehigh University.
The Faculty Steering Committee in conjunction with the President and the Provost also sets the agenda for the university faculty meetings.

The committee does not typically vote on issues; rather, we discuss and try to reach a consensus.

**R&P Subcommittee**

The Faculty Steering Committee has one standing subcommittee, whose function is described in R&P as follows:

"The steering committee will have a standing subcommittee on regulations and procedures, consisting of the four faculty representatives elected by the four colleges. The chairperson of the subcommittee is appointed by the chairperson of the steering committee.

The subcommittee (1) conducts a continuing review of regulations and procedures within the university with the purpose of maintaining efficient and effective operations, (2) initiates proposals for changes in university governance, (3) reviews the language and form of these faculty regulations revisions submitted to the steering committee, and (4) reports to the steering committee as it seems appropriate.

The subcommittee will incorporate legislation adopted by the trustees or faculty in this manual. The subcommittee prepares each year an up-to-date edition of the university regulations." (R&P, section 1.2.2.1.1)

The R&P Subcommittee serves an important function by working with the Secretary of the Faculty and the Provost's office ensuring that R&P is current and includes all legislation that has been approved by the faculty and the Board of Trustees. It also works with the administration on major pieces of legislation, such as the "Policy on Policies" and "Academic Freedom Policy" to resolve conflicts between the faculty and the administration.

**Activities**

The following activities are a sample of the issues that were brought to the steering committee this past academic year:

1. Asked the Faculty Personnel Committee to bring forward a revised motion on the extension of the tenure clock for untenured faculty members who become the parent of a child during their probationary period.
2. Asked the R&P Subcommittee to work with Professors Eades and Matthews, Deputy Provost Soderlund, and the University General Counsel to prepare a motion on academic freedom to be voted on by the faculty.
3. Asked the R&P Subcommittee to prepare a motion on electronic voting to be voted on by the faculty.
4. Asked the R&P Subcommittee to work with the Student Senate and the Disciplinary Review Panel to address student concerns with the new Student Judicial System passed by the faculty in the spring of 2006.

5. Heard a report from the University Diversity Leadership Committee on the climate survey with a request for us to encourage faculty participation.

6. Discussed how the Board of Trustees’ actions should be communicated to the faculty.

7. Discussed and approved the addition of the Secretary to the Faculty as a permanent member of the steering committee. A motion to this effect was approved by the university faculty.

8. Discussed the problem of new faculty not having access to Banner, Blackboard, IDs, and other items before the start of their first semester.

9. Discussed the issue of admission targets with the President and Provost.

10. Discussed the need for every academic program to be affiliated with a particular department.

11. Discussed the need for and helped the President identify a parliamentarian for university faculty meetings.

12. Represented the faculty on the Inaugural Steering Committee.

13. Represented the faculty at Board of Trustees’ meetings in the fall and spring.

14. Discussed the revised Commencement Speaker Selection Process.

15. Discussed the South Mountain College proposal.

16. Reviewed the Nominations Committee responsibilities.

17. Discussed the technology fee for graduate students.

18. Discussed the Middle States Accreditation Process.

Many of these issues were steered to the R&P Subcommittee and its annual report details actions taken by that committee.

**Summary**

It's been a busy year for the steering committee and I would like to personally thank those who participated on the committee for their diligence and hard work:

- Rosemary Mundhenk – R&P Subcommittee
- Ed Shapiro – R&P Subcommittee
- Dan Lopresti – R&P Subcommittee
- Keith Gardiner – Educational Policy Committee
- Hugo Caram – Graduate and Research Committee
- Frank Gunter – Faculty Compensation Committee
- Elizabeth Fifer – Faculty Compensation Committee
- John Smith – Financial Planning and Operations Committee
- April Metzler – Financial Planning and Operations Committee
- Jacob Kazakia – Faculty Personnel Committee
- Steve Thode – Secretary to Faculty
All of these colleagues represent what is truly great about Lehigh University. Their willingness not only to serve, but to commit themselves to making Lehigh a better place, should be a model for all of us. A simple thanks is not enough but, unfortunately, that’s all I can give you.

I would also like to acknowledge the splendid cooperation of the President and Provost throughout the year. There was a wonderful sense of cooperation and a commitment to resolve conflicts where possible. In addition to efforts of the President and Provost, I would also like to acknowledge the valuable inputs from Carl Moses, Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs, and Jean Soderlund, Deputy Provost for Faculty Affairs. They made my job as chair much easier.

Finally, I want to thank our wonderful secretary, Amy Fantasia. She did an outstanding job of keeping a record of our meetings, not an easy task with a committee this large.

Ed Shapiro will take over as chair of the committee as July 1st and I wish him the best of luck for the coming academic year.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael G. Kolchin, Chair
Faculty Steering Committee
FCC Annual Report

President Gast’s Remarks on Faculty Compensation (9 Feb07)

1. Competitive compensation for faculty is important – and she believes that faculty are currently under-compensated

2. A long-term strategy to deal with faculty compensation is a necessity.

Provost generously invited the FCC to participate in a series of detailed talks with the four College Deans on faculty compensation – where each college has been, where it is now and where each college wants to go. These talks will probably begin in the next few weeks.

Basic Faculty Compensation Questions

1. What faculty compensation/salary target is consistent with the University’s goal of overall excellence?

2. What is the current status of Lehigh faculty with respect to this target? (Must be presented to the faculty at least annually with minimal aggregation to protect privacy.)

3. What is the ten year trend of Lehigh faculty compensation/salary with respect to this target? (Also, annually presented to the faculty.)

4. What is the University multi-year plan to achieve and maintain faculty compensation/salary at the target level?

FCC Will Not Present Its Annual Report Today – In the hope that we will be able to provide more detailed (and useful) data and analysis at the beginning of Fall Semester.
April 27, 2007

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

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

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

1. **Curriculum**
The Curriculum Subcommittee, chaired by Alec Bodzin, reviewed a number of proposals from all four colleges for both course changes and for new certificate and degree programs. Most proposals required minimal changes; all curriculum proposals were subsequently approved by the full committee. Specifically the committee debated the Women’s Studies Certificate Program and the MA in Environmental Policy.

2. **Petitions Appeals**
The existence of Graduate SOS Committee has reduced the need for the GRC to participate in the decisions. Petitions were referred to the full committee in only two cases.

3. **University Fellowships**
The Fellowship Subcommittee, chaired by Sibci Pamukcu, reviewed applications from each college for fellowships for top students, and chose which should be offered University Fellowships. The subcommittee reviewed and revised the Fellowship guidelines in November 2006, which subsequently were approved by GRC. The revisions relaxed some of the previous restrictions to allow for a larger pool of fellowship nominations. A copy of the guidelines is attached.

The subcommittee also reviewed and approved a set of metrics to evaluate the nominees. These metrics included academic standing, standard test scores, reference letters, and indicated support of the nominating department/college for each candidate. A total of 49 candidates were reviewed with 17 being recommended in the first tier category and 3 in the second tier category. The subcommittee discussed the current review process, which is rolling nomination and review
throughout the academic year. Based on the increased number of candidates, it is recommended to set nomination deadlines, possibly one each semester.

4. **Center or Institute Proposals**
The Research Subcommittee, chaired by Alastair Macaulay, reviewed the proposal from the COE for a new “Center for Urban Leadership”. After a few changes the proposal was approved by the GRC.

5. **Graduate Student Life Subcommittee (GSL)**
The Task Force on Graduate Student Life was initially chaired by Stephen Peters. Due to Dr. Peters’ sabbatical, Hugo Caram became interim chair in February. The subcommittee addressed the following questions:

1. TA evaluations
2. The Technology Fee
3. Graduate Students Compensation Package
4. Leave Policy for Graduate Students
5. Facilities: Transportation and Gym Facilities.

**TA Evaluations**: The committee met in the fall with the Vice Provost for Institutional Research, Steve Devlin and arrived at a satisfactory evaluation procedure for TA. It provides adequate feedback on teaching performance and can be used as a reference for students interested in academic careers.

**The Technology Fee**: The GRC was concerned about the imposition of a “Technology Fee” since, at $300/yr, it was a significant burden to the graduate students and supported a letter from the graduate student senate (GSS) requesting reevaluation of the fee. After discussions with Vice Provost Taggart, VP Finance Margaret Plympton and Provost Mohamed El-Aasser, the committee concluded that the charging of a separate fee was not appropriate and that it should be included as part of the tuition as requested by the GSS. The GRC voted to take the issue to the faculty, but decided to postpone the presentation since the Provost and President will work on the Tech Fee issue in consultation with the GRC and GSS during the summer of 2007.

**Graduate Student Compensation Package**: In conjunction with Steve Devlin the GSLS made a comparison based on published information from the Chronicle of Higher Education on TA and GA salaries in the peer institutions (as defined by the university administration). While at first inspection the salary levels appear adequate, no correction was made for the local cost of living. Salaries also show wide variability within Lehigh.

**Leave Policy for Graduate Students**: The proposal for a Leave Policy for Graduate Students was revised to include TA’s and to offer policies equivalent to those applied in other institutions such as Penn State, Ohio State and Stanford. A copy of the Leave Policy approved by the committee and sent to the provost is attached.
Facilities:
Transportation: It is desired to facilitate access to Mountaintop and Saucon Village during evenings and weekends.
Gym: Longer hours during summer and winter breaks will help faculty and graduate students in making better use of the facilities.
Initial contacts have been established but further work is needed.

6. Proposals to Change R&P
The GRC referred a proposal to change R&P 3.27.2 to the faculty for approval. The proposed change will not allow N or N( ) grades for graduate students to remain indefinitely in the student transcript but will require completion to be made in a finite amount of time before it will convert into a failing F or parenthetical grade. A copy of the proposed change is attached.

7. Interviews with Candidates for the Position of Vice Provost for Research.
The committee interviewed three candidates for the position. Individual evaluations were forwarded to the search committee.

8. Research Competitiveness
It is critical to determine the comparative cost of research at Lehigh University from the point of view of the investigator. Specifically, the objective is to find out the external funding required per supported graduate student. Since schools have different methods of providing support to graduate students and different tuition requirements, it is difficult to estimate the cost by addition of the different factors. An attempt was made to use the research expenditures reported to the National Science Foundation in 2004 to determine the cost per student/postdoc as is described in the attachment. Regrettfully, the results vary widely (30K Lehigh, 35K Boston College, 60K Brandeis). This may be attributed to institutions trying to maximize reported research expenditures.
Comparison with public state institutions indicates stronger research support than what is found in private universities. Much work will be required here.

Respectfully submitted,

Hugo S. Caram
Chair, GRC, 2006-2007

Attachments:
Leave of Absence Policy
Draft Proposal for N grade policy
University Graduate Fellowships Policy
Research Competitiveness at Lehigh.
LEAVE OF ABSENCE POLICY
Graduate, Research, and Teaching Assistantships and Internal Fellowships
Leave of Absence Guidelines
Revised, April 2007

The purpose of this document is to delineate a University-wide leave of absence policy for graduate students receiving University funding. The goal, whenever possible and appropriate, is to preserve students’ financial support and full-time status.

For the purposes of these guidelines, an Assistantship is defined as an award given by Lehigh University in conjunction with graduate study and refers to Graduate (GA), Research (RA), and Teaching (TA) Assistantships as well as internal Fellowships. For externally-funded Fellowships, students should follow the regulations outlined by the funding agency. In cases where the Fellowship has no explicit leave of absence policy, the guidelines outlined here should be followed. Typically,

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

Short Term Absences

During each 12 month period, a GA/RA/TA/Fellow (hereafter referred to as “the funded student”) may take the following short term absences, during which time the assistantship will continue:

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

For short term absences, the expectation is that the students will make up the work upon their return. If necessary, a substitute TA will be found in consultation with the department chair.

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

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

- Should inform the following people of his/her departure date and expected date of return
- His/her faculty advisor (hereafter, the word ‘advisor’ will also mean ‘research project supervisor’ where applicable)
- The department chairperson
- The graduate program director

- Must obtain written approval for the leave of absence from the advisor, department chairperson, or graduate program director who controls funding for the position

In instances where the leave is less than one month the stipend will not cease if the funded student

- Makes up the work or performs the work offsite in a reasonable timeframe. The details must be approved by the advisor and department chairperson in advance. OR
- Carries out newly assigned duties instead of the ones originally assigned (e.g., developing the department website instead of conducting laboratory experiments or grading exams instead of leading a recitation).

In case of conflict, students should petition the college Deans and subsequently the Graduate and Research Committee if a mutually acceptable solution is not found.

Graduate students supported by assistantships that adopt or give birth to a child will be excused from their regular research duties for a period of six weeks during which they will continue to receive support.

Departments will determine the expenses incurred as a result of the leave period and the college deans will provide the necessary financial resources.

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

- To the graduate program director
- To the Registrar’s office, for notation on the student’s transcript; and
- To the Financial Aid office, which may begin the Federal Stafford Loan grace period and/or the repayment of the Federal Supplemental Loan for Students

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

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

- The student’s resumption of full-time study, and
- Resource availability.
All extended military leaves of absence will be handled according to existing Lehigh policies and government regulations.
The GRC recommends that the following change be added to R&P 3.27.2 based on the discussion in the GRC on February 13, 2007, the discussion at the March Lehigh faculty meeting, and the subsequent discussion of the GRC on March 27, 2007:

Change the sentence “Graduate student incomplete course grades which are not removed remain as N grades on the student’s record” to:

Graduate student incomplete course grades that are not removed remain as N or N(grade) on the student record for one year. After one year, the N grade will be converted to an F and the N(grade) will be converted to the parenthetical letter grade. Incomplete grades may be extended an additional year with approval of the course instructor and the graduate coordinator. After two years, outstanding incomplete grades would be converted to the parenthetical mark. Past two years, students could appeal to the Committee on Standing of Graduate Students (SOGS) with a timeline and plan for completion.

Revised 3.27.2 would now read:

3.27.2 Incomplete (N grade)

The N grade is defined as in section 3.8.2 except that parenthetical grades are not required for thesis or research courses and graduate students have a calendar year to remove course incomplete grades unless an earlier deadline is specified by the instructor. Graduate student incomplete course grades that are not removed remain as N or N(grade) on the student record for one year. After one year, the N grade will be converted to an F and the N(grade) will be converted to the parenthetical letter grade. Incomplete grades may be extended an additional year with approval of the course instructor and the graduate coordinator. After two years, outstanding incomplete grades would be converted to the parenthetical mark. Past two years, students could appeal to the Committee on Standing of Graduate Students (SOGS) with a timeline and plan for completion. Thesis or research project N grades may remain beyond one year until the work is completed.

Rationale:

Numerous N grades remaining on some graduate student transcripts for many years and are never resolved. Currently, incomplete marks stay on students’ transcripts indefinitely.

Incompletes may be being used by instructors to avoid assigning failing marks to students.

Graduate course work, originally scheduled to be completed in one semester should expected to be completed in a finite amount of time. One year plus an additional year by petition was considered by the GRC to be a reasonable amount of time for completing the work originally planned for a semester period.
In graduate programs with a “4 C” rule, the meaning of a student’s record of 3 C’s and one incomplete N grade is difficult to interpret for a program director’s decision on “continuing competency,” which could result in the student’s dismissal.

Students currently with three N(F) grades on an academic transcript in a graduate program for over a year or after a sufficient amount of time to complete graduate course work are currently in good academic standing. Under the revised 3.27.2, after a sufficient amount of time has been granted to a student to complete the graduate student course work, a student with three N(F) grades would be converted to three F grades. This conversion would display a more accurate picture of the true academic standing of the student in a graduate program.

The proposed incomplete policy would go into effect Fall 2007.
Past incompletes will not be affected.
Thesis or research project N grades may still remain beyond one year until the work is completed. No change in this policy.
University Graduate Fellowships
2006-2007

Revised – 12/10/06

Concept
The university has made a commitment in the past to invest in excess of $100,000 annually towards graduate fellowships. Since not all the funds have been utilized in the past the Graduate & Research Committee is encouraging the departments to recommend their best prospective graduate students for these fellowships. Two mechanisms for awarding these fellowships are suggested by the GRC:

(1) Departments with funds to support a student will be able to request up to $11,000/year for up to two years to enhance their offers to prospective students to $26,000/year for up to two years.

(2) Up to 2-$44,000 fellowships each year could be awarded to incoming doctoral students in areas that are traditionally challenged to find student support (e.g., humanities). These fellowships would be distributed at the discretion of the student’s admitting department over a four year period.

Use of a University Graduate Fellowship concurrently to supplement TA, GA positions slated for teaching/grading is not permitted.

Objective
This approach will:

a) Reward those faculty members and departments able to generate support from external or supplemental (revenue-sharing) sources.

b) Make Lehigh stipends more competitive with the best nationally (e.g., NSF and DOD fellowships are now > $30,000 annually).

c) Give sufficient time for the faculty or departments to find the extra support to continue this level of stipend through the completion of the doctorate.

Mechanism

a) Departments are strongly encouraged to submit their best candidates for these supplementary fellowships as soon as they are approved for acceptance into Lehigh. Fellowships are intended to recruit the best students to Lehigh; hence departments may have up to four potential candidates and must rank their candidates.

b) The Faculty member or department responsible for the primary financial support of the graduate student, along with the source of primary funding, should be identified.

c) Award decisions will be made by the VP for Research and the GRC committee.

d) Approval of the awards will be made on an on-going basis as long as highly qualified and competitive nominations are submitted and approved until the funding is fully committed.
Application Process

What to submit

a) The student's full application file, including, but not limited to:
   Application form
   Transcripts
   Letters of recommendation
   Statement of purpose
   GRE, GMAT, TOEFL or TSE scores (where applicable)
Supplemental materials (writing samples, publications, etc.) can be included to support an application

b) Letter of recommendation from the department chairperson or graduate coordinator. The letter should address the aspects of the file that make the student "worthy" of the fellowship. These include all elements of the file described above as well as caliber of the institution where the student received his/her degree and potential contributions to the program that may not be obvious to the committee. For example: work experience, publications, writing samples etc. Supplemental material, such as evidence of correspondence between the candidate and potential faculty supervisor, would be encouraged.

c) A statement, including an account number, describing how the student will be supported outside of the fellowship. For the fellowships at large this statement should describe how the student would be supported during the years not provided by the fellowship. For the fellowships that "top off" existing money the statement should describe the source of the baseline funding.

Where to submit
Seven (7) copies of the above materials should be submitted to:

Pat Newhart
Office of the Vice Provost for Research
Alumni Memorial Building
27 Memorial Drive West
RESEARCH COMPETITIVENESS AT LEHIGH UNIVERSITY

OBJECTIVE:
Determine how much it costs to do research at Lehigh relative to benchmark and inspirational schools

See next page for listing of schools

Examples of Typical Research Costs:
Grad Student Tuition and Stipend *
Post Doctoral Salary and Benefits *

Equipment Usage
Laboratory Supplies
Office Supplies
Publications
Travel
Subcontractors
Equipment Purchase

* - Amount should vary by institution and should be accessible
Other amounts should not be too sensitive to institution and are not readily accessible

APPROACH:
• Compare individual graduate student stipend and tuition and post-doctoral salaries and benefits
• Also compare a parameter (P) that accounts for all these factors

\[ P = \frac{\text{total research exp.} - (\text{equip. use + Supplies})}{\text{total number grad students} + X \cdot \text{total number postdocs}} \]

\[ X = \frac{\text{postdoc salary (including benefits)}}{\text{grad student tuition + stipend}} \]
LIST OF SCHOOLS FOR COMPARISON

Schools marked with (*) have data readily available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baylor University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University, All Campuses *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh University *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern University *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State U, All Campuses *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice University *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers the State Univ of NJ, All Campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Louis University, All Campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Methodist University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University, All Campuses *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Christian University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufts University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University of Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Dayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland-College Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan, All Campuses *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of St Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester Polytechnic Institute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2006-2007 Annual Report of the Faculty Personnel Committee

The membership of the Faculty Personnel Committee consists of four full professors, one elected from each college, and one university-wide elected member who must be an associate professor at the time of election. All five members serve for five years. The current membership is Ken Kodama from Arts and Sciences, Mike Kolchin from Business and Economics, Ward Cates from Education, Jacob Kazakia from Engineering and Applied Sciences, and Susan Szczepanski, our university-wide elected representative.

This past year, Jacob Kazakia served as our representative to the Faculty Steering Committee and Susan Szczepanski served as our representative to the University Diversity Leadership Committee.

This year the committee dealt with three appeals:
- One dealt with denial of tenure.
- One dealt with ethical conduct.
- One dealt with faculty misconduct.

While we cannot discuss the details of these cases because of the confidentiality of the appeal process, we can report to you the recommendations we made to the President and/or Provost concerning general processes regarding the handling of these cases.

Recommendations concerning the promotion and tenure process

- College P&T Committees and department faculty must be reminded of the tenure review process as prescribed in R&P and the respective college standards and their role in the process. This should be done annually by the Deans in charging the College Promotion and/or Tenure Committees before they begin their review of cases brought before them.
- College P&T Committees and department faculty must be instructed to ensure their evaluations of candidates and their recommendations are consistent. Specifically, what they write in their letters should support what they are recommending.
- All members of a College P&T Committee and department faculty must actually make a clear, unambiguous recommendation. Not to do so is a failure to live up to the responsibilities with which they have been charged.
- Confidentiality must be maintained throughout the process.
- Personal issues such as family, health, or other personal situations should not be considered when making decisions concerning the granting of tenure. College P&T committees should be instructed not to request access to such information, even when the probationary period has been extended. Personal issues are better handled through the extension of the probationary period if so warranted.
- Lack of a response from an external evaluator should not be judged as a negative evaluation.
- The language in R&P should be changed to remove the confusion around the single versus joint meeting in section 2.2.6.13.
• The Provost, Deans, and department faculty must do a better job of defining what *excellence* is and then communicate these criteria to candidates for promotion and tenure.

Many of these recommendations have already been acted upon by the Provost and the Deans of the various colleges.

**Recommendations concerning the handling of faculty misconduct cases**

In our review of the case concerning faculty misconduct, it became clear to the members of the Faculty Personnel Committee that there is a need to develop a more formal process for handling such cases. Specifically, care must be taken to ensure the rights of faculty members who have been charged with misconduct. At the present time, the only process that exists is the one spelled out in section 2.2.11.1 of R&P, Dismissal for Cause. What is needed is a similar process for those instances of faculty misconduct that warrant severe sanctions, for example suspension, that do not rise to the level of dismissal.

**Other Activities**

In addition to hearing appeals, the Faculty Personnel Committee participated in the following activities:

• The committee participated in the searches for the Dean of the College of Business and Economics, the Vice provost for Research, and the Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid. In the latter case, we met only with the search firm responsible for conducting the search.

• The committee brought forward the motion for the extension of the probationary period for untenured faculty members who become the parent of children during this period.

• The committee made motions for minor changes to R&P to bring consistency to sections concerning tenure and promotion.

• The committee continued to work on developing a more detailed process for dismissal for cause.

**For the Future**

During the next academic year, the Faculty Personnel Committee plans to work on the following:

• Developing a more detailed process for dismissal for cause and for faculty misconduct that warrants severe sanctions that do not rise to level of dismissal.

• Bringing forth a proposal clarifying the language in section 2.2.6.13 of R&P regarding when the Provost intends to go against a “faculty recommendation” as to whether the meeting with the Dean, Promotion and/or Tenure Committee, and the department faculty members involved in the review should consist of separate meetings or a single, joint meeting.
• Bringing forth a motion revising the description of the Faculty Personnel Committee that is contained in section 1.2.2.6 of R&P. Part of the discussion concerning this motion should consider when an appeal may be brought to the Faculty Personnel Committee. The committee was instructed last summer by the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees that we may not hear an appeal concerning tenure and promotion until a decision has been rendered by the board.

• Reviewing the status of Professors of Practice with the Provost.

Next Year’s Committee Composition

At the end of the academic year, Jacob Kazakia will be leaving the committee having served his five-year term. We will miss Jacob’s tireless efforts and his sound judgment and thank him for his extraordinary service to the committee and to his faculty colleagues.

Ward Cates will become chair of the committee for the academic year 2007/2008 and Mike Kolchin will serve as the committee’s representative to the Faculty Steering Committee.

A new member will be added to the committee to represent the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences to replace Jacob.

On behalf of the Faculty Personnel Committee,

Michael G. Kolchin, Chair
R & P Subcommittee Activities for 2006 – 2007

Discussion with students related to changes in the new code of conduct

Presented motion for change in composition of FSC to include secretary of the faculty

Met with President Gast regarding her perspective on faculty governance

Academic Freedom Policy presented to faculty for vote – motion passed

Removal of sections 4.1.7.1 and 4.1.7.2 from R & P related to athletics and renumbering of R & P related to removal of information—motion passed

The Faculty Personnel Committee proposes that the last two paragraphs of section 2.2.6.9, College Tenure Review Committee, be added at the end of section 2.2.9.9, College Promotion Review Committee – motion passes

Added statement related to Roberts’ Rules into R & P

Presented addition to R & P related to electronic voting
The Rules and Procedures Subcommittee of the Faculty Steering Committee proposes the following addition, allowing the faculty to designate some decisions as suitable for electronic voting, to R&P 1.1.3.

The addition appears in context in italics below.

1.1.3 Faculty meeting
Regular meetings of the university faculty are held at 4:10 p.m. on six approximately evenly spaced Mondays within the academic year. Specific dates are chosen by the president to be consistent with the university calendar, legal and religious holidays, and vacation periods. Special meetings may be called by the president or upon written request of ten voting members of the faculty.

Faculty meetings are open to a limited number of Lehigh University students as observers, except under the following conditions:
A meeting may be declared closed by a vote of a majority of the voting members of the faculty present, or at the discretion of the chairman.
A meeting is closed when student discipline cases (e.g., judiciary cases, appeals, etc.) are under consideration.
A meeting is closed when actions relating to student academic standing (e.g., waivers and appeals from graduation requirements, etc.) are under consideration. An observer may be granted the privilege of the floor by a majority of the voting members of the faculty present provided that a request for that privilege is submitted before the start of the meeting.

The president or, in his or her absence, the vice president and provost shall chair the regular meetings of the university faculty. The chairperson of the steering committee shall preside over the faculty meetings should the president wish to speak from the floor.

A quorum consists of the voting members of the faculty present unless challenged, whereupon a quorum shall consist, during the remainder of the meeting, of one-third of the total voting members of the university faculty (not including those on leave).

_The assembled faculty may decide, by a majority vote, that a particular motion should be voted upon electronically. In such cases, electronic voting is administered by the Office of Institutional Research and accessible to all voting faculty for seven calendar days. Faculty voting electronically may choose “Yes,” “No,” or “Present, but Not Voting.” (with “Present, but Not Voting” counting only to establish a quorum, which is defined for an electronic vote as one-third of the total voting members of the university faculty not including those on leave). Electronic voting is confidential; votes are submitted to a secure server that tallies the votes and rejects duplicates. The Personnel Committee, the Faculty Steering Committee and the President or Provost each designate one person to serve on a committee to oversee the procedure._

Rationale:
The addition to this section specifies a mechanism for electronic voting when and if the faculty sees fit, as it has in some cases in the past. The addition, however, does not mandate when or why electronic voting is advisable. That decision is left to the faculty assembled at a faculty meeting.

The options (“Yes” and “No” as votes; “Present, but Not Voting” counting only to establish a quorum) are based on the form of electronic voting used by the U.S. House of Representatives. Because electronic voting would be selected when broad faculty input is desired, the quorum is defined as 1/3 of the voting faculty, consistent with R & P.