Presiding: President Alice Gast

President Gast called the meeting to order at 4:14 PM.

I. Minutes: The March 17, 2008, meeting minutes were approved unanimously by the Faculty, as posted on both the Registrar’s Web page and the Secretary of the Faculty folder on the Lehigh University Faculty Blackboard.

II. Motions by the Registrar (See end materials included with these minutes.)
Registrar Bruce Correll moved the four customary graduation resolutions permitting the granting of degrees, honors, awards and prizes to those candidates who complete all requirements by 8:30 am, May 14, 2008 and moved the three customary resolutions for those who complete all requirements after this time but before 8:30 am, September 3, 2008. All motions passed unanimously.

III. Committee Motions: (See end materials included with these minutes.)

Nominations Committee:
Professor Judy Duffield presented the slate of candidates for the election for open faculty committee positions, distributed and collected ballots.

Educational Policy Committee

1.) Prof. Linda Lowe-Krentz provided a second reading for the motion to add an NCr grade as a revision to R & P 3.8.1. No discussion occurred and it passed on a voice vote.

2.) Prof. Lowe-Krentz provided a first reading of proposed changes to R & P subsection 3.14.1 for the description of undergraduate programs offered by the CAS. Prof. Sands seconded the motion. Prof. Gunter moved to suspend a second reading, which was seconded by Prof. Weintraub. This was passed unanimously by the faculty as was the subsequent vote on the main motion for the new CAS program description.

Graduate and Research Committee

Prof. John Smith proposed that a new course, EES 411 be added to the EES graduate core curriculum. This passed unanimously.

R & P Subcommittee

1.) Prof. Dan Lopresti gave a second reading of the motion for an R&P change that identifies the Registrar as a non-voting member of both Ed Pol (1.2.2.2) and GRC (1.2.2.3) to make this role parallel on both committees. Prof. Gunter requested that this type of making parallel changes between these two committees be done by the committee when appropriate and other wording changes come up in the future. Prof. Lopresti agreed. The motion passed unanimously.
2.) Prof. Lopresti gave a second reading of the motion for an R&P change (1.1.6) that includes the “Professor of Practice” (better known as a “POP”) among faculty positions and identifies these faculty as non-voting with respect to faculty motions. This passed unanimously without further discussion.

3.) The second reading of the motion for an R&P change (1.2.1) that eliminates the restriction on consecutive terms for elected standing committees also passed unanimously without comment.

4.) The second reading of the motion for an R&P change (3.19) that eliminates language on inspection trips passed unanimously with no discussion.

5.) Prof. Lopresti gave a first reading and moved a proposal to remove R&P 1.15, which is a restriction on publicizing information on faculty meeting actions without direction from the President, Lehigh vice presidents or the secretary of the faculty. Prof. Nagel seconded the motion. Prof. Sami asked why it should be removed. Prof. Lopresti replied that the committee believes that it is a unneeded restriction on faculty actions and conflicts with academic freedom of information about what happens in faculty meetings. Prof. Lopresti also commented that this and other first readings in the current, May 5, meeting will be given second readings for a vote at the first faculty meeting in the fall, 2008, semester.

6.) Prof. Lopresti gave a first reading of a motion to clarify language in R&P 2.6 (Vacations for Instructional Staff) on faculty academic duties and explained that the current wording was difficult to understand. The proposed rewording should keep the original intent. The motion was seconded. Discussion ensued with Prof. Weintraub objecting that “vacation” was not appropriate for actual faculty duties which often include research and other bona fide academic work-effort conducted off-campus at non-academic times. He suggested striking the first sentence in the second paragraph of the proposed revision. Prof. Nagel opined that “vacation” is not relevant to faculty. Prof. Shapiro proposed an amendment to eliminate the second revised paragraph entirely, which was seconded by Prof. Deily. Prof. Nagel suggested that the R&P committee review the removal of this paragraph before doing so. Prof. Lopresti said that he would check with University Counsel Frank Roth to see whether the use of “vacation” with respect to faculty is entirely outdated. The question was called and the amendment to strike the second paragraph passed.

7.) Prof. Lopresti gave a first reading of a motion to change the language about the Lehigh Abroad Policy Board, R&P 1.2.4.5 to change the name to the “Study Abroad Policy Board” and update the description and responsibilities to match the actual activities of this committee. The one substantive change is to remove reference to graduate studies abroad. Prof. Morgan seconded the motion. Prof. Kate Arrington asked for an explanation of why graduate study should be removed from this committee’s purview. Prof. A. King responded that there are currently no graduate academic programs operated by the University, only undergraduate ones.

8.) Prof. Lopresti commented that the “Discussion item: Eliminating Section 4 of R&P” contained in the R&P committee’s handout will be discussed with committee reports in today’s meeting.

**Discipline Review Committee**

Prof. Kay presented the second reading of the motion to revise Appendix A of R&P 4.2.1, University Conduct System, to include minimum sanctions in academic dishonesty cases. With no discussion, the vote was unanimous, passing this motion.
**Personnel Committee**

Professor Cates presented the second reading of the motion to revise R&P 2.2.3.1 on Joint Appointments, which the committee recommended in order to improve the clarity of the process for departments and the individual faculty member involved. He also confirmed, in response to the question from Prof. Gunter, that the current version of this motion included the amendment which added the department chair as a recipient of the individual letters as well as the faculty member’s promotion (or "special") committee chair. Prof. Neti asked whether this motion reflected all changes for all responsible department centers. Prof. Cates responded that there are parallels with the same rights to the joint appointee as for single-department appointees. Prof. and Deputy Provost Soderlund commented that the proposal includes the home department as well as the special committee that is appointed by the dean with consideration for the individual, plus faculty from other groups. The “home department” filing promotion/tenure review is the one in charge of the process. After a call for the question, the motion passed unanimously.

**IV. Unfinished Business - None**

**V. New Business**

**Personnel Committee**

After acknowledging the strong leadership this year of Mike Kolchin as Personnel Committee chair in working with the Sloan and Personnel committees and others to formulate tenure flexibility options, Professor Ward Cates, incoming Personnel Committee chair, initiated a discussion on a tenure flexibility initiative for a different probationary period than the 6 years currently allowed that has been developing for some time at several levels. The objective of these developments is to enhance initial recruiting and subsequent retention of new faculty. There have been comparisons with 17 schools and other businesses. The main direction and intent has been thus far to explore keeping the same standards for P&T [Note: Secretary’s emphasis added for the following discussion and comments] but to allow the time interval before the tenure review process to change. There are a number of versions under consideration:

- **Version 0** is the one currently in place with 6 years for probation;
- **Version 1** increases the time to 8 years with various extensions possible;
- **Version 2** increases the time to 7 years with additional extensions for a total of 9 years;
- **Version 3** increases the time to 8 years with no extensions for personal reasons, etc.

Prof. Cates said his role today was to facilitate discussion to hear feedback from faculty about these versions that have been discussed already with the Sloan and Personnel Committees and all of the College Deans.

Prof. George White clarified that each of the versions has the same policy for a terminal or final year for the tenure candidate. Prof. Weintraub recommended keeping the current version because increasing the probationary time for junior faculty does them the disservice of raising the uncertainty of their long-term status at Lehigh. As the Chair of the Math Department, he has only had requests for an earlier decision on tenure (decreased probationary time) from faculty, not a longer probation period. Prof. Sami commented that an early decision is still an option and then asked what an unpaid leave of absence does to the probationary period. Some schools do not count this type of leave time towards tenure. Prof. Soderlund replied that, for example, a one-year leave could be considered a leave “for any reason” and incorporated into versions 1, 2, or 3. She also
remarked that other schools have many other reasons that justify an extra year for the probationary period.

Prof. Deily suggested a Version 4 that would be the same as Version 0 but with 7 years of probation. This would be a “simple and clean” solution. Prof. Soderlund responded that when meetings were held with two groups of pre-tenure faculty, the committee members were surprised to hear that the faculty strongly felt that this would, over time, “ramp up” explicit or implicit requirements and expectations of increased output and thus offset the benefit of the extended time. However, these groups also added their support for leaves for personal and family reasons, possibly unforeseen at the time of hiring, such as parenthood.

Prof. Cutcliffe asked, given the possibility of early tenure or promotion consideration, what would be required by any of the proposed versions if the candidate was formally rejected for this. Would this result preclude the candidate being considered again at the “regular” time, for example in the current policy of after the sixth year? Prof. Cates replied the Sloan Committee is looking into the issue of a second consideration but R&P is currently silent on this issue. However, the candidate still has the option to withdraw the early tenure request at the department or college level as long as the portfolio has not been received by the Provost and Trustees. If the withdrawal is done by this point, then a later (“normal”) tenure consideration could be thought of as a “second chance.” Prof. Soderlund she recommended to the Personnel Committee that because issues about a second consideration complicated the current discussion about the length of the probationary period, this issue should be discussed at a later time.

Prof. Thornton asked about how a single semester leave would be counted, given that the versions are worded in terms of years, with a 2 year maximum leave(s) in Version 2. He thought that there was an issue of correctly wording about the desired leave period.

Prof. Morgan asked for a list of the peer institutions used for comparisons. Prof. Soderlund responded that the 17 peers or aspirational peers are Boston College, Carnegie Mellon University, Case Western Reserve University, Colgate University, Columbia University, Cornell University, Duke University, Georgetown University, George Washington University, Georgia Institute of Technology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Princeton University, Tufts University, University of California – Berkeley, University of Michigan, University of Pennsylvania, University of Wisconsin – Madison. Some of these have as many as 8 or 9 years for probation. Prof. Dearden commented that he was surprised to see that Washington University (St. Louis, MO) was not on the list, a common comparator for Lehigh. Also, he was concerned about the current slowdown in academic journal response times, at least in some social science fields such as economics which now average 2 – 2.5 years. This is a big problem that can lead to a tenure denial in the current framework of 5 to 6 years, solely due to editorial practice.

Prof. Lutz asked how the current reappointment cycle would be affected with/by Version 3 specifically. Also, he commented that the most frequent concern he had heard expressed while he was interim dean from faculty members was that, despite the design intentions for any of the new versions, implicitly expectations will be changed. Will there be written assurance to new faculty hires that the intent will be not to ratchet up the evaluation criteria? Prof. Cates responded that the Personnel Committed clearly wants no new, higher expectations at the end of the extended probation period.
Prof. Simon asked when Version 2 or 3 would go into effect for current assistant professors. Prof. Cates said he expected that there would be an option for current faculty to continue with the current probation period, if they preferred it.

Prof. Kevin Narizny asked if there had been any budgetary implications of a longer probationary period for any of the new versions proposed. Presumably, the probationary period should not be too short to lose good productive faculty, yet it should allow departments to distinguish and dismiss non-productive faculty. Also he asked whether there had been any study of an “optimal” period for probation. Prof. Cates responded that the Personnel Committee was working on the basis of comparisons with peer institutions that 7 to 8 years might be better than our current 6 years. Prof. Soderlund replied that this discussion should aim to discover what is right for Lehigh. Also, in all discussions to date there has been no budgetary impact foreseen.

Prof. Sami observed that the current system has evaluation safeguards in place with the biennial process for untenured faculty. Prof. Weintraub commented that in the math department, the typical probation period has been 2 to 5 years, for which accepted papers and as yet unpublished papers are included in the portfolio. However, he expected with Version 1 the maximum number of expected papers would increase with outside evaluators. Prof. Nandu Nayyar said that in finance, there is a lag of 2 to 3 years in the publications process so that he is in favor of extending the probationary period especially for the extremely competitive recruiting process for top finance candidates. He believes that assistant professor candidates will perceive an 8-year period at other competing schools as better than Lehigh’s current effectively 5- to 6-year period. Prof. Sharon Friedman commented that “early” tenure was not a good term to describe what we mean. Perhaps “ready” would be better because it allows the flexibility for individual situations where in some cases 3 or 5 or some other number of years is when that person is “ready.” In addition, she commented that she seems to have observed recently that there are more faculty requesting “early” decisions when they are not really “ready;” and, department chairs also do not seem to be discouraging these requests.

Prof. Vasconcellos asked why there was no mention of promotion without tenure and whether there was any school known not to have a “tenure clock.” For example, were there ones that had renewable three-year contracts? Prof. Cates responded that his charge was to facilitate discussion about flexibility in tenure specifically, not promotion. Prof. Soderlund answered the second question that prior Lehigh discussions and research had not revealed any such schools, but typically no one had been looking for them. Prof. Nation inquired about why all Lehigh colleges have the same probationary period and whether each could establish its own length. Prof. Soderlund replied that there had been some discussion about this, but in order to facilitate the Provost’s required management of the tenure process, it has not been considered in any detail. Prof. Cates added that from the Personnel Committee’s viewpoint different required probationary periods could easily create difficulties about inequities across the whole institution for adjudicating tenure case appeals.

Prof. Caram observed that academic salaries are typically lower than in non-academic positions so that tenure provides employment and income stability over time for an academic. In his view, junior faculty want a finite short-term probationary period for the long-term certainty of tenure. While there are benefits in the flexibility of probationary periods to allow for some individual differences, the lengthened time increases uncertainty which could counteract the benefits of the flexibility. Prof. Shapiro hypothesized that a 7-year period plus no penalty for a second consideration could increase flexibility and is to the institution’s benefit. Thus, the committees designing this proposal should consider a “second chance” as part of the tenure process.
Prof. Szczepeanski observed that Lehigh’s intention with the current discussions is to respond to the need for a process more than “one size fits all.” Versions 0 to 3 all focus on specific time periods to define “flexibility,” but differing personal and department times are needed based on the human being involved and the particular professorial “lines” involved. Would it be possible to create a range of times that would allow “flexibility” to include a human dimension? Prof. Arrington observed that implementation of even Version 1, a small extension of current Version 0, for reasons other than birth/adoption (as now already approved policy) will not be clear-cut. For example, who will decide what is sufficient for “flexibility”? Prof. Soderlund responded that currently the Provost makes the final decision on the basis of a formal request and considers several reasons, such as under Family and Medical Leave provisions. Prof. Arrington asked a follow-on question, when extensions are granted, whether the tenure portfolio will include information about the extension. Prof. Soderlund replied that the individual’s tenure committee chair should include in the letters to external evaluators that expectations of the candidate’s output should not be increased due to the extension. Prof. Sherer commented that tenure is a long-run decision on an employment contract of which a major objective is to minimize the probability of mistakes for both the individual and the institution. Different people have different situations. The reappointment process, early promotion and flexibility all help to decrease the risk of errors in long-run decisions.

Prof. Gunter asked how an academic leave due to military service fits with Version 1. In this case, the leave is essentially involuntary for both the individual and the institution, given that there are Federal laws governing the conditions. For example, the institution is required by law to hold the person’s position available for 5 years. Prof. Soderlund replied that Lehigh would not consider military service as more than one leave, but in any case will always follow Federal law. Other schools do not distinguish military service as a separate type of leave.

Prof. Scott Gordon commented that as a new faculty member he has found that assistant professors are anxious about a 7-year probationary period and find the 8-year period even more problematic. Prof. Bishop asked whether discussion forums have been held by rank. Prof. Soderlund replied that the Sloan Committee held several focus group meetings with pre-tenure and recently tenured faculty, who gave little support for longer tenure periods. Prof. Pavlock asked whether it was unusual to allow extensions in the last year of probation in other comparison schools. Prof. Soderlund gave the example of Auburn University as typical in their allowance of an extension for any reason plus one additional year afterwards before tenure decisions, with a maximum probation period of 7 years.

Prof. Roger Simon requested that the working group first list all possible reasons for extensions, then allow one additional year and to trust the colleagues’ decisions. In a second request he suggested that when the survey is taken, the respondent’s rank be recorded so that we can be aware of where strong objections may be to changes from the current policy.

**VI. Committee Annual Reports.** (See end materials included with these minutes.)

In the interest of time, the committee chairs who provided their annual reports agreed to answer any questions from colleagues after the meeting and referred everyone to the reports which could be found on the Faculty Blackboard site.

**Personnel Committee – Prof. Ward Cates**

**Graduate and Research Committee – Prof. John Smith**
Educational Policy Committee – Prof. Linda Lowe-Krentz

Financial Planning and Operations Committee – Prof. Sudhakar Neti

Discipline Review Committee – Prof. Edwin Kay

Faculty Compensation Committee – Prof. Roger Nagel

R&P Subcommittee – Prof. Dan Lopresti

Faculty Steering Committee – Professor Ed Shapiro

VII. Reports and Announcements (See end materials included with these minutes.)

Election Results for Faculty Committees

President’s Report
President Gast thanked all the committee members and faculty who have participated in the discussion about tenure flexibility proposals. People have worked hard in thinking about substantive issues. The entire faculty deserves thanks for working on many issues important to Lehigh’s success at being the very best it can be.

She expressed appreciation for faculty contributions and participation in a number of important initiatives over this past year: Middle States Accreditation chaired by Carl Moses and Peggy Plympton; the broad input to and the impact of the Strategic thinking group; the Council for Equity and Community chaired by Mike Raposa and Carolina Hernandez; the new Ombuds Office with Rosemary Mundhenk and Chuck Smith as the new Ombudspeople; the Lehigh Environmental Advisory Group lead by Sudhakar Neti and Peggy Plympton; the South Bethlehem Development Study Group headed by Tom Hyclak and Dale Kochard; the R&P group and their time consuming efforts to revise and update R&P in detail; and last but not least the important developing and fundraising for the new financial aid policy to reduce barriers for prospective students and their families towards accessibility of a Lehigh education, regardless of their financial circumstances.

Provost’s Report:
Provost El-Aasser gave an update on admissions for our target entering F ’08 class of 1170 students. As of today we have 3622 offers (yield of 33.8%) and 1265 deposits, with some “melt” expected. SAT scores average 1309 and the AI averages 207. As evidence of improved diversity, we have 35% non-white of our incoming first-years, including 71 international students, 67 Hispanics, 95 Asians and 57 African Americans. For new faculty hires, we started with 40 slots and as of today have 39 verbal offers outstanding, 24 accepted and 5 pending. For Global Lehigh we have an oversight committee with half of the members from the professional staff and half from the faculty. There is a Five-Point Action Plan that colleges have worked on over the past semester, focusing on the “Required International Experience” (REI). Provost El-Aasser will present it to the Board of Trustees at their next meeting.
The Provost made his regular semester-end report as requested by the faculty about the impact of the USA Patriot Act. The record shows that no faculty, staff or students were denied visas during the spring 2008 semester.

**VIII. Other - None**

**IX. Adjournment** at 6:07 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Next Meeting:

*September 15, 2008, 4:10 p.m., in Sinclair Auditorium; 3:30 p.m. reception.*
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 14, 2008, 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.
May 5, 2008

SEPTMBER 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,
September 3, 2008, 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 September 3 and that the Graduate Committee be
empowered to so act in cases involving candidates for graduate degrees.
### Lehigh University Standing Committees Election
**May 5, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary to the Faculty</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>1-year term</td>
<td>Art King, CBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Governance Committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Compensation Committee</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
<td>Jeffrey Milet, CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Toulouse, CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAS Rep</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
<td>Neal Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COE Rep</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
<td>Arnie Spokane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RCEAS Rep</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
<td>Roger Nagel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Vote for 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee</strong></td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Complete Term expiring in 2009</td>
<td>Anne Anderson, CBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Steering</strong></td>
<td>CBE Rep</td>
<td>4-year term</td>
<td>K. Sivakumar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geraldo Vasconcellos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vincent Munley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Personnel Committee</strong>*</td>
<td>CBE Rep</td>
<td>5-year term</td>
<td>Geraldo Vasconcellos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Hyclak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Administrative Committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations Committee</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>2-year term</td>
<td>Erica Hoelscher, CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iveta Silova, COE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisory Committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Users’ Committee</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>2-year term**</td>
<td>Barbara Pavlock, CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Discipline</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
<td>Keith Gardiner, RCEAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Vote for 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Gallagher, CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Hall, CBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Rickman, RCEAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keith Schray, CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Lecturers’ Committee</td>
<td>CAS Rep</td>
<td>2-year term</td>
<td>Janet Laible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CBE Rep</td>
<td>Complete Term expiring in 2009</td>
<td>Gopal Krishnan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tenured Faculty Only

**Reduced terms for Library Users’ Committee to reestablish staggered terms
Proposed Change to R&P 3.8.1

Current:

3.8.1 Definitions of grades
Other symbols used for courses on student records are: Cr, credit allowed

Proposed:

3.8.1 Definitions of grades
Other symbols used for courses on student records are: Cr, credit allowed; NCr, no credit awarded (because coursework, while not necessarily evaluated as “failing”, did not meet the standards of a particular program in which “Cr” is the designation for successful completion)

Rationale: This change would accommodate the grading practices of a program like South Mountain College. Presently, students in SMC are supplied with extensive oral and written narrative evaluations of their work. The designation “Cr” is placed on their transcript if that work meets SMC standards. But there is, at present, no appropriate designation for work that does not meet such standards. (The judgment that a student’s work does not meet such standards is not the equivalent of the judgment that it should be graded as an “F”, since a student could do D-level work but not meet the standards to earn credit in the program.) The Registrar has requested such a designation which is provided by this proposal of a new “NCr” designation.
CAS R&P Changes in program text.

Replace 3.14.1 (under Special Regulations) with a simple statement of where to find the actual and current information and DELETE 3.14.1.1 and following subsections (pp 86-90 of R&P—3.14.1.2 through 3.14.1.5). Note: see previous text for section 3.14.1 appended at the end of this document.

NEW TEXT

3.14.1 College of Arts and Sciences

The College of Arts and Sciences offers 4 year BA and BS degrees in a wide variety of majors, all requiring a minimum of 121 credit hours, as well as various distinctive and cross-college programs. Curricula are proposed and updated through a process of review that originates in departments or programs and passes through the CAS Policy Committee (see 1.3.3.1.1), the College Faculty, the Educational Policy Committee, and the University Faculty. Current information on and regulations governing all College and cross-college offerings are maintained in the annually updated University Catalog.

Previous text from Section 3.14 appended below (strikeout font indicating text to be deleted).

3.14 Special regulations

3.14.1 College of Arts and Sciences

3.14.1.1 Curricula in the College of Arts and Sciences

The College of Arts and Sciences offers several curricula. They are:

1. A four-year curriculum in arts and science leading to a degree of Bachelor of Arts.

2. Four-year curricula in the fields of biochemistry, biology, chemistry, computer science, environmental science and resource management, geological sciences, geophysics, molecular biology, physics, and statistics leading to a degree of bachelor of science in the designated field.

3. A five-year curriculum in arts engineering leading to a baccalaureate degree from the College of Arts and Sciences and a bachelor of science degree in the student's field of engineering.
Students in all curricula satisfy a freshman English requirement of six hours of composition and literature (normally English 1 and 2) and successful completion of Arts and Science 1.

3.14.1.2—Bachelor of Arts degree in the College of Arts and Sciences

The Bachelor of Arts degree requires the completion of a minimum of 121 credit hours of collegiate work, apportioned to cover distribution and concentration requirements. A cumulative average of 2.0 or better in courses required in the student's major program and the completion of all general requirements apply to all candidates for baccalaureate degrees. Candidates must complete Arts and Sciences 1, and must receive writing certification in the junior year. A maximum of six credit hours of advanced military science or aerospace studies courses may be applied toward the degree.

There are three categories of distribution requirements: a College requirement (Arts and Sciences 1, Choices and Decisions) designed to acquaint freshmen with the approach to a liberal education; a General Skills requirement, to be completed by the end of the sophomore year, ensuring minimum competency in English, and mathematics; and the Distribution requirement (to be completed by the end of the junior year), which obliges all bachelor of arts students, whatever their major, to take a minimum number of courses in five essential subject areas:

1. College Requirement (to be completed by the end of the freshman year), one hour total, A&S 1, Choices and Decisions.

2. General Skills Requirement (to be completed by the end of the sophomore year):

   A. English composition (two courses during the freshman year).

   B. Mathematical Sciences (two courses).

Two courses from among mathematics, computer programming, logical theory of which at least one must be a mathematics course.

3. Distribution Requirement (to be completed by the end of the junior year).

At least one of the courses in Physical or Life Sciences must also include the associated laboratory course. Courses taken with the major department to satisfy a major may not satisfy distribution requirements in more than one area:

C. Physical Science

Two courses from among those designated in: astronomy, chemistry, geological sciences, physics.

D. Life Sciences
One course from among those designated in biological anthropology, biology, and psychology.

E.—Social Sciences

Four courses from among those designated in—anthropology, economics, government, history, international relations, journalism, psychology, social psychology, sociology, STS, and urban studies.

E.—Humanities

Four courses from among those designated in—classics, history, history of architecture, history of art, history of music, history of psychology, history of theater, journalism, literature, cultural studies, music theory, philosophy, and religion studies.

C.—Performing and Studio Arts

One course from among those designated in—architectural design, creative writing, journalism, speech, theater, studio arts, music composition and performance.

The ultimate decision as to which course will apply to the distribution requirement in disciplines within the first three distribution areas rests with the dean of the college in consultation with the course and curriculum committee.

A student's program is not official until approved by the student's adviser.

During the second semester of the sophomore year, each student selects a sequence of studies in some field as a major. This may be a standard major sequence or it may be a specially structured interdisciplinary major sequence. A major consists of at least twelve semester hours of advanced work. Including preliminary college work, the minimum number of hours constituting a major is twenty-four. Majors or changes in majors must be approved by the professors concerned and the dean of the college.

After a student has selected a standard major sequence, the chairman of the department or the committee responsible for the major is the official adviser of the student and shall guide him or her in the choice of major and collateral courses.

On the advice of the official adviser and with the consent of the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, a senior of unusual ability who wishes to concentrate in his or her chosen field may be allowed to substitute not more than six hours of unscheduled work per semester for six hours of elective work otherwise required for graduation.

A cumulative average of 2.00 in the major field of concentration is required for successful completion of the curriculum of arts and sciences. The courses to be included in the computation are those appearing on the student's official major program. The computation is based on all reported grades in these courses, including F's, W's, absences from final examinations, and incomplete grades, unless the course was completed or repeated, in which case only the new grade will be used in the computation.

A student who has fulfilled all other requirements for graduation in arts and sciences, but does not have the required average in the major field, and wishes to continue work
towards graduation in that field, takes additional course work as prescribed by the major adviser to bring the average up to the required minimum.

A departmental or major program committee may, if it wishes, also require the passage of a comprehensive examination in the major subject for successful completion of the major or the awarding of departmental honors.

3.14.1.3——Bachelor of Science degree in the College of Arts and Sciences

A Bachelor of Science curriculum in the College of Arts and Sciences consists of at least 121 hours including a major program and distribution requirements. The Bachelor of Science distribution requirements consist of a minimum of thirty credit hours taken in courses outside the natural sciences and mathematics. Of these thirty credit hours, at least twelve credit hours must be taken in courses in the humanities and at least twelve in the social sciences. The humanities and social science courses satisfying this distribution requirement are those approved by the faculty for this purpose and are listed under the appropriate categories of the distribution requirements for the B.A. degree. The curriculum is to be approved by the university faculty. Students successfully completing the curriculum and all other requirements for graduation (see 3.14.1.1 and 3.20.1) are awarded the degree of Bachelor of Science in the major field.

3.14.1.4——Arts-Engineering Program

The arts-engineering program requires the student to complete the requirements of the bachelor of arts curriculum (excepting the requirement of a cumulative average of 2.00 in the major field of concentration) or one of the bachelor of science curricula in the College of Arts and Sciences and to complete the requirements of a bachelor of science in the College of Engineering and Applied Science. To qualify for both degrees, the student submits for the second degree thirty hours in addition to the number required for the B.S. in engineering above.

3.14.1.5——College of Arts and Sciences honors program

The college scholar program offers the qualified student a unique opportunity for maximum enhancement of critical faculties, abilities and intellectual interests. This end is achieved through a structured program conforming to exceptional standards of breadth and rigor.

Undergraduates in the College of Arts and Sciences may apply for acceptance into the program at any time during the college career. An application is made to an honors committee and acceptance is governed by the performance of the student to date and the committee’s estimate of the likelihood that he or she will be able to fulfill the requirements of the program.

In order to be graduated with the designation "college scholar," a student must fulfill the requirements and achieve a cumulative average of 3.5.
Each student is required to have an individually structured program which must be approved by the director. No course taken pass/fail may be used to satisfy the requirements. The requirements follow.

--- Area of concentration

The major. Departmental or interdepartmental. The academic level expected of candidates in the area of concentration can be attained by satisfactory completion of courses such as those at the 400 level, independent study, etc.

Thesis. The student takes a certain number of hours in independent study of thesis courses, culminating in a thesis or research report. This is read and rated by an ad hoc committee of three faculty, one of whom must be from outside the department or departments in which the student is doing major work.

Comprehensive. There is to be a comprehensive examination in the area of concentration; it may be written, oral or both. A committee in charge of the examination includes at least one person from a department other than that (or those) in which the student is doing major work.

--- Distribution requirements

- English. English 1 and either 2, or 10, 14, 16

Language. Proficiency in a classical or modern foreign language sufficient to complete the work of the fifth semester in any 3-3-3-3-3 sequence of credit hours; in a 4-4-3-3 sequence, completion of the fourth semester is required. There is no restriction on the language acceptable.

Mathematics. One course from among Math 21, 31, or 41.

Natural Science. Four courses chosen from two of the following areas: astronomy, biology, chemistry, geology, physics, and psychology. At least one of these courses shall be in chemistry or physics, and at least one of the four courses shall include the accompanying laboratory course.

Social Science. Four courses chosen from the areas of archaeology, economics, government, history, international relations, psychology, social relations and urban studies. At least one must be in economics and one in history.

Humanities. Four courses chosen from the areas of drama, fine arts, literature (English and advanced courses in classical and modern foreign languages), music, philosophy, and religion studies. At least one of these courses must be in philosophy or religion studies, one in literature, and one the creative arts (theater, music and art and architecture).

Note: Each of the last three requirements is stated in terms of areas, not departments, in recognition of the fact that not all humanities courses are offered in the departments whose names appear under "Humanities," not all historical courses are offered by the history department, not all philosophy courses by the philosophy department, etc.
The committee makes the decision, in consultation with the appropriate departments, under which rubric a specific course may be counted. It also is empowered to admit what substitutions it deems wise.

— Honors seminars

Two seminars, normally to be taken during the sophomore or junior year. A study of major ideas which have dominated western thought.
Course Changes

Course: EES 411

Cross-listed Course(s):

Submitted By: Anastasio, David J. <dja2@lehigh.edu> on 3/24/2008 9:46:58 AM

Type: Add

Program: Earth & Environmental Science

Description: EES 411: Physical and Chemical Processes at the Earth's Surface

An advanced treatment of physical and chemical processes and their interactions in the critical zone. Quantitative methods, modeling, and process oriented approaches are presented in a systems context from the meter, to watershed, to continental scale. Topics include weathering and soils, chemical and physical fluxes from watersheds, and global hydrology and erosion. 3 NS Peters and Pazzaglia.

Rationale: EES Core course in a major disciplinary area of Earth & Environmental sciences. The department has added a great deal of faculty strength in this area through faculty hires in the last 5 years. Core courses are by design highly accessible. This new course will open up a segment of the EES graduate curricula to a wider graduate student audience.

Student Impact (Internal): Greater choice in core course selection, a requirement for all EES graduate students

Student Impact (External): none

Faculty Impact (Internal): Alternate year offering and team taught. This raises the teaching commitments and loads of Peters and Pazzaglia.

Faculty Impact (External): none

University Impact: none

Internal Approval: Yes

External Consultation: No
The Discipline Review Committee, which consists of Sharon Basso (Dean of Students), Christopher Mulvihill (Conduct Officer), Michael Kolchin (Chair of the Committee on Discipline), and Edwin Kay (Chair of the Disciplinary Appeal Committee), would like to move the following motion at the next university faculty meeting.

Currently, Appendix A of R&P section 4.2.1, which describes the University Student Conduct System, has guidelines for three kinds of sanctions, those involving sexual assault and sexual harassment, those involving physical assault, and those involving hazing.

We move to add to Appendix A the following guidelines for sanctions involving violations of academic integrity.

D. Guidelines for sanctions in cases involving violations of academic integrity

_Students found responsible for violations of the Code of Conduct related to academic integrity, are subject to expulsion or other lesser penalties as outlined in Article VII of the code._ The following represents recommendations for minimum sanctions in these cases. These sanctions demonstrate the seriousness that Lehigh University attaches to these types of violations. Academic integrity violations constitute intellectual fraud and should result in serious sanctions.

Hearing panels are not limited to these guidelines in determining an appropriate sanction, but any deviation from these suggested sanctions should be justified, especially when considering sanctions less than the minimum. Hearing panels may supplement the sanctions below with other appropriate mandates including, but not limited to, educational workshops, completion of work for no credit, written apologies, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Minimum Primary Sanction</strong></th>
<th><strong>Minimum Secondary Sanction</strong></th>
<th><strong>Educational Sanction</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Offense</td>
<td>A minimum of Disciplinary Probation for 1 full semester</td>
<td>Assigned Grade of “F” in the course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Offense (related to academic dishonesty) or Serious First Offense</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A minimum of Disciplinary Suspension for 4 full semesters</td>
<td>Assigned Grade of “F” in the course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
March 6, 2008

R&P on Joint Appointments

Rationale
In the past five years, a number of faculty members have been hired to joint appointments involving a department, program, and/or center. The University faculty approved R&P 2.2.3.1 in Fall 2001 to provide guidelines on appointment, mentoring, and evaluation of faculty hired through joint appointments. Efforts to implement this section have indicated gaps in the current policy as listed below. The proposed revisions address these gaps, providing more specific guidance in hiring and evaluation, including annual and triennial review, reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

- This section applies specifically to faculty members who have joint appointments spelled out in an appointment letter, not faculty who have a less formal affiliation with another department, program, and/or center.

- The current reappointment review process indicates that the special committee will review only research while the home department will review only teaching and service. In fact, faculty evaluators in departments, programs and/or centers often have broad knowledge of the faculty member's contributions and thus can provide evaluations across these domains. In addition, the role of the special committee needs more clarity.

- The current process for selecting the special committee is vague and lacks participation by the faculty member.

- No process is specified for annual review of pre-tenure faculty or triennial review of associate professors.

- The current tenure and promotion review process is described inadequately. For example, the selection of external reviewers is not discussed and, for joint appointments in more than one college, no guidance exists on the role of the second dean and college P&T committee.

- Benchmarking suggests developing a memorandum of understanding among the participating units prior to the hire, then adjusting the MOU to meet the circumstances of the new faculty member.

See p. 10 for current text of 2.2.3.1.
2.2.3.1Faculty Joint Appointment

A Faculty Joint Appointment is an appointment of a faculty member to more than one academic department, program, and/or center. This section applies specifically to faculty members who have joint appointments formalized in an appointment letter or memorandum of understanding. It does not apply to faculty members who have a less formal affiliation with another department, program, and/or center.

2.2.3.1.1Initial Appointment

As a standard practice, whenever funds for faculty positions become available, the dean(s) funding these positions determine(s) the department(s) in which a position will be located, given the provost’s approval.

In the case of joint appointments, a faculty position may reside within two departments, within a department and program, or within a department and center—in a single college or in more than one college. The home department in which the candidate will hold his or her appointment will be identified at the start of the search process or after the search committee makes its recommendation for employment to the participating units. “Participating units” are the departments, programs, and/or centers participating in the joint appointment.

When a position is designated as a joint appointment, the dean(s) responsible for the participating units will assemble a group of faculty (which may include the department chairs, program directors, and/or center directors of the participating units) to develop a preliminary memorandum of understanding (MOU) addressing the expectations for the joint appointment. See 2.2.3.1.2 below. This group of faculty will then develop a position description from the MOU that will designate the participating units to which the new hire will be expected to actively contribute. The position description will also include the interdisciplinary scholarly expertise required for the position and state the expectations in teaching and service. Each participating unit must approve the MOU and position description. The MOU and position description will then be sent to the deans(s) of the participating units and provost for approval.

If the dean(s) and provost approve the MOU and position description, the dean(s) will select a search committee, with the advice of the chairs/directors of the participating units. The search committee will consist of faculty with disciplinary expertise related to the proposed hire and any other professionals deemed qualified to review prospective candidates for the position. The search process
will be conducted in consultation with the faculty in all participating units. After identifying qualified candidates for review, the search committee will recommend candidates for on-campus interviews for approval by the participating units and the dean(s). After the interviews, the search committee will make its recommendation for employment to the participating units. The home department (identified before the search or at this point in the search process) and the search committee will jointly recommend a candidate to the dean(s) of the participating units. As with all appointments to the faculty, the dean(s) will make their recommendation to the provost for approval.

When a faculty member hired by one department requests a joint appointment with another department, program, and/or center, the department chair will initiate the procedure outlined in 2.2.3.1.10, below.

2.2.3.1.2 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

As noted in 2.2.3.1.1, prior to the search, the dean(s) responsible for the participating units will assemble a group of faculty (which may include the department chairs, program directors, and/or center directors of the participating units) to develop a preliminary MOU addressing the expectations for the joint appointment. The MOU will articulate expectations about budget, space, fields of research and scholarship, teaching, and service contributions. After hiring, the dean of the college in which the home department is located will assemble the chairs/directors of the participating units and the new faculty member to modify the MOU to match the particular circumstances of the new faculty member. The dean of the home department must approve the revised MOU. In addition to new hires, an MOU will be developed and approved for each current faculty member who has a joint appointment formalized in an appointment letter.

2.2.3.1.3 Special Committee

By the beginning of the new faculty member’s second semester at Lehigh, for full professors hired without tenure, associate professors, and assistant professors, the dean of the home department, in consultation with the new faculty member and chairs/ directors of the participating units, will appoint a special committee of three to five tenured faculty members. The committee will include at least one member from each of the participating units. The committee will be charged with evaluating the faculty member’s teaching, research and scholarship, and service, taking into consideration the expected contributions of the faculty member to each participating unit. A committee member from the faculty member’s home department will participate in both the home department and special committee discussions but will vote only with the special committee.

The membership of the special committee will remain as consistent as possible throughout the faculty member’s reviews for reappointment, tenure, and
promotion. The special committee for a tenured associate professor will be composed of full professors.

2.2.3.1.4 Mentoring
The chair of the faculty member’s home department will be responsible for mentoring the faculty member in the areas of teaching, research and scholarship, and service. The chair of the home department will seek guidance from the chairs/ directors of the other participating unit(s). If there are any disagreements about the expectations for the faculty member that cannot be resolved informally, the respective chair(s) or directors(s) will meet jointly with the dean(s) to whom they report to resolve any disagreements. A report of this meeting will be given to the faculty member.

2.2.3.1.5 Annual Evaluation for Merit
The chair of the faculty member’s home department will be responsible for the annual merit evaluation of the faculty member. The chair will use the annual report of the faculty member and solicit a written evaluation of the faculty member’s performance from the chairs/ directors of the other participating unit(s) that will be included as part of the annual evaluation. The chair of the home department will recommend the merit increase to the dean(s) responsible for the participating units. The respective dean(s) will review the recommended increase to ensure that the merit increase fairly reflects the evaluations submitted. The chair of the home department will provide written feedback to the faculty member.

2.2.3.1.6 Annual Review of Pre-Tenure Faculty
The home department and the special committee will conduct the annual review of the pre-tenure faculty member using the standard criteria of teaching, research and scholarship, and service. As noted in 2.2.4.1, the annual review is more abbreviated than the reappointment and tenure review process. The special committee will meet with the tenured faculty of the home department to discuss the candidate’s portfolio. The chairs of the home department and the special committee will each write a letter summarizing the views of their respective groups. The members of each group will review and comment on their chair’s summary letter. After making any needed revisions, the special committee chair will send his/her summary letter to the home department chair, who will include a summary of the special committee’s letter in the home department’s summary letter. The home department chair will send this letter to the tenured faculty of the home department and the members of the special committee for review and comment.

The home department chairperson will meet with the faculty member to discuss the written final department summary that includes the summary of the special committee’s letter. The faculty member will be informed that he/she has the right to respond in writing to the summary letter. Copies of the summary letter and any
written response by the pre-tenure faculty member will be placed in the pre-tenure faculty member’s file in the home department. Copies of both documents are sent to the dean of the home department and provost, who will review the substance and process of the evaluation for consistency with the criteria stated in section 2.2.1.5.

2.2.3.1.7 Reappointment

The home department and the special committee will conduct the reappointment review of the faculty member using the standard criteria of teaching, research and scholarship, and service. The special committee will meet with the tenured faculty of the home department to discuss the candidate’s reappointment portfolio. The tenured faculty of the home department will write individual letters that include recommendations for or against reappointment as described in 2.2.7.1 and submit them to the department chair. The members of the special committee will write individual letters that include recommendations for or against reappointment as described in 2.2.7.1 and submit them to their committee chair with copies to the department chair. The chairs of the home department and special committee will write their own individual letters. Individual letters from the home department will not be shared with special committee members and vice versa.

The chairs will then each write a letter summarizing the views of their respective groups. The members of each group will review and comment on their chair’s summary letter. After making any needed revisions, the special committee chair will send his/her summary letter to the home department chair, who will include a summary of the special committee’s letter in the home department’s summary letter. The home department chair will send this letter to the tenured faculty of the home department and the members of the special committee for review and comment. If there is major disagreement among these faculty evaluators, the home department chair will convene a meeting of all the faculty evaluators to resolve the disagreement. If the disagreement cannot be resolved, the home department chair will designate a faculty member representing the minority opinion to write a letter that will become part of the reappointment review file. The individual votes of the tenured department faculty and special committee members will be tallied and recorded on the reappointment recommendation form.

Proceeding according to 2.2.7.2, the home department chair will provide a copy to the candidate of the final written department summary that includes the summary of the special committee’s letter. The department chair will inform the candidate that he/ she may write a response that will become part of the reappointment review file. All individual letters and both summary letters will be forwarded to the dean of the home department as part of the reappointment review file. See R&P sections 2.2.7.3 through 2.2.7.5.5 for the remaining steps in the reappointment process.
2.2.3.1.8 Tenure and Promotion

For more information on the tenure/promotion review process, see R&P sections 2.2.6 (for tenure) and 2.2.9 (for promotion to full professor). The following paragraphs discuss the collaboration of the special committee with the home department in the tenure/promotion review for faculty with joint appointments.

The home department and the special committee will conduct the tenure/promotion review of the faculty member using the standard criteria of teaching, research and scholarship, and service. The special committee will meet with the participating faculty of the home department to assist in preparing the list of external evaluators. After the candidate’s tenure/promotion review file is prepared and external review letters are received, the special committee will meet with the participating faculty of the home department to discuss the candidate’s tenure/promotion file and external letters. The participating faculty of the home department will write individual letters that include recommendations for or against tenure or promotion as described in 2.2.6.4 or 2.2.9.4 and submit them to the department chair. The members of the special committee will write individual letters that include recommendations for or against tenure or promotion as described in 2.2.6.4 or 2.2.9.4 and submit them to their committee chair with copies to the department chair. The chairs of the home department and special committee will write their own individual letters. Individual letters from the home department are not shared with special committee members and vice versa.

The chairs will then each write a letter summarizing the views of their respective groups. The members of each group will review and comment on their chair’s summary letter. After making any needed revisions, the special committee chair will send his/her summary letter to the home department chair, who will include a summary of the special committee’s letter in the home department’s summary letter. The home department chair will send this letter to the participating faculty of the home department and the members of the special committee for review and comment. If there is major disagreement among these faculty evaluators, the home department chair will convene a meeting of all the faculty evaluators to resolve the disagreement. If the disagreement cannot be resolved, the home department chair will designate a faculty member representing the minority opinion to write a letter that will become part of the tenure/promotion review file. The individual votes of the participating department faculty and special committee members will be tallied and recorded on the tenure/promotion recommendation form.

Proceeding according to 2.2.6.6 or 2.2.9.6, the home department chairperson will provide a copy to the candidate of the final written department summary that includes the summary of the special committee’s letter. The department chair will inform the candidate that he/she may write a response that will become part of
the tenure/promotion review file. All individual letters and both summary letters will be forwarded to the dean of the home department as part of the tenure/promotion review file.

The dean and the tenure/promotion committee of the college in which the home department is located will consider and make recommendations on the faculty member’s tenure/promotion. See R&P 2.2.6.7-2.2.6.13 or 2.2.9.7-2.2.9.13 for the remaining steps in the review process.

2.2.3.1.9 Triennial Review of Associate Professors
The home department and the special committee will conduct the triennial review of a tenured associate professor using the standard criteria of teaching, research and scholarship, and service. The triennial review is conducted every three years or upon request of the tenured associate professor. (See 2.2.8.2 on the frequency of promotion review.) The special committee will meet with the tenured full professors who are voting members of the home department to discuss the candidate’s portfolio. The chairs of the home department and the special committee will then each write a letter summarizing the views of their respective groups. The members of each group will review and comment on their chair’s summary letter. After making any needed revisions, the special committee chair will send his/her summary letter to the home department chair, who will include a summary of the special committee’s letter in the home department’s summary letter. The home department chair will send this letter to the tenured faculty of the home department and the members of the special committee for review and comment.

The home department chair will meet with the associate professor to discuss the written final department summary that includes the summary of the special committee’s letter. The home department chair will inform the faculty member that he/she has the right to respond in writing to the summary letter. Copies of the summary letter and any written response by the associate professor will be placed in the associate professor’s file in the home department. Copies of both documents will be sent to the dean of the home department, who will review the substance and process of the evaluation for consistency with the criteria stated in section 2.2.1.5.

2.2.3.1.10 Conversion to or from a Joint Appointment
A decision to convert an appointment in one department into a joint appointment shall require a MOU among the faculty member, all participating units, and the appropriate dean(s). The decision will become final upon the approval of the provost. This procedure shall also be followed to convert a joint appointment into an appointment in a single department.
Once either change is approved, any personnel decisions concerning merit, reappointment, tenure and promotion will follow the specific procedures outlined for appointments in single departments or for joint appointments.

Revisions of the following sections in **bold** to reflect the draft changes to 2.2.3.1:

### 2.2.2.1 Reappointment
When reappointment is under consideration, voting members of the department include tenured faculty of the department and administrators who are tenured members of the department. In the case of a department with fewer than three tenured faculty, the department chairperson, after consulting with the dean and the candidate, will involve appropriate tenured faculty from closely-related academic disciplines as voting members on the reappointment decision. In the case of a joint appointment, see section 2.2.3.1. (section 2.2.3.1), voting members from both departments participate.

### 2.2.2.2 Tenure
When tenure is under consideration, voting members of the department include all tenured faculty of the department and administrators who are tenured members of the department. In a department with fewer than three tenured faculty, the department chairperson, after consulting with the academic dean and the candidate, will involve appropriate tenured faculty from closely related academic disciplines as voting members on the promotion decision. In the case of a joint appointment, see section 2.2.3.1. (section 2.2.3.1), tenured faculty from both departments will participate. In a department in which the chairperson is not tenured, the dean, in consultation with the college promotion and tenure committee and the department, appoints a tenured member of the department to assume the chairperson's duties with regard to the tenure review process.

### 2.2.2.3 Promotion to professor
When promotion to full professor is under consideration, voting members of the department include tenured full professors of the department and administrators who are tenured full professors in the department. In a department with fewer than three tenured full professors, the department chairperson, after consulting with the academic dean and the candidate, will involve appropriate tenured full professors from closely related academic disciplines as voting members on the promotion decision. In the case of a joint appointment, see section 2.2.3.1. (section 2.2.3.1), tenured full professors from both departments will participate. In a department in which the chairperson is not a tenured full professor, the dean, after consulting with the college promotion and tenure committee and the
department, appoints a tenured full professor in the department to assume the chairperson's duties with regard to the promotion review process.

2.2.4.2 Tenured associate professors
The procedures described above are followed for all tenured associate professors every three years or upon request, as regards their eligibility for promotion. Only tenured full professors who are voting members participate in this process. In small departments and for joint appointments, the procedures for including personnel from other departments, described in section 2.2.2.2.3, are followed. See 2.2.3.1 for joint appointments. (See section 2.2.8.2 regarding the frequency of the promotion review process for tenured associate professors.)

2.2.9.2 Initiating the promotion review process
When a promotion is under consideration, the department chairperson calls together all tenured voting members above the rank of the candidate (including eligible administrators who are members of the department) to discuss the proposed promotion. If the department chairperson is not tenured or does not hold rank above that of the candidate, the dean, in consultation with the department and the college promotion and tenure committee, appoints another member of the department (with tenure and the appropriate rank) to assume the chairperson's duties with regard to the promotion review process. In a department with fewer than three tenured faculty above the rank of the candidate, the department chairperson consults with the academic dean and chooses appropriate tenured faculty from closely related academic disciplines to be involved as voting members in the review process. In such a case, the chairperson informs the candidate of the selection of extra-departmental faculty; the candidate is given the opportunity to object to the selection on the grounds that the selected extra-departmental evaluators could not or would not provide qualified, fair, and impartial evaluations; if the candidate is not satisfied with the final selection, he/she may add a statement explaining these objections to his/her promotion review file (described in the following paragraph). In the case of joint appointments, see section 2.2.3.1. (section 2.2.3.1), voting faculty of both departments participate.
2.2.3.1 Faculty Joint Appointment

Initial Appointment
The standard practice for all faculty appointment is that whenever funds for faculty position become available, the dean(s) whose funds will underwrite the position will determine in which department(s) that position is to be located, subject to the provost’s approval.

In the case of joint appointments, a position may be located in departments within a single college, or departments in more than one college. The dean(s) involved need(s) to assemble an appropriate group of faculty (drawn from two or more departments, which may include the department chairs, program chairs, and/or center directors) to develop a draft position description. That description must designate departments, programs or research center to which he or she will be expected to actively contribute. The position description must also include not only the interdisciplinary scholarly expertise required for the position, but also state the instructional expectations and proposed assignments. Each department, program or research center with which the position is to be affiliated must approve the position description.

If the dean(s) and provost approve the position description and the budget, the dean(s) will select a search committee, with the advice of the department chairs, program chairs, and/or center directors responsible for the appointment. The search committee is to consist of faculty with disciplinary expertise related to the proposed hire and any other professionals deemed qualified to review prospective candidates for the position. With the approval of the dean(s), the search committee identifies qualified candidates for review and recommends candidates for employment. The search process shall be conducted in consultation with the faculty in all departments, programs, or research centers involved in the appointment. The search committee will make recommendation to the departments, centers or programs involved. The primary department in which the candidate will hold his or her appointment will be identified. The primary department will recommend a candidate to the dean. As with all appointments to the faculty, the dean(s) will make their recommendation to the Provost for approval.

Mentoring
The chair of the primary department in which the faculty member holds his/her appointment will be responsible for the mentoring of the faculty member in the area of research, teaching, and service. The chair of the primary department will also seek the guidance of the chair or program head of the secondary unit(s). If there is any disagreements about the expectations for the faculty member that
cannot be resolved informally, the respective chair(s) or program head(s) shall meet jointly with the dean(s) to whom they report to resolve any disagreements. A report of this meeting will be given to the faculty member.

**Annual Evaluation for Merit**

The chair of the primary department in which the faculty member holds his/her appointment shall be responsible for the annual evaluation of the faculty member. In addition to the annual report of the faculty member, the chair will solicit a written evaluation of the faculty member’s performance from the secondary department chairs, program directors, or research center directors that will be included as part of the annual evaluation. The chair of the primary department shall recommend the merit increase. The respective dean(s) will review the recommended increase to insure that the merit increase fairly reflects the evaluations submitted. The chair of the primary department shall provide written feedback to the faculty member.

**Reappointment**

The chair of the primary department will be responsible for conducting the reappointment of the faculty member using the standard criteria of research, teaching and service. In the area of research only, the chair will assemble with the approval of the dean(s), a special committee of three to five tenured faculty members from the department(s), program(s), or research center(s) with which the faculty member is affiliated. The special committee shall make written report to all the relevant departments and programs. All tenured faculty in the primary department will evaluate the faculty member’s teaching, and service. The chair shall also solicit faculty letters from the secondary department, programs, and research centers in evaluating performance in these two areas. Secondary departments, programs, and research centers will make a recommendation that shall be available to the tenured faculty in the primary department. The tenured faculty of the primary department will consider all the reports and make a recommendation on reappointment to the dean.

**Tenure and Promotion**

The procedures outlined in the reappointment section above shall be followed in making a recommendation on tenure or promotion. The recommendation on tenure or promotion must come from the primary department. If the faculty member's joint appointment is within one college, that college’s promotion and tenure committee will make the recommendation to the respective dean and provost. If the appointment is in two or more colleges, the promotion and tenure committees of both colleges will meet jointly to make a single recommendation to the respective dean(s) who will also make a single recommendation to the Provost.
Conversion to or from a Joint Appointment

A decision to convert an appointment in one department into a joint appointment in another department, program, or research center shall require an agreement between the faculty member, the departments, centers or programs involved, and appropriate dean(s). The decision will become final upon the approval of the provost. This procedure shall be followed to convert a joint appointment into an appointment in a single department.

Once either change is approved, any personnel decisions concerning merit, reappointment, tenure and promotion will follow the specific procedures outlined for appointments in single departments or for joint appointments.
May 5, 2008

To: University Faculty

From: R & P Subcommittee of the Faculty Steering Committee

Motions: To update R&P language as described below.

Over the past academic year, the R&P Subcommittee conducted a “top-to-bottom” review of the R&P document. Our goals were to:

(a) Identify outdated language in R&P and propose ways of updating it.
(b) Identify cases where the language in R&P is inconsistent with current practice and propose ways of resolving the inconsistencies.
(c) Identify portions of the R&P document that have outlived their usefulness or that may no longer be appropriate for inclusion in R&P and propose ways of removing this language.

At this meeting, we bring forth another set of recommended changes to R&P. We begin with a number of motions that will receive their second readings, after which the faculty will vote. We then present a set of motions that will receive their first readings at the meeting. Finally, we wish to begin discussing with the faculty a potential major modification to R&P that may be worth making at some time in the future.

At this time, we present to the faculty the following proposed changes which received their first reading at the faculty meeting on March 17, 2008.

Motion #1 (second reading): Clarifying the role of the Registrar on EdPol and GRC

In R&P, the Registrar is not currently listed as a member of the Educational Policy Committee, but is listed as an ex officio (i.e., voting) member of the Graduate and Research Committee. The R&P Subcommittee feels the Registrar’s role should be equivalent and parallel on the two committees and, with guidance from the Faculty Steering Committee, proposes the following new language for the sections in question:

1.2.2.2 Educational policy committee

... The committee consists of nine tenured members of the teaching faculty, the provost, and the dean of each of the four colleges. The nine faculty members will serve three year non concurrent terms. Three will be elected from the College of Arts and Sciences, three from the P.C. Rossin College of Engineering and Applied Science, two from the College of Business and Economics, and one
from the College of Education. These members may vote in the meetings, but none shall be permitted to vote in absentia or to send a voting delegate.

The Registrar or his/her delegate serves as a non-voting member of the Educational Policy Committee.

...

1.2.2.3 Graduate and Research Committee

...

The committee consists of twelve elected faculty members, seven ex officio members, and four non-voting members.

...

Ex officio members are the Vice Provost for Research, the Director of Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, Deans of the four Colleges, and the Director of Graduate Student Life. The Registrar or his/her delegate serves as a non-voting member of the Graduate and Research Committee. Two graduate students selected by the Graduate Student Senate, and one undergraduate student selected by the Student Senate, also serve as non-voting members.

Motion #2 (second reading): Listing Professor of Practice as non-voting faculty

R&P Section 1.1.6 lists the various university faculty positions, but Professor of Practice is not mentioned. The R&P Subcommittee proposes the following new language:

1.1.6 University faculty

...

Lecturer, adjunct, part-time (unless tenured), professor of practice, and visiting members of the instructional or research staff are not voting members of the faculty.

...

Motion #3 (second reading): Eliminating restriction on committee terms

The R&P Subcommittee recommends the following language be deleted from Section 1.2.1 of R&P:

No member of a standing committee who has served a full term may be reelected to that committee until a full year has elapsed.
Motion #4 (second reading): Eliminating language on inspection trips

The R&P Subcommittee recommends that Section 3.19 on inspection trips be deleted from R&P:

3.19 Inspection trips

All inspection trips must be justified on the basis of educational merit. Attendance is required of all students registered in the courses concerned. No inspection trip shall cause absences in excess of three consecutive days of classes.

Other than as specified in the following paragraph, permission must be obtained from the appropriate academic dean or the provost for all inspection trips involving absences from classes outside of the department conducting the trip. Department chairpersons may schedule trips for one day or less, during the periods scheduled for their own work, without petitioning or notifying the dean of students.

...

We also present to the faculty the following proposed changes which are receiving their first reading at this meeting.

Motion #5 (first reading): Restriction on publicizing information on faculty action

The R&P Subcommittee recommends the following language be deleted from R&P:

1.1.5 Information regarding faculty action

No information regarding faculty action shall be given for publication except by direction of the president of the university, the vice presidents of the university, or the secretary of the faculty.

Motion #6 (first reading): Clarifying language on term of academic duties

Section 2.6 of R&P currently reads as follows:

2.6 Vacations for Instructional Staff

Any full time member of the teaching staff or full time graduate assistant has vacation arrangements included in his or her appointment as teacher or graduate assistant and will not draw vacation pay from additional projects to which he or she may be assigned during summer months or in addition to his or her teaching or graduate study.

The annual salary of members of the teaching staff is compensation for
academic duties, including attendance at the first faculty meeting at the beginning of the academic year and at commencement exercises on university day, even though such salaries may be paid in twelve monthly installments.

The R&P Subcommittee recommends rewording this to be:

2.6 Term of Academic Duties

The annual salary of faculty members is compensation for academic duties extending from the first day of classes in the academic year through commencement day, even though such salaries may be paid in twelve monthly installments.

A full time member of the faculty has vacation arrangements included in his/her appointment (times during the nine-month academic year when classes are not normally in session). Full time faculty members will not accrue additional paid vacation for other duties assumed during the summer months.

Motion #7 (first reading): Changes to language for Study Abroad Policy Board

The R&P Subcommittee recommends the following changes to Section 1.2.4.5 of R&P:

1.2.4.5 Lehigh Study Abroad Faculty Policy Board

The Study Abroad Faculty Policy Board is responsible for: the coordination of courses, curriculum and credit for both graduate and undergraduate students who study abroad; development and implementation of quality criteria for Study Abroad programs; and consultation with faculty in respective colleges on a core of acceptable and available programs abroad which meet the curricular needs of each college.

The Board consists of eight tenured faculty members: one at large from the Educational Policy Committee; one each from the colleges of Business and Economics, Education, and Engineering and Applied Science; one from each of the three divisions in the College of Arts and Sciences; and, ex-officio, the Chair of the Modern Languages and Literature Department. There are four two ad hoc members: the Director of the Office of International Education, Study Abroad; the Lehigh Abroad Program Officer, and a representative from Student Affairs, the Dean of Students, and a returned Lehigh Abroad student. Ad Hoc Administrative Advisors such as the Registrar will serve as needed.

Except for the Chair of the Modern Languages and Literature Department, each of the seven faculty members may serve a maximum of two consecutive three-year terms. The Educational Policy Committee elects its representative; the six college representatives are elected by their respective college constituency. The ad hoc members serve by virtue of their position.
One of the faculty members serves as chair for a one-year term. At the spring board meeting the board elects a chair-elect who serves as vice-chair for the ensuing academic year. Both the chair and the chair-elect take office on July 1. The Director of the Office of International Education Study Abroad serves as secretary to the Board.

Each semester annually the Faculty Policy Board presents a report to the Educational Policy Committee on the status of Study Abroad.

Discussion item: Eliminating Section 4 of R&P

The R&P Subcommittee wishes to raise the following topic for discussion with the faculty. As this issue is complex and will likely involve some debate and a fair amount of work should it go forward, we do not have in mind a specific timeframe for calling for a vote on this proposal.

Section 4 of R&P is titled “Miscellaneous regulations pertaining to undergraduate student matriculation and conduct” and contains the following subsections:

4.1 Student matriculation
4.1.1 Admission
4.1.2 Requirements
4.1.3 Freshman orientation
4.1.4 Financial aid
4.1.4.1 Scholarship aid
4.1.4.2 Tuition loans
4.1.5 Registration for undergraduates
4.1.6 Band
4.1.7 Health Service
4.1.8 Student organizations
4.1.9 Motor vehicles
4.1.10 Alcoholic beverages
4.1.11 Firearms
4.1.12 Guest speakers
4.1.13 Use of university buildings
4.1.14 Freshman housing
4.2 University student conduct system
4.3 University policy on dissent

As part of its final report dated April 29, 2003, the Student Life Policy Review Committee (sometimes called the “Sinclair Committee”) made the following recommendation:

“Recommendation #7: Through its normal procedures for amending R & P, the
faculty should delete Section 4.1 of R & P. Policy responsibility in these areas should be assigned to Administrative Policy and governed by the Lehigh University Policy Structure.”

Having considered this recommendation and conducted its own review, the R&P Subcommittee recommends removing Section 4 from R&P, with the following changes propagated elsewhere in the document.

(a) Specific language delegating the faculty's authority over student matters should be developed and added to the following statement which appears in Section 1.1.6:

The faculty may delegate any of its responsibilities to an officer of the university, to a committee, or to any other group.

(b) The following language from Article VIII should be moved to Section 1.2.5.1:

The University Committee on Discipline

The University Committee on Discipline is responsible for hearing cases to determine student or organization accountability for violations of this Code of Conduct in a manner that insures fundamental fairness, and to assign sanctions in cases where responsibility is determined.

The committee shall be composed of fifteen undergraduate students, (chosen by the Dean of Students Office in consultation with the current student members of the University Committee on Discipline and the faculty chairperson of the University Committee on Discipline), three graduate students (chosen by the Dean of Students Office in consultation with the Graduate Student Senate and the faculty chairperson of the University Committee on Discipline), twelve members of the faculty (four elected by the university faculty at large and two from each of the college faculties), and seven administrators (appointed by the Vice Provost for Student Affairs from the student affairs professional staff). Faculty shall be elected for three-year staggered terms. Students shall be selected for one-year renewable terms. Administrators shall be appointed for three-year renewable terms. The Conduct Officer shall have the authority to appoint alternate members for student and administrative representatives to ensure the committee’s ability to function.

The chairperson of the Committee on Discipline shall be a faculty member elected by the committee for a one-year term.

(c) The following language from Article IX should be moved to Section 1.2.3.4:

Disciplinary Appeals Committee

The University disciplinary appeals committee is a faculty committee set up to consider written appeals by students found responsible by any hearing panel.
The Disciplinary Appeals Committee shall consist of five faculty members, two undergraduate students, and two graduate students. The undergraduate student members will hear appeals submitted by undergraduate students and the graduate student members will hear appeals submitted by graduate students. The students shall be chosen by the Dean of Students Office in consultation with the Student Senate and the Graduate Student Senate. Faculty shall be elected, one from each college and one at large. The faculty shall serve staggered three-year terms, and students shall be appointed for one-year terms. At the discretion of the Conduct Officer additional student members may be selected to serve as alternates.

The Disciplinary Appeals Committee shall elect its own chairperson from the faculty members. The chairperson of this committee shall also serve on the Disciplinary Review Committee.

The Disciplinary Appeals Committee is responsible for reviewing any appeals by students or organizations that are properly submitted. It is also responsible for reviewing all cases involving disciplinary expulsion.

(d) If Section 4.3 ("University policy on dissent") is to be kept in the R&P document, some modification will be necessary in moving it from a context where it is intended to refer to undergraduate students and placed elsewhere. If this is deemed desirable and the rewrite takes place, the new version could follow Section 2.1.1 ("Policy on academic freedom"), otherwise an alternative would be simply to delete this section.
Tenure Flexibility Initiative

Over the past year, the Lehigh Sloan Program Advisory Committee has met with pre-tenure faculty, department chairs, deans, and the Faculty Personnel Committee to discuss proposals for increasing flexibility in the tenure clock. The primary goal is to create the additional flexibility needed to be competitive in recruiting and retaining faculty at different stages of their careers and lives. Policies to increase career flexibility are becoming much more common among institutions in higher education, business, and the non-profit sector. Feedback from some pre-tenure faculty after passage of the tenure extension for parenthood in 2006 has suggested that additional flexibility is needed. To date we have identified no consensus plan for increasing tenure flexibility at Lehigh. We have identified a number of models for discussion, which are outlined below along with the current Lehigh policy. We will discuss these versions at the May 5, 2008 faculty meeting and hope to achieve consensus about which direction is preferred. We would then draft R&P language for consideration at faculty meetings in Fall 2008.

Version 0—current Lehigh policy
1. Normal probationary period is 6 years; tenure review may take place prior to final year.
2. Tenure extension for birth or adoption of child (one year for each child with two-year maximum); one-semester extension associated with FMLA leave for personal disabling health condition; primary care of family member with serious health condition; placement of a child for foster care.

Version 1
1. Keep current 6-year probationary period and current tenure extension for parenthood.
2. Permit extensions (for one semester or one year each) for additional personal reasons, including parenthood of children under age 6 (when faculty member starts tenure-track position at Lehigh), personal disabling health condition, primary care of family member with serious health condition, foster care, public or military service, and extreme personal hardship. FMLA leave would not be necessary to take an extension. Maximum of two one-year extensions.
3. In the last year of his/her probationary period, a faculty member may decide to take a one-year tenure extension for any reason. This extension may be taken only one time.
4. Maximum probationary period of 8 years; tenure review may be conducted prior to final year.

Version 2
1. Expand regular probationary period to 7 years, which is the norm among two-thirds of Lehigh’s peer institutions.
2. Keep current tenure extension for parenthood and expand personal reasons for extensions as discussed in Version 1, #2.
3. Maximum probationary period of 9 years; tenure review may be conducted prior to final year.

Version 3
1. Expand regular probationary period to a maximum of 8 years.
2. Eliminate all tenure extensions, including those for parenthood, personal disabling health condition, etc.
3. Reviews for reappointment would occur every two years without extensions for personal reasons. Tenure review may be conducted prior to final year.
Faculty Career Flexibility Programs: Benchmarking Research

Flexible Tenure Clock Policies

Introduction

In February 2007, Provost El-Aasser asked the Lehigh Sloan Program Board, as part of its mission, to review the *Agenda for Excellence: Creating Flexibility in Tenure-Track Faculty Careers* (2005) published by the American Council on Education/Office of Women in Higher Education and make recommendations to increase the flexibility for faculty careers at Lehigh. As part of the review process, the Sloan board benchmarked Lehigh’s policies regarding the tenure clock with those of seventeen peer and aspirational peer institutions. Please note that no information is included when the website search yielded none. Information is from the university websites which varied in quality and may not be up-to-date in all cases. In addition, we attach information from Jared L. Bleak, “On Probation: The Pre-Tenure Period,” chapter 2 in Cathy A. Trower, ed., *Policies on Faculty Appointment: Standard Practices and Unusual Arrangements* (Bolton, MA: Anker, 2000), pp. 18-78.

Benchmarked Institutions (17)

Boston College, Carnegie Mellon University, Case Western Reserve University, Colgate University, Columbia University, Cornell University, Duke University, Georgetown University, George Washington University, Georgia Institute of Technology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Princeton University, Tufts University, University of California—Berkeley, University of Michigan, University of Pennsylvania, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Summary of Results

Length of normal probationary period
In comparison with Lehigh’s six-year probationary period, 12 of the 17 benchmark schools (70 percent) have probationary periods of more than six years. The most common length is 7 years. Jared Bleak’s analysis of 37 Research 1 and 2 institutions indicated that 65 percent allowed seven years and 14 percent allowed eight years.

Maximum length including extensions
Eight of the 17 benchmark institutions have established a maximum length for the probationary period: one at 7 years, three at 9 years, and four at 10 years. Five institutions have no limit on the duration of the probationary period when extensions are approved; four are unknown.
Reasons for extensions
The most common reason for tenure-clock extension among the 17 benchmark institutions is parenthood. The following list summarizes the frequency with which institutional policies specify availability of extensions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth or adoption of child</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member’s own disabling health condition</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary care of family member for serious health condition</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional issue (delay in lab setup, publication delay, etc.)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/ military service</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hardship</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement for foster care</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reappointment patterns
The length and pattern of appointments during the probationary period varies considerably, in part because of variations in the tenure clock. For the twelve institutions with probationary periods of seven or eight years: one has 1-year appointments; one has 2-3-2; one has 3-year appointments; one is 3-4; four have variable appointments; four are unknown.

Are external evaluations needed for reappointment?
Yes (department option): 3 institutions
No: 12
Unknown: 2

Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
Yes: 3
No: 12
Unknown: 2

Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
Yes: 13
No: 0
Unknown: 4

Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time
Yes: 3
No: 1
Unknown: 13
Lehigh University
- Length of normal probationary period: 6 years
- Maximum length including extensions: unspecified
- Reasons for extensions (length permitted for each):
  - birth or adoption of child (one year for each child with two-year maximum)
  - extension associated with FMLA leave for care of faculty member’s spouse, child, or own parent who has a serious health condition; faculty member’s own serious disabling health condition; placement of a child in faculty member’s home for foster care (one semester per FMLA leave)
  - faculty are able to request from Provost a tenure-clock extension for their own serious health condition with medical certification, even if they did not take an FMLA leave; this is not a written policy
- Reappointment patterns: 2-2-2
- Are external evaluations needed for reappointment; if so, how many; any guidelines on how to evaluate?
  - No
- Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
  - No
- Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
  - Yes. R&P 2.2.6.1: A faculty member may be considered for tenure prior to the final year of his or her probationary period upon the recommendation of the department (if the candidate concurs) or at the request of the candidate.
- Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time
  - R&P does not address this
- Other variables:
- Information link(s):
  http://www.lehigh.edu/~inprv/infoandresources.html

- Boston College
- Length of normal probationary period: 7 years
- Maximum length including extensions: unlimited due to extensions
- Reasons for extensions (length permitted for each):
  - ill health
  - childbearing/adoption
  - unusual requirements for the care of a family member
- Reappointment patterns:
- Are external evaluations needed for reappointment; if so, how many; any guidelines on how to evaluate?
  - If desired by a department
    - Department must give the candidate an opportunity to suggest names of those who may be consulted. One of the candidate’s nominees must be among those from whom the Department solicits opinions
  - If desired by the promotion committee
- Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
  - No
- Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
  - Yes
  - A faculty member who is not in the last year of a terminal contract and
    therefore has not been considered for promotion by his/her department, 
    may request that his/her name be added to the list of faculty members
    being considered for promotion as the list of names goes to the next level.

- Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time

- Other variables:

- Information link(s):
  - http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/acavp/avpofc/Statutes/stats_index.html
  - http://www.bc.edu/publications/fachbk/policies/tenure/

- Carnegie Mellon University

- Length of normal probationary period: 6 years
- Maximum Length including extensions: 9 years

- Reasons for extensions (length permitted for each):
  - Public service (duration of service)
  - Birth or adoption of a child (1 year extension per child)
  - If, upon the appointment of a faculty member to a tenure-track position, the
    university promised in writing space, equipment or other resources, and yet delays
    in fulfilling these commitments in such a way that impairs substantially the
    faculty member's ability to carry out the full range of his or her academic
    responsibilities, the length of the delay will not be counted in the probationary
    period.

- Reappointment patterns: 3-3

- Are external evaluations needed for reappointment; if so, how many; any
  guidelines on how to evaluate?
  - No

- Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
  - Yes
    - The University Non-Tenure Committee, which makes recommendations
      on reappointment at the rank of assistant professor, is made up of the
      Provost (who presides), the dean of each of the colleges/schools, three
      faculty members appointed by the chair of the Faculty Organization and
      two faculty members appointed by the provost. These members are
      appointed for staggered two-year terms.

- Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
  - Yes

- Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time
  - Yes

- Other variables:
  - Each college/school establishes its own criteria for reappointment

- Information link(s):
  - http://www.cmu.edu/policies/documents/Tenure.html#appterm
- Case Western Reserve University
  - Length of normal probationary period: 6-9 years, depending on the school
  - Maximum Length including extensions:
  - Reasons for extensions (length permitted for each):
    I. Unlimited number of extensions possible
      - Live birth/adoption: 1 year extension
      - For exceptionally worthy candidates in the event of unusual constraints in the University, or part or parts thereof, which would prevent tenure award at the end of the normal period: 1 year extension
    II. Extensions together may not exceed 3 years
      - Serious illness, family emergency, responsibility as a primary care-giver, or extraordinary teaching or administrative assignments: 1 year extension each, 3 year max on these extensions
  - Reappointment patterns: 3-3 or 3-3-3, depending on the school
  - Are external evaluations needed for reappointment; if so, how many; any guidelines on how to evaluate?
    - No
  - Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
    - No
  - Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
    - Yes, if they have served at another university before coming to Case Western.
  - Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time
  - Other variables:
  - Information link(s):
    - http://www.case.edu/president/facsen/frames/handbook/highlights2006.htm#1

- Colgate University
  - Length of normal probationary period: 7 years
  - Maximum Length including extensions: 9 (can be longer in very extreme cases)
  - Reasons for extensions (length permitted for each):
    - Scholarly leave for three terms or more: 1 year extension
    - Disability leave or pregnancy/parental leave; if leave is for 1-2 terms—1 year extension, if leave is for 3 or more terms—2 year extension
  - Reappointment patterns: annual; comprehensive review in third year
  - Are external evaluations needed for reappointment; if so, how many; any guidelines on how to evaluate?
    - No
  - Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
    - No
  - Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
  - Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time
  - Other variables:
  - Information link(s):
• **Columbia University**
  - Length of normal probationary period: 7 years
  - Maximum Length including extensions: 9 years
  - Reasons for extensions (length permitted for each):
    - When the candidate is expected to produce scholarly work during the forthcoming year that will have a material effect on the outcome of the tenure review: 1 year
    - Scholarly and professional: 1 year extension, 2 in extreme cases
    - Medical:
    - Maternity: 1 year per child, limited to two extensions
    - Compulsory military service: length of service
    - Personal hardship: length of service
  - Reappointment patterns: 3-4
  - Are external evaluations needed for reappointment; if so, how many; any guidelines on how to evaluate?
    - No
  - Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
    - No
  - Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
    - Yes, starting in their 4th year
  - Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time
  - Other variables:
  - Information link(s):

• **Cornell University**
  - Length of normal probationary period: 6 years
  - Maximum Length including extensions:
  - Reasons for extensions (length permitted for each):
    - FMLA leaves: 1 year per leave
  - Reappointment patterns: 3-3
  - Are external evaluations needed for reappointment; if so, how many; any guidelines on how to evaluate?
    - No
  - Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
    - No
  - Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
  - Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time
  - Other variables:
  - Information link(s):
- Duke University
  - Length of normal probationary period: 8 years
  - Maximum Length including extensions:
    - Reasons for extensions (length permitted for each):
      I. Unlimited number of extensions possible
         - Birth or adoption of a child:
           - If both parents are untenured and want leave: 1 semester extension each
           - If only one parent wants leave: 1 year extension
      II. Extensions may not exceed a maximum of two
         - Family illness where faculty member is the primary care giver: 1 semester extension
         - Personal illness: maximum 2 semester extension
         - Death of parent, child, spouse or domestic partner: 1 semester extension
         - Catastrophic residential property loss: 1 semester extension per faculty member in household
  - Reappointment patterns:
    - Are external evaluations needed for reappointment; if so, how many; any guidelines on how to evaluate?
      - No
    - Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
      - Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
        - Yes
          - http://www.provost.duke.edu/pdfs/fhb/FHB_App_C.pdf
    - Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time
    - Other variables:
      - Information link(s):
        - http://www.provost.duke.edu/pdfs/fhb/fhb_chap_4.pdf#Leaves
        - http://www.provost.duke.edu/pdfs/fhb/FHB_App_C.pdf

- Georgetown University
  - Length of normal probationary period: 7 years
  - Maximum Length including extensions:
  - Reasons for extensions (length permitted for each):
    - Public or professional service: however long the service is
  - Reappointment patterns:
  - Are external evaluations needed for reappointment; if so, how many; any guidelines on how to evaluate?
  - Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
  - Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
    - Yes, at anytime after the end of the 3rd year of the probationary period
- Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time
  - Yes
  - http://www3.georgetown.edu/admin/provost/facultyrecords/TenureClock/The%202006%20Georgetown%20University%20Tenure%20Clock%20Policy.doc
- Other variables:
- Information link(s):
  - http://www3.georgetown.edu/admin/provost/facultyrecords/TenureClock/The%202006%20Georgetown%20University%20Tenure%20Clock%20Policy.doc
  - http://www3.georgetown.edu/admin/provost/facultyrecords/TenureClock/The%202006%20Georgetown%20University%20Tenure%20Clock%20Policy.doc

- George Washington University
  - Length of normal probationary period: 7 years
  - Maximum Length including extensions:
    - A faculty member with more than three years' previous full-time service at another institution may be appointed at rank below that of professor without tenure for four years as a term or condition of his or her initial appointment, even though his or her total period of service in the academic profession is thereby extended beyond seven year
  - Reasons for extensions (length permitted for each):
    - Childbirth/adoption: 1 year extension
    - Leaves for study for a degree:
    - Leaves for military service/personal reasons:
    - Leaves for family/medical reasons:
  - Reappointment patterns:
    - Assistant professors may be appointed for a period of not more than three years and may be reappointed, with or without tenure, for one or more additional periods.

- Are external evaluations needed for reappointment; if so, how many; any guidelines on how to evaluate?
  - No

- Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
  - No

- Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
- Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time
- Other variables:
- Information link(s):
• Georgia Institute of Technology
  - Length of normal probationary period: 5 years
  - Maximum Length including extensions: 7 years
  - Reasons for extensions (length permitted for each):
    - Service in the armed forces
  - Reappointment patterns: 3-2
  - Are external evaluations needed for reappointment; if so, how many; any guidelines on how to evaluate?
    - No
  - Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
    - Yes
  - Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
    - Faculty may go up for tenure after their second year in the probationary period if they have had service at another university
  - Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time
  - Other variables:
  - Information link(s):

• Massachusetts Institute of Technology
  - Length of normal probationary period: 8 years
  - Maximum Length including extensions: 10
  - Reasons for extensions (length permitted for each):
    - Birth/adopter of a child: 1 year extension, 2 extension limit
  - Reappointment patterns: First appointment can be for 1-5 years, the reappointment review comes one year prior to the end of their first appointment
  - Are external evaluations needed for reappointment; if so, how many; any guidelines on how to evaluate?
    - No
  - Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
    - No
  - Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
    - Yes
  - Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time
  - Other variables:
  - Information link(s):
    - http://web.mit.edu/policies/3.2.html#3.2.1

• Princeton University
  - Length of normal probationary period: 6 years
  - Maximum Length including extensions: potentially unlimited
  - Reasons for extensions (length permitted for each):
- Childbirth/adoption: 1 year extension, unlimited
- If the type of scholarship in which the faculty member is engaged requires an unusually long period of time to make an adequate scholarly reputation: an additional three-year appointment is granted before going up for tenure (3-3-3)
- If, for other extraordinary reasons, the faculty member has not had adequate opportunity to demonstrate his or her ability and potential as a teacher-scholar: an additional three-year appointment is granted before going up for tenure (3-3-3)

-Reappointment patterns: 3-3
- Are external evaluations needed for reappointment; if so, how many; any guidelines on how to evaluate?
- Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
  - Yes
    - The recommendation for/against reappointment is sent to the Dean then the President who then sends it to the Faculty Advisory Committee. After consultation with this Committee, the President recommends to the Board of Trustees such action as he or she may deem proper.
    - http://web.princeton.edu/sites/dof/publs/rpfac94/fchap4.htm#chap4

- Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
  - Yes
    - http://www.princeton.edu/pr/pwb/05/0911/3a.shtml

- Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time
  - Yes
    - http://web.princeton.edu/sites/dof/publs/rpfac94/fchap4.htm#chap4

- Other variables:

- Information link(s):
  - http://www.princeton.edu/pr/pwb/05/0911/3a.shtml

- Tufts University
- Length of normal probationary period: 7 years
- Maximum length including extensions: 10 years
- Reasons for extensions (length permitted for each):
  - If the faculty member did not have his/her PhD before taking a tenure-track position: 3 year extension
  - Birth or adoption of a child: 1 year extension, limit of two

-Reappointment patterns: 2-3-2; but the reappointment reviews come in the second year and the fourth year
  - http://ase.tufts.edu/faculty-handbook/chapter2.htm

- Are external evaluations needed for reappointment; if so, how many; any guidelines on how to evaluate?
  - Yes, departments may solicit outside reviews for the fourth year review

- Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
  - No

- Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
  - Yes
- Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time
- Other variables:
- Information link(s):
  - http://ase.tufts.edu/faculty-handbook/chapter2.htm
  - http://provost.tufts.edu/policies/freedom/

- University of California-Berkeley
  - Length of normal probationary period: 8 years
  - Maximum Length including extensions: 10 years
  - Reasons for extensions (length permitted for each):
    - Birth/adoptive: 1 year extension
    - Family illness: 1 year extension
    - Personal illness: 1 year extension
    - Extensions together cannot exceed two years
  - Reappointment patterns: 6-2; however, a faculty member can be reviewed/reappointed before their 6th year
  - Are external evaluations needed for reappointment; if so, how many; any guidelines on how to evaluate?
    - If desired by a department
      - Evaluations should come from a reasonable number of reviewers suggested by the faculty member; these outside evaluations are not required.
  - Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
    - No
  - Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
  - Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time
  - Other variables:
  - Information link(s):

- University of Michigan
  - Length of normal probationary period: 8 years officially, but in many departments, faculty members go up after their 6th or 7th year
  - Maximum Length including extensions:
  - Reasons for extensions (length permitted for each):
    - Childbirth/adoptive: 1 year extension
    - Medical conditions: year extension
    - Caring for a dependent: 1 year extension
  - Reappointment patterns: depends on the department
  - Are external evaluations needed for reappointment; if so, how many; any guidelines on how to evaluate?
- Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
  - No
- Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
  - Yes
- Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time
- Other variables:
- Information link(s):
  http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/handbook/6/6.C.html
  http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/handbook/6/6.E.html

- University of Pennsylvania
- Length of normal probationary period: 7 years
- Maximum Length including extensions: 10 years
- Reasons for extensions (length permitted for each):
  - Birth/adoption/foster care of a child: 1 year extension
  - Personal serious health condition: 1 year extension
  - Family serious health condition: 1 year extension
  - Catastrophic event: 1 year extension
- Reappointment patterns:
- Are external evaluations needed for reappointment; if so, how many; any guidelines on how to evaluate?
  - No
- Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
  - No
- Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
  - Yes, if appointed to the position of Associate Professor and having been at another institution, a faculty member may choose to go up for tenure after 5 years, but they are not required to do so.
- Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time
- Other variables:
- Information link(s):

- University of Wisconsin, Madison
- Length of normal probationary period: 7 years
- Maximum Length including extensions: 8 years, unless childbirth/adoption extensions taken
- Reasons for extensions (length permitted for each):
  I. Unlimited number of extensions possible
     - Childbirth/adoption: 1 year, unlimited
  II. Extensions together may not exceed one year
     - A leave of absence, sabbatical or a teacher improvement assignment:
- Elder/dependent care:
- Personal illness/disability:
- Circumstances beyond the control of the faculty member, when those circumstances significantly impede the faculty member’s progress toward achieving tenure:

- **Reappointment patterns:** Review appointments can be made at any time; however they must follow a specific procedure
  - [http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/governance/FPP/Chapter_7.htm#703](http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/governance/FPP/Chapter_7.htm#703)
- Are external evaluations needed for reappointment? If so, how many? Any guidelines on how to evaluate?
  - No

- Is there an internal faculty committee review for reappointment?
  - No

- Ability to go up for tenure prior to the last year of the probationary period
  - Yes

- Ability to go up for tenure a second time if unsuccessful the first time

- Other variables:

- Information link(s):
  - [http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/governance/FPP/Chapter_7.htm#704](http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/governance/FPP/Chapter_7.htm#704)
  - [http://www.legis.state.wi.us/rsb/code/uws/uws003.pdf](http://www.legis.state.wi.us/rsb/code/uws/uws003.pdf)
2007-08 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 and may serve only one such five-year term. Current members include Ken Kodama (Arts and Sciences), Mike Kolchin (Business and Economics), Ward Cates (Education), Roger Nagel (Engineering and Applied Sciences), and Susan Szczepanski, our university-wide elected representative. Mike Kolchin served as committee chair and was our representative to the Faculty Steering Committee.

This year the committee heard one appeal that dealt with allocation of physical space. While we cannot discuss the detail of this case because of the confidentiality of the appeal process, we can report that, with the assistance of the Faculty Personnel Committee, the issue was resolved by the parties involved.

Other Activities

In addition to hearing one appeal, the Faculty Personnel Committee:

- Made motions for minor changes to R&P to clean up the description of the Faculty Personnel Committee (R&P 1.2.2.6).
- Participated in a Board of Trustees full-day session on tenure and the university.
- Participated in the search for the Vice-president for Advancement.
- Worked closely with the Sloan Committee to discuss and formulate alternative options for handling the tenure probationary period and second consideration for tenure.
- Brought to the faculty for action changes in R&P 2.2.3.1: joint faculty appointments.
- Worked with the Professor of Practice Task Force to conduct the mandated review of the rules and procedures governing Professors of Practice at Lehigh.
- Continued to work on developing a more detailed process for dismissal for cause (R&P 2.2.11).

For the Future

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

- Finalize a more detailed process for dismissal for cause and for faculty misconduct that warrants severe sanctions but do not rise to level of dismissal and then bring this to the faculty for consideration and action.
- Bring to the faculty a proposal clarifying the language in section 2.2.6.13 of R&P addressing when the Provost is considering going against a “faculty recommendation.”
- Continue to review the regulations governing Professors of Practice.

Ward Cates will chair the Faculty Personnel Committee next year, as well as serving as its representative to the Faculty Steering Committee.

On behalf of the Faculty Personnel Committee,

Ward Cates, Acting Chair
April 24, 2008

To: Lehigh University Faculty  
From: Graduate and Research Committee  
RE: Annual Report

1. SOGS
The Standing of Graduate Students Committee (SOGS) is doing a great job of handling graduate student petitions. The GRC only had to deal with one petition this year.

2. Voting members of GRC (R&P 1.2.2.3)
The GRC in recent years has operated under a number of different voting regimes. In some years only the elected faculty members have voted. According to R&P and Roberts Rules or Order, ex officio members of the committee are entitled to vote unless specifically exempted. The ex officio members of the GRC are the Vice Provost for Research, the Director of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, Deans of the four Colleges, the Registrar, and the Director of Graduate Student Life. The GRC voted to allow each Dean to appoint another faculty member to act as her/his voting representative. This will require a change in R&P.

3. Leave of Absence policy for Graduate, Research, and Teaching Assistantships and Internal Fellowships
Last spring the GRC passed this leave of absence policy. This year the policy has stalled at the legal review stage because of possible tax implications. The GRC will be meeting with the university lawyers on May 6 to review the situation.

4. University Fellowship Awards
The GRC Fellowship subcommittee worked with Bruce Koel, Vice Provost for Research, to manage this process. The fellowship fund was divided between the RCEAS and the three other colleges. The RCEAS had twenty eight ranked applicants, of which ten would be offered $11,000 supplements to their support packages. The RCEAS went through the entire list and to date has about six acceptances. The candidates for the other three colleges were offered a one-year award of $22,000. Offers were eventually made to all twenty-three ranked candidates; three accepted leaving two slots unfilled. (It should be noted that several of these applicants were also on the CAS fellowship list. The CAS was able to recruit three students, leaving one slot unfilled, out of a list of ten candidates.)
The GRC believes that attracting and retaining excellent graduate students is an effective way to improve research at Lehigh. This year we had an outstanding pool of applicants. Unfortunately, we were unable to attract many of these students, especially the top ranked ones, to Lehigh. We need to develop a strategy to bring more of these students to Lehigh. One issue is the timing of our offers. We make the allotted number of offers and then wait for rejections before making additional offers. We most likely lose some applicants during this interval. The GRC recommends making a significant
number of initial offers realizing that most of these applicants will not accept. We have enough experience with this process over the past five or six years to expect a 30% acceptance rate. Of course, we need some budgetary flexibility in the happy event that we exceed our quota of students. In addition, we should consider increasing the size of the awards to improve our acceptance rate.

5. International Experiences for Lehigh Students
With regard to the international experience for Lehigh students, the graduate students at Lehigh are very international. We need to find ways to integrate these students more fully into the campus community. One way to do this would be create housing and recreational facilities that foster interaction between graduate and undergraduate students.

6. Graduate Research Assistants holiday and vacation policy
A debriefing of our outgoing ombudsman revealed that scheduling conflicts sometimes arise between students wanting to observe holidays or take vacations and advisers who require them to work instead. Lehigh does not seem to have any policy with regard to this issue. The GRC believes that all new graduate students be made aware of the time commitments of research, and that advisors make every effort to accommodate reasonable requests for time off, especially for religious holidays. Disgruntled graduate students are certainly not the most productive ones, and are also unlikely to recommend Lehigh to other potential students. The GRC will continue to work to create a statement of principle on this subject.

7. Time to degree for part-time students (R&P 3.23.1)
Many part-time students are finding it difficult to complete degrees within the time to degree limits in R&P. These students have usually made significant financial investments in their programs when they run out of time. The GRC will consider relaxing time to degree constraints for part-time students. To make this policy effective it is necessary to clearly delineate part-time from full time students. One possible approach is to define a full time student as one who has been full time for two years.

8. Schedule Limitations
Two graduate programs in the College of Education—Counseling Psychology and School Psychology—require supported students to take an average of twelve credits per semester. The large number of required course credits result from accreditation requirements by the American Psychological Association. Currently, R&P 3.21.4 restricts these students to ten credits per semester. Students in this program have had to petition the registrar for an exemption every semester. The GRC will consider whether R&P should be amended to accommodate these students.

10. Course and Curriculum Changes
These were rather routine this year. The most important ones were the approval of two new terminal masters of engineering in the RCEAS.
Education Policy Activities during 2007-2008
Submitted by Linda Lowe-Krentz, Chair

Review of Chapters for Middle States Accreditation Process with feedback to Chapter authors.
Meeting with Accreditation Visiting Team

Review of Getting to Global Lehigh – many concerns expressed regarding how adoption of programs can proceed without a resource plan

Course and Curriculum changes
Values course in business and other minor changes
Development of IDEAS concentrations and minor other changes in Engineering
Deletion of Applied Life Sciences Program and HHD minor and addition of new minors and lots of newly cross-listed courses (see below) as well as many other changes in Arts and Sciences
Committee requests course and curriculum change documents to allow two Ed Pol readings of major changes before they must move to the University Faculty in March

Established a Cross-listing Task Force to report back in fall 08 on recommendations

Discussions regarding courses considered experiential with questions regarding credits and overloading. Outcome is to restart the discussion in fall 08 with new CAS associate Dean Ripa.

Began a discussion of final presentation scheduling during finals, no resolution as of now

Began discussions regarding revisions of R&P
NCr grade – passed to faculty
CAS introduction passed to faculty
Make-up of Ed Pol – formal addition of Registrar and Dean of Students representative passed to faculty.
Serious concerns regarding voting representatives for Academic Deans remain

New Officers for next year
Lowe-Krentz was both Associate and Chair this year, will be Chair next year
New Associate chair/rep to SOS will be Robin Dillon for 08-09
Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee
2008 Report to the Faculty -- May 5, 2008

Madam President and the faculty:

It is my privilege to report to you the proceedings of and progress made by FFPOC during this academic year.

The charge of the FFPOC is covered in the R&P under --
1.2.2.5 Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee

The Committee represents the concerns of the faculty in advising the President, Provost, Vice President for Finance and Administration regarding financial planning. The primary purpose of the committee is to ensure that the long-range academic concerns of the faculty are represented in the financial operations of the University. To this end, the committee shall receive appropriate information and make timely recommendations in the financial planning process. The committee reports regularly to the faculty.

1) 20/20 like initiatives and the prospect of continuing such initiatives at the prerogative of the President:

The Committee had a presentation on the original formulation of the 20/20 initiative, the many initiatives that have been funded since the program was put in place, and the current status of the program. There was a sense from the committee that this sort of “venture capital” investment fund was valuable in giving new and innovative programs a chance to get started, in order to explore their viability before making them permanent.

2) FFPOC input to the Middle States Accreditation process

The co-chairs of the Technology chapter of the focused self-study presented to the Committee the major findings/recommendations that were included in the University’s self-study report, and encouraged the Committee members to participate in the University review of the document in its entirety. This was a follow-up to the invitation that the Committee received last year to participate in the review of the Compliance section of the report. FFPOC availed the opportunity to give some input.

3) FFPOC/FCC joint meeting that clarified and put in perspective faculty compensation in the context of the University budget

The two Committees have met together for at least the last 2 years to have a “tour” of the University’s revenues and expenditures, and major components of the budget (financial aid, compensation, cost of buildings, etc). The meeting provides a useful overview for both committees, particularly for new members who have not had previous exposure to these topics and clarifies faculty compensation as part of the University budget.
4) Meeting with Lehigh Chief Investment Officer (CIO) Peter Gilbert and review of investment strategies for the University endowment that has now gone past the $1 billion mark.

    The endowment represents a significant asset of the University, and an increasing, though still relatively small, portion of the total university revenues (approximately 13% of the FY08 total revenues). This meeting was an opportunity for the Committee to better understand the role of the newly appointed CIO, the University’s current and future asset allocation strategies, the major components of the endowment, the overall investment governance structure, etc. The committee is comfortable with the overall strategies being contemplated.

5) Endowment contributions to financial aid and how they can be sustained

    The committee had an update on this most successful component of the Shine Forever Campaign, and talked about the importance of continuing to receive donor support to maintain and enhance our financial aid strategies for going forward.

6) FFPOC did get a chance to discuss and review Lehigh University’s response to the inquiries from the U.S. Senate Finance Committee about how endowments are used by schools with over $500 million in endowment assets.

    The committee was updated by several members of the team that put together the University’s response to the Senate Finance Committee request (a copy of the full response is available on the President’s webpage under “speeches and writings”). The complexity of the information requested and the importance of being comprehensive in the response were noted and various specific questions were discussed. It is not clear what more may come of this request, although current indications are that Senator Grassley, the chair of the Finance Committee, does not see the need for further legislation at this time. On the whole Lehigh is in safe territory here.

7) “People count” at Lehigh between 2001 and 2006, causes and effects of the numbers

    The committee received a detailed analysis of the changes in numbers of faculty, research staff, non exempt staff and exempt staff, tracking additions, vacancies and other changes for each unit, over each of the years since the Banner system was installed. Although the initial take of the committee was that the more detailed information makes it much easier to understand the numbers, and to see them in context that makes them make much more sense, there is much more analysis to be done, which will be on the agenda for next year’s Committee.

8) Benchmarking of our peers and aspirants from a University affordability point of view

    The committee had an initial presentation about the University benchmark schools, both for “undergraduate” comparisons (primarily admissions-related) and
“research university” comparisons (more for university-wide information), how they were selected and what characteristics are used to identify “peer” and “aspirational” institutions. This provides the first step in being able to benchmark against institutions that are comparable to Lehigh on various dimensions, an area the committee will continue to work on next year.

9) Affordability of Lehigh a decade or more from now

The committee discussed the need for a longer term view to be kept in mind, as the US higher education cohort is under pressure in so many directions—downward demographic trends of traditional aged students, increasing federal regulations and pressure on costs and financial aid, decreased federal support for financial aid programs, etc., etc. This will continue to be a major “bread and butter” issue for us with the anticipated national changes related to social and economic scene. This area too will be one for continuing focus in the coming year. We understand our Board is also getting ready to look at related issues.

We are very appreciative of the cooperation we continue to receive from the vice-president for finance and administration, Peggy Plympton.

Thank you for your attention.

Respectfully submitted by FFPOC members.

Sudhakar Neti, Chair
Mathew Melone, Chair next year
Alex Doty
Erin Moore
Annual Report of the Disciplinary Review Committee
24 April 2008
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 (Michael Kolchin), 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 in the spring of 2006. 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. In the past two years there have been five such conferences. The process continues to work well.

In the past, for any charge, a student or organization could opt for a hearing before a Disciplinary Committee panel. Under the new code, for non-academic dishonesty infractions there is no such option. That decision is up to the Conduct Officer. A number of members of the Disciplinary Appeals committee (and others we have informally talked with) feel that the students and organizations should always have the option for a hearing panel. For the present, the Conduct Officer has agreed to always offer the student the option of a hearing panel. The one successful appeal this year might have been avoided if the case had been heard before a Disciplinary Committee panel. In the fall we intend to visit this issue, as well as some other minor issues. It is likely that we will propose some changes to the code next year.

This year we did propose to add to the Discipline Code a set of guidelines for sanctions in cases of academic dishonesty. That motion is very likely to be passed by the faculty earlier in the meeting where I give this report.

Below are statistics for discipline cases heard this year and closed as of 2 April 2008. Most cases were handled with administrative hearings, three cases were handled with an academic integrity conference, and 15 cases were handled with a hearing panel.

**Overall Data**
- Total number of cases: 774
- Total number of cases in which the student was found responsible: 490
  - (Cases involving alcohol: 375)
- Primary Sanctions:
  - Disciplinary Warning: 266
Disciplinary Probation: 193
Deferred Suspension: 12
Suspension: 8
Expulsion: 1
Secondary Sanctions:
  Counseling: 276
  Parental Notification (alcohol offense): 280
  Educational Sanction: 226

(The data below are included in the numbers above)

Hearing Panel for Academic Dishonesty
  Total cases: 11
  Responsible: 11
  Sanctions:
    Expulsion: 1
    Suspension: 2
    Deferred Suspension: 0
    Probation: 8
    Warning: 0
    F in course: 9
    Recommend lower grade: 1

Hearing Panel for other cases:
  Total cases: 4
  Responsible: 4

Academic Integrity Conferences:
  Total cases: 3
  Total responsible: 3
  Sanction (same in each case): Probation + F in course

Finally, the statistics for appeals heard by the Disciplinary Appeals Committee are as follows (as of 25 April 2008):

  Appeals submitted: 10
  Appeals granted: 1
FACULTY COMPENSATION COMMITTEE’S UPDATE TO
FACULTY STEERING COMMITTEE

Salient Points Addressed in 2007-2008

- We have created a cordial working relationship with the senior administration and that relationship is the foundation for the current and future activities of FCC.

- There is an agreement in principle regarding the broad approach and parameters of market gap analysis and market gap adjustment which will compliment the merit based system.

- We have obtained access to longitudinal data from the Office of Institutional Research and we will be conducting some more analysis to gain further insights.

- Our meetings with the four deans offered interesting insights into the process of merit review. There are similarities as well as variations across colleges. We will share some of the best practices with the Council of Deans and the faculty in the May meetings. In the future, we will augment this analysis with a review of best practices and benchmarks from other institutions.

Projected Activities for 2008-2009

- We will work with the senior administration to implement specific strategies to address the significant market gaps. Issues such as identifying comparison schools, the kind of benchmarks to be used, specifics of implementation at the individual faculty level, and so on will need thinking and collaboration across all levels.

- We will continue discussions with the deans and the senior administration to establish and implement best practices in the faculty evaluation and compensation process in general and the merit review process in particular.

- Review of benefits with respect to issues such as tuition reimbursement.

- Review of retirement process, benefits, and so on.

- Other issues raised by members and/or suggested by the administration.

Conclusion

We look forward to constructive engagement and discussion to continuously make Lehigh a better place for faculty, staff, and students and to enhance its academic reputation.

Discussion notes prepared by Silva on 04/18/2008 based on inputs from Roger Nagel
Date: May 5, 2008
To: University Faculty
From: R&P Subcommittee of the Faculty Steering Committee
Subject: Annual committee report

In addition to assisting other university standing committees in their activities relating to
R&P, the R&P Subcommittee conducted its own “top-to-bottom” review of the R&P
document over the past academic year. Our goals in doing so were to:

(a) Identify outdated language in R&P and propose ways of updating it.
(b) Identify cases where the language in R&P is inconsistent with current practice and
propose ways of resolving the inconsistencies.
(c) Identify portions of the R&P document that have outlived their usefulness or that may
no longer be appropriate for inclusion in R&P and propose ways of removing this
language.

The R&P Subcommittee brought forth a large number of proposed changes, many of
which were either approved by the faculty or are in the process of being approved. To
summarize briefly, these include:

(1) Instituting a two-reading rule for proposed changes to R&P.
(2) Numerous updates to modernize the language of the document (e.g., changing
“chairman” to “chairperson,” “his” to “his or her,” “regulations and procedures” to “rules
and procedures,” etc.).
(3) Revising language concerning the requirement that all faculty must participate in
formal academic processions.
(4) Implementing a Consent Calendar.
(5) Updating the language for a number of university committees to bring it in line with
current practice.
(6) Eliminating restrictions on summer teaching and consecutive committee terms.
(7) Disbanding four university committees that had become moribund over the years.

While we were able to act on many of the issues we identified in our review this year, we
anticipate that the process of revising R&P will continue into the next academic year.

R&P Subcommittee Membership for 2007-08:
Dan Lopresti, RCEAS Computer Science & Engineering (Chair)
Mike Kolchin, CBE Management
Ed Lotto, CAS English
Ed Shapiro, COE Education & Human Services
Faculty Steering Committee Annual Report
May 5, 2008

Chairperson: Edward S. Shapiro, Professor
Education & Human Services

As indicated by R & P, the charge of the FSC is:

"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."

During the current year, the FSC rearranged the standing agenda to place the reports of the President and Provost early in the agenda of the FSC to better meet the charge of the committee.

During the 2007-2008 academic year, the FSC has specifically engaged in the following activities and actions:

- Chair met with President Gast in September regarding her desire to use the FSC more to facilitate communication and development of the University strategic plan
- Organized and facilitated the posting of motions on the registrar's web site
- Worked with Art King, University Secretary to the Faculty, and Ed Kay, University Parliamentarian to archive past University faculty meeting minutes and to provide these to the registrar's web site
- Organized the Faculty Blackboard for maintaining motions and discussion items from committees
- Asked R & P subcommittee to conduct a front-to-back review of R & P and make recommendations to the faculty for revisions
- Held additional meetings with President Gast regarding discussion of the University Strategic Plan
- Met with Middle States team during preliminary and on-campus site visit
- Initiated change in University faculty meeting agenda to include a consent calendar
- Initiated change in University faculty meeting procedures to require two readings of motions involving changes to R & P
- Engaged in discussion and interaction with the President and Provost on many key ideas related to University administration
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary to the Faculty</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Art King, CBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Governance Committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Compensation Committee</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Jean Toulouse, CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAS Rep</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Neal Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COE Rep</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Arnie Spokane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RCEAS Rep</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Roger Nagel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>John Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Financial Planning and Operations Committee</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Anne Anderson, CBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Administrative Committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations Committee</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Erica Hoelscher, CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisory Committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Users’ Committee</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Barbara Pavlock, CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Discipline</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Ed Gallagher, CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Keith Schray, CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Lecturers’ Committee</td>
<td>CAS Rep</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Janet Laible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CBE Rep</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Gopal Krishnan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tenured Faculty Only*