
Department of Education and Human Services Departmental Handbook of Policies and Procedures

Chairperson: Christopher T.H. Liang

Administrative Assistant: Donna Ball

Updated November 2019

Table of Contents

Lehigh University Non-Discrimination Statement.....	1
I. Organization and Structure	2
College of Education Strategic Goals & Mission Statement	3
College of Education Organizational Structure	4
Department Chair Job Description	5
Associate Department Chair Job Description	6
Academic Program Director Job Description	7
Associate Dean for Graduate Studies Job Description	8
Associate Dean for Research Job Description.....	9
College of Education Standing Committees	10
Operating Principles for the Center for Promoting Research to Practice	13
Center for Developing Urban Educational Leaders (CDUEL)	15
Global Distance Graduate Degrees and Training Office	16
II. Teaching-related Policies and Procedures	17
Departmental Policy on Faculty Teaching Load	18
Course Release Policy for Grant Activity	19
Departmental Policy on Class Size Limitations	20
College Policy on Summer Teaching Compensation	21
COE Procedures for Offering Inter-Session Courses	23
University Policy on Handling Adverse Weather Conditions	26
Policy for Staff Working from Home During Inclement Weather	28
College Policies on Classes during Adverse Weather	29
III. Adjunct and Visiting Appointments.....	30
College Process for Adjunct Appointments	31
College Process for Adjunct Evaluations	32
COE Procedures for Visiting Appointments	33
IV. Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment.....	38
College of Education Promotion & Tenure Guidelines.....	39
College of Education Promotion and Tenure Criteria	42
COE Statement on Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor.....	47
Dossier Preparation for Reappointment Reviews and Promotion and Tenure in the College of Education.....	48
Lehigh University Best Practices for College Promotion and Tenure Committees	56
Guidelines for Frequency of Academic Leaves for Faculty	57
Pretenure Academic Leave	61
COE Reappointment Review for Professors of Practice and Lecturer.....	62
V. Student-related Policies and Procedures.....	63
College Criteria for Admission as a Regular Graduate Student	64
Non-degree Student Options	65
College Policy on Admission of Students Whose First Language Is Not English	66
Criminal and Health Clearances for Students in College of Education Programs	67
Process for Securing Approval for a Graduate Student to Carry a Workload Overload under the Affordable Care Act (ACA) University Regulations and Workload Restrictions.....	71
Full-time vs. Part-time Student Status; Leaves of Absence	78

Academic Scholarship Requirements for COE Degree Programs.....	78
College Policy on Adequate Academic Progress.....	80
College Academic Integrity Policy.....	81
Termination of Student Status.....	84
College of Education Grievance Procedures.....	85
College Policy on Transfer of Credits to Master’s Degree Program	90
Lehigh University Graduate Petitions.....	93
 VI. Doctoral Program Policies and Procedures.....	 98
College of Education Doctoral Program Requirements and Procedures	99
Doctoral Dissertation and Master’s Theses Preparation/Submission Guidelines	108
Eligibility Criteria for Participation in University Doctoral Hooding Ceremony	111
University Dissertation Award Processes	112
 VII. Resource Allocation Policies and Procedures	 119
Minimal Faculty Resources	120
Resource Allocation Recommendations.....	122
Allocation of Vacant Faculty Slots	123
Allocation of Available University-supported Lectureships.....	124
Allocation of University-supported Graduate and Research Assistantships	125
Allocation of Available University Scholarships	126
Allocation of Faculty Travel Support for Professional Meetings.....	127
Allocation of Space	128
College Policy on Indirect Cost Recovery Sharing	129
 VIII. College Emergency Response Plan	 130
Response Leadership and Disaster Levels, College Involvement in Response to Emergencies.....	131
Organizational Structure, Decision Responsibility Hierarchy	132
Evacuation Site.....	132
Lockdown Procedures	132
Emergency Contact Numbers	132
Active Shooter Situations	133
Fire Safety.....	135
Emergency Evacuation Procedures.....	135
Dangerous and Disruptive Persons	136
Bomb Threat	137
College Hierarchy for Emergency Decision Making	140
List of Building and Floor Monitors	140

Lehigh University Non-discrimination Statement

Lehigh University seeks talented faculty, staff, and students from diverse backgrounds. Lehigh University does not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, gender, gender identity, marital status, national or ethnic origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran status in any area, including student admissions; scholarship or loan awards; athletic, co-curricular, recreational, or social programs; academic programs, policies, or activities; and employment and employment development.

Questions and complaints about this policy should be directed to:

The Provost or The Vice President for Finance and Administration,
Alumni Memorial Building,
Lehigh University,
Bethlehem, PA 18015

Organization and Structure

Strategic Goals & Mission Statement

Adopted May, 2017

STRATEGIC PLAN (2017 - 2022)

PURPOSE

To enhance the understanding and well-being of communities of learners in ways that will improve educational access, opportunities, and outcomes.

VALUES

We value...

- Innovation, rigor, and critical enquiry
- Fairness and integrity
- Collaboration and collegiality
- Inclusivity, equity, and diversity
- Involvement and an engaged community

MISSION

To excel in graduate education by advancing theory, creating new knowledge, and promoting evidence-based practices.

OBJECTIVES

1. Lead with high-quality research
 - a. Engage in research that solves big problems and influences policy through evidence-based integration
2. Expand reach of new knowledge
 - a. Disseminate knowledge in ways that are meaningful and useful to others
 - b. Increase visibility of faculty contributions to research and practice
3. Connect research and practice
 - a. Collaborate with local, regional, national and international communities (e.g., schools, educational, and community organizations)
4. Promote inclusion and equity
 - a. Strengthen recruitment and retention of faculty, staff, and students committed to values and principles of inclusion and equity
 - b. Enhance curriculum and training
 - c. Increase access and decrease barriers to graduate education
5. Engage in critical thinking and reflective pedagogy
 - a. Enrich and broaden teaching and learning perspectives
 - b. Increase access to cutting edge professional development

College of Education Organizational Structure

Adopted May 1994, edited June 2008, May 2013, December 2017

The College of Education consists of:

- A single department, the Department of Education and Human Services, comprised of a set of interrelated academic programs;
- Centennial School;
- The Center for Promoting Research to Practice (CPRP);
- The Center for Developing Urban Educational Leaders (CDUEL); and
- The Global Distance Graduate Degrees and Training Office

COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

The College of Education is led by a college dean supported by two associate deans. The dean's office is also supported by a variety of staff positions. The EHS department is led by a department chairperson and an associate department chairperson.

PROGRAM DEFINITION

An academic program consists of a cluster of Lehigh graduate certificate programs, external certification programs and/or degree programs that share a similar professional or research focus.

A program director is appointed by the department chair after consultation with the program faculty. Program directors serve three-year renewable terms.

PROGRAM CONFIGURATION

The Department of Education and Human Services consists of the following five academic programs:

- Counseling Psychology
- Educational Leadership
- School Psychology
- Special Education
- Teaching, Learning and Technology (encompassing both teacher education and instructional technology)

NON-PROGRAM STRUCTURE

All centers (present and future) and externally funded long-term research or training programs report directly to the dean of the college and coordinate with the chair on matters of faculty buy-out and student support. The department chair has a voting position on the Centennial School governance council.

Department Chair Job Description

August 2013

The **Department Chairperson** is a teaching faculty member in the department and has all the rights and responsibilities of a faculty member. The primary function of the chair is to carry out the business of the Department of Education and Human Services.

The chair facilitates the long-range development of the department within the context of college and university vision, mission, and goals. He/she articulates the department's goals and needs within the university and works with the dean to advance the department's programs, both within and outside the institution.

Because a department's reputation is built upon the quality of its faculty and students, the chair plays a leadership role in faculty hiring and faculty development. The chair is an *ex officio* member of all departmental faculty search committees and interviews all candidates. The chair conducts regular mentoring sessions with departmental pretenure faculty members and participates in new faculty orientation. Professors of Practice also report to the chair.

The chair manages the major functions and activities of the department, including:

- convening and chairing department faculty and program director meetings;
- approving departmental purchases and expenditures;
- overseeing departmental financial accounts;
- evaluating student petitions for approval;
- reviewing and evaluating academic program student admissions decisions;
- evaluating faculty and departmental staff performance for the purposes of recommending merit pay decisions to the College of Education Dean;
- ensuring that student grievances are addressed in accordance with college-specific procedures (where appropriate) and comply with university processes and mechanisms;
- addressing staff and faculty grievances;
- determining faculty teaching loads;
- dispensing travel support to faculty and students;
- distributing tuition scholarships and graduate assistantships to academic programs; and
- overseeing the work of standing and *ad hoc* departmental committees.

The chair works with the Department Coordinator and Program Directors to produce course schedules for each semester.

The chair works with the Associate Department Chair to schedule and conduct annual, reappointment, triennial, promotion and/or tenure reviews of tenure-track faculty, as per guidelines set forth in the Rules and Procedures of the Faculty, as well as provided by the Provost's Office. The chair is responsible for contacting and securing external tenure and promotion reviewers.

The chair represents the College of Education on the Chairs' Executive Committee convened by the Provost's Office, as well as on other university committees as assigned by the College of Education Dean or Provost.

The Department Chair reports to the Dean of the College of Education.

Associate Department Chair Job Description

August 2013

The **Associate Department Chairperson** is a teaching faculty member in the department, and has all the rights and responsibilities of a faculty member. The primary function of the chair is to assist the Department Chair in managing selected aspects of faculty evaluation and review, including:

- scheduling and conducting annual, reappointment, triennial, promotion, and/or tenure reviews of tenure-track faculty;
- conducting reviews of professors of practice for possible reappointment;
- reviewing student course evaluations for all departmental faculty each semester;
- addressing low student course evaluations with responsible faculty and/or program directors;
- monitoring and advising pre-tenure faculty and tenured associate professors as they prepare review and promotion materials;
- coordinating faculty review schedules with the Provost's office;
- preparing departmental review and promotion letters for the Department Chair; and
- substituting for the Department Chair in departmental or university meetings, as necessary.

The Associate Department Chairperson reports to the Department Chair.

Academic Program Director Job Description

Title Change November 2010; edited June 2013

THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR...

- Reports to the Chair of the Department of Education and Human Services.
- Is elected by the program faculty after consultation with the Chair.
- Serves for three years and may be re-appointed.
- Is an ex-officio voting member of the Departmental Coordinating Council.
- Is evaluated annually as part of the performance review process for salary administration.
- Shall be responsible for the effective coordination and leadership for all aspects of the academic program. All pertinent *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty*, as well as operating policies of the department, shall be applied as necessary and as appropriate in the exercise of these duties.

Principal Duties and Responsibilities

1. Prepare, in consultation with program faculty, teaching schedules appropriate to the students' programmatic needs.
2. Coordinate, in consultation with program faculty, the recruitment and admissions of students to the program.
3. Coordinate, in consultation with the program faculty, program and course changes, presenting any proposals to the Departmental Faculty for approval.
4. Coordinate the use and allocation of program-specific instructional and research resources, equipment and space, including both those of the University and those that may be provided by external agencies.
5. Make recommendations, when necessary, regarding the appointment of adjunct faculty.
6. Maintain accurate and up-to-date records of students enrolled in the program.
7. Monitor the progress of all students, especially doctoral students, within the program.
8. Attend meetings of the Chair's Council and represent the views and interests of the program students and faculty when necessary and/or appropriate.
9. Coordinate and prepare program-specific material for use by external accrediting or evaluating bodies and for the purposes of long-range planning.
10. Make recommendations, after consultation with the program faculty, to the Chair regarding the appointments of GA/RA/TAs and the awarding of scholarships and fellowships.
11. Mentor and support the professional development of pretenure faculty.
12. Hold meetings of the program faculty at regular intervals during the course of the academic year.
13. Serve as the initial point of contact for faculty and student concerns and complaints.

Compensation

Program Directors receive a stipend of \$4,000 per academic year as compensation for their service. The stipend can be used as academic-year buyout of one course or for other purposes in support of the professional development of the Program Director, such as travel, GA support, equipment purchase, and the like.

This policy of compensation is reviewed annually and continued at the discretion of the Dean.

Associate Dean for Graduate Studies Job Description

July 2019

The Associate Dean, an academic administrator position, is the primary point of contact for graduate education processes affecting the College of Education and performs a wide variety of academic administrative activities that support graduate student progress and faculty development, initiate policy development and implementation, and promote growth and innovation through enhancing educational programs at the graduate level.

- Works closely with the Dean and other associate deans within the College and across the campus to implement the core values and strategic plans of the College of Education.
- Work closely with Department Chair to implement policies that promote and enhance the graduate education of the College

Graduate Student

- Graduate Admissions for domestic and global education and Fulbright admissions
- Lead efforts to recruit and retain high-quality graduate students to grow the doctoral programs and to expand master's enrollments.
- Review admissions decisions of domestic and international students who do not appear to meet College admissions requirements; review TOEFL waiver requests
- Monitor academic progress of graduate students; Guide decisions relating to graduate student progress and take a leading role in monitoring graduate student progress and keeping faculty informed about their students' progress or failure to progress.
- Handle appeals/petitions, usually on behalf of faculty, regarding special requests related to student programs, for e.g., special waivers and consideration in exceptional cases.
- Participate on University Awards Committee and Coordinate/Chair College Student Awards, Facilitate Graduate Fellowships
- Work with admissions staff to advise on graduate admission procedures.

Faculty Professional Development

- Develop College-wide efforts around faculty development and mentoring with a focus on promoting curriculum and enhanced instruction.

Curriculum/Program Development, Evaluation, and Reporting

- Provides leadership and support in areas of curriculum development, implementation of new graduate academic programs, and the revision of existing programs; manage and develop MOU's
- Coordinate global initiatives in the areas of graduate education
- Provides relevant administrative support the Department Chair and Program Directors to ensure Programmatic/College compliance with accreditation.
- Work with the Department Chair in coordination of periodic review of graduate programs informed by continuous assessment
- Primary responsibility for United Educators Report

Committees

- Represent the college in University-wide meetings and events.
- Collaborate with leaders across the University on initiatives of importance to the College of Education.
- Serve on University Advisory Committee on Graduate Education (SOGS, GRC)

Supervisory Responsibilities

- Domestic Admissions, Global Online, and Communications

Other responsibilities as assigned by Dean

Associate Dean for Research Job Description

July 2019

The Associate Dean for Research is responsible for overseeing and supporting research and scholarship activities undertaken by COE faculty and students. This responsibility includes support and oversight related to preparation and submission of internal and external grant applications.

Specific responsibilities include:

- Collect and communicate data regarding research and scholarship objectives of COE strategic plan
- Plan, organize, and supervise all activities related to preparation and submission of internal and external research grant applications from COE
- Collaborate with Director of Center for Promoting Research to Practice (CPRP) in planning, organizing, and implementing Center initiatives
- Supervise and support work of senior grants specialist
- Consult with and mentor COE faculty and students regarding preparation of grant applications
- Supervise and support work of professor of practice assigned to assist faculty and students with research design and statistical analyses
- Periodically assess research and scholarship needs of COE faculty and doctoral students to prioritize support areas and strategies
- Conduct monthly surveys of COE faculty research and scholarship activity
- Organize and manage password-protected website that provides COE faculty with grant application resources and templates
- Review and approve all external grant submissions for office of research and sponsored programs
- Review and approve all internal grant submissions. For those grant submissions that include graduate student tuition cost-share, coordinate with EHS department chair to reserve tuition scholarship credits if the grant is awarded
- Provide conference travel support to COE faculty and students
- Collaborate with COE director of marketing in development, implementation, and maintenance of research and scholarship webpage disseminating information about COE faculty and student research activities
- Collaborate with program directors and CPRP director to display posters of recent research in Iacocca Hall
- Review COE faculty requests for courseload reduction to prepare external grant applications for research funding
- Organize, implement, and evaluate workshops on grant preparation, research design, data analysis, and related research/scholarship activities for COE faculty and students
- Oversee Stout Dissertation Award nomination and review process for COE
- Participate in Deans Cabinet meetings
- Participate as member of university's Data Governance Executive Committee
- Meet bi-weekly with Dean to address all research-related issues
- Participates in department health and well-being initiatives (ex. research lunches)
- Participate with Learn Dean advocacy group through periodic meetings in Washington DC
- Other responsibilities as assigned by COE Dean

College of Education Standing Committees

[See Lehigh R&P sections 1.3.1.1 & 1.3.3.4] [Edited June 2013]

The standing committees of the College of Education include the Nominations Committee, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Diversity Committee, the Mentoring Committee, and the International Programs Policy Committee.

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

The College of Education nominations committee consists of three members, one elected each year for a three-year term. The senior member is chairperson. This college committee prepares slates to be submitted to the faculty for election of the other standing college committees described below, as well as of college representatives on university committees. Election requires a plurality of votes cast, unless the college decides before an election that a majority is required. In every case the slate consists of two nominees for each post. Additional nominations may be made from the floor when the slate is presented. The nominations committee attempts to achieve the widest possible distribution among programs, disciplines, and points of view.

PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE

[Revised version approved by COE faculty April 17, 2009]

The college promotion and tenure committee consists of five elected tenured university faculty members. Three members are elected from the college as a whole, two of whom shall be full professors. The college elects two members in related disciplines from the faculties of the other three colleges. These members shall be at the rank of full professor. Each elected member serves a three-year term. No member may serve more than two terms consecutively. Each year the college nominations committee shall prepare a slate of candidates for each open position.

The committee will elect its own chairperson, and it may establish additional operating procedures, consistent with R&P. The committee will present an annual report to the college faculty. There shall be no confidential material in this report.

While the committee may establish additional operating procedures, the following may be changed only by a majority vote at a duly constituted faculty meeting:

1. College of Education members of the promotion and tenure committee will not vote when the tenured faculty of the college considers the candidate at the departmental stage of the promotion and tenure review process
2. All five committee members must be present at any meeting where tenure is discussed. All full professors on the committee must be present at any meeting where promotion to full professor is discussed. All members will vote on all promotion and tenure decisions of assistant professors. Only full professors on the tenure committee will vote on the promotion to full professor. In the latter case, if an associate professor currently serves on the committee, then the faculty will elect a full professor to replace the associate professor on the committee for that case only.
3. All tenure and promotion proceedings are to be kept confidential. All cases involving tenure are the province of the full tenure committee.

4. Tenure and promotion recommendations by the committee require a majority vote, with no abstentions by eligible voters. The vote is reported to the dean with each recommendation.
5. In cases in which the vote is not unanimous, both a majority report and a minority report will be submitted to the dean, with each conveying the reasons for the recommendation.
6. Each candidate's complete file will be available to all committee members during the evaluation period.
7. In the event that a file is incomplete or deemed inadequate, the committee will follow the procedures in 2.2.6.9, paragraph 2.
8. The chair will present confidential summary reports to the dean on the individual cases considered. These reports will include the vote of the committee (a majority vote for the candidate constitutes a positive recommendation) and a statement of reasons for each recommendation. The letters from each member voting will accompany this summary report.

DIVERSITY COMMITTEE

[Standing committee added by COE faculty approval 12/12/08]

The diversity committee undertakes and oversees activities designed to enhance diversity in the College of Education. This includes oversight of the multicultural resource center, diversity speaker series, and other support to COE faculty, students, and staff.

The committee shall consists of seven members: three tenure-track faculty in the college, two students in good standing in programs in the college, and two staff members employed by the college. At least one of the tenure-track faculty members must be tenured. Across the three member categories, no more than two representatives from any one college academic program shall serve on the committee. Each year the committee shall elect its chairperson from among the tenure-track faculty.

One faculty member is elected to a 3-year term by the college faculty in the spring semester of each academic year, producing staggered terms of service. In the second year of his or her term, a faculty member shall serve as junior co-chair, while in the final year of his or her term that faculty member shall serve as senior co-chair.

Every spring a student member shall be appointed to serve a two-year term, producing staggered terms of service. Student members are appointed by the Education and Human Services department chair from among students nominated either by themselves or by others.

Every spring, a staff member shall be appointed to a two-year term by the Education and Human Services department chair from among staff members nominated either by themselves or by others. This produces staggered terms of service for staff members.

MENTORING COMMITTEE

[Standing committee added by COE faculty approval 12/12/08]

The mentoring committee's duties include welcoming and orienting new faculty as they make the transition to Lehigh; fostering positive relationships between potential mentors and mentees; advocating for concerns, supplying individual guidance and supporting resolution of conflicts; ensuring equity of expectations for performance during faculty reviews and periodically reviewing departmental policies and promotion and tenure requirements; facilitating mentoring training opportunities and consultation for the college as a whole; and conducting regular needs assessments and evaluations of the mentoring program.

The committee shall be made up of five members: four tenure-track faculty members, two of whom shall be tenured and two of whom shall be pretenure, and the Education and Human Services department associate chair for faculty. Faculty representation shall be, to the greatest extent possible, across academic programs within the college. Each spring one or two faculty members, as appropriate, shall be elected to a three-year term on the committee, producing staggered terms of service. Each year the committee shall elect its chairperson.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS POLICY COMMITTEE

[Standing committee added by COE faculty approval 4/17/09]

The college international programs policy committee is responsible for analyzing proposals for new international programs in the college, considering the feasibility of such proposed programs in light of the priorities and resources of the college, and making recommendations to the dean for his or her final approval.

The committee consists of one representative each from each of the academic programs in the college plus a representative from the college Office of International Programs. The dean, in consultation with the Education and Human Services department chair, appoints members to three-year terms and appoints the chair of the committee from among its members. There is no restriction on how many terms a member may serve.

Operating Principles for the Center for Promoting Research to Practice – Schools, Families, Communities

Approved by COE faculty May 2002, edited June 2018

MISSION:

The mission of Lehigh University's Center for Promoting Research to Practice is to generate new knowledge that will truly impact the lives of individuals with disabilities or those at-risk for disabilities. The primary objective of Center is to create a living laboratory that establishes partnerships with schools, parents and families, and community service providers to enhance the use of best practices for individuals with disabilities.

BUILDING THE INFRASTRUCTURE:

The CPRP needs to build an infrastructure that will allow it to offer the resources needed by faculty to develop a research rich environment. Although the CPRP has initial funding for an Executive Director, an individual responsible for web development, and a part of a secretary, these funds are not sufficient to sustain more than an 18-month period of development. The key needs for the CPRP are for a permanent Executive Director that represents a tenured or tenure-track faculty member, a business manager who can oversee budgets of several projects embedded in the CPRP, a web development person who can support projects brought into the CPRP, and the possible hiring of a staff of data collectors who can support various projects.

The infrastructure can be built in several ways. First, when grants are submitted through the auspices of the CPRP, the budget will be constructed to contain a small portion of the personnel costs for these types of positions. The exact amount will be negotiated between the Executive Director and the prospective Principal Investigator.

Second, when grants are submitted through the CPRP, the University portion of Research Incentive Funds (RIF) are returned to the CPRP and not the Department. Dollars are returned on the indirect costs at a rate of approximately 4% per year of total ICR, as defined in the RIF formula implemented by the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at Lehigh.

Third, when grants are submitted through the CPRP, faculty will often write in their time dedicated to the project. For many grants, the amount of time may be as high as 50% of calendar year. The cost of faculty buyout as per departmental policy is 10% of academic year salary per course. The cost of teaching replacements for the department is the cost of an adjunct hired to teach the course (approximately \$4500). Thus, there is a portion of dollars that is available above the cost of teaching replacement for each course bought out by a faculty member. Current policy is for those dollars to remain within the departmental budget to provide additional discretionary dollars that the Chairperson can use to support departmental needs. Most of these discretionary dollars will remain with the CPRP, rather than the department. Specifically, the CPRP retains 80% of the dollars beyond teaching replacement costs and the department retains 20%.

Here is an illustration. Faculty A receives a grant that allows a buyout of 1 course. The total dollars available for the academic year buyout in the project is \$10,000. The department first claims money for adjunct replacement. The remaining funds are divided between the CPRP (80%) and the department (20%).

Fourth, over the past two years, COE has adopted a policy of returning to PIs a portion of the return through revenue streams to the College on Indirect Cost Return. The dollars returned to PIs is based on a formula that calculates the proportion of which the projects held by the PI

contribute to the total ICR return to the college. The percentage of contribution is multiplied by the amount of dollars returned under the revenue streams formula. There are two important issues that need to be considered in formulating a future policy for the distribution of COE funds. (1) The COE distribution to PIs must be equivalent (or greater in the CPRP) whether the project is in the CPRP or the department. (2) The CPRP needs to benefit from the COE RIF return policy as well.

Because the CPRP will be taking a percentage of the overall return (as will the Dean), the following formula will be employed:

Dean takes 25% of the total ICR return to the college. Calculation of the proportion of ICR contributed to the total is done in the same way as described above. The remaining dollars are distributed such that the PI receives 80% of the remaining dollars and the CPRP OR DEPARTMENT receive 20%. Thus, PIs would receive the same levels of support whether the project is in the CPRP or the Department. Here is an illustration:

Total ICR generated by COE in a single year is \$1,000,000. Faculty B contributes \$100,000 in that year to the ICR of the COE which represents 10% of the ICR return to COE for that year. Total return to COE after the revenue stream division is \$800,000.

- Dean would take 25% of \$800,000 = \$200,000.
- Remaining dollars, \$600,000, are divided such that 10% of the amount returned related to this project (\$60,000) is divided such that the PI gets 80% (\$48,000) and the Dept/CPRP would get \$12,000.

This policy applies only to newly submitted projects (both in the Department as well as through the CPRP). Existing projects are subject to the existing policy, as modified by the Dean (i.e., Dean takes 25% of ICR return, remainder is distributed to PIs proportional to contribution to total COE ICR generation).

It is also noted that the policy of COE RIF return is in effect only if COE exceeds its specified target. Should COE fall below its target, dollars owed by COE to the University will be shared equally between the Center, Department, and Dean's office.

Types of Projects Remaining in Department versus Center

The CPRP shall be open to all types of projects that are consistent with its mission on Promoting Research to Practice. It is anticipated, however, that those projects whose primary mission is the training of students leading to degree or certification outcomes would be most appropriate to remain within the Department rather than the CPRP. It is still unclear whether contractual types of projects (i.e., Transition & Assessment Services, Lehigh Support Community Choices, state-funded contracts) should belong to the CPRP. The option shall be available for these projects to come to the CPRP if it is the desire of the PI to do so.

Types of Resources to Be Developed and Offered by the CPRP

Once the CPRP is in full operation, it is planned to hire a business manager, an individual responsible for web and Internet development, and a set of data collectors. The CPRP will provide budget development support along with templates for boilerplate sections of grants. It is also hoped that the CPRP will be able to offer support for all projects in information technology needs as well. The CPRP will also actively seek and disseminate information to all faculty on available grant opportunities, as well as facilitate collaboration across discipline areas when projects require such efforts.

Center for Developing Urban Educational Leaders (CDUEL)

University approved spring 2007

MISSION STATEMENT:

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

RESEARCH DESCRIPTION

(Initiatives, scholarship, collaborations, services, product development and other activities of this center):

The Center for Urban Leadership has several different research and practice foci that will continue to evolve as the center grows and matures over the next several years. The four areas of study that were initially identified include:

1. New models of urban leadership that include principals and teachers.
2. Links between community agencies and schools as they relate to building capacity for educational reform.
3. The interplay between economic development and school reform.
4. The study of psychosocial and economic factors that influence attitudes and behaviors of children in urban schools

EDUCATIONAL DESCRIPTION

(How the center contributes to Lehigh's mission to integrate teaching and research for undergraduate, graduate and continuing education students with short courses, certificate programs, seminars, workshops and other endeavors):

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

1. Contribute to the ongoing development of the Aspiring Urban Principal certification program that extends the current work done in Philadelphia to other urban centers.
2. Result in seminars and focused workshops designed to translate research to practice for current urban leaders. These sessions will be designed to develop a broader understanding by urban educators and urban community leaders representing community action groups, parents, social service agencies and business and industry of the critical issues facing urban education.
3. Inform the creation of meaningful partnerships with regional urban educational and community agencies (The Urban Communities Educational Partners program). An expected outgrowth of these partnerships is the development of problem-based learning experiences and case studies that will be used in various courses throughout the university.
4. Provide opportunities for both undergraduate and graduate students to intern and/or conduct research through the Center's Urban Communities Educational Partners program.
5. Guide the development of the teacher leader certificate program and a new urban community leaders certificate program.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The center is led by an executive director, supported through the Peter E. Bennett '63 Chair endowed chair. The center also includes a Professor of Practice and a doctoral-level scholar, both funded through the center's endowment and active fundraising.

Global Distance Graduate Degrees and Training Office

Edited December 2017

MISSION STATEMENT:

The Global Distance Graduate Degrees and Training Office began in 2001 as the Office of International Programs, and its purpose is to provide online graduate education and training to students within Lehigh University's College of Education. The College of Education's Global Distance initiatives are designed specifically to reach the global community, whether in international settings or in the United States. We offer graduate degree programs, principal certification, professional education certificates, summer professional institutes, and online academic courses throughout the academic year.

Since its inception, the Global Distance Office has educated students from 67 countries across five continents. We offer Masters and Doctoral Degree programs in Educational Leadership, International Counseling and Comparative and International Education.

The goal of this office is to provide professional students meet their academic graduate goals while they continue to balance careers and continuing education. Students can use credits towards completion of a professional education Certificate program, a Doctoral or Master's degree program or as non-credit towards professional development. The Global Online Graduate Degrees and Training Office offers the following Degree programs:

- Ed.D. in Educational Leadership;
- M.Ed. in Educational Leadership; and
- M.Ed. in International Counseling.

It offers Professional Education Certificate programs in:

- International Counseling;
- Second Language Teaching; and
- Technology in the Schools.

Students must complete a minimum of four courses (12 credits) in order to complete a Certificate program in one of these specialized areas. These programs are designed as a shorter alternative to a Degree program. Students may later apply credits earned in a Certificate program towards our Degree programs.

Summer Institutes are offered every year and affords students the opportunity to network with other international students and leaders from around the world on Lehigh University's campus in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. On occasion, the Summer Institute offers courses at The American College of Greece in Athens, Greece.

The Global Distance Office is led by a director who reports directly to the COE Dean. There is an assistant director and an office secretary who report to the Global Distance Director.

Teaching-related Policies and Procedures

Departmental Policy on Faculty Teaching Load

Approved April 2000; revised May 2002, revised February 2008; edited June 2013,
revised June 2018

The Teaching Load in the Department of Education and Human Services is considered to be the equivalent of 18 credit hours (6 courses or equivalent) for the contracted academic year. All members of the departmental faculty are normally released from three credit hours (1 course or equivalent) per academic year to fulfill the advising responsibilities appropriate to a graduate department, to engage in the normal committee assignments associated with managing the Department and the University, and to engage in the routine scholarship expected of a faculty member in such a department. A normal Teaching Load is, consequently, considered to be 15 credit hours per year (5 courses or equivalent). This policy also recognizes that, in special circumstances, faculty members choosing not to engage in scholarship or significant departmental and university advising and service may be required to teach in excess of 15 credit hours per academic year in order that they may fulfill reasonable contractual obligations.

The normal teaching load of 15 credit hours (5 courses or equivalent) can be reduced under the following circumstances and is subject to the following conditions:

1. When a new, untenured faculty member joins the department, a 6-credit-hour (2 course or equivalent) course load reduction will be granted during his/her first academic year and a 3-credit-hour (1 course or equivalent) course load reduction will be granted during his/her second academic year in order that he/she may develop his/her personal research program. This will bring the normal teaching load for his/her first academic year to 9 credit hours (3 courses or equivalent) and the normal teaching load for his/her second academic year to 12 credit hours (4 courses or equivalent).
2. A faculty member has time "bought out" by external contract or grant support. This "buy-out" time cannot exceed 6 credit hours (2 courses or equivalent) per academic year. The cost of a faculty member buying out an academic course is 1/10 or 10% of his or her academic year salary. In some exceptional circumstances where faculty are able to reduce their academic teaching loads through the acquisition of external support, reductions below a 9-credit-hour (3 courses or equivalent) course load per year can only be granted after discussion and approval with the Chairperson and Dean. Programs must negotiate such reductions by demonstrating the capacity to maintain excellence in teaching and training of students.
3. When a faculty member is actually and demonstrably engaged in significant research and scholarly activities, his or her teaching load may be reduced by up to 3 credit hours (1 course or equivalent) per academic year. The determination for such a reduction will be made in January by the Departmental Chair who may seek the advice of appropriate colleagues. The burden of demonstrating such significant involvement is upon the faculty member requesting the reduction. Such requests should be made during the annual evaluation period in January and should precede the formulation of the following fall semester teaching schedule. At the discretion of the Chairperson, a reduction of teaching load can be made for a period of up to two years for those faculty who have maintained evidence of significant research and scholarly activities.

Reductions in teaching load described in 1-3 above will be made under the assumptions that (1) the teaching responsibilities of the Department with regard to its degree programs can be met by available adjunct faculty; (2) students' progress toward their degrees is not unduly impeded by such reduction, and (3) adequate resources are available to provide for adjunct coverage.

The total reduction in teaching load under ANY combination of the above conditions should never exceed more than 9 credits (3 courses or equivalent). That is, the minimum required teaching load that is expected of all non-administrative faculty is 3 credits (1 course or equivalent) per academic semester. *Under exceptional circumstances, and only with the permission of the Chairperson and Dean, a non-administrative faculty member would be permitted to reduce her/his teaching responsibilities to one course per academic year for no more than a 3-year period.*

Course Release Policy for Grant Activity

April 2012 (revised April 2019)

Consistent with COE strategic plan goals (i.e., leading with research), this opportunity is designed to *incentivize and support* faculty members who are engaged in new grant proposal development. Because working on a proposal can occur during the semester or during the summer (depending on the grant competition) and can take a significant amount of time, faculty members may be eligible for academic year course release or summer stipend based on the following criteria:

1. Criteria for Eligibility
 - a. The faculty member should develop a brief written proposal detailing the following:
 - i. Proposal topic
 - ii. Funding source and type of funding
 - iii. Length of funding for initial award
 - iv. Collaborators
 - v. Role in the preparation of the proposal
 - vi. Inclusion of student support
2. Semester Support: When a faculty member intends to work on a proposal during a semester, the faculty member can request a 1-course release for that semester. The proposal to be developed must be significant. That is, the potential funding level should be high and the amount of work that must be done to complete the program must be correspondingly high. For example, NSF, NIH, foundational, or corporate opportunities that include funding of multiple graduate students and/or compensation for faculty time (e.g., course buy-out or summer salary) are appropriate venues for consideration. Conversely, working on a revision of a grant, working with another faculty member on a grant when the other faculty member will be doing most of the work, or proposals that do not require a great deal of work and time, or are for very modest funding, do not meet the criteria for potential course release.
3. Summer Support: Because some grant competitions (e.g., IES) may involve late summer submission dates, faculty can request a stipend equivalent of a course buyout (i.e., adjunct instructor salary) for the summer when engaged in grant proposal preparation. If a summer course stipend is requested, it is expected that the faculty member will be devoting significant time to grant proposal preparation and will not be teaching any summer courses.
4. The request must be made in a timely manner in order to allow the program to identify an adjunct faculty member to cover the course. The following guidelines should be followed:
 - a. For a Fall Semester course release, the request should be made in March of the previous Spring Semester.
 - b. For a Spring Semester course release, the request should be made in July of the previous summer.
 - c. For a summer course release, the request should be made in December of the previous Fall Semester.
5. In addition to the above considerations, a number of other variables will play a part in the acceptance of the proposal:
 - a. Other course buy-outs: For example, no faculty member can completely buy-out of teaching.
 - b. Faculty vs. Adjunct coverage of Program courses: It is critical that most of the courses in our programs be taught by tenure track faculty members. Therefore, any course release decision should be made in consideration of Program needs in this respect.
 - c. Once a faculty member receives a course release under this policy, that faculty member will not be eligible to receive another proposal course release for the next 2 academic years.
6. All faculty requests will be submitted and reviewed in the following progression: Program Director, Department Chair, Associate Dean for Research, Dean.

Departmental Policy on Class Size Limitations

EDUC 403 RESEARCH

Passed at faculty meeting, September 1998, revised and passed at faculty meeting November 2019

Effective with the spring 2020 semester, enrollment in a single section of Educ 403 (Research) will be capped as follows:

On campus: Soft cap will be 16. Once soft cap is reached, additional students may be added with instructor permission to a hard cap of 20. Section size may not exceed 20.

Distance (Winter Session Only): Soft cap will be 12. Once soft cap is reached, additional students may be added with instructor permission to a hard cap of 15. Section size may not exceed 15.

Rationale:

The writing intensive nature of the Educ 403 course as currently offered warrants more individual student attention than can be given in a larger class of 28. This course is offered every semester and summer, providing ample opportunities for those who need it to register. Enrollments will be monitored each semester to ensure that enough sections of Educ 403 are offered to meet student needs and to ensure that students who need this course to graduate will be accommodated.

CPSY/EDUC 471 DIVERSITY AND MULTICULTURAL PERSPECTIVES

Passed at faculty meeting, December 16, 2005; edited June 2013

Based on recommendations made by the Diversity Task Force and the Chair's Council, effective with the Spring 2006 semester, enrollment in a single section of CPsy/Educ 471 (Diversity and Multicultural Perspectives) will be capped as follows:

On-campus: For courses that take place on Lehigh's campus, there will be a soft cap of 16. Once the soft cap is reached, with overrides additional students may be added up to a hard cap of 20. Section size may not exceed 20, however. Overrides will be coordinated by the course instructor and the Associate Chair for Students who will work together to determine which students should be added.

Off-campus: For courses offered off-campus through the international program, the soft cap will also be 16, but the hard cap is 25.

Rationales:

The goal of controlling section size for CPsy/Educ 471 (Diversity and Multicultural Perspectives) is to ensure course quality and assure that students have the proper environment in which to develop the intended awareness. There is much evidence that large sections inhibit such development and have a negative impact on both instructor and student learning and satisfaction.

The higher hard cap reflects differences in international enrollment timelines that make it difficult to determine sections size until at or near the beginning of the course. In addition, when the course is taught synchronously (using live online sessions), the distribution of students across time zones usually produces smaller groups for discussion, since synchronous online courses normally are offered in two sessions per week in order to address these time differences.

College Policy on Summer Teaching Compensation

December 18, 2012 (Policy for 2013), updated December 2017

Summer teaching is considered “off-load,” and faculty may or may not choose to participate. To be considered for summer teaching, all courses must be rostered by the Registrar and appear in the Summer Sessions Bulletin. The COE Dean, in consultation with the EHS Chair, determines summer compensation for faculty. To receive an exception to the following COE summer teaching compensation policy, the EHS Chair will seek permission to grant a waiver from the COE Dean. This policy includes all individuals asked to teach COE courses, regardless of their primary College affiliation and/or the program in which they will be teaching.

1. Active Lehigh University Faculty and COE Professors of Practice

The instructor in courses that have 9 to 23 students officially registered on the first day of a summer class will be compensated *no more* than \$2,300 per credit hour. (This is the same level of compensation as the previous four years).

For the instructors of courses with fewer than 9 students officially registered on the first day of a summer class, the maximum compensation will be according to the table below:

Students registered	Compensation per credit hour	Total for a 3-credit course
9	\$2300	\$6900
8	\$2133.33	\$6400
7	\$1833.33	\$5500
6	\$1500	\$4500
5	\$1433.33	\$4300
4	\$1133.33	\$3400
3	\$850	\$2550
2	\$566.67	\$1700

For the instructors of courses with more than 23 students officially registered on the tenth day of a summer class, the compensations will be scaled according to the table below:

Students registered	Compensation per credit hour
24-25	\$2500
26-27	\$2800
28-29	\$3000
Over 30	\$3200

2. Active Faculty from Other Universities

The compensation rate is the same as number 1. Adjunct faculty who teach during the summer sessions require the same approval as those teaching during the academic year. The EHS Chair is responsible for identifying which summer courses a non-Lehigh faculty member is teaching.

3. Adjunct and Retired Faculty

Adjunct and retired faculty will be compensated as follows, based on a 3-credit course:

Students Registered	1 st Time Adjunct Appt Total Compensation	Returning Adjunct Appt Total Compensation
5 and above	\$4,100	\$4,750
4	\$3,700	\$4,300
3	\$3,100	\$3,600
2	\$2,250	\$2,600

4. Co-taught Courses

If a course is listed for credit only and is co-taught with one or more faculty and/or speakers, panelists, etc., total compensation is calculated as though there is one instructor in the course. The salary compensation is determined for each individual as it pertains to his/her affiliation to Lehigh University but will not exceed \$2,300 per credit.

5. Cross-listed Courses

In the case of a cross-listed course, the college that incurs the cost of offering the course (including the payment of the instructor) receives all of the tuition revenue regardless of students' affiliations. Payment of the instructor follows the summer compensation policy of the college that contracted with the faculty member to offer the course. Faculty involved in a cross-listed college course should clear the expected compensation with the Chair and Dean of the appropriate college.

6. Supervision of Graduate Students

The University policy states that there is no compensation for the supervision of graduate students or graduate-student activities.

7. Courses Sponsored by Global Distance

For Global Distance-sponsored courses being taught at Lehigh, faculty will be compensated as per number 1 or 2 depending upon their affiliation with Lehigh University. The number of students needed per course for the compensation level follows number 1. For Global Distance-sponsored courses being taught overseas, the Global Distance Office will issue separate contracts for those faculty.

8. Summer Institutes Taught Overseas

Faculty teaching week-long institutes at an overseas site will be provided with a separate contract from COE's Global Distance Office. A minimum number of registered and paid-in-full participants are needed by a specified date for the institute to be offered. The cancellation of the institute will be done immediately following the registration deadline and faculty should not make any personal financial obligations to travel overseas until that date. A faculty member not consulting with the Global Distance Director (who then seeks approval from the COE Dean) prior to making financial commitments will not be reimbursed if the institute is canceled.

9. Special Course Offerings

Courses that have non-credit as well as credit students will need an exception for the additional payment of speakers, panelists, faculty, etc. See number 10 of this policy for the process on how to seek exceptions in COE. In addition, a budget will have to be submitted to the EHS Chair's office for approval by the COE Dean before the course is listed in the summer catalog.

10. Exceptions

The EHS Chair will seek approval from COE's Dean for exceptions to the COE Summer Teaching Compensation Policy. This should be in writing.

11. Benefits

Contact the Lehigh Human Resources Office for information concerning benefits for summer teaching or support.

COE Procedure for Offering Inter-Session Courses

RATIONALE

Graduate course offerings in one of the three potential inter-sessions (*winter term* = after end of fall semester, but before start of spring semester; *post-spring term* = after the end of spring term, but before start of summer session; *post-summer term* = after end of summer session, but before start of fall semester) are relatively new, and as of now, the ways in which they are scheduled and offered are not well defined. So far, the Registrar's Office has been minimally involved in such scheduling, deferring to departments and colleges to decide how to handle such scheduling. Such inter-session offerings may, however, hold great potential as we move forward, and COE programs may wish to consider offering more such courses in future. Our definitions of what constitutes an inter-session course, as well as the procedures described below, are not, therefore, university definitions and procedures. They apply only to proposed inter-session course offerings by College of Education faculty and programs.

The process by which courses are scheduled to be offered during fall, spring and summer terms is a collaborative one in which all COE program directors –and by extension, all program faculty— are involved in considering how offered courses complement one another. This consultative and cooperative process is designed to assure that required courses are offered when needed by students, and that courses outside the normal academic year do not draw down the number of students available to allow courses in fall or spring semesters to “make” (meet required student minimums).

If, however, courses are offered without this level of consultation, the potential exists for a course to be offered that has negative effects on other course offerings. For example, a course offered in an inter-session term might draw away students that would normally take the same course in spring and, thus, the spring section might not make.

Further, when we build our course schedules for fall, spring and summer terms, we are required to do so well in advance. This allows time for all concerned to consider implications of proposed course offerings and look for potential negative impacts. Presently, however, there is no early deadline for scheduling inter-session courses. This means they may be scheduled quite late, allowing less time for program directors to consider such implications, while also creating time-crunch hardships for our department coordinator (Donna Ball).

Thus, it makes most sense to have procedures for the approval of inter-session courses. Those procedures are detailed below and the next page contains the form for proposing inter-session course offerings.

PROCEDURES

Deadline for Submitting Proposed Course Schedule

Given that winter term inter-session courses most likely have implications for enrollments in spring courses, faculty wishing to teach winter term courses need first to submit a proposed schedule to their program directors for discussion by program faculty and then for program directors to submit for discussion by Chair's Council by the same deadline as employed for the *spring schedule*. Given that post-spring term and post-summer term inter-session courses most likely have implications for enrollments in summer and fall courses, faculty wishing to teach post-summer term courses need first to submit a proposed schedule to their program directors

for discussion by program faculty and then for program directors to submit for discussion by Chair's Council by the same deadline as employed for the *summer schedule*.

Consultation on Courses Affecting Students in More than One Program

If a faculty member or program proposes to offer a cross-program course that is likely one needed by students from multiple COE programs, such as a research methods course, he or she needs to consult in advance with the core faculty that normally teach such courses. This allows those core faculty to determine if there is likely to be any serious negative impact on enrollments in sections offered during spring and summer terms. Similarly, if a program or faculty member wishes to offer a course that might be marketed to students in another department/college, that other department/college should be consulted. Such consultation is designed to eliminate unintended effects on such courses that might, in turn, negatively affect students in multiple programs/departments.

Clarification of Intended Audience for Inter-session Courses

A faculty member or program proposing to offer an inter-session course needs to make clear whether the intended audience is *domestic students*, *students at a distance* or a *combination of the two*. Once approved, that course may only be offered to the student audience for which it was approved; additional sections for other audiences may not be added, since they may change the impacts on other courses and sections scheduled to be offered in fall, spring or summer.

COE Inter-session Course Offering Request Form

COURSE INFORMATION			
Inter-session for Course Offering (Check 1):	<input type="checkbox"/> Winter Term	<input type="checkbox"/> Post-spring Term	<input type="checkbox"/> Post-summer Term
Program Proposing Course Offering:			
Name of Proposed Instructor (write <i>adjunct</i> if not regular faculty):			
Course Number & Title:			
Proposed Course Start Date:			
Proposed Course End Date:			
Proposed Timeslot:			
When Course Last Offered:			
When Course Next Scheduled:			

PROPOSED DELIVERY METHOD	# OF SEATS
Completely Face-to-face?	
Completely Online?	
Blend of Face-to-face and Online?	
Total Number of Students (Hard Cap)	

RATIONALE FOR OFFERING THIS COURSE IN INTER-SESSION TERM

CROSS-PROGRAM IMPACT	ENTER X ON LEFT BELOW IF ANSWER TO QUESTION IS NO. ENTER REQUESTED DETAILS ON RIGHT BELOW IF ANSWER IS YES.	
QUESTION	NO	YES (In space below, please provide details.)
1. Is this a cross-program course or a course likely to be taken by students in more than one academic program, either within the COE or across colleges? (If so, which programs/depts?)		
2. Have you spoken with faculty who typically teach this course or consulted directors of other programs whose students are required or likely to take this course (If so, with whom)?		
3. Does offering this course have any likely impact on enrollment in other courses?		
4. Is there anything else unusual about this course offering?		

Program Director Endorsement:

Signature

Date

Department Chair Endorsement:

Signature

Date

(Approved by Chair's Council 9/10/15)

University Policy on Handling Adverse Weather Conditions

The university's adverse weather policy classifies employees into one of three Adverse Weather Staff Classifications:

1. **Essential Services Staff (ESS)** are required to report to campus and remain on campus during inclement weather and other emergency situations. They are defined as those needed to deliver student services and maintain campus facilities, campus safety, and security. These staff members ensure the health, safety, and well being of our students, given that Lehigh is primarily a residential university.
2. **Instructional Staff (IS)** includes exempt and nonexempt staff members needed in order to hold instruction.
3. **Non-Instructional Staff (NIS)** includes nonexempt and exempt staff members who do not directly support class instruction and are not essential to ensuring health, safety, and well being of students.

Unsure of your category? Your **Position Description (PD)** now includes your classification. To access your PD:

1. Log on to the Campus Portal
2. Select the Employee tab
3. Choose Position Description Information in the Human Resources channel (you'll need to scroll down to find the PD information)
4. Log into the PD Tool with your position number and ID (Human Resources can provide both of these numbers if you do not know them).

VARYING CONDITIONS, VARYING SCENARIOS

There are *five* possible scenarios that can happen during inclement weather. Decisions about these are made by the Provost, after consulting with Facilities Services.

These include:

1. The university remains open. All faculty and staff members are asked to report and classes will be held.
2. The university remains open and classes are held. Instructional Staff and Essential Services Staff will report at the normal time. To allow for snow removal, Non-Instructional Staff would have a delayed start time.
3. The university remains open and classes are held. Instructional Staff and Essential Services Staff are asked to report to work. Non-Instructional Staff are told not to report.
4. The university is closed and no classes are held. Essential Services Staff would report for work and Instructional Staff and Non-Instructional Staff would not have to report to work.
5. The university is closed early and classes are cancelled at which time Essential Services Staff would report for work or stay at work and Instructional Staff and Non-Instructional Staff would not report or leave work early.

It is important to note that the Provost is the only individual who makes the decision about campus operations in times of severe weather. Departments are not empowered to make individual *ad hoc* decisions to curtail university operations.

INFORMATION SOURCES

Employees can access updated information through the university's newswire at **610-758-NEWS (-6397)**. Every effort is taken to ensure that information on the voicemail, along with the radio stations and other venues, is updated by 6:30 a.m. on days of inclement weather.

We also encourage all employees to sign up for **LU-Alerts**, which provide text messages and email alerts regarding not only adverse weather closings, but also any potential emergency situations on campus. Go to the [LU-Alert page](#) on the Lehigh website to register.

If the university curtails administrative operations or cancels classes, the announcement will be made on local radio stations, on WFMZ-TV (Channel 69), and on the front page of Lehigh's internal website. Other online resources include the 69 News [website](#) and the [Reading Eagle](#).

Policy for Staff Working from Home During Inclement Weather

Adopted May 2019

In the event of inclement weather and in the absence of a University closing, the College of Education allows staff to work from home in lieu of taking PTO. Permission to work from home must be sought from your supervisor or supervisors. Note that if working from home, you need to be accessible by phone/zoom/email. Further, given the interpersonal nature of our work, please use this option judiciously.

In addition, the home computer must be running both anti-virus software (available for free from www.avast.com) and the Cisco AnyConnect VPN (available for free from <https://software.lehigh.edu>). Any Lehigh University resources must be accessed through LUApps (<https://luapps.lehigh.edu>). Do not download any data to your home computer. Instead, any files that require you to save/download to access must be saved to your H: or I: drives. Both drives are accessible via LUApps.

Please also be aware of Lehigh's Classification of Data which can be viewed here: <https://confluence.cc.lehigh.edu/display/EGO/Classification+of+Data+Table>

College Policies on Classes during Adverse Weather

EXCUSING STUDENT ABSENCES WHEN BUSES ARE NOT OPERATING

January 2006; Edited May 2013

As noted under the *University Policy on Handling Adverse Weather*, the Provost issues decisions on whether or not the university will remain open during adverse weather. On rare occasions when the university remains open in adverse weather, Lehigh buses may, however, cease to run, preventing some students from attending class. In such cases, the absences of these students are to be excused and they are to be given extensions for submission of assignments or completion of quizzes, tests or exams they missed by their absence.

The most up-to-date information on bus stoppages can be obtained by calling 610-758-1700 or by going online to: <http://www.lehigh.edu/~inubs/parking/routes.shtml>. After 4:30, this website is not updated until the next day.

INSTRUCTOR DECISIONS ON CANCELLING CLASSES IN ADVERSE WEATHER

The majority of College of Education classes meet on Mountaintop campus and, when there is adverse weather, conditions on Mountaintop can often be more treacherous than on lower campus, particularly in winter, when Mountaintop's slightly lower temperatures are more prone to produce icing. This problem may be further complicated by the fact that COE classes typically meet from 4:00-7:00 or 7:00-10:00pm, when plummeting winter temperatures or snow accumulations can produce increasingly dangerous driving conditions as the evening progresses.

There may be instances in which the university remains open, but instructors and students become concerned about personal safety. Instructors may find themselves fielding inquiries about whether COE evening classes are to be held under the conditions described above. And, since many students in COE graduate courses commute from some distance to reach campus, such inquiries may begin in early-to-mid-afternoon. In addition, conditions along the routes these students must drive may be substantially worse than the conditions on campus.

Clearly, instructors should meet their classes whenever possible, particularly when the provost has decided the university will remain open during adverse weather. That said, instructors and students are expected to behave rationally, including acting in responsible ways in terms of personal safety. If, in the judgment of a course instructor, weather conditions are so serious as to put the safety of the instructor or his/her students at great risk, the instructor may cancel a class. The expectation is that instructors will then reschedule the missed class for an alternate date.

Further, an instructor may say to his/her students that they should use their best judgment about the risk in coming to class under such conditions and decide accordingly. When an instructor has provided students with the ability to make such a judgment, he or she should then honor whatever decision the student makes, without penalizing that student in any way. This may entail rescheduling class presentations, providing extensions to course deadlines involving class activities, or otherwise modifying sequences or requirements to accommodate that absence.

Adjunct and Visiting Appointments

College Process for Adjunct Appointments

Added September 2013

Credentials

To qualify for adjunct instructor status the applicant should have a doctorate degree from an accredited institution in the field appropriate to which he/she will be teaching or equivalent credentials. While preference should be given to adjuncts who possess their doctorate in a field related to the course topic(s), non-doctoral-level adjuncts may also be appointed to teach provided their qualifications are matched to the curriculum content.

Vita

The applicant must provide a curriculum vitae.

Approval

At a Chair's Council meeting, the Program Director presents the vita and supplies information regarding the applicant and the initial course s/he is to teach. However, sometimes adjuncts need approval prior to a scheduled Chair's Council meeting. This usually occurs in the summer and during the winter break when there are no meetings. Sometimes courses are rostered with instructors listed as TBAs and the instructor is only found closer to the beginning of the semester. When this occurs, the Program Director sends an e-mail to the Chair and to the Department Coordinator, along with the vita and a short blurb indicating the suggested adjunct's credentials and course to be taught. The Chair's office via the Department Coordinator then sends this information to the Program Directors for their approval.

Term

All adjuncts will initially be appointed to a one-year term. After the first year, an adjunct then can be considered for subsequent 3-year terms contingent upon approval of Chair's Council.

Restriction

Adjuncts may not supervise a student in an independent study.

College Process for Adjunct Evaluations

Approved EHS Meeting March 14, 2008

1. Department administrative assistant summarizes all adjunct course evaluations.
2. Course evaluations are sent to adjuncts with an email from the associate department chair informing them to strengthen what they do well, while addressing student concerns and, if interested or necessitated due to a low evaluation, directing them to see the program director for advice about improving coursework.
3. Summary of course evaluations is sent to program directors.
 - Overall scores below 4.0 for course quality and effectiveness are "red flagged" by the associate department chair.
 - Program directors provide feedback to adjunct faculty with low evaluations.
4. Course syllabi of adjuncts are reviewed by the academic program; feedback provided by that program.
 - This activity can be independent of or done in conjunction with "red flagged" adjuncts.
5. Chair will monitor course evaluation scores of adjuncts over time. Repeated low scores will result in adjuncts not being approved.

Feedback loop (e.g., program directors report back to chair regarding feedback given to adjuncts)

COE Procedures for Visiting Appointments

This document describes the types of non-paid individuals who receive visiting appointments, addresses what they must provide and what Lehigh agrees to provide, and lays out the procedures by which such appointments are made.

TYPES

There are three different types of individuals from other universities, agencies and organizations who might wish to come to Lehigh to work with you. These include *Visiting Scholars*, *Visiting Pre-doctoral Research Associates*, and *Fulbright Visiting Student Researchers*. All are non-paid appointments of specified duration and require many of the very same accommodations here in the COE. Each title, however, conveys something different, is used for a specific purpose and has its own appointment/invitation letter. The differences among the three are described below.

TITLE	DESCRIPTION
Visiting Scholar	An individual that holds a doctoral degree and is requesting to come to Lehigh to further his/her research. May be under Fulbright funding.
Visiting Pre-doctoral Research Associate	An individual that does not yet hold a doctorate and is requesting to come to Lehigh to conduct research in his or her area that likely will contribute to completion of his or her doctoral work.
Fulbright Visiting Student Researcher	An individual identified and supported under Fulbright funding who is requesting to come conduct research (not coursework) at Lehigh.

EXPECTATIONS OF CANDIDATES

There are five expectations for all candidates for visiting appointments. They are expected to:

1. Demonstrate English proficiency/fluency by one of 3 accepted methods: TOEFL within 2 years, study at U.S. higher education institution within 2 years, or documented video or face-to-face interview. If an interview is used, host must complete approved documentation form (attached)
2. Provide all of their funding. Lehigh should not be expected to cover travel, housing, medical insurance, or any other expenses related to coming to do work at Lehigh. Candidates will be required to provide evidence of this support. If the candidate wishes to take coursework here, he/she will be expected to pay the requisite tuition. Unpaid attendance at classes is limited to no more than two to three visits per course and such visits may only take place at the explicit advance invitation of the course instructor.
3. Identify in advance a suitable COE faculty host/mentor and secure that person's agreement to sponsor them. This agreement must happen at the individual level; an academic program as a whole may not sponsor a visiting appointment without such naming an individual host.
4. Identify a specific period of time during which they wish to be at Lehigh under the visiting appointment.
5. Identify the specific topic/research objective they wish to pursue while at Lehigh.

WHAT LEHIGH PROVIDES

The College of Education agrees to provide the following to those holding visiting appointments:

1. Library access and interlibrary loan privileges
2. Access to public computers
3. Lehigh email account
4. Shared work space. [Where possible, we will seek to have visiting scholars share space with others who hold a doctorate, while we will seek to have all pre-doctoral visitors share a common space that may also be used by graduate students.]

HOW TO REQUEST A VISITING APPOINTMENT

Visiting appointments are issued by the dean, in consultation with the department chair. In order to request an appointment, a faculty member completes the attached Visiting Appointment Request Form and submits it to the associate dean who will then take it through the approval process with the dean and chair. Only the dean has the authority to make the final decision.

Please note that this form requires that the program director (at minimum) be informed of the proposed visiting appointment. The program director is not, however, asked to endorse or approve such appointments.

As part of the request packet, you need to prepare the appropriate letter of invitation/appointment that will be transferred to the dean's stationery later for his/her signature, should your request be approved. The three different types of letter templates are available as Word documents.

Requests for visiting appointments should be submitted *at least three weeks* in advance of when the invitation/appointment letter is to be issued. Otherwise, it may be difficult or impossible to garner the necessary approvals in time.

If there is anything unusual in the nature of the request, or you are unsure how to proceed, please consult the associate dean.

FACTORS CONSIDERED IN MAKING DECISION

While the dean's decision may be based on many considerations, several factors are likely to play a greater role in that decision. These include:

- Closeness of the match between the candidate's research interest and the mentor/host's research agenda
- Number of other visiting appointments this mentor/host and other program mentor/hosts would be working with during the proposed appointment period
- Number of other visiting appointments the college would be hosting during the proposed appointment period
- Extent to which hosting this candidate is likely to enhance host/mentor and program productivity and scholarly output (as opposed to drawing against faculty resources that might be better used in other ways)
- Availability of shared workspace

POST-DEAN APPROVAL PROCESS

If the dean approves the request, the dean's office will notify both the appropriate program director and faculty host/mentor and will issue the appointment letter. If the appointed visiting person is coming from outside the United States, the mentor/host faculty member will then work with the appropriate dean's office staff member to see that the visiting person's information is entered into the online international visa system employed by the Office of International Scholars (OIS).

COE VISITING APPOINTMENT REQUEST FORM					
Name of Candidate:			Candidate's Email Address:		
Home Institution/Organization:			Home Instit./Org. Country:		
Proposed App't Start Date:			Proposed App't End Date:		
Date Request Submitted:			Date App't Letter Needed:		
Type of Appointment (Check one)	Visiting Scholar		Individual holding doctoral degree requesting to come to Lehigh to further his/her research. May be under Fulbright funding.		
	Visiting Pre-doctoral Research Associate		Individual not yet holding doctorate asking to come to Lehigh to conduct research likely contributing to doctoral completion		
	Fulbright Visiting Student Researcher		Individual identified/supported by Fulbright requesting to come to Lehigh to conduct research (not coursework)		
COE Faculty Host/Mentor:			COE Academic Program:		
Proposed Research Topic (Title and brief description)					
Please attach candidate vita/resume.					
How well candidate's proposed research matches host/mentor's research (Check one.):	<input type="radio"/> EXACTLY	<input type="radio"/> VERY CLOSELY	<input type="radio"/> CLOSELY	<input type="radio"/> RELATED	<input type="radio"/> TANGENTIAL
☑ Confirmations (Please check one box on right for each question and explain any NOs in the comment box below.)				YES	NO
Has candidate's English proficiency been confirmed/documented? If so, indicate how below				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
				Attach documentation.	
Will COE host/mentor be on campus during entire proposed appointment period?				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Only visiting appointment with whom host/mentor would work during proposed period?				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has program director been informed of this request?				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does candidate have full financial support for duration of appointment?				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does candidate hold a doctoral degree?				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Will candidate wish to take coursework for credit while at Lehigh?				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mentor/Host Comments/ Explanations:					
Associate Dean Confirmation					
		COMMENTS	SIGNATURE	DATE	
Dep't Chair Confirmation:					
		COMMENTS	SIGNATURE	DATE	
Dean's Decision:	<input type="radio"/> YES	<input type="radio"/> NO			
		COMMENTS	SIGNATURE	DATE	
Date Letter Issued:					

CERTIFICATION OF ENGLISH FLUENCY
for
J-1 Exchange Visitors & Scholars

Department name:	
Host Faculty Member's Name:	
J-1 Exchange Visiting Scholar Name:	

Method of English fluency certification used (check one):

☐

A recognized English language test
(Find a copy of the exam score report attached.)

☐

Signed documentation from an academic institution or English language school
(Transcript documentation attached.)

☐

A documented interview conducted by the sponsoring LU faculty member either in-person or by videoconferencing, using Lehigh's fluency certification process and documented by attached completed form.

Videoconference Information and Certification

A minimum of 5 questions from at least 3 of the five topic areas below should be generated by the faculty member interviewer. These questions should be asked of the scholar during the interview or videoconference to assist the faculty member in making a clear determination of the Scholar's English proficiency. Since spontaneity is a key aspect of judging fluency, avoid using the same questions with all interviewees. Asking probing, open-ended questions that call for the scholar to generate dynamic and less predictable responses is suggested. Sample questions are provided only as examples, faculty are at liberty to generate other questions under each topic.

Topic Areas and Sample Questions

1. Daily life in US (interactions with Americans, shopping, eating, apartment living, hobbies, traveling)
Ex: "If you were invited to a dinner party with only American people, what two topics of conversation would you like to talk about? Why?"
2. Navigating American culture and customs (academic and social)
Ex: "What do you think will be the most confusing or annoying American custom that you will encounter during your stay in the US? Why do you think so?"
3. Aspirations/goals for time at Lehigh and in US (professional and personal)
Ex: "In what ways will your time and work at Lehigh university impact the direction of your research agenda when you return home?"
4. Current activities (professional and personal)
Ex: "How has the way you balance work responsibilities with life responsibilities changed in the last two years? Why?"
5. Other international or institutional experiences (as relevant)
Ex: "Describe for me how you spent your time at institutions other than your own and the nature of the challenges during those visits."

Date of video conference interview: _____

List five of the questions that the host faculty member asked the scholar during the videoconference:

Q1:	
Q2:	
Q3:	
Q4:	
Q5:	

Host faculty member decision (check one):

In terms of completing the proposed activities during the time of his/her period at Lehigh...



☐

Scholar is sufficiently fluent in English.

☐

Scholar's English proficiency is below the necessary level.

Host faculty member's signature:	
Host faculty member name (printed):	
Date signed:	

 Forward this completed and signed certification form to: Office of International Students and Scholars, Coxe Hall. 

Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment

College of Education Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

EXPECTATIONS FOR TENURE

(Approved May 9, 2014)

The College of Education's Promotion and Tenure Criteria are intended guidelines to help faculty members attain levels of performance necessary for advancement. Lehigh University's standard for tenure and promotion is excellence in all three areas of scholarship, teaching and service. A successful faculty member will meet this standard by achieving a demonstrated balance of excellence in scholarship, teaching and service. Expectations for tenure are described below.

Scholarship

The successful candidate for tenure will provide clear evidence that he/she has demonstrated excellence in scholarship. The fundamental expectation is that the candidate will produce a focused program of peer-reviewed scholarship that advances knowledge and is consistent with the rigors and expectations of one's specific or interdisciplinary field. Because, a tenure decision represents a long-term university investment in a faculty member, the candidate must demonstrate scholarly leadership and national / international recognition in one's field. The candidate must also demonstrate the *potential* for continued and sustained productivity across one's career.

Excellence in scholarship is judged through internal and external (i.e., outside reviewers) evaluation. Consideration is given to each of the following indicators:

- *Peer-reviewed scholarship.* Because peer-reviewed or refereed publications provide a means of external evaluation of one's work, strong consideration is given to peer-reviewed products in one's portfolio in relation to non-peer reviewed work. Although the candidate's portfolio may consist of multiple scholarly products including non-peer reviewed work that can have an important impact on one's field, candidates are expected to demonstrate a strong record of peer-reviewed publications.
- *Knowledge-generating scholarship.* Importance is also given to scholarship that adds knowledge to the field and/or stimulates or encourages growth in new directions. Examples of such scholarship include empirical research and conceptual articles that advance theory, uniquely synthesize research, or provide new models for the application of innovative practices. Although publications in peer-reviewed practitioner-oriented outlets that translate or disseminate research or best practices for implementation for practitioners are valued, this type of work should not be the majority of one's work.
- *Productivity.* Although quality is the primary indicator of excellence, the quantity of one's work must be sufficient to demonstrate impact, scholarly merit, and a continuous and sustained scholarly commitment to one's field. To evaluate productivity, consideration includes the number or rate of publications per year, continuous publication across years and products that are developed and under review.

- *Quality and Impact.* The quality and impact of candidate's work is evaluated using multiple indicators. These indicators may include: (a) first authorships, (b) the rigor, sophistication, and innovation of published work, (c) the quality of publication dissemination outlets (e.g., reputable journals and book publishers in one's field, impact and/or national rankings of journals, presentations at national and international conferences), (d) the emerging record of citations and other evidence that one's work is influencing other scholars in the field and (e) external reviewer letters attesting to the relative contributions of one's scholarship to the field. At the time of tenure, the expectation is that the candidate's contributions are receiving national / international recognition.
- *Independent Scholarship.* Although continued collaboration with one's former graduate advisor or post-graduate mentor is helpful in the early stages of one's career, the candidate must demonstrate leadership in generating new projects that do not depend upon that former advisor's or mentor's program of research. Independence may be determined by first-authored publications and/or sufficient evidence of publications that do not involve one's former advisor. When continued collaboration with one's former advisor or mentor is necessary because of the prominence or centrality of that former advisor or mentor in the field, the candidate is expected to have a distinct research agenda over which he or she exerts leadership.
- *External Funding.* Although external funding is not required for tenure, external funding at the national or international level that supports scholarship or training efforts may provide another indicator of leadership and national or international recognition.

Teaching

Lehigh faculty members are expected to be highly effective teachers and mentors, who provide excellent instruction and guidance to students through courses, the supervision of student research (e.g., dissertations, master's theses) and other collaborative efforts (e.g. co-authorships in publications, novel projects, and presentations). Teaching excellence is judged through multiple indicators including:

- Well-developed course syllabi, which reflect sound pedagogical and research-based practices in one's field and provide sufficiently rigorous and meaningful learning experiences (e.g., course content, assignments) for students.
- Evidence of innovation in course instruction (e.g., unique learning experiences for students, the development of curriculum or new learning materials, novel development and/or use of technologies).
- A consistent record of strong student end-of course evaluations across courses.
- Reflective teaching as evidenced by self-evaluation and responsiveness to student and faculty feedback for improvement.

- Demonstrable leadership in supervising quality graduate student projects and research (e.g., doctoral qualifying projects, dissertations, master's theses) as chair or a member of a student's committee.
- Evidence of promoting students' professional development by way of co-authorship on peer-reviewed publications, projects and presentations.

Service

Because the successes of the university and individual professions require engaged commitment and leadership, service to the University and one's profession are expected. Both the quality of one's service and the quantity of service activities are important consideration for tenure.

With regard to university service, faculty are expected to show a willingness to contribute to and demonstrate leadership in the operation of the academic enterprise. Service activities to the university during the early pre-tenure years are typically limited to participation in program activities and departmental activities to allow pre-tenured faculty to establish their research and teaching agendas. By the time the candidate approaches the tenure decision, growth is expected in the form of greater participation and contribution to department, college, and university committees. Although chairing such a committee is not expected for tenure, demonstrated leadership and active participation are expected.

Professional service is intertwined with scholarship as well as the candidate's and university's national visibility and recognition. Pre-tenure faculty members are expected to demonstrate increasing growth in leadership and engagement in service activities commensurate with their professional development and years in rank. Quality indicators of professional service activities include membership/leadership in committees of professional organizations; holding office in professional organizations at the state, regional, or national/international level; presentations of national-level workshops, and editorial work, including appointments on journal editorial boards and ad hoc reviewing.

College of Education Promotion and Tenure Criteria

April 1995, Revised October 2002, May 2014, October 2014

A. Research and Scholarship

Primary Importance I¹

- Publication of specific research studies or theoretical expositions as a book or monograph
- Publication of research studies in peer-reviewed national or international journals²
- Publication of nonresearch articles in peer-reviewed national or international journals that generate new knowledge
- Publication of nonresearch articles in peer-reviewed national or international journals that translate research to practice
- Publication of articles in renowned national or international periodicals that have significant impact on one's field but are nonrefereed
- Publication of textbooks. (A textbook should either extend knowledge of one's field beyond what a journal article can do, promote best practices in the field, or do both.)
- Research, training, and/or demonstration grants, contracts, or sub-contracts that are funded by an external agency using a refereed process
- Patent granted for educational product
- Technology product that is an instructional and/or a professional resource that (1) is designed and developed for use by an audience broader than simply Lehigh learners; (2) supports, demonstrates, or advances one's research agenda; (3) has been validated by being recognized by a national or international reviewing agency/organization or distributed commercially at the national or international level; and (4) is comprehensive, covering much material (breadth) and including a wide range of high quality materials and/or activities (richness).
- Publication of a psychological or educational test which has undergone a refereed process

Primary Importance II

- Chapters in edited textbooks, research volumes and books of readings.
- Validated instrument for assessing or categorizing technology products
- Paper published in conference proceedings (peer reviewed only)
- Editorship of a book of readings or special issue of a journal that has undergone a refereed process
- Research, training, and/or demonstration grants or contracts that have been funded by an external agency using a non-refereed process

Secondary Importance

- Peer-reviewed or invited presentations at nationally or internationally recognized professional meetings.
- Paper published in conference proceedings (except peer reviewed)
- Publication in peer-reviewed journals of nonrefereed articles (for example, editorials; comments; reviews of tests, books, or software)

- Publication of research or non-research articles in peer-reviewed journals that are not nationally or internationally recognized
- Internal faculty research grants
- Technology product that is an instructional and/or a professional resource that (1) is designed for use by an audience broader than simply Lehigh learners; (2) supports, demonstrates, or advances one's research agenda; (3) has regional or state validation through multiple external citations/recommendations/linkages to the product and/or formal recognition by a regional or state agency or organization; and (4) is moderately comprehensive, covering little material (breadth) and/or using a limited range of materials and/or those materials are of medium quality (richness).
- Submission of a final technical report on a funded project or an evaluation report on an externally funded project.
- Submission of grant or contract proposal to an external agency that employs a competitive review

Tertiary Importance

- Publication of supplemental teaching material
- Publication of research or non-research articles in journals that are edited and/or refereed by non-academic peers (This category includes articles in newsletters of national organizations, letters in newspapers or articles in popular periodicals or trade journals, and the COE Theory to Practice.).
- Presentations at local/state/regional professional meetings
- Technology product that is an instructional and/or professional resource and (1) is designed for use by an audience broader than simply Lehigh learners; (2) supports, demonstrates, or advances one's research agenda; (3) has local or no recognition (validation); and (4) is not very comprehensive, covering little material (breadth) and/or its activities are not particularly rich.
- Submission of an annual report as a requirement for continuation of an externally funded project

B. Teaching/Advising

Primary Importance I

- Teaching performance in didactic courses, seminars, and supervision of practice. (Note: Courses which require new preparations or courses which are newly developed and implemented and which meet specifically defined department or program goals or needs as stated in the departmental plan are weighted more heavily than are routine course assignments.)
- Chair, completed dissertation
- National teaching or mentoring award
- State/local or university teaching or mentoring award
- Development and delivery of a new online learning course

- Implementation of innovative approaches to teaching and learning (for example, modularization of courses, appropriate use of online learning, incorporation of constructivist learner-centered activities, incorporation of unusual scheduling flexibility to address learner needs, exemplary use of newer technologies in teaching and learning), or design and development of a technology product intended primarily for use with Lehigh learners or which does not support, demonstrate or advance one's research agenda.
- Mentoring student publication or presentation at a national or international conference of work conducted at Lehigh

Primary Importance II

- Development of a summer institute or continuing education program that generates revenues
- Teaching classes markedly larger than the departmental norm during the probationary period
- Advising student loads markedly larger than departmental norm during the probationary period
- Mentoring student publication or presentation at state, regional, or local conferences of work conducted at Lehigh
- Assigned consultation to a local school district, agency, counseling center, or the like as part of regular academic duties
- Chair, completed qualifying project
- Consultant, statistics/research design in the COE for research project, dissertation, qualifying project, or grant
- Member, dissertation committee

Secondary Importance

- Teaching of cross-program or cross-department courses that serve the college or university
- Teaching an independent study course
- Teaching apprentice teaching
- Member, qualifying project committee

C. Service³

Professional Service

Primary Importance I

- Member (or chair) of national or international review panel (for example, U.S. Dept. of Education, NIMH, NSF)
- Editor, refereed journal, book series, or renowned national or international periodical that has significant impact on one's field but is not refereed.
- Elected officer, national or international organizations
- Advisory committee member or consultant to a major research, training, or demonstration grant outside of the university
- Advisor or consultant to a government, government-affiliated agency, or non-governmental organization

Primary Importance II

- Associate editor, refereed journal
- Chair, national or international committee
- Chair, national or international conference

- Serving on a dissertation committee at another university

Secondary Importance

- Editorial or review board member, refereed journal
- Chair, regional/state committee
- Member, national or international committee
- Editor, newsletter, communiqué, or column
- Chair, state/local conference
- Editor, computer news group; computer bulletin board
- Site visitor for APA or another accrediting body

Tertiary Importance

- Ad hoc reviewer, refereed journal or book series
- Editorial board member, nonrefereed journal
- Member, regional/state committee
- Reviewer of presentation proposals for international/national conferences

University Service

Primary Importance I

- Chair, major university committee (for example, FCC, GRC, Personnel, FFPOC)
- Program Director
- Chair or major leadership role in COE accreditation or external review

Primary Importance II

- Chair, other university committee
- New major, non-grant funding which supports departmental students
- Ongoing consultation to Centennial School
- Program admissions coordinator

Secondary Importance

- Other new non-grant funding which supports departmental students
- Chair, college committee
- Coordinator of minority recruitment
- Practicum coordinator

Tertiary Importance

- Director, existing departmental grant
- Member, university committee
- Member, college committee
- Occasional consultation or inservice to Centennial School

Community Service

- National training or consultation
 - State/local consultation
 - Liaison with state or regional organization or school district
 - State/local workshop or inservice session
-

Footnotes to Promotion and Tenure Criteria

1. Publication in peer-reviewed national or international journals is required for tenure and promotion. It is the quality of this work that is important. While the number of such publications one should have cannot be quantified, an average of fewer than one publication per year is risky. At least three methods are available to evaluate the quality of a candidate's overall publications: (a) how often the candidate's work has been cited (for example, listings in the Social Sciences Citation Index); (b) the rejection rates of the journals in which the candidate publishes; and (c) invitations to the candidate to serve on editorial boards.

Research and nonresearch articles are both highly valued. For example, literature reviews, guidelines for teaching practice, and conceptual articles are all valued, provided they are published in peer-reviewed national or international journals or in renowned non-refereed journals. A candidate may make a case that a non-peer-reviewed national or international journal is renowned and therefore comparable to a peer-reviewed journal by documenting that journal's circulation, rejection rate, and likely impact on the field.

While both research and nonresearch articles are highly valued, because candidates are graduate faculty guiding doctoral students, the overall record of publications presented for tenure must include research articles. While the overall record may have a practitioner-focus or be weighted towards nonresearch articles, an absence of articles reflecting research comparable to that expected of student dissertations places the faculty member at risk.

Research articles may be experimental or nonexperimental. Both true experimental and quasi-experimental (group or single subject design) research are highly valued. Nonexperimental research may use qualitative methods, quantitative methods, or a blend of the two methodologies; all three approaches are highly valued.

The primary criteria for an article being a "research article" are (a) investigation of one or more research questions; (b) using a research design (experimental or nonexperimental design) and rigorous methodology; and (c) collection of data to answer the questions posed. Candidates are encouraged to highlight their research publications in presenting their credentials.

2. JOURNALS — The quality of the journal, not the method of delivery (print or online), is the key issue here. When submitting evidence, the faculty member needs to demonstrate that the journal is edited and/or refereed by academic peers, not simply by graduate students or others.
3. It is understood that there is a distinction between the level of an activity within the service hierarchy and the quality of performance of that activity. Excellence in service can occur at any level. It is also understood that involvement in activities at the higher levels, while expected from senior faculty, is not typical for pre-tenure faculty. In those instances where pre-tenure faculty are active at higher levels, their case is credited accordingly.

Lehigh University College of Education (COE) Statement on Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor

Promotion to the rank of professor in the Lehigh University College of Education (COE) is based upon demonstrated leadership and impact upon one's field. Contributions are viewed in the aggregate with respect to overall impact. Promotion to professor is based upon quality, level of accomplishment, commitment, and impact of teaching, scholarship and service, beyond that demonstrated for promotion to associate professor.

Teaching must show mastery, mentoring and progress of students, leadership in instructional practice, quality and level of interaction with students and/or significant contributions to field-relevant and/or interdisciplinary pedagogy.

Scholarship for promotion to professor should reflect a specific line of continuous research that is influencing one's disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary field of study and should include "top-tier" peer-reviewed professional journals and publication outlets. External funding is a strong indicator of impact, but is not a requirement for promotion to professor. Field differences in the value of external funding should be considered in decisions about promotion to professor. External funding should result in dissemination of findings, generating new knowledge, innovations in education or training, and/or impact on policy or procedures. Impact or influence on the direction of one's disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary field is typically reflected in such things as positive comments by external reviewers and the frequency of citations of one's contributions by colleagues at comparable institutions, recognizing one's work as having generated new knowledge or created novel inquiry paradigms, frameworks, or technologies.

Service should reflect a balance of "distinguished" university roles (e.g., key committees) and professional service at the national or international level (e.g., office in professional organization, grant panel review membership, etc.).

There is no one combination of accomplishments or one formula that automatically results in promotion to professor. Instead, promotion to professor is a matter of judgment about the substance, quality and impact of contributions. The professors in the COE will consider each portfolio with respect to its unique strengths and its balance of high-level accomplishments, and those faculty members may differ in their judgments. Time in rank is not a consideration in decisions about promotion to professor.

Types of evidence of accomplishment for promotion to professor in the COE are detailed in the document, *Criteria for Promotion and Tenure* (revised October, 2002).

Dossier Preparation for Reappointment Reviews and Promotion and Tenure in the College of Education

Approved November 11, 2016; modified for Lyterati on December 15, 2017; modified for practicum courses March 16, 2019; modified October 15, 2019

This document describes dossier or portfolio preparation for reappointment reviews and for promotion and tenure (i.e., Assistant to Associate Professor, Associate to full Professor).

Typically, **pretenure faculty** work under 3-year contracts and, therefore, are evaluated by the COE faculty and the Provost every 3 years for reappointment consideration. For most, this means that you will need to prepare and submit reappointment dossier materials in year 3. Your promotion and tenure review will occur in year 6, unless you request an earlier review or are eligible for a later review based on R&P. For more information about the annual timeline for reappointment and promotion and tenure activities, refer to the Provost's website at <http://www.lehigh.edu/~inprv/faculty/promotion.html>

In addition to the reappointment reviews, the College of Education also performs "annual reviews" of dossier materials in years 1, 2, 4, and 5. The intent behind these more informal reviews is to provide feedback to the candidate on his/her progress in the years between reappointments. The materials to be submitted for annual review will be the same as the reappointment review materials.

Tenured faculty at the **Associate Professor** Rank are reviewed "triennially" or every three years from the time of initial appointment. The candidate **must** be considered for promotion to full in the 9th year in rank. A tenured associate professor may postpone a scheduled required promotion review for one to three years by submitting a written request to the dean through the department chair, with notification to the provost. Note: If postponed by one year, the faculty member will be required to submit their materials in the following year, and not three years from the postponement. Triennial reviews will continue until promotion to Full Professor is achieved.

The reappointment and tenure/promotion dossier should consist of a separate summary section in the E-portfolio followed by all supporting documentation, in as many additional sections in the E-portfolio as necessary.

Lyterati Section in E-Portfolio

The Lyterati section includes the following materials: 1) personal statement, 2) vita, and 3) summary of accomplishments. The following information needs to be in each section:

1. Personal Statement of your personal goals and accomplishments in the areas of research, teaching, and service (may not exceed 10 pages total)

The overall purpose of the scholarship, teaching, and service personal statement is to help faculty determine if the candidate has met the criteria in P&T as well as provide a context for understanding his/her accomplishments and goals for the future. The candidate may also wish to describe how his/her achievements in these areas are integrated or overlap. There are three personal statement sections in this document that address scholarship, teaching, and service separately. The personal statement should begin with a short introduction and be written in a way that permits educated laypersons to understand the significance of the candidate's work in each area.

Research and Scholarship section: The research and scholarship section should provide a general narrative of the candidate's scholarly interests, achievements, goals, and methodologies. While this statement can take various forms, the purpose is to provide a clear indication of the substance of the

candidate's current and future scholarship and its contribution to her or his academic discipline. It should also include the impact of the candidate's own contributions in these areas (e.g., when collaborating with others, specify the candidate's contribution). For specific content guidelines, see the Provost webpage.

Growth: For tenure and promotion, the research and scholarship personal statement must show that the candidate has had a significant positive impact on his/her field over the 6 years of pretenure service. Promotion to Full Professor is based upon demonstrated leadership and impact upon one's field and is based upon the quality, level of accomplishment, commitment, and impact of research and scholarship beyond that demonstrated for promotion to associate professor.

Teaching and Mentoring section: The teaching and mentoring statement should discuss the candidate's achievements, goals, and methodologies. This statement should include the candidate's teaching philosophy and explanations of why he or she teaches various courses in a particular way. The candidate should also discuss her/his contributions in course and curriculum development and emphasize the ways in which her/his courses contribute to the mission of her/his department, program(s), and the university as a whole. In addition, the candidate should discuss how he/she mentors students outside the classroom to engage in research, scholarship, and professionalism.

Growth: Over the 6 years of pretenure service, candidates for tenure and promotion must provide materials that demonstrate they are effective teachers in the classroom and strong mentors who foster professional development among their students. Promotion to Full Professor is based upon teaching that shows mastery, mentoring, and progress of students, leadership in instructional practice, quality and level of interaction with students and/or significant contributions to field-relevant and/or interdisciplinary pedagogy.

Service section: The service statement should cover the candidate's achievements and goals in service including university service (e.g., program, department, college, and university-wide) and professional service (e.g., leadership in professional organizations, reviewing for journals and conferences). Your statement should focus on your service contribution and engagement.

Growth: As with teaching and scholarship, the university expects candidates for promotion and tenure to demonstrate increasing levels of professional service over the 6 years of pretenure service. Promotion to Full Professor is based upon service that reflects a balance of "distinguished" university roles (e.g., key committees) and professional service at the national or international level (e.g., office in professional organization, grant panel review membership, etc.).

2. Vita

Include a personal curriculum vita that follows the provost's guidelines (see Provost webpage and attached). That document includes all the components that need to be included in the vita. Be sure to adhere to category order that is listed.

Below is a list of items on the vita that you should pay particular attention to. Please note that each category from the vita is not included below.

a. For Publications:

Articles in refereed journals. Provide full citation, including pagination. Peer-reviewed articles and invited articles should be identified.

- List articles that have been accepted for publication as "in press" and provide DOI if available (for example Online First articles).

Working papers (include status of paper).

- List manuscripts that are currently “in revision” for a journal. This includes manuscripts with a decision of “accept with revision” or “revise and resubmit.” List articles that have been submitted to a journal and are currently under review as “in review”. You may also wish to list manuscripts that are “in preparation”. For example, you may have a conference paper that is currently being prepared for submission to a journal.
- b. Research funding and training grants are to be broken down into the following categories in this order:
- Competitively awarded research grants (including any collaborators).
 - Non-competitive research grants (including any collaborators).
 - Competitively awarded training grants (including any collaborators).
 - Non-competitive training grants (including any collaborators).
 - Institutional/equipment grants (including any collaborators).
 - Contract/consulting work (including any collaborators).

Competitively awarded research grants are awarded through a foundation, federal agency (for example, NSF, NIH or US DOE) or state agency. Institutional grants are funded projects that Lehigh (or another university or institution) provides you; these grants are reviewed internally at Lehigh.

Be sure to list your specific role for each of your grants. For example, PI, co-PI, research scientist, etc.

- c. University Service
Use the following headings in this order:
- Service to university.
 - Service to college.
 - Service to interdisciplinary programs.
 - Service to department.
- d. Professional Service. Use the following headings in this order:
- Office and committee memberships held in professional organizations.
 - Other non-university committees, commissions, panels, etc.
 - International activities not listed above.
 - Community service
 - Other.

3. Summary of Accomplishments

In this portion of the E-portfolio, you will supply specific details on how your accomplishments match the College of Education Promotion and Tenure criteria (see attached). Include summary documentation in the E-Portfolio for the following areas: Research and Scholarship, Teaching and Mentoring, and Service. Include the following details in each area:

Research and Scholarship: This section consists of a summary of research and scholarship accomplishments according to the COE P&T criteria (Section A), information on the journals in which you are published, and a report of works cited (after the second reappointment review).

- COE Promotion and Tenure Criteria: Break out research and scholarship accomplishments according to Primary Importance I, Primary Importance II, Secondary Importance, and Tertiary Importance. If you have nothing to report in an accomplishment area, there is no need to list it. Also, note that *manuscripts under review* are not considered Primary Importance I, Primary

Importance II, Secondary Importance, or Tertiary Importance so should not be included under accomplishments.

- **Journal information:** Supply information on the journals in which you are published including: name of journal, acceptance rates, and journal impact where possible according to your field. Please avoid N/A for acceptance rates. If the journal's acceptance rate is not published on the journal's Web site, please contact the editor of the journal to obtain this information.
- **Works cited:** After your second reappointment review, include a summary table that reports the total number of your works cited per article through Social Citation Index and / or Google Scholar. Your summary table should not include self-citations or dissertations. In your file, you may also include the H-index without your self-citations. Be sure to indicate the sources of your works cited. If using Google Scholar, include a copy of your "My Citations" page from Google Scholar in your portfolio.

Teaching and Mentoring: This section consists of a summary of teaching and mentoring accomplishments according to the COE P&T criteria (Section B) and an overall summary of courses taught.

- **COE Promotion and Tenure Criteria:** Break out teaching accomplishments according to Primary Importance I, Primary Importance II, and Secondary Importance.
- **Summary of Courses Taught:**
 1. Provide a summary of courses taught **organized by semester**. This summary should include:
 - Name of course
 - Any special circumstances (e.g. taught online, new prep, large enrollments, cross program, service course).
 - Number enrolled.
 - **For all courses up until Summer 2018:** Mean course evaluation ratings for instructor, course quality, and learned a great deal (items 1, 2, and 14) per course.
 - **For all courses from Fall 2018 - present:** Mean course evaluation ratings for presented content in an organized manner, teaching methods contributed to my understanding of the course material, responsive when I had difficulties or questions, constructive feedback, assignments provided opportunities for participative learning within the course, and course increased my knowledge of the subject matter (items I1-6) per course.

Note: Do not list I1-6 evaluation items for practicum courses.

2. Provide the number of graduate and undergraduate students you advised each year; include your academic advisees that are non-research directed.

Service: The service section consists of a summary of accomplishments according to the COE P&T criteria (Section C).

- **COE Promotion and Tenure Criteria:** Break out service accomplishments according to professional, university, and community service. Within those categories further classify accomplishments according to Primary Importance I, Primary Importance II, Secondary Importance, and Tertiary Importance.

Supporting Documentation Section of your E-Portfolio

In your supporting documentation section of your E-portfolio, supply evidence of your accomplished work in scholarship and teaching. Generally no additional documentation is required for service accomplishments.

Research and Scholarship Documentation

Include copies of all scholarly works to date organized according to COE P&T document/ accomplishments that are listed as Primary Importance I and Primary Importance II. Where possible, include actual copies of your published work. Manuscripts may be used for works accepted and “in press.” You may also include materials that have been submitted and are “in review” in order to demonstrate scholarly works in progress. Secondary Importance and Tertiary Importance scholarly works/supplemental materials do not need to be included into your portfolio.

You do not need to include in your E-portfolio funded grant proposals from an external agency since they may have proprietary information.

For a published book or monograph: If you are unable to upload your book file to your portfolio, provide a Web address link to the publisher’s Web site and/or provide a hard copy of your book to the Coordinator, Secretary for Chair.

For articles in renowned national or international periodicals: Provide documentation that the periodical is renowned and belongs in the Primary Importance I category. You must demonstrate that the periodical has significant impact to your field with supporting documentation (for example, external validation, circulation number, etc).

For a technology product: Provide a way for the faculty to view your technology product. You may:

- Provide a Web address link to the technology product if it is publicly available.
- Provide a Web address link publisher’s Web site and include an access code.
- Provide a physical copy of the technology product (for example, DVD copy) to the Department Coordinator.

Teaching and Mentoring Documentation

Provide a chronological listing of courses taught, with number of credits for each course, and the number of grades assigned in each course. For each course taught, include a syllabus and student evaluations (include course summary sheets, course graph, and individual student responses). Organize all course materials by semesters taught (e.g., Fall 2015, Spring 2016, Summer 2016...)

OPTIONAL: Include any additional documentation to demonstrate innovations in teaching and learning.

For triennial reviews: Provide student course evaluation summary reports for a minimum of the last three years.

Lyterati Portfolio Requirements for Annual and Reappointment Reviews
Upload all documents as PDF formatted files

Bucket	Items in Bucket and Notes
Curriculum Vitae Lyterati Single Document Upload	(1) Faculty member's recent vitae (following the format on the Portfolio Guidelines for Review of Tenure Track Faculty document)
Candidate's Statement Lyterati Multiple Document Upload	(1) Statement on research, teaching and service – all three uploaded here – maximum of 10 pages for all statements. (2) Summary of Research and Scholarship accomplishments according to the COE P&T criteria (3) Summary of Teaching and Mentoring according to the COE P&T criteria (4) Summary of Service accomplishments according to the COE P&T criteria (5) Journal Information (6) Works Cited (needed for reappointment and all reviews after that)
Student course evaluation tabular listing	(1) Tabular listing will be provided as a PDF file to the faculty member from OIR and will include the information for all courses taught by the faculty member
Student Course evaluations Lyterati Multiple Document Upload	Upload all your student course evaluations here Triennial Reviews: Minimum of last 3 years
Sample course materials Lyterati Multiple Document Upload	Sample syllabi, tests and assignments (No more than 30 pages including additional supporting materials below)
Additional Supporting Materials Lyterati Multiple Document Upload	Commendations, student letters (No more than 30 pages including sample course materials above)
Memorandum of Understanding, if applicable Lyterati Multiple Document Upload	Signed MOU if a joint appointment

Lyterati Portfolio Requirements for Tenure and Promotion Reviews
Upload all documents as PDF formatted files

Bucket	Items in Bucket and Notes
Curriculum Vitae Lyterati Single Document Upload	(1) Faculty member's recent vitae (following the format on the Portfolio Guidelines for Review of Tenure Track Faculty document)
Candidate's Statement Lyterati Multiple Document Upload	(1) Statement on research, teaching and service – all three uploaded here – maximum of 10 pages for all statements. (2) Summary of Research and Scholarship accomplishments according to the COE P&T criteria (3) Summary of Teaching and Mentoring according to the COE P&T criteria (4) Summary of Service accomplishments according to the COE P&T criteria (5) Journal Information (6) Works Cited (needed for reappointment and all reviews after that)
Chronological Course Listing	(1) Chronological list of courses taught with number of credits per course, and the number of grades assigned in each course
Student Advising Document	(1) Advising, including non-majors: indicate number of students advised, the dates of service, and the advisory format (frequency of contact, individual or group meetings)
Student course evaluation tabular listing	(1) Tabular listing will be provided as a PDF file to the faculty member from OIR and will include the information for all courses taught by the faculty member
Student Course evaluations Lyterati Multiple Document Upload	Upload all your student course evaluations here Triennial Reviews: Minimum of last 3 years
Sample course materials Lyterati Multiple Document Upload	Sample syllabi, tests and assignments (No more than 30 pages including additional supporting materials below)
Additional Supporting Materials Lyterati Multiple Document Upload	Commendations, student letters (No more than 30 pages including sample course materials above)
Memorandum of Understanding, if applicable Lyterati Multiple Document Upload	Signed MOU if a joint appointment

Supporting Documentation Section of your E-Portfolio

Select to place your required supporting E-Portfolio artifacts into **Mahara** or **COE Faculty Portfolio Artifacts CourseSite**.

Include three distinct areas or “boxes” labeled:

- (1) Primary Importance I Publications
- (2) Primary Importance II Publications
- (3) Course Syllabi

Place all your Primary Importance I publications, Primary Importance II publications and course syllabi in the appropriate area.

Lehigh University Best Practices for College Promotion & Tenure Committees

The following guidelines regarding procedures and practices of college promotion and tenure committees are based upon national guides such as *Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation: Advice for Tenured Faculty, Department Chairs, and Academic Administrators* (American Council on Education, American Association of University Professors, and United Educators: 2000)*; Lehigh's *Rules and Procedures*; applicable legal requirements; and recommendations from the Faculty Personnel Committee.

Clarity

Consistency

Candor

Consultation

Confidentiality

Caring

- In all deliberations and recommendations, evaluators at every level (department/ program faculty, P&T committee, dean, and provost) must use and adhere to all applicable University policies and procedures, including *R&P* and the college guidelines on criteria for tenure and promotion. If the college guidelines contradict *R&P* in any way, the university-wide *R&P* prevails.
- When a question or a "gray area" arises regarding the criteria or procedures (and interpretation questions are not unusual in such matters), the committee chair should consult first with the deputy provost for faculty affairs who will consult with others as needed.
- Committees must reach their own substantive and independent recommendation on whether or not a candidate merits tenure/ promotion.
- Committee members should check to make sure that the candidate's portfolio is complete so that the committee can evaluate the individual's candidacy with full information. The committee chair should contact the department chair or dean's office if materials are missing.
- The committee may consider new positive information that becomes available during their deliberations, such as publication of a book or article. The candidate is responsible for making the information known to the department chair, who forwards the information for addition to the candidate's portfolio.
- College P&T committees must ensure that their evaluations of candidates and their recommendations (i.e., votes) are consistent. Specifically, what they write in their letters should support what they are recommending.
- All voting members of a college P&T committee must make a clear, unambiguous recommendation. *R&P* requires that at least five members must vote without abstention. In practice this means that all committee members must vote yes or no.
- Confidentiality must be maintained throughout the process.

- Personal issues such as family, health, or other personal situations must not be considered or discussed when making decisions concerning the granting of tenure/ promotion. Committees must not request access to such information, even when the probationary period has been extended.
- The standards for tenure will remain the same for candidates who receive tenure clock extensions as for those who do not receive extensions.
- Personal characteristics such as race, ethnicity, gender, disability, etc. must not be considered or discussed when making decisions concerning the granting of tenure/ promotion. Discrimination is unacceptable and illegal. Committees should familiarize themselves with and adhere to the University's Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action/Non-Discrimination Policy available at: <http://www.lehigh.edu/~policy/university/eo.htm>.
- Lack of a response from an external evaluator must not be judged as a negative evaluation.
- The committee chair must make sure that copies of appropriate documents (for example, written communications to the department regarding the committee's recommendation and any departmental response) are included in the candidate's portfolio.

August 29, 2007

**Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation: Advice for Tenured Faculty, Department Chairs, and Academic Administrators* (American Council on Education, American Association of University Professors, and United Educators: 2000), available on the Web at <http://www.acenet.edu/resources/chairs/index.cfm>.

Guidelines on Frequency of Academic Leaves for Faculty

Issued by Provost Office January 23, 2013

Section 2.4 of the Rules and Procedures (R&P) of the Faculty describes the types of leave that are available to faculty members:

2.4 LEAVE OF ABSENCE

1. The university recognizes three types of leave that are available to faculty members of professorial rank: (a) academic leave for professional development activities; (b) unpaid leave for temporary service in other academic institutions, governmental organizations, business entities, fellowship programs, or for personal reasons; and (c) medical leave. Requests for leave are made by letter to the provost through the department chairperson and academic dean. The following paragraphs pertain to the first type of leave - academic leave.
2. Academic leave of absence from the university is a valuable means of providing faculty with an opportunity for study, research, travel, writing, professional reeducation, and other professional development activities - in short, for self-improvement that will be beneficial to the university.
3. A faculty member who desires a leave should request the leave with reasons in a letter to the department chairperson. The chairperson is expected to seek the advice of departmental faculty members in considering the request. Other administrative personnel normally involved in the decision-making process include (center director, if relevant), the academic dean, (vice provost for research, if relevant), provost, president, and the board of trustees.
4. Each application will be evaluated for potential improvement that will be beneficial to the university, as stated in paragraph 2; appropriateness of timing with respect to other leaves taken by the individual and with respect to leaves being requested by other faculty in the same department; and special needs of the department, college, and university. An academic leave will be granted only where satisfactory arrangements are made to carry on the essential work of the department. Sincere efforts will be made at each level involved in the decision-making process to work out such arrangements.
5. An academic leave for any full-time faculty member, whether supported fully on the teaching budget or partially on the teaching budget and partially on research, is normally for one semester at full salary, or one academic year at half salary, with fringe benefits being fully paid in either case. Adjustments in salary may be made depending on the amount of outside support available for the leave - the intent being that total financial support during the leave should be on a "no loss/no gain" basis to the faculty member. Under exceptional circumstances an academic leave may be extended for an additional year, usually without salary.
6. Each faculty member returning from academic leave will furnish, through the chairperson and academic dean, to the provost a written report of accomplishments while on leave.

POLICY GUIDELINES

Section 2.4 of R&P does not address the time frame in which faculty members are eligible to apply for a leave. For the purpose of this policy it is helpful to distinguish between three categories of leave, all of which are consistent with the R&P guidelines above:

TYPE I	<p><i>Leaves Supported Entirely by University Funds</i></p> <p>This type of leave is generally referred to as a sabbatical leave, ‘normally for one semester at full salary, or one academic year at half salary, with fringe benefits being fully paid in either case.’</p>
TYPE II	<p><i>Leaves Supported Entirely by External Funds</i></p>
TYPE III	<p><i>Leaves Supported Partially by External Funds and Partially by University Funds</i></p> <p>The opportunity for this type of leave arises when a faculty member becomes eligible for financial support, outside the scope of a normal sabbatical leave, for professional development activities, where this support is <i>less</i> than what would be required to provide the faculty member’s <i>full semester or academic year salary plus the applicable employee benefits rate</i>.¹</p> <p>Guggenheim, National Endowment for the Arts, and National Endowment for the Humanities awards are examples of this type of funding opportunity.</p> <p>In all cases, approval of this type of leave will be contingent upon documentation that the professional development activities will benefit both the faculty member and the university to a degree that is commensurate with the university support being requested. The logistical calculations for combining external funding and university support for this category of leave should be submitted by the faculty member, with an accompanying letter of support by her or his department chair, to the college dean who will then make a recommendation to the provost. These calculations must take into account employee benefits as well as academic year salary, together with the contribution from external funding sources. The request must also document fully what, if any, commitments the faculty member will continue to make during the period of leave in the areas of teaching, service and directing or mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students.</p> <p>¹Faculty members should consult with Human Resources to determine this rate.</p>

TIMING GUIDELINES

Faculty members normally may apply every seven years for a fully university-funded academic leave (TYPE I) using the application process described in R&P Section 2.4. In no instance may a faculty member apply for *more than two* university-funded academic leaves (TYPE I) within a 14-year period. The faculty member must submit a formal request for a leave to her/his chair and dean, minimally one year before the leave would begin.

Faculty members may apply before seven years have expired since their previous leave for a second academic leave that is supported partially or totally through research grants and/or externally funded sources. (TYPE II and TYPE III above). Partially or totally externally funded leaves may comprise no more than a single two-year period or a series of one semester per academic year leaves over a three consecutive year period. In either of these cases, individual leaves must be requested and approved on a one-year basis and then renewed subject to the purpose and benefit of the leave being clearly documented in the renewal request. Following either of these leave formats the faculty member must wait seven years before applying for a fully university-funded (TYPE I) academic leave. In all cases the provost must approve the request.

Faculty members are required to spend one semester at Lehigh after completing any type of academic leave.

Faculty members preparing to apply for any type of academic leave should consult the [Faculty Academic Leave Application Checklist](#) and the [Leave Accommodation Form for Faculty](#).

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS DURING ACADEMIC LEAVES

Faculty members on academic leave continue to have access to all benefits available to them when working on campus. The terms and conditions for participating in the plans generally do not change.

There are two important exceptions:

1. Short Term Disability Benefits - A faculty member who becomes ill while on a leave of absence is not eligible for short-term disability benefits until he or she is scheduled to return to work.
2. Retirement Plan Contributions – Contributions made to the retirement plan are based on the actual eligible compensation paid to the faculty member. This means that receiving a reduced salary will result in proportionally reduced retirement plan contributions.

Pretenure Academic Leave

Effective fall 2004; edited June 2013

The College of Education provides untenured faculty with the opportunity to apply for a one-semester pretenure academic leave to allow an individual to enhance his or her scholarship and teaching. Submitting an application does not automatically result in the granting of a pretenure leave.

Each application is evaluated for potential contributions to the individual's tenure portfolio, as well as benefits to both the college and university. In addition, the dean recommends such academic leave to the provost when satisfactory arrangements can also be made to carry on the essential work of the academic program and the college during that individual's absence.

The guidelines and procedures for pre-tenure academic leaves are as follows:

1. During the third year of service, an untenured COE faculty is eligible to apply for a pretenure academic leave.
2. Pretenure academic leave is granted to an individual for one semester at full pay and benefits.
3. The period of a pretenure academic leave is included in the faculty member's probationary period. The letter granting the academic leave must state that the time on leave is included in the probationary period.
4. No more than two pretenure faculty in the COE are granted pretenure academic leave during any given academic year.
5. A COE faculty member granted a pretenure academic leave would be unlikely to receive support for a professional leave of absence funded by the university fewer than seven years following that pretenure leave.
6. Applications for pretenure academic leave are due February 1st for the following fall semester and September 1st for the following spring semester.
7. Pretenure academic leave applications are made through a proposal letter submitted to the Department Chair. Following discussion with the applicant's program director about how courses and other responsibilities will be covered, the Chair makes a recommendation to the Dean, who then makes a formal recommendation to the Provost. The Provost will inform the candidate as to whether the application is approved or not.
8. No later than two months after the pretenure academic leave is completed, the faculty member must submit to the Provost a post-leave report that is included in his/her tenure review.

Note: These procedures operationalize what is described in detail in Section 2.4 Leave of Absence of the *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty* pertaining to academic leaves.

COE Reappointment Review for Professors of Practice and Lecturers

Approved EHS Meeting January 30, 2009

CONSIDERATIONS PRIOR TO THE REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW

The dean's office will establish a reappointment schedule for lecturers and professors of practice following the schedule and guidelines for reappointment review established by the provost's office. The dean's office will establish a schedule that works well for the college.

The process of considering a reappointment review should occur at least 4 months prior to the end of the candidate's contract so that the candidate can be given sufficient notice of either reappointment or appointment. If it is not possible to meet the four-month notice deadline (e.g., because of funding issues), notice of reappointment and non-reappointment should be made as soon as possible. The department chair will inform the professor of practice/lecturer about any problems with providing four months' notice.

The process prior to the reappointment review is as follows:

1. By mid June each year, the provost's office will send a list of professors of practice and lecturers whose appointments end by August of the following year.
2. By the end of September, the dean's office will confirm the list of candidates for reappointment with the provost's office. If it is clear at this point that an appointment will not be continued past the current contract, the department chair will inform the professor of practice or the lecturer in writing.

STEPS IN THE REAPPOINTMENT PROCESS

1. If the decision is to go forward with a reappointment review, the chair will appoint an evaluation committee consisting of (a) the program faculty of the POP/lecturer and (b) one faculty member outside of the of the POP/lecturer's program.
2. The candidate for reappointment will compile his or her portfolio (See Provost Guidelines and Checklist) for review by committee.
3. The faculty committee will review the candidate's portfolio in relation to the candidate's contracted responsibilities. The department chair convenes a meeting of the committee to discuss the candidate's portfolio. The committee members will vote formally at a meeting as to whether or not they support reappointment. If the committee supports reappointment, the review process continues. If the committee does not support reappointment, the department chair will send a letter of non-reappointment to the candidate, with copies sent to the dean and provost. The department chair meets with the candidate to discuss the content of the letter.
4. If the committee supports reappointment, the department chair will write the department summary letter. If the reappointment is for 3 years or more, the department chair solicits individual letters of evaluation from each faculty evaluator and also writes an individual department summary letter. (Individual faculty letters are only needed for reappointments of three years or more). The department chair's summary letter is circulated to the program faculty/committee members. The chair meets with the candidate to discuss the content of the letter.
5. The chair forwards to the dean the candidate's portfolio, chair summary, and individual faculty letters from the committee (if required).
6. If the dean approves the appointment, he/she makes the recommendation to the provost. The official portfolio, including all original letters, is sent to the provost's office. See provost checklist for organization of materials for the provost.
7. If the dean does not approve reappointment, he/she will discuss the decision with the department chair.
8. The provost reviews the reappointment portfolio and sends a letter of reappointment or non-reappointment to the candidate, with copies to the dean and the department chair.

Student-related Policies and Procedures

College Criteria for Admission as a Regular Graduate Student

Approved by COE faculty November 2008

The College of Education has established minimum standards for admission to its graduate programs, although academic programs within the college may establish more rigorous admission criteria. Those minimum standards are as follows.

The applicant must meet ONE of the following criteria, as appropriate to the applicant's level of previous study at time of admission.

If applying as a **post-bachelor's degree** admit:

- Have an undergraduate grade point average of at least 3.0 on a 4.0 scale,
--OR--
- Have an undergraduate grade point average of at least 3.0 on a 4.0 scale on the last 48 credits of undergraduate study,
--OR--
- Have a graduate grade point average of at least 3.0 on a 4.0 scale for a minimum of 12 credits,
--OR--
- Attain a combined score at the 75th percentile for education across verbal and quantitative subtests of the GRE aptitude test (a combined score of 1117 across the verbal and quantitative subtests of the GRE aptitude test) or the 75th percentile of the MAT,
--OR--
- Successfully fulfill the requirements of Associate Admission status (that is, complete at least 9 credits and no more than 12 credits with a GPA of 3.00 or better and no final course marks lower than B-; students receiving a grade lower than a B- will be dropped from the program).

If applying as a **post-master's degree** admit:

- Have a graduate grade point average of at least 3.0 on a 4.0 scale on a minimum of 30 credits,
--OR--
- Successfully fulfill the requirements of Associate Admission status (that is, complete of at least 9 credits and no more than 12 credits with a GPA of 3.00 or better and no final course marks lower than B-; students receiving a grade lower than a B- will be dropped from the program).

Non-Degree Student Options

Non-degree for external certification passed at EHS Meeting February 9, 2007; university approved 2007

In addition to degree programs, there are two non-degree options as well: (1) Regular non-degree and (2) Non-degree for external certification.

Regular non-degree admission is for students who wish to take up to 12 credits of graduate coursework at Lehigh without seeking a degree. Any transcript or other record from the University will clearly indicate the student status as non-degree. Non-degree students are not permitted to audit courses. University admissions criteria for non-degree graduate students are (a) a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution with an overall grade point average of at least 3.0 on a four-point scale (Applicants with undergraduate GPAs slightly below 3.0 may be admitted with approval from the department of Education and Human Services) or (b) to have achieved a GPA of 3.0 or higher on a four-point scale for a minimum of 12 graduate credits at another accredited institution.

Non-degree for external certification students are admitted to pursue coursework for the purpose of obtaining certification through an external accrediting agency. Applicants are expected to have an undergraduate GPA of 3.0 or higher on a four-point scale or to have achieved a GPA of 3.0 or higher on a four-point scale for a minimum of 12 graduate credits at another accredited institution. Applicants are assigned certification advisors on admissions and must work with the advisor to assure that they complete all requirements for certification satisfactorily. Non-degree for external certification students complete the coursework and any other required field experiences for the appropriate certification, with the number of credits and field experiences being dictated by the external accrediting agency. Given this external control of credit requirements, the number of credits will vary and will typically exceed the 12-credit limit for regular non-degree students. Certification involves qualitative components as well as credits; a non-degree student seeking such certification must meet the quality standards of the certification program, as well as completing the necessary coursework and field experiences.

CHANGING FROM NON-DEGREE TO DEGREE STATUS

Non-degree students of either type may seek admission to a degree program. Non-degree students who seek admission to a degree program must meet all regular admissions criteria, complete all regular procedures, and present all documents normally required of degree-seeking applicants to that program. Courses taken by a non-degree student who later enters a degree program will count towards the completion of the program to the extent that those courses fall within the normal requirements of the program and to the extent that the student's performance in the course(s) is acceptable for degree program purposes. Any course which is counted towards the completion of a degree must be completed within the established time limits for that degree, whether taken initially as a degree or non-degree course.

College Policy on Admission of Students Whose First Language is Not English

Approved by COE Faculty April 9, 2010; edited June 2013; updated December 2017

All international students must show proof of English proficiency to be admitted to Lehigh. The TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) or the IELTS (International English Language Testing System) is required for all graduate students whose FIRST language is not English. The TOEFL/IELTS requirement may be waived if a student has completed a degree program at a U.S. university. Students with TOEFL Internet-Based Test (iBT) scores are not required to take the English Proficiency Assessments upon arrival to Lehigh.

If the TOEFL iBT is currently not available in a student's home country, paper-based TOEFL (PBT) scores may be submitted. A minimum PBT score of **583** is required. However, because the PBT does not provide speaking score data, students should be assessed on their speaking proficiency prior to the start of their COE programs.

The following are the required TOEFL iBT and IELTS section scores for the College of Education.

TOEFL iBT Test Section	COE-required Minimum Score	IELTS Test Section	COE-required minimum band scores
Reading	24	Writing	6.5
Listening	20	Speaking	7.5
Speaking	24	Reading	7
Writing	25	Listening	6.5
Composite	93	Overall minimum band score	6.5

Students who do not meet the minimum scores will be required to complete English courses at Lehigh. Please see the following table for ESL course-placement guidelines.

ESL Placement Rubric	
Condition	Requirement
All minimum scores are met. (composite and individual sections)	Unconditional admission.
One minimum section score is not met.	Completion of ESL credit course within the student's first two semesters of study, according to the course-alignment table below.
Two or more section scores are not met.	Completion of StepUp Intensive English program prior to the start of the student's COE courses.

Individual TOEFL or IELTS section scores and the corresponding required ESL credit courses are as follows. Each course is 1 credit and offered during both fall and spring semesters.

ESL Course-alignment Table		
TOEFL Section	Score	Required Course
Reading	< 24	ESLP 002 – Academic Writing and Reading
Listening	< 20	ESLP 004 – Academic Speaking and Listening
Speaking	< 24	ESLP 012 – Advanced Spoken English & Presentations
Writing	< 25	ESLP 002 – Academic Writing and Reading
Two or more sections	< minimum	Complete StepUp program

Criminal and Health Clearances for Students in College of Education Programs

Approved by EHS faculty May 9, 2008; revised & reapproved Nov. 2011;

Legal counsel edits Jan 2012

Effective: January 5, 2012

This policy covers the clearance requirement of field-based or research experience in child-focused settings as part of the degree or certification program (referred to as “field experience” in the rest of this document) for all professionals-in-training in all College of Education (COE) programs. For purposes of this policy, *child-focused settings* include all schools and organizations whose activities involve children from birth through age 21. Examples of such organizations include, but are not limited to the following:

- Civic organizations; for example, Scouts
- Religious organizations; for example, Sunday School, CCD
- Community education organizations; for example, YMCA/YWCA, PBA athletic teams
- Youth and family service agencies; for example, Broughal Family Center, Pinebrook Family Services, Valley Youth House
- Social/support groups; for example, Children of Divorce, LGBTQI youth services, social skills groups
- Residential settings

This policy aligns with the Pennsylvania Department of Education’s (PDE) regulation that is intended to protect children and reflects changes to Section 111 of the Pennsylvania Public School Code (referred to as “School Code” in the rest of this document) effective September 28, 2011.

PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

This policy represents the minimum requirements for programs and professionals-in-training with respect to criminal and health clearances. Individual programs and/or child-focused settings can set more stringent requirements.

CLEARANCE REQUIREMENT

All COE students who come into contact with children through field experience are required to obtain and present the following **original** and **current** (not older than one year) clearance documents to the Office of Teacher Certification and Field Placements (OTC):

Pennsylvania and federal criminal clearances provide a record of all arrests, charges and convictions:

- *PA State Police Criminal Records Check (Act 34)*
- *PA Child Abuse Clearance (Act 151)*
- *Federal Criminal History Record (Act 114)*

The **health clearance** provides a record of tuberculosis:

- *Mantoux Tuberculosis Screening; result of a chest X-ray; or blood test*

Professionals-in-training who are currently employed by a school district and have clearances on file in that district may complete a **School Clearances Waiver** obtained from the OTC. The **original** document signed by an authorized school district official must be presented to the OTC.

A waiver on file in the OTC allows a professional-in-training to complete field experiences in that particular school district. In order to be eligible for field experiences in other PreK-12 settings, professionals-in-training must obtain and present all four **original** and **current** clearance documents to the OTC. Any of the criminal or health clearances that are not on file with a school district must be presented to the OTC as original and current documents.

NOTIFICATION OF CLEARANCE REQUIREMENT

The COE notifies professionals-in-training of its clearance requirement in multiple ways.

- *College of Education Acknowledgement of College Policy on Clearances* requires applicants to acknowledge the policy in order to submit a complete online application
- Letter of admission to a COE program signed by the dean reminds prospective professionals-in-training to apply for their clearances as outlined on the COE website
- Detailed clearance information, including application instructions, from the OTC via email to all newly matriculated professionals-in-training

RESPONSIBILITIES OF PROFESSIONALS-IN-TRAINING

Upon admission to any of the COE's five programs, prospective professionals-in-training bear sole responsibility for obtaining all 4 clearance documents, including the specific actions noted below.

- Applying for clearances upon admission to a COE program
- Maintaining current clearances throughout the degree or certification program
- Pursuing all actions required in response to a clearance outcome; for example, expungement proceedings
- Providing original clearance documents for authorized review in a child-focused setting

CRIMINAL CLEARANCE RECORD

Seven categories of criminal record emerge from the School Code:

- *Category 1: "No record exists"* qualifies professionals-in-training for a field experience. The following notations are deemed equivalent to "no record exists":
Non-conviction/Quashed/Dismissed/Demurrer Sustained
Non-conviction/Nolle prossed/Withdrawn
- *Category 2: School Code Section 111(e) crimes:* The School Code permanently excludes from school employment individuals convicted of a Section 111(e) crime. The COE permanently excludes such individuals from field experience.
- *Category 3: Felony offenses:* The School Code states that conviction of any felony of the first, second or third degree, not listed in School Code Section 111(e), prohibits individuals from school employment for ten years after the expiration of the sentence. The COE permanently excludes such individuals from field experience.
- *Category 4: First-degree misdemeanors:* The School Code states that conviction of any first-degree misdemeanor, with the exception of a second conviction of driving under the influence of alcohol or a controlled substance (DUI), prohibits individuals from school employment for five years after the completion of the sentence. The COE excludes such individuals from field experience for five years after completion of the sentence. After this five-year exclusion, the COE will determine eligibility for field experience on a case-by-case basis as described below.

- *Category 5: DUI second offense:* The School Code states that a second DUI conviction prohibits individuals from school employment for three years after the completion of the sentence for the most recent offense. The COE excludes such individuals from field experience for three years after completion of the sentence for the most recent offense. After this three-year exclusion, the COE will determine eligibility for field experience on a case-by-case basis as described below.
- *Category 6: Second- and third-degree misdemeanors and summary offenses:* The School Code allows discretion in the employment of individuals convicted of second- and third-degree misdemeanors and summary offenses. A DUI first offense is included in this category. The COE will determine eligibility for field experience on a case-by-case basis as described below.
- *Category 7: Arrest or charge, without conviction, of crimes in categories 2-5:* The School Code allows discretion in the employment of individuals who have been arrested or charged, but not convicted, of crimes in categories 2-5 above. The COE will determine eligibility for field experience on a case-by-case basis as described below.

Criminal Clearance Record Categories 2-3: Permanent Exclusion from Field Experience and Withdrawal from Certification Program

When a professional-in-training has been convicted of a crime described in categories 2-3, such an individual is permanently excluded from field experience. Because this exclusion will prevent the individual from successfully completing courses that require field experience, he or she becomes unable to complete the certification program and must withdraw from it. This individual is required to sign and submit an original *Acknowledgement of Criminal Record Ineligibility for Field Placement* to the OTC.

Criminal Clearance Record Categories 4-7: Eligibility for Field Experience

Determination of eligibility. Eligibility for field experience is determined by the program director and the Director of the Office of Teacher Certification and Field Placements (referred to as “OTC director” in the rest of this document), in consultation with other University offices, as appropriate. The purpose of case-by-case determination regarding eligibility for field experience in categories 4-7 is to insure a safe environment for all children in child-focused settings and to acknowledge the human condition of indiscretion and non-constructive choices. The COE strives to balance these equally important considerations in administering this policy. The following case-by-case circumstances will be considered in determining eligibility for field experience:

- The nature of the arrest/charge/conviction, including ramifications in a child-focused setting
- Recidivism (multiple arrests/charges/convictions related to a single crime and various crimes)
- Time elapsed since most recent arrest/charge/completion of the sentence for the most recent conviction
- Compelling evidence of rehabilitation

Professionals-in-training must be aware that while the COE may determine that an individual with a category 4-7 record is eligible for field experience, personnel in a child-focused setting retain the right to decide whether or not they will host such an individual for field experience. The *Acknowledgement of College of Education Policy on Clearances* signed and submitted with the COE application advises applicants of this caveat.

If the COE determines that a professional-in-training with a category 4-7 record is eligible for field experience, the OTC will pursue an appropriate placement until the second refusal. Once a second child-focused setting has refused to host an individual because of this record, the OTC will no longer pursue a field placement on this individual's behalf. In keeping with COE field placement procedures, a professional-in-training may locate a field placement host and provide this information to the Coordinator of Teacher Field Placements (Coordinator) in the OTC, who will arrange the placement details. The Coordinator must receive this information no later than Friday of the third week of classes. All field placement experiences must be completed through the OTC.

When a child-focused setting agrees to host a professional-in-training with a category 4-7 record, an authorized official of the host institution signs and submits an original *Acknowledgement of Criminal Record Placement* to the OTC.

If the COE determines that a professional-in-training with a category 4-7 record is not eligible for field experience, the individual is notified in writing by the OTC director and is asked to sign and submit an original *Acknowledgement of Criminal Record Ineligibility for Field Placement* to the OTC.

Appeal of ineligibility. Professionals-in-training who have been ruled ineligible for field experience as a result of a category 4-7 record have the right to appeal this decision. To do so, they should follow the *Course-related Non-Grade Grievance* process (see the *Grievances* section of the program handbook or the Education and Human Services department manual).

Criminal Clearance Record Categories 4-5: Eligibility for PDE Certification

As noted above, a category 4 conviction (first-degree misdemeanors) prohibits individuals from school employment for five years after the completion of the sentence and a category 5 conviction (DUI second offense) prohibits individuals from school employment for three years after the completion of the sentence for the most recent offense. Professionals-in-training must be aware that PDE may withhold a certificate for the period of time during which an individual is prohibited from school employment.

NOTICE OF ARREST OR CONVICTION

The College requires that any professional-in-training who is currently enrolled in a degree or certification program must notify the OTC within seventy-two (72) hours of an arrest, charge or conviction that occurred since the most recent criminal clearances were submitted to the OTC.

HEALTH CLEARANCE RECORD

The Mantoux Tuberculosis Screening must be "negative"; the result of a chest X-ray must be "clear"; or the result of a blood test must be "negative" as documented by the signature of a licensed medical professional. Any other outcome disqualifies professionals-in-training from a field experience.

CLEARANCE RECORD CONFIDENTIALITY

Any professional-in-training whose criminal clearance record indicates other than "no record exists" (meaning a category 2-7 record) or whose health clearance record indicates other than "negative" or "clear" must discuss the record with the OTC director. In order to determine the individual's status with regard to field placement and program or degree enrollment, this information may be shared with other University personnel in accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

In addition, child-focused settings that host field placements may request to review a professional-in-training's criminal and health clearances.

Process for Securing Approval for a Graduate Student to Carry a Workload Overload under the Affordable Care Act (ACA) University Regulations and Workload Restrictions

We need to be careful to abide by university regulations limiting student workload. Student work hours may come in any form, or combination of forms, including work as a GA, RA, TA, work/study, camp worker, and the like. We monitor student workload to avoid placing too heavy a burden on graduate students pursuing their advanced degrees, and to avoid accidentally having them work so many hours that such students unintentionally qualify for full-time health care, an expensive benefit for which there is no current budget. To prevent such unintentional errors, the Payroll Office will not pay a graduate student for more than 20 hours per week, unless the appropriate college's graduate associate dean (GAD) has approved those hours *in advance*.

For this purpose, the university has created a form by which grad students request an overload and another form for all supervisors, academic advisers and department chairs to review the student's request and indicate their approval or disapproval. Once the approval form is completed, it is returned to the GAD. If all have approved, the GAD notifies payroll to authorize the additional hours. Until then, the student may not be paid for more than 20 hours per week. Overload requests should be submitted as early in the semester/term as possible; waiting until the end invites pay problems.

The university only tracks hours worked for the university, so this approval process only involves such hours. It is important, however, that faculty advisers and supervisors ensure that the student is not attempting to carry so much workload that his or her studies might suffer. For this reason, they should not approve on-campus work hours for students who are employed full-time outside the university. Advisers and supervisors should inquire about a student's employment status.

Fall and Spring Semesters

The university rule is that, during the fall and spring semesters, full-time graduate students are limited to 20 hours per week. In order to be allowed to carry up to 25 hours per week, that grad student needs to submit to the graduate associate dean (GAD) a completed request form, asking to carry an overload. That overload request is then reviewed by all supervisors, the student's academic adviser, and then the department chair, before coming back to the GAD. By university policy, no grad student may be approved to carry more than 25 hours per week; requests to carry more than 25 hours will automatically be denied, therefore.

Overlapping appointments that cross into summer, either before fall or after spring, can create problems, so it is important for supervisors to comply with university-established start and end dates for appointments. If you are unsure of these dates, ask your department coordinator or college business manager. If supervisors need to employ some other dates, they should make sure the GAD is aware of this fact, and they should use alternate dates only when there is a

compelling need and it is *impossible* to use the established university start and end dates for such appointment.

Summer Terms

Under ACA, graduate students may work full-time (40 hours per week) in the summer, provided they do not go over those 40 hours and do not carry “too much” coursework while working full-time. As always, if students hold a GA/RA/TA appointment in the summer, or their spring or fall appointments overlap with summer work, they have to petition to be allowed to carry over 20 hours. The catalog is unclear, however, exactly how a grad student is expected to balance workload and courseload.

Thus, we need a metric to help us determine the optimal balance. Since all university full-time employees are allowed to take one course as an employee benefit at the same time that they are working, it logical that a grad student should not need permission to take *one* 3-to-4-credit course while working full-time. Since there are two summer sessions, a student working full-time should be able to carry one course in each summer term, or two full-term courses across the two summer terms.

When Students Need To Petition for an Overload

- If grad students are taking no classes and have no GA/RA/TA position that overlaps with the summer 40 hours of work per week, *no petition is required*.
- If summer work hours overlap with a spring or fall GA/RA/TA position (either at the start of the summer or the end of the summer), such students need to submit an overload petition. The overlap may not lead to a student working more than 40 hours per week.
- If grad students want to take coursework while working full-time (40 hours per week), they cannot take more than *one course* (3 or 4 credits) while they are working full-time. If they wish to carry additional courses/credits, they must reduce the number of hours worked.

Summer Workload Reduction

If a student wishes to take more than one 3-to-4-credit course, the following metric applies:

While taking coursework in summer, the student needs to reduce his or her workload by 3.33 hours for every credit taken *in addition* to the first course.

[LOGIC: 12 credits is the maximum load in summer. If one divides 40 work hours by 12, one gets 3.33 hours/credit.]

Applying this rule, a grad student taking one 3-to-4-credit course *plus* one additional 3-credit course *at the same time* would need to reduce his or her work hours by 10 hours per week (for a maximum of 30 work hours/week). If the second course were a 4-credit course, the reduction in work hours would need to be by 13 (4 x 3.33), producing a maximum of 27 hours of work per week while taking the additional 4-credit course. Naturally, if the additional course were a single

credit, that would produce a reduction of 3 work hours per week, while a 2-credit course would produce a reduction of 7 work hours per week while taking the additional course.

During the time the grad student is taking coursework beyond the permitted single course, he or she must reduce workload by 3.33 hours per credit for any *additional* course/credits. The rest of the summer, he or she can work 40 hours per week.

Influence of Course Format on Workload Reduction

Different course formats also affect when a student needs to reduce his or her workload. Thus, if the student took his or her *second* 3-credit course:

- In the *one-week format*, he/she would only have to reduce to 30 hours/week during that week.
- In the *two-week format*, he/she would only need to reduce to 30 hours/week for those two weeks.
- In the *regular 5-week course format*, he/she would need to reduce to 30 hrs/week for those 5 weeks.
- In the *regular 5-week course format in each summer term*, he/she would need to reduce to 30 hours/week during both summer sessions (since there is no credit overlap across summer terms).
- Once again, if the second course carries fewer or more than 3 credits, his/her workload would need to be adjusted proportionally.

Students are not allowed to carry more than two courses in a summer term. If, however, a student working full-time successfully petitions SOGS to be allowed to do so, his or her workload needs to be reduced a further 3.33 hours per week for every additional credit taken.

If you are in doubt about what you are allowed to do, please ask your college GAD for guidance.

Graduate Student Work Limit Overload Petition

(Request to work at Lehigh more than 20 hours per week during an academic semester)

Because students enroll at Lehigh University with the primary purpose of completing an academic course of study, a student's academic success is the University's first consideration in establishing student workload policies and making exceptions to those policies. Lehigh University limits students' **paid work to 20 hours per week** during the semester. While some graduate students working at Lehigh are paid on an hourly basis, most graduate students are employed in RA/GA/TA positions calling for 20 hours of work per week. Thus, the Lehigh workload should average **no more than 20 hours per week** during an academic semester.

The policies for summer and winter intersessions are a bit different: If a student (1) is registered for classes in each semester of an academic year, and (2) works an average of 20 hours per week during these semesters, and (3) is not enrolled in courses during the winter intersession or the summer, that student may work full time (40 hours per week) during the winter intersession and the summer.

For semesters in the academic year, students may petition to exceed the 20-hour standard limit and work up to 25 hours per week. Students must be compensated for this additional work, and they must record their work hours on time sheets each week.

Graduate student work overload petitions must be approved by the graduate associate dean in the student's home college.

Student Information

Name:		LIN:	
College:		Department:	
Phone Number:		Email Address:	
When requested work overload would occur:	<input type="checkbox"/> Fall semester	Year	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Winter intersession		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Spring semester		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Summer session		
		Academic Adviser Name & Email Address:	

Academic Information

In the space below, please identify your academic standing (good standing, probation, suspension) and where you are in your program of study (just beginning, half-way through, near end), along with your status in terms of degree milestones (such as thesis, general examination, comprehensive examination, dissertation proposal, submission of final document and defense). Describe your planned course load for the requested overload semester.

In the space below, please provide any additional information about your academic progress that you believe would be helpful for the dean to consider when reviewing your petition. This might include information about your schedule during the requested overload semester, how you expect to manage your academic and employment responsibilities, and any special circumstances you might have.

Information about Work Assignment(s)

Please list the relevant information for each work assignment you expect to hold; place where you work, work title or duties, and hourly commitment for each position during the overload semester. Please include both on-campus and off-campus jobs; attach an additional sheet for additional positions if necessary.

	Primary Work Assignment	Additional Work Assignment
Lehigh unit name and office (e.g., Lehigh Chemistry Dept):		
Your work title/duties:		
Commitment in hours per week:		
Supervisor name:		
Supervisor email:		
Supervisor phone #		
Any other work-related info you feel the dean should know:		

If necessary, the student should attach additional sheet(s) with information about any other on-campus or off-campus work assignments.

Signature & Confirmation

By signing below, I confirm that the information above is accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Graduate Student Signature

Date Signed

Submit this form, with attachments of information about any additional jobs, to your College graduate associate dean's office.

Graduate Student Work Limit Overload Petition Recommendation/Approval Form

NOTE: BY UNIVERSITY POLICY, GRADUATE STUDENTS MAY NOT WORK MORE THAN 25 HOURS PER WEEK. REQUESTS TO GO ABOVE THAT LEVEL SHOULD NOT BE APPROVED.

STUDENT NAME: _____ LIN: _____

PRIMARY ON-CAMPUS SUPERVISOR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND ENDORSEMENT

I have reviewed the attached petition for an overload and my recommendation is,

☐

Approve the request

☐

Deny the request

I recognize my support for this petition does not constitute/guarantee College approval.

Primacy of Graduate Studies:	I understand that if I recommend approval and the petition is approved, I am agreeing to monitor the student's academic progress to ensure that the additional work does not negatively affect his or her studies, and that the hours worked in this office do not exceed the number indicated on this form.		
Signature:		Date:	
Printed Name:		Title:	
Department:			

SECONDARY ON-CAMPUS SUPERVISOR (ADDITIONAL HOURS) ACKNOWLEDGEMENT & RECOMMENDATION

After reviewing the attached petition for an overload, my recommendation is,

☐

Approve the request

☐

Deny the request

I recognize my support for this petition does not constitute/guarantee College approval.

Primacy of Graduate Studies:	I understand that if I recommend approval and the petition is approved, I am agreeing to monitor the student's academic progress to ensure that the additional work does not negatively affect his or her studies, and that the hours worked in this office do not exceed the number indicated on this form.		
Health Care Eligibility:	I further understand that if working in this position for me, <i>in addition to any existing work responsibilities</i> , causes this student to exceed a total hourly work limit of 29 hours per week at Lehigh , I expect my office will be responsible for paying the full cost of the subsidy for the health insurance Lehigh would subsequently be required to offer this student, provided he/she accepts such coverage.		
Signature:		Date:	
Printed Name:		Title:	
Department:			



If necessary, attach additional sheets for additional supervisor recommendations and signatures for any additional positions on campus.



NOTE: BY UNIVERSITY POLICY, GRADUATE STUDENTS MAY NOT WORK MORE THAN 25 HOURS PER WEEK. REQUESTS TO GO ABOVE THAT LEVEL SHOULD **NOT** BE APPROVED.

STUDENT NAME: _____ LIN _____

ACADEMIC ADVISOR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND RECOMMENDATION

After reviewing the attached petition for an overload, my recommendation is,

☐ Approve the request ☐ Deny the request

I recognize my support for this petition does not constitute/guarantee College approval.

Primacy of Graduate Studies:	I understand that if I recommend approval and the petition is approved, I am agreeing to monitor the student's academic progress to ensure that the additional work does not negatively affect his or her studies. If I determine that the additional work hours are negatively affecting the student's studies, I will contact my department chair or director of graduate studies and discuss this with the student's campus supervisor(s).		
Signature:		Date:	
Printed Name:		Title:	
Department:			

DEPARTMENT CHAIR (OR DESIGNEE) ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND RECOMMENDATION

I have reviewed the attached petition for an overload and my recommendation is,

☐ Approve the request ☐ Deny the request

I recognize my support for this petition does not constitute/guarantee College approval.

Health Care Eligibility:	If working in this position, <i>in addition to any existing work responsibilities</i> , causes this student to exceed a total hourly work limit of 29 hours per week at Lehigh , and the responsible supervisor listed above proves unable to pay the full cost of the subsidy for the health insurance Lehigh would subsequently be required to offer this student, provided he/she accepts such coverage, my office would NOT be responsible for covering this cost.		
Signature:		Date:	
Printed Name:		Title:	
Department:			

This form, with all information and signatures attached, should be returned to the graduate associate dean's office of the student's College.

COLLEGE ACTION

☐ Request approved ☐ Request denied

Signature:		Date:	
Comments:			

Version 1.2-COE June 2015

Full-time vs. Part-time Student Status; Leaves of Absence

Full-time student status

Certification as a full-time student is based on where a student is in his or her program of study. Full-time status has important legal implications, including affecting visas, loan repayment schedules and the university's IRS status.

Students who require certification as full-time students must complete the appropriate form at the start of EVERY fall and spring semester. Questions of full- or part-time status do not apply to the summer session.

In order to qualify for full-time student status, a student normally must be registered for at least nine (9) credits in a semester. As noted on the full-time student status certification form, however, there are specific circumstances under which a student carrying fewer credits may be certified as full-time.

Part-time student status

Part-time students commonly register for one course (3 credits) or two courses (6 credits) during a fall or spring term.

Leave of Absence

Any student who wishes to not enroll for a semester during their program should apply for a Leave of Absence through the Graduate Life Office. Any student using university resources must be registered; accordingly, a student on a Leave of Absence should not use university resources.

Academic Scholarship Requirements for COE Degree Programs

In keeping with Lehigh University regulations, academic units may have *more stringent* scholarship requirements than those established at the university level. The standards below represent the more stringent academic performance standards required by all degree programs in the College of Education.

Associate Status Students: will be placed on probation when they receive their *first* final course mark below B- and will be dismissed for poor scholarship at the end of any semester in which they are assigned a *second* final course mark below B-. Once on probation, associate students remain on probation until they are granted regular status or receive the degree.

If an associate student is assigned two final course marks below a B- in the same semester, that student will be dismissed for poor scholarship without first being placed on probation. Receiving a final course mark below C- will also result in the associate student being dismissed for poor scholarship without being first placed on probation.

Associate status students must petition to assume regular status once they have completed 9 credits of coursework numbered 200 or above. Students who are eligible to be granted regular status but fail to apply after completing 9 credits will be evaluated according to the criteria that apply to regular status students (below).

Regular Status Students: will be placed on probation at the end of any semester in which they receive their *second* final course mark below B-. Students receiving *three* final course marks below B- will be dismissed for poor scholarship.

Academic Probation: Students placed on academic probation must submit a proposed academic improvement plan to their academic advisors. That plan must include an explanation of why the student received final course marks below B- and must offer a specific plan to address in future coursework the cause of such inadequate academic performance. This plan must be approved by the program faculty. Once regular status students are placed on probation, they remain on probation until completing the degree.

Readmission: Graduate students who have been dismissed for poor scholarship are ineligible to register for coursework in the program. After one semester away, such students may petition for readmission. The program and the dean's office must approve the petition. Students whose petitions are granted will be readmitted on probation and will be dismissed permanently if they receive any additional final course mark below B-.

No final course mark lower than C- may be counted toward a graduate degree and pass-fail registration is not allowed for graduate students.

College Policy on Adequate Academic Progress

The College of Education employs more stringent academic standards than the university for academic performance of graduate students (see <http://www.lehigh.edu/coursecatalog/admission-to-graduate-study.html>). Students failing to meet those standards will be placed on probation or dismissed for poor scholarship. In addition, graduate students in the College of Education (COE) must also continue to make adequate academic progress. Adequate progress is expected of students seeking degrees, non-degree students taking focused coursework toward subsequent admission to an academic program or toward external certification, and students seeking a Lehigh University post-baccalaureate certificate.

To assure graduate students in COE academic programs make necessary academic progress in those programs, faculty of the program in which a student is enrolled may review that student's progress. If, in the judgment of the program faculty, a student is not making adequate progress, by majority vote of the voting program faculty, they may either bar that student from registering for further coursework in the COE until he or she demonstrates adequate progress by completing specified actions, or drop that student from the program for inadequate academic progress. In cases where a student is non-degree, such a vote to drop shall have the effect of barring that student from taking further coursework in that academic program unless (1) that student is subsequently admitted to a COE academic program and (2) such coursework is required by the student's subsequent program of study.

Events that may trigger such an adequate progress review include:

- A graduate student carrying two or more incompletes in non-research courses,
- A graduate student withdrawing from the same course more than once,
- A graduate student withdrawing from more than three required courses in a program of study,
- A graduate student failing to complete non-course program requirements in a timely fashion,
- Any COE faculty member or instructor requesting such a review.

In addition, some COE academic programs mandate periodic reviews of the academic progress of all students in those programs and these reviews shall take place without the necessity of a triggering event.

In making decisions about adequate progress, program faculty shall take into consideration a student's personal health and/or life situation. To assist in such consideration, program directors may request that students clarify the reasons behind their failure to make adequate academic progress.

Right of Appeal

Students have the right of appeal if they feel academic program faculty have erred in (1) barring them from further coursework in the COE until completing some specified indicator(s) of adequate academic progress, (2) dropping them from the program in which they were enrolled, or (3) barring them from taking non-degree coursework in that academic program. Such students should follow the appeal process laid out in the *College of Education Grievances Procedures*, detailed elsewhere in this handbook. The form to use for appeals of sanctions related to *adequate progress* decisions is the *Non-course-related Grievance Form* (available online at: https://coe.lehigh.edu/sites/coe.lehigh.edu/files/COE_NonCourseRelatedGrievanceForm.pdf).

College Academic Integrity Policy

The Faculty of the College of Education is committed to upholding the highest standards of personal, professional, and academic integrity. Thus, each graduate student, graduate assistant, or research assistant in the College of Education is expected to act in accordance with the university's Student Code of Conduct and the standards set by the university faculty. Further, each student is expected to act in accordance with the professional standards set forth by his or her field of study (for example, the Pennsylvania Department of Education and the American Psychological Association).

The faculty will not tolerate acts of plagiarism, cheating, data falsification and other forms of academic misconduct. Using the appropriate procedure, the faculty will send suspected cases of academic dishonesty to the Office of Student Conduct and Community Expectations to initiate a fair process for resolving alleged misconduct.

Students found responsible under the Student Code of Conduct for specific charges of academic misconduct will not be eligible to receive a university recommendation for professional licensure or certification. While this ineligibility might not prevent such students from completing the coursework for a degree and receiving that degree, it would eliminate their ability to achieve certification or licensure.

Process for Resolving Suspected Student Academic Misconduct Under the College Of Education Academic Integrity Policy

This section details the “appropriate procedure ... for resolving alleged misconduct” cited in the policy above. The two-stage procedure consists of an *informal resolution* stage and a *formal resolution* stage. The informal resolution stage takes place *within* the college, while the formal resolution stage takes place *outside* the college and is administered by the Office of Student Conduct and Community Expectations. A two-stage procedure is designed to protect both faculty and students and is intended to be transparent in operation. Each stage is described below.

Informal Resolution (within the College)

If a faculty member, or several faculty members together, have reason to suspect student academic dishonesty —plagiarism, cheating, data falsification or some other form of academic misconduct— he/she/they should first discuss the suspected offense with the student(s) involved and see if they are able to resolve it without involving anyone else. If, however, they are unable to resolve it to their mutual satisfaction **in a timely fashion**, the faculty member(s) should complete the *Suspected Student Academic Misconduct Resolution Process* form (see https://coe.lehigh.edu/sites/coe.lehigh.edu/files/COE_StudAcadMisconductResolveGuide.pdf) and submit it to the Department Chair for administrative acknowledgement. Such acknowledgement makes sure that others within the department and college are aware of the situation and helps insure due process is followed, without removing control of the resolution process from the faculty and student(s) involved, unless they wish it so removed.

This form (see image on right) asks the faculty member(s) to identify the student(s) and faculty involved, to classify the nature of the suspected misconduct, and to describe both the suspected events and attempts at resolution to date.

It further asks the faculty member(s) whether both she/he/they **and the student(s)** wish to pursue informal resolution. If the answer is negative, the issue will move forward immediately to formal resolution through the Office of Student Conduct and Community.

If the submitting faculty member(s) **and the student(s)** respond that they wish to pursue informal resolution, the form requires a date by which that resolution must be achieved or the matter automatically moves forward to the formal resolution process. Specifying a date encourages all involved to complete the informal resolution process in a timely fashion and in good faith. This is an important component of appropriate due process.

College of Education

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY

Suspected Student Academic Misconduct Resolution Process Form

Student Name(s):	LIN #(s):
Name(s) of Submitting Faculty Member(s):	Email(s): Phone #(s):

Nature of Suspected Misconduct: ☐ PLAGIARISM ☐ CHEATING ☐ DATA FALSIFICATION ☐ OTHER

Did the suspected misconduct occur in relation to a course? ☐ YES. (Please complete boxes on right.) ☐ NO. (Continue below.)

COURSE # & TITLE
YEAR TAKEN
TERM (CHECK ONE): ☐ Fall ☐ Spring ☐ Summer

Is the suspected misconduct related to a research project? ☐ YES. (Please complete boxes on right.) ☐ NO. (Continue below.)

WAS THE RESEARCH FUNDED? ☐ YES ☐ NO
WERE HUMAN SUBJECTS INVOLVED? ☐ YES ☐ NO
HAVE FALSE DATA BEEN SHARED PUBLICLY (FOR EXAMPLE, PRESENTATION OR PAPER)? ☐ YES ☐ NO

Please briefly describe what the student(s) did (with dates, if possible) and why you believe it to be an act of academic misconduct. (Feel free to attach a separate document if you need additional space.)

Have you met with the student(s) to discuss your suspicions and seek an informal resolution? (Check one) ☐ YES ☐ NO Date of that meeting:

If you have met with the student(s), please describe the outcome of that meeting. (Feel free to attach a separate document if you need additional space.)

Do both you and the student(s) named wish to continue to seek informal resolution? ☐ YES. (Please enter informal resolution date right.) ☐ NO. (Please enter today's date in box on right.)

Enter below the date by which you must notify the dean's office that this matter has been resolved or it should move forward automatically to the formal resolution process:

I hereby notify the dean's office of this suspected act of student academic misconduct as the required first stage of resolution under the COE Academic Integrity Policy.

Faculty Signature(s) (above)
Date signed:

ADMINISTRATIVE ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:
By signature, each person below acknowledges that the faculty member(s) above suspect(s) academic misconduct and that he/she/they either seek(s) to resolve it informally within the specified time period or wish(es) it to move immediately to consideration by the Office of Student Conduct and Community Expectations.

Department Chair:	Name	Date	Signature
Associate Dean:	Name	Date	Signature

Successful Resolution: If the informal resolution process is successful, the faculty involved notify the department chair of this fact using the *Informal Resolution Status Update Form* (see https://coe.lehigh.edu/sites/coe.lehigh.edu/files/COE_InformResolveStatusUpdateForm-Enter%26Save130502.pdf). The chair then acknowledges this resolution by signing the form and notifying all parties involved **in writing**. The chair then forwards the signed form to the associate dean and the matter is considered resolved. No further action is taken at the departmental or college level.

Termination of Informal Resolution Process: If, at any point before the date specified on the *Suspected Student Academic Misconduct Resolution Process* form, one or more of the faculty **or** student(s) involved may use the *Informal Resolution Status Form* to request the termination of the informal resolution process and that the matter be moved forward to formal resolution. In this case, the department chair shall notify all parties involved **in writing** that the issue is moving forward before the specified informal resolution deadline at the request of one or more of the parties involved. The chair copies the associate dean on this notification.

Mutually Agreeable Extension of Informal Resolution Deadline: If, at any point before the date specified on the *Suspected Student Academic Misconduct Resolution Process* form, **all** parties involved (both all faculty and all students) agree that they wish to extend the informal resolution period, they may request an extension using the *Informal Resolution Status Update Form*. The chair then signs this form, as does the associate dean, and the newly specified deadline for

informal resolution becomes effective. Only one such extension may be granted, however, and it must be confirmed **by signature** as acceptable to **all** parties involved.

Failure to Resolve by Informal Resolution Deadline: If the department chair does not receive notice of successful informal resolution by the date specified on the *Suspected Student Academic Misconduct Resolution Process* form, she/he then notifies all parties involved **in writing**, stating that the informal resolution date has passed without resolution and the issue is moving forward to the formal resolution process. The chair copies the associate dean on this notification.

Formal Resolution Process (outside the College)

The formal resolution process is governed by specific university policies and procedures. These may be found online at:

<http://www.lehigh.edu/~indost/conduct/handbook/sect6.shtml>

Each of the parties involved in the suspected student misconduct plays the role specified in these policies and procedures and is governed by the due process employed.

Termination of Student Status

The student status of students enrolled in the College of Education may be terminated for seven reasons:

1. *Voluntary Termination:* A student notifies the university, through academic advisers, program directors or other university officials, that he/she wishes to discontinue pursue of studies.
2. *Inadequate Academic Progress:* If, in the judgment of the program faculty, a student has failed to meet the expectations of the program in terms of making adequate academic progress, as defined by the College of Education's *Adequate Academic Progress Policy* (see above), that student may be dropped from the program.
3. *Failure to Meet Program Standards/Requirements:* Selected degree programs in the COE (for example, Counseling Psychology and School Psychology) have periodic reviews of student performance and behavior. If, in the judgment of the program's voting faculty, a student has failed to meet the expectations/requirements of the program, that student may be dropped from the program. Such expectations/requirements include both course-related and non-course-related performances and behaviors.
4. *Dismissal for Poor Scholarship:* Regularly admitted students in degree programs who fail to meet the COE's *Academic Performance Standards Policy* will be dismissed from the college.
5. *Disciplinary Dismissal:* Students who undergo a disciplinary review in which they are found responsible, may have their student status terminated (see <http://www.lehigh.edu/~indost/conduct/handbook/sect6.shtml>). The COE has its own procedures for attempting informal resolution of suspected academic misconduct (https://coe.lehigh.edu/sites/coe.lehigh.edu/files/COE_StudAcadMisconductResolveGuide.pdf), procedures aligned with the university's process.
6. *Certification/Licensure Program Termination:* A student in a program leading to external certification or licensure who is found to have violated the COE *Academic Integrity Policy*, will no longer be eligible to pursue such certification and licensure, although he or she may be eligible to complete a degree program that does not include such certification/licensure. Similarly, if, in the judgment of the voting program faculty, a student seeking certification is not suited to further pursuit of that certification (as might happen in programs that prepare school teachers, administrators, counselors and psychologists), that student will be offered the option of completing a degree without certification. This latter instance most frequently occurs when that student has failed to succeed in one of more field placements and/or has demonstrated temperamental/ emotional issues causing concern about recommending to the certifying/licensing agency that the student be granted certified/licensed.
7. *Termination of Doctoral Studies:* A student that fails either the Doctoral Qualifying Examination or the Doctoral General Examination, does not garner approval for the dissertation proposal, or ultimately fails to defend his/her dissertation successfully will no longer be eligible to pursue doctoral studies (see <http://www.lehigh.edu/coursecatalog/degree-information.html>). In such cases, the student may be offered, instead, the opportunity to receive a master's degree, through meeting its requirements.

The college and university have appropriate appeal processes designed to assure students have access to due process. For details of those processes, please see the College of Education *Grievance Procedures* section in this handbook.

College of Education Grievance Procedures

While our goal should be to resolve disagreements, misunderstandings and conflicts through discussions among those involved, there are times when more formal procedures of resolution are needed in order to resolve student grievances. For this reason, students in the College of Education may seek redress of grievances through various agencies and procedures within the college and the broader university. The sections that follow describe procedures to be employed in appealing specific types of grievances.

If a student feels his or her grievance is not addressed by one of the procedures below, however, or the student is unsure how to proceed and would like advice on available options for recourse, that student may meet with the Associate Dean for the College of Education (A325 Iacocca Hall, 610-758-3249), the Dean of Students Office (UC 210; 610-758-4156; <http://www.lehigh.edu/~indost/>) or one of the university ombudspersons (<http://www.lehigh.edu/~inombuds/contact.html>).

Mark/Grade Appeals

1. A student (or group of students) questioning the validity of an assigned mark must file a *written* appeal with the course instructor no later than the last day of classes of the semester following receipt of the final course mark. In the case of spring and summer courses, this means the last day of class of the fall semester, while for fall courses, this means the last day of classes of the spring semester. These deadlines do not, however, limit the ability to correct a mark/grade based on miscalculation or data entry error.
2. In this written appeal, the student(s) shall, using the *Mark/Grade Appeal* form, provide the title and number of the course taken, the name of the course's instructor(s), the term (Fall, spring, summer) and year in which the course was taken, the specific mark under appeal and what it covered (for example, homework assignment, project, presentation, field experience, final course mark) and a detailed description of the reason(s) the assigned mark is inappropriate. Students may obtain the *Mark/Grade Appeal* form online (https://coe.lehigh.edu/sites/coe.lehigh.edu/files/COE_GradeAppealForm.pdf), or from either the program coordinator for their program or the departmental administrative assistant, Donna Ball, in A325.
3. If the student(s) and instructor(s) are unable to resolve the disagreement to the satisfaction of the student(s), the written appeal –now with a written response from the instructor(s)—moves forward to the director of the academic program. (In certain cases involving adjunct instructors, however, the appeal may go first to a faculty supervisor appointed by the academic program. If such a supervisor is involved, he or she meets with the student(s) and instructor(s) and attempts to help resolve the disagreement. If unable to do so, that supervisor adds his or her comments on the merits of the appeal and sends the appeal packet to the program director.)

The program director meets with the parties to seek a resolution. If the program director is unable to facilitate resolution, he or she adds comments on the merits of the appeal to the appeal package and it then moves to the department chair who follows the same procedures in attempting to resolve the difference. If he or she is also unsuccessful, the appeal package – now including the department chair's comments—moves to the Dean of the College of

Education who examines the entire packet, interviews the student(s) and instructor(s) —if the dean deems such interviews necessary— and issues a decision on the grade appeal.

4. If, upon receiving the decision of the dean, the student or students involved still wish to pursue appeal, they may use the formal university graduate petition process described below under *Right of Appeal of Academic Grievances*.

Redress of Grievances Based on Discrimination

Any student complaint of discrimination, if such complaint is not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Standing of Graduate Students (SOGS) or the University judicial system, shall be dealt with in accordance with the university discrimination grievance procedures. This includes appeals regarding accommodations granted by the Office of Academic Support for Students with Learning Disabilities.

For the purpose of these procedures, a *grievance* is a claim that a student has been discriminated against on the basis of age, color, disability, gender, gender identity, marital status, national or ethnic origin, race, religion, sexual orientation or veteran status, in violation of the University's policy on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action/Non-Discrimination.

Before filing a formal grievance, the complainant should discuss the complaint with the Associate Dean of Students (UC 210; 610-758-4156; <http://www.lehigh.edu/~indost/>) who will then advise on an appropriate course of action. This step provides an opportunity for the informal resolution of a situation that may be discriminatory. In such a resolution, the Associate Dean of Students may refer the student to other sources of help or serve as a mediator between the student and the perceived source of the problem.

Where the matter is not subject to informal resolution, the student may file a formal grievance with the Associate Dean of Students (UC 210) who serves as designee for the Provost for receipt of such grievances under the University's Policy on Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action/Non-Discrimination. Such formal grievances will be handled using the university discrimination grievance procedures detailed in the university student handbook.

Redress of Grievances Based on Harassment

Grievances based on harassment are covered under university procedures specified in the university policy on harassment. Please visit:

<http://www.lehigh.edu/~inprv/faculty/harassmentinformation.html>

to obtain a copy of the policy, as well as information on the university person(s) you should contact.

Redress of Other Course-related Academic Grievances

1. A student (or group of students) with a complaint that arises out of any course but is not covered by one of the procedures above should bring the complaint first to the instructor of the course in which the source of the grievance occurred. This grievance may be presented orally, although the student(s) should make clear the nature of the grievance and what action he/she/they would like taken to resolve that grievance.

2. If, after meeting with the instructor, students do not feel satisfied, they prepare a written grievance to take to the director of the academic program in which the course is offered. This written grievance, which must be completed using the *Course-related Non-grade Grievance* form, shall document the title and number of the course taken, the name of the course's instructor(s), the term (fall, spring, summer) and year in which the course was taken, a description of the events or actions leading to the complaint and a proposed resolution to the complaint. Students may obtain the *Course-related Non-grade Grievance* form online (https://coe.lehigh.edu/sites/coe.lehigh.edu/files/COE_CourseRelatedNonGradeGrievanceForm.pdf) or from either the program coordinator for their program or the departmental administrative assistant in A325.
3. The program director asks the instructor(s) to submit a written response to the grievance and attaches this response to the student grievance packet. The program director then meets with the parties to seek a resolution. If unable to do so, he or she adds comments to the grievance package and it then moves to the department chair who follows the same procedures in attempting to resolve the situation. If he or she is also unsuccessful, the grievance package –now including the department chair's comments— moves to the Dean of the College of Education who examines the entire packet, interviews the student(s) and instructor(s) —if the dean deems such interviews necessary– and issues a decision on the grievance.
4. If the student/group of students has/have serious concerns about meeting with the instructor, he/she/they may skip the meeting described under #1 above and move the grievance directly to the director of the academic program. Similarly, if students have serious concerns about meeting with the program director (#2 above), the grievance may move directly to the department chair. In either case, the grievance must be written, being sure to include the information specified in #2 above.

While skipping individuals in the hierarchical grievance procedure is not a recommended course of action, if students have *serious* concerns about holding such meetings, they may choose to do so. This does not, however, eliminate the ability of the individual skipped to respond to the grievance packet. It simply eliminates the face-to-face meeting that might have resolved the grievance without moving to the next higher level. If students have such serious concerns, they may consult the Associate Dean for the College of Education (A325 Iacocca Hall, 610-758-3249), the Dean of Students Office (UC 210; 610-758-4156; <http://www.lehigh.edu/~indost/>) or one of the university ombudspersons (<http://www.lehigh.edu/~inombuds/contact.html>) for guidance on how to submit the grievance.

5. If, upon receiving the decision of the dean, the student or students involved still wish to seek redress, they may use the formal university graduate petition process described below under *Right of Appeal of Academic Grievances*.

Redress of Non-course-related Grievances

1. A graduate student (or group of graduate students) with a grievance related to an activity **outside** courses –including research activities— that is not covered by one of the procedures listed above, should bring that grievance first to the responsible faculty or staff member. In the meeting with that faculty or staff member, students may describe their grievance orally, provided that they make clear the nature of the grievance and how they would wish it redressed.

2. If, after meeting with the responsible faculty or staff member, students wish to pursue the matter further, they use the *Non-course-related Grievance* form to prepare a written grievance that (1) identifies the individuals involved, (2) notes when the events or actions leading to the grievance occurred, (3) describes why they were inappropriate and (4) proposes actions to resolve the grievance. Students may obtain the *Non-course-related Grievance* form online (https://coe.lehigh.edu/sites/coe.lehigh.edu/files/COE_NonCourseRelatedGrievanceForm.pdf), or from either the program coordinator for their program or the departmental administrative assistant, Donna Ball, in A325.
3. The written grievance then moves to the appropriate program director or university supervisor, who asks the responsible faculty or staff member to submit a written response to the grievance and attaches this response to the student grievance packet. The program director or university supervisor then meets with the parties involved and seeks to resolve the grievance. If unable to do so, he or she adds comments on the merits of the grievance to the grievance package and it then moves to the department chair who follows the same procedures in attempting to resolve the situation. If he or she is unsuccessful, the grievance package –now including the department chair’s comments— moves to the Dean of the College of Education who examines the entire packet, interviews the student(s) and responsible faculty or staff member —if the dean deems such interviews necessary– and issues a decision on the grievance.
4. If the student/group of students has/have serious concerns about meeting with the responsible faculty or staff member, he/she/they may skip the meeting described under #1 above and move the grievance directly to the director of the academic program or the appropriate university staff supervisor. Similarly, if students have serious concerns about meeting with the program director or university staff supervisor (#3 above), the grievance may move directly to the department chair. In either case, the grievance must be written, being sure to include the information specified in #2 above.

While skipping individuals in the hierarchical grievance procedure is not a recommended course of action, if students have *serious* concerns about such meetings, they may choose to do so. This does not, however, eliminate the ability of the individual skipped to respond to the grievance packet. It simply eliminates the face-to-face meeting that might have resolved the grievance without moving to the next higher level. If students have such serious concerns, they may consult the Associate Dean for the College of Education (A325 Iacocca Hall, 610-758-3249), the Dean of Students Office (UC 210; 610-758-4156; <http://www.lehigh.edu/~indost/>) or one of the university ombudspersons (<http://www.lehigh.edu/~inombuds/contact.html>) for guidance on how to submit the grievance.

5. If, upon receiving the decision of the dean, the student or students involved still wish to seek redress, they may use the formal university graduate petition process described below under *Right of Appeal of Academic Grievances*.

Right of Appeal of Academic Grievances

In general, a graduate student has the right to petition on any academic matter of concern. Petition forms are available online (https://coe.lehigh.edu/sites/coe.lehigh.edu/files/LU_GradStudentPetitionForm.pdf), or from all program coordinators in the College of Education, as well as the Deans Office (A325 Iacocca Hall).

With the exception of grievances involving discrimination and harassment, which are covered by separate policies and sets of procedures, student failing to gain satisfaction using the procedures described above may appeal by petition to the Committee on Standing of Graduate Students (SOGS). This committee includes the graduate associate deans of all four colleges, the Director of Graduate Student Life and a representative from the Graduate and Research Committee (GRC). The SOGS committee meets regularly with the Registrar and considers all graduate petitions. The Registrar's Office notifies the petitioner of the decision of the committee.

If a petitioner is not satisfied with the decision of the SOGS Committee, he or she may appeal the decision to the full GRC. Appeals to the full GRC are, however, rare and the appellant must make clear in writing why the decision of the SOGS Committee was inappropriate and why whatever resolution the petitioner proposes is more appropriate.

College Policy on Transfer of Credits to Master's Degree

Approved by COE Faculty May 2003, edited June 2013

The College of Education has adopted a more restrictive policy on transfer of credits than has been approved by the University. Such policy is permitted by R & P 3.22.2.

With the approval of the department chair offering commensurate courses and the student's department chair (if different), a maximum of six credits may be transferred from another university to a Lehigh master's program.

Students must complete a *course transfer petition* (shown on next two pages and available online at <http://coe.lehigh.edu/content/current-student-information>) and see that it receives the necessary signatures and is submitted to the Registrar, along with course descriptions and an official transcript. Students may also be asked for a statement from their former institution to confirm that the course has not been used toward a prior degree.

To be eligible for credit towards a Lehigh Master's program, all transferred courses must:

1. Have been taken at the graduate level
2. Be one in which the student received a final mark of B or better
3. Not have been used toward any prior degree
4. Have been completed within four years of first enrollment into a Lehigh graduate program
5. Be transferred from an institution that is accredited by one of the six regional accrediting associations.

Transfer Credits within the Five-year Teacher-certification Program

Graduate students who were undergraduates admitted to the five-year program may petition to transfer up to 12 credits of completed Lehigh coursework taken while they were undergraduates, provided those courses meet ALL the criteria listed below.

To be eligible for transfer toward a teacher-preparation master's degree each course must:

1. Not have been applied toward the Lehigh undergraduate degree.
2. Have been reserved for application to the graduate degree through completion of the required form (see LINK).
3. Be a course in the program of study for that master's degree.
4. Be one in which the student received a final course mark of B- or better.

NOTE: Students do NOT need to petition to apply courses toward meeting the requirements of certification, since there is no requirement that such courses be part of a degree program.

Graduate Course Credit Transfer Petition

Student Name: _____	LIN # _____
Department: _____	College: _____
Degree sought: _____	Advisor: _____
I wish to attend/have attended _____ name of other college/university	during _____ semester (e.g., Summer 2010)
I request credit for the following course in place of the approved course at Lehigh University:	
Course number and title at other college or university: _____	# of credits: _____
Lehigh course number/title to be replaced by requested course: _____	Registrar's decision on # of Lehigh credits:

Lehigh University Faculty policy for transfer credit towards a graduate degree:

Transfer of credit from other institutions is the responsibility of the registrar. Graduate students planning to take work at other institutions in the United States or elsewhere should initially check with the registrar on policies and procedures. Current graduate students may not be concurrently enrolled at any other institution without prior permission from the Standing of Graduate Students (SOGS) Committee. Transfer of final course marks from other institutions is not possible; only the approved credits transfer.

- Pass/Fail courses are not acceptable for transfer.
- Credits may not be transferred toward a Lehigh doctoral degree.
- Courses must be taken with graduate student status; courses taken under a limited/non degree seeking, continuing education, or simply post-baccalaureate status are not eligible.
- Courses must be designated at the graduate level and not have been used toward any prior degree.
- Advanced undergraduate courses are not eligible for graduate degree credit.
- Only courses for which the student received a final mark of "B" or higher will transfer. Courses for which the student received a final mark of "B-" or below will not transfer.
- Students may receive credit at Lehigh equivalent to that which was granted as indicated on the transcript of the other college/university, but only up to the number of credits for the equivalent course at Lehigh. Courses taken on the quarter system have credit granted on a 3-to-2 ratio, producing a whole number for the transfer credits (for example, 10 quarter credits of approved coursework become 6 credits at Lehigh, not 6.67).
- Please see the back of this form for additional policies that limit how many credits may be transferred.
- The Registrar determines the number of credit hours awarded upon receipt of the official transcript.

If you have any questions about these policies, please contact the Registrar's Office.

I confirm that I have read the policies above and on the back and understand that they govern my requested course credit transfer:

Student Signature (above)

Date signed:

Grad Program Coordinator/Adviser:	Name	Date	Recommendation & signature
Department Chair:	Name	Date	Recommendation & signature
Associate Dean:	Name	Date	Recommendation & signature
Registrar:	Name	Date	Approve <input type="checkbox"/> Disapprove <input type="checkbox"/>
		Date	Action

Comments:

Additional Graduate Degree Transfer Credit Policies/Limitations

Student petitions meeting the standards listed on the front are also bound by the following five limitations on course transfers into a Lehigh Master's degree program. Any request for more than six credits must be submitted with a filled out Masters Degree Program form with all appropriate approvals.

1. The maximum number of credits that may transfer in is determined by the total number of credits in the master's program:
 - Up to nine credits for programs of 36 credits or less
 - Up to twelve credits for programs of 37 to 48 credits
 - Up to fifteen credits for programs of 49 to 60 credits
2. To be eligible for credit towards a Lehigh master's program all transferred courses must:
 - Have been taken at the graduate level
 - Have been completed within four years of first enrollment into a Lehigh graduate program
 - If taken in the U.S, be offered by a U.S. institution and that institution must be accredited by one of the six regional accrediting associations: Middle States Association of College and Schools, North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, New England Association of Colleges and Schools, Northwest Association of Colleges and Schools, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and Western Association of Colleges and Schools.
3. To be eligible for transfer, courses from by an international institution must be offered by a post-baccalaureate degree-granting institution. Credit will be evaluated on an individual basis.
4. Certain colleges or degree programs may have more restrictive policies with regard to the number of transferable credits or eligibility of courses.
5. Students must submit to the Registrar (a) the completed *Graduate Course Credit Transfer Petition* form, (b) an official course description from the institution at which the course to be transferred is offered, and (c) an official transcript. Students may also be asked to provide a statement from the institution offering the course confirming that the course has not been used toward a prior degree.

NOTE: Only those courses listed and approved on this form will transfer. Any student taking a course different from the one listed, risks having the course not be eligible for transfer credit.

PROCEDURES

1. Complete one form for each course that you wish to transfer into your master's degree program.
2. Complete **all parts** of the front of this form and secure the necessary signatures. (Please note: Departmental recommendations are used to inform the Registrar's decision, but the Registrar is the final authority for the university.)
3. Submit the completed petition form to the Office of the Registrar, along with all attachments.
4. Once a course has been completed, you must request that an OFFICIAL transcript be sent to:
Office of the Registrar, Lehigh University, 27 Memorial Drive West, Bethlehem, PA 18015

Information for Current Graduate Students considering leaves of absence

Graduate students are eligible to petition for up to a two-year leave of absence from Lehigh for circumstances beyond their control. The assumption is that graduate students who take a leave of absence from Lehigh will not be taking coursework toward their degree at another institution of higher education during that leave. This assumption is reflected in the fact that the time-to-completion-of-degree is extended by the length of the leave of absence. Thus, if you plan to take coursework at another institution while on a leave of absence, please discuss your situation with your advisor and recognize that you would need to:

1. Secure approval to take coursework toward your degree while on leave.
2. Receive advance approval (using this form) before taking any such coursework.
3. Follow all procedures listed above.

Direct questions about leaves of absence to Kathleen Hutnik, Director of Graduate Student Life (kaha@lehigh.edu).

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY
Office of the Registrar
27 Memorial Drive West
Bethlehem, PA 18015



Lehigh University Graduate Petitions

Students wishing to petition, use the official university *Graduate Petition* form (shown on next page and available online at https://coe.lehigh.edu/sites/coe.lehigh.edu/files/LU_GradStudentPetitionForm.pdf).

This PDF document allows the petitioner to check various types of requests, or check OTHER and then describe his or her request in 50 words or less. The petitioner has approximately 200 words to describe the reason(s) why what he or she has requested should be granted. Once again, the petitioner enters this text directly into the PDF form. Alternatively, the petitioner may prepare the text in a word-processing document and then cut-and-paste the text from that document. If the petitioner needs more than 200 words, he or she may note that fact on the form and then print out an additional page and attach it.

Whenever possible, however, the petitioner should make his or her *very best* effort to use the PDF and not attach additional pages. This environmentally conscious approach not only reduces use of paper, it is also more efficient.

The petitioner may save the form to his or her computer and complete it in several sessions. Once the petitioner has completed the form, he or she prints out a copy for distribution to obtain the necessary signatures and recommendations.

The *Graduate Petition* form notes the exact nature of required documentation and the petitioner, as well as those faculty and administrators who subsequently consider the petition, should be certain to include that required documentation. Otherwise, the petition will likely be tabled until such documentation is provided. This will delay a petition by at least two weeks and can lead to a petition being denied for lack of documentation if that documentation is not provided in a timely fashion after the petition is tabled.

Faculty may attach additional printed pages to make clear why they support or oppose the petitioner's request. Each faculty or administrative signer must either recommend *approve* or *deny*. Signers are, however, allowed in their comments to make clear any reservations they have in supporting the petitioner.

Petition-consideration Process

1. A student obtains a petition form and (1) checks the appropriate boxes for what action he/she wants taken ["I respectfully request: ..."] **and** (2) enters text telling why that action is more appropriate than the action already taken ["Reasons: ..."]. The student fills out the top of the petition, entering contact information, prints the form and then signs and dates it.
2. The signed form then goes to the student's academic adviser. That adviser reviews the petition, makes a recommendation ["Approve" or "Deny"], provides any justification for his/her recommendation and then signs and dates the form.
3. The doubly signed form goes next to the graduate coordinator who reviews the petition and any attachments, makes a recommendation ["Approve" or "Deny"], provides any justification for his/her recommendation and then signs and dates the form.

4. The triply signed form next goes to the department chair who reviews the petition and any attachments, makes a recommendation ["Approve" or "Deny"], provides any justification for his/her recommendation and then signs and dates the form.
5. Now carrying four signatures, the petition form goes to the dean's office where the associate dean reviews the petition and any attachments, makes a recommendation ["Approve," "Deny" or "Defer to SOGS"], provides any justification for his/her recommendation and then signs and dates the form. [Associate deans recommend "Defer to SOGS" when they feel there may be cross-college issues that should be discussed before making a recommendation.]
6. The petition leaves the college at this point and goes down to the registrar's office. The registrar reviews the petition and any attachments, checks the student's record for any additional relevant information, and determines if the petition is covered by a recent precedent by the Committee on the Standing of Graduate Students (SOGS). If so, the registrar acts on the petition based on that precedent. If not, the registrar distributes the petition electronically to all members of SOGS and schedules it for discussion at the next SOGS meeting.
7. The SOGS committee meets every other week, including some meetings in the summer, and typically considers between four and 12 petitions at each meeting. Each petition is discussed and carefully considered and the committee votes to *approve*, *deny*, or *table* the petition.
8. If a petition is tabled, the graduate associate dean from the petitioner's college notifies the department/program of that fact and requests the missing documentation. A petition may remain on the table for *no more than two meetings*; if the requested documentation has not been supplied by then, the petition is automatically denied.
9. If the committee decides to *approve* or *deny* the petition, the registrar's office notifies the petitioner of the decision of the committee.
10. If a petitioner is not satisfied with this decision, he or she may appeal to the Graduate and Research Committee (GRC). This appeal should be in the form of a letter to the GRC that the student delivers to the chair of the GRC. In this letter, the student should make clear (1) what action he or she wishes taken instead of the action taken by SOGS, (2) why the action taken by SOGS was inappropriate, and (3) why the requested action is the more appropriate action.
11. The GRC as a whole considers the student's appeal and issues its decision.



Graduate Student Petition

Student Name:		LIN #	
Local Address:		Department	
		College:	
Local Phone #:		Email Address:	

I respectfully request... (Choose one or more from list at right and check all applicable boxes related to your request):	<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of time to doctoral degree [D1 & D2]	<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of time-to-degree for master's [D1 & D2]
	<input type="checkbox"/> Registration change: Drop 1 course; add 1 course (Course swap) [D3, D6 & D9]	<input type="checkbox"/> Waiver of late fee [D6]
	<input type="checkbox"/> Late addition of one or more courses [D3, D6 & D9]	<input type="checkbox"/> Late withdrawal from a course (Course drop) [D6 & D9]
	<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of time to remove incomplete [D8]	<input type="checkbox"/> Tuition-related appeal [D4]
	<input type="checkbox"/> Permission to carry an overload [D7]	<input type="checkbox"/> Waiver of registration in semester of graduation
	<input type="checkbox"/> Transfer from previous program to new program [D5]	<input type="checkbox"/> Readmit to academic program after time away [D10]
	<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER [D11] (Describe on right in 50 words or less.):	
	Please describe the reason(s) you believe what you request above should be granted. (Accepts approx. 200 words; attach separate page if need more space.)	

Required Documentation Student submitting petition or those asked to approve it MUST provide the documentation listed on the right (as indicated by #'s in brackets after each request above).	<input type="checkbox"/> [D1] New timeline to degree with major milestones + adviser confirmation student likely to complete within extension <input type="checkbox"/> [D2] Adviser explains why student unable to complete in allotted time to degree and confirms coursework still valid (not too old). <input type="checkbox"/> [D3] Instructor confirms late add is OK and student can make up any missed work. <input type="checkbox"/> [D4] Instructor provides final date student attended class or participated in course (or confirms student never attended/participated). <input type="checkbox"/> [D5] Both old and new programs agree to program transfer. <input type="checkbox"/> [D6] Student (and/or instructor) explains why request to change registration after the applicable deadline. <input type="checkbox"/> [D7] Student states whether is TA, GA, RA or Undergrad and explains why can't take coursework under existing load limitations. <input type="checkbox"/> [D8] Instructor confirms incomplete is in research or non-research course + supports extension with reason for student delay. <input type="checkbox"/> [D9] Completed and signed Drop/Add form <input type="checkbox"/> [D10] Copy of internally-generated LU transcript showing course marks and cumulative GPA. <input type="checkbox"/> [D11] Documentation supporting the need for OTHER action identified above and confirming the reasons given above
--	---

IMPORTANT: To allow adequate time for members of the SOGS Committee to review this petition before the meeting at which it is to be considered, the Registrar's Office MUST receive your **completed** petition WITH ALL SIGNATURES BELOW no later than 4:45pm the Thursday before that meeting.

Student Signature (above)	Date signed

ADMINISTRATIVE CONSIDERATION:
 Each person listed below is to review the student's request, any attachments, and the recommendations of those who have considered that request before him or her. If a person signing below is unable to fit his or her comments into the recommendation and signature block or wishes to include more comprehensive comments or information, he or she may prepare that as a separate document and attach it to this form.

Adviser:				
	Name(s)	Email Address	Date	Recommendation & signature
Grad Program Director:				
	Name	Email Address	Date	Recommendation & signature
Department Chair:				
	Name	Email Address	Date	Recommendation & signature
Dean's Office:				
	Name	Email Address	Date	Recommendation & signature
Registrar Action:	APPROVED	DENIED		
			Date	Initials
Other comments/conditions (35 words or less):				

Version 2.0 August 14, 2015



Faculty Guide to Providing Support for Graduate Student Petitions: Increasing the Odds of Achieving Desired Outcomes

At Lehigh, one often hears, "A student can petition anything." While this may be true, it is also true that not all petitions are successful. The Committee on the Standing of Graduate Students (SOGS) meets every other week, including some meetings in the summer, and we typically hear between four and 12 petitions at each meeting.

Our desire is to see that petitions that should be approved are approved and ones that should be denied are denied. The best situation would be for every petition to provide the information needed to make an informed decision and for petitions to be treated equitably. In order for this to happen, it is important that faculty members make sure they provide enough information to make clear why they support or oppose a petition.

This brief guide outlines the petition process at Lehigh and offers some ways to enhance the likelihood that a petition is judged appropriately. Many of these suggestions may seem obvious to you, but members of SOGS can tell you that we view petitions at every meeting that do not follow them. Further, associate deans often send back proposals that fail to provide the necessary information and this slows the process.

A brief description of the petition process at Lehigh, arranged chronologically:

1. A student obtains a petition form and writes (1) What action he/she wants taken ["I respectfully request: ..."] and (2) Why that action is more appropriate than the action already taken ["Reasons: ..."]. The student fills out the top of the petition, providing contact information, and then signs and dates it.
2. The signed form then goes to the student's academic adviser. That adviser reviews the petition, makes a recommendation [*Approve* or *Deny*], provides any justification for his/her recommendation and then signs and dates the form.
3. The doubly signed form goes next to the graduate program director who reviews the petition and any attachments, makes a recommendation [*"Approve"* or *"Deny"*], provides any justification for his/her recommendation and then signs and dates the form.
4. The triply signed form next goes to the department chair who reviews the petition and any attachments, makes a recommendation [*Approve* or *Deny*], provides any justification for his/her recommendation and then signs and dates the form.
5. Now carrying four signatures, the petition form goes to the dean's office where the associate dean reviews the petition and any attachments, makes a recommendation [*Approve*, *Deny* or *Defer to SOGS*], provides any justification for his/her recommendation and then signs and dates the form. [Associate deans recommend "Defer to SOGS" when they feel there may be cross-college issues that should be discussed before making a recommendation.]
6. The petition leaves the college at this point and goes down to the registrar's office. The registrar reviews the petition and any attachments, checks the student's record for any additional relevant information, and determines if the petition is covered by a recent precedent by the SOGS committee. If so, the registrar acts on the petition based on that precedent. If not, the registrar distributes the petition electronically to all members of SOGS and schedules it for discussion at the next SOGS meeting.
7. The SOGS committee meets to discuss the petition and then makes a decision on whether to approve or deny it. The registrar's office then notifies the petitioner of the decision of the committee.
8. If a petitioner is not satisfied with this decision, he or she may appeal to the Graduate and Research Committee (GRC). This appeal should be in the form of a letter to the GRC that the student delivers to the chair of the GRC. In this letter, the student should make clear (1) what action he or she wishes taken instead of the action taken by SOGS, (2) why the action taken by SOGS was inappropriate, and (3) why the requested action is the more appropriate action. (<http://www.lehigh.edu/~indost/conduct/handbook/sect4.shtml>)
9. The GRC as a whole considers the student's appeal and issues its decision.

Updated 7/31/2011

Now some suggestions for faculty in supporting or denying a graduate student petition:

Suggestion	Explanation
Make sure the requested action is clearly indicated:	If student does not make clear in his/her statement on the petition exactly what he or she is requesting, don't sign the petition. Instead, send it back to the student for clarification. A petition that is unclear about what it is requesting should never move forward; you cannot make a recommendation on such a petition.
Always make a recommendation:	Before you sign your name, write Approve or Deny . It is not enough to simply sign your name. Don't make your colleagues later in the petition process guess what you intended. If they are uncertain, they will likely send the petition back to you and that slows the process down.
Always include an approved plan for completion (with timeline) with requests for doctoral extensions:	When a graduate student is requesting an extension to the 7-year period (post-master's) or the 10-year period (post-bachelor's), the petition must have attached to it a timeline for completion that includes key milestones (like qualifying examination, comprehensive exams, proposal presentation, research/data collection, dissertation write-up, and dissertation defense). The doctoral adviser needs to state in writing that he or she believes this new schedule is reasonable and that the student is capable of meeting it. While this does not bind the adviser, advisers should be candid about the likelihood of students finishing. It is not a kindness to prolong the timeline of a student who is not likely to finish.
Provide documentation for petitions to drop a class after 10 days with a refund:	Any time a student petitions to drop a class and receive a refund, a statement from the instructor confirming the last day attended must be attached to the petition. This determines how much the student gets back in refund. If this statement is not included, SOG will not act on the petition until it is provided.
Recognize that dropping a class and getting a full refund is rare:	Students very seldom receive a full refund. They have almost always used university resources such as email, the library and the time of professors and staff. What students receive is a prorated refund, based on how long they were enrolled in a course. Fortunately, there is a more generous medical refund for emergencies. If a student petitions for a full refund, contending that he/she never attended classes, used course materials or met with the instructor, the instructor's letter must confirm these contentions.
For extended absence, request a leave of absence, not an extension:	If a student has been (or expects to be) away from graduate study for 1-2 years for professional, personal or health reasons, consider requesting a leave of absence instead of an extension. Leave of absences for changing jobs, family events, and medical reasons are almost always granted and they extend the doctoral clock automatically. Recognize, however, that a student must take no more than two years of leave of absence.
For anything unusual, give a justification:	While many requests are straightforward, other requests are not. If there is anything unusual about the student's request, attach a statement telling why you support or don't support it. This need not be a long statement, but such a statement makes a big difference to your colleagues later in the petition process. You are usually closer to the situation and will know persuasive information that you can share.
Only approve deserving petitions:	If a petition is worthy of support, approve it. If, however, you do not think it should be approved deny it. It is not fair to the signers that follow you in the process for you to pass the task of denying to them.

Updated 7/31/2011

Doctoral Program Policies and Procedures

College of Education Doctoral Program Requirements and Procedures

Approved March 1, 1985; Amended October 4, 1996, September 1, 2000, Summer 2003, January 2006, May 2013, December 2017)

I. ADMISSIONS

A. Admission to Graduate Standing

1. Admission of a student to the College of Education must be executed through the College of Education Graduate Admission Office. For a student to be admitted with regular graduate standing, all credentials must reach this office at least thirty days before classes commence for the semester in which the student wishes to register. Admission is offered only upon approval of the academic program faculty. Students admitted within 30 days prior to start of classes will be granted *Associate* admission.
2. A graduate student who is absent from the University for more than a semester must petition to be readmitted to graduate standing.

B. Admission to the Doctoral Program

The College of Education has established minimum standards for admission to the Ed.D. and Ph.D. programs, although academic programs within the college may establish more rigorous admission criteria. Those minimum standards are as follows:

1. On initial application, the applicant must meet ONE of the following criteria, as appropriate to the applicant's level of previous study at time of admission:
 - A combined score at the 75th percentile for education across verbal and quantitative subtests of the GRE aptitude test or the 75th percentile of the MAT. (Programs can make their own decisions about whether to use the GRE writing sample subtest for purposes of admissions.);
 - OR--
 - An undergraduate grade point average of at least 3.00 (if applying as a post-bachelor's degree admit) or a graduate grade point average of at least 3.5 on a minimum of 30 credits;
 - OR--
 - An undergraduate grade point average of at least 3.00 in the last two semesters (if applying as a post-bachelor's degree admit).
2. Students must successfully pass the qualifying process, which varies from academic program to program. Students should consult their program's manual for information on the qualifying process of their particular academic program. A student who successfully completes the qualifying process will be informed in writing by the Program Director. At that point, the student will be considered to be formally admitted to the doctoral program and is henceforth referred to as a *doctoral* student (having previously classified simply as a *graduate student* pursuing doctoral study).

C. Admission to Candidacy

In order to be admitted formally to candidacy for the doctorate, the student must have a *formally accepted, final dissertation proposal* presented to the Dean. (Note: A dissertation proposal with revisions requested is not yet complete.) To pursue candidacy, the student must submit an application, a proposed program of study, and a proposal for the dissertation (see Section IV) to the Dean of Education for approval. Included in the

application is verification of meeting the concentrated learning requirement. The form of the application is prescribed in an instruction sheet available from the Program Coordinator's Office.

- D. A doctoral student who wishes to transfer from one academic program to another within the College of Education must:
1. Petition to transfer into the new program, and
 2. Meet the eligibility requirements for that new program.
 3. Be accepted into the new academic program.

II. ADVISEMENT, REGISTRATION, AND REGULATIONS

A. Advisement

1. The director of the academic program through which the student is admitted to graduate standing appoints a member of the faculty in the student's major field to advise the student on the program and support that student's registration for courses.
2. The director of the academic program that accepts a student for doctoral study establishes a file for the official credentials, records, and correspondence which relate to that student. This student file is a program file.
3. The value placed on prior professional experience and course work of each doctoral student is determined by the faculty of the program in which the student is enrolled.
4. The program of study for each doctoral student is developed by the student in consultation with his or her faculty adviser, in keeping with the curricular decisions of the faculty of that academic program.

B. Registration

1. A student that is registered full-time may take no more than 15 credit hours concurrently. A student holding a TA, RA, or GA appointment entailing 20 hours of effort per week (labeled as a *half-time appointment*) is limited to taking 10 concurrent credit hours. Students holding an appointment entailing less than 20 hours of effort per week are not so limited, although –like graduate students who are employed elsewhere and can give only part of their time to graduate work—they should restrict their academic loads accordingly.
2. Students are expected to register-before the first day of classes. After the first day of classes, late registration or registration changes are permitted only by petition to the Registrar and a late fee is charged. Generally, registration is refused after the 15th day (8th day in summer).
3. All students using Lehigh University resources MUST be registered. A student must be registered in the semester in which the degree is conferred.
4. Any student who wishes to not enroll for a semester during their program should apply for a Leave of Absence through the Graduate Life Office. Again, any student using university resources must be registered; accordingly, a student on a Leave of Absence should not use university resources.
5. If the minimum degree registration requirement of 72 or 48 credits is attained prior to formal admission to doctoral candidacy, continued registration of at least three credits per semester (fall and spring) is necessary. This "minimum degree registration" requirement differs, according to the student's academic level prior to

initial admission to the doctoral program: For students admitted to the doctoral program after completing their bachelor's degree, the minimum is 72 credits. For students admitted after completing their master's degree, it is 48 credits.

6. If the student has completed all required coursework, he or she traditionally registers for 3 credits of dissertation.
7. After admission to doctoral candidacy, regardless of whether a student wishes full-time student status, that student **MUST** maintain candidacy by registering at least two times each calendar year (in both fall and spring semesters or in either fall or spring semester plus one summer session). After completion of the minimal registration requirement plus any additional requirements of the student's department or program, students may register for one credit hour of 'Maintenance of Candidacy' (MOC).

C. Full-time Student Status

1. Certification as a full-time student is based on where a student is in his or her program of study. Full-time status has important legal implications, including affecting visas, loan repayment schedules and the university's IRS status.
2. Students who require certification as full-time students must complete the appropriate form at the start of EVERY fall and spring semester.
3. In order to qualify for full-time student status, a student normally must be registered for at least nine (9) credits in a semester. As noted on the full-time student status certification form, however, there are specific circumstances under which a student carrying fewer credits may be certified as full-time.

D. Time Limits (*Time-to-degree Clock*)

1. A student's time-to-degree clock begins with the *first* course to be counted toward that degree.
2. All work beyond the baccalaureate to be counted toward the doctorate must be completed within a ten-year period after commencing graduate study.
3. If the student interrupts his/her studies after completing the Master's degree, he or she has seven years to complete the doctorate.
4. Extension of the time limit is granted only for good cause, such as serious health or personal issues or military service. Approval of such an extension is through the petition process and will only be granted in cases where there is support from the doctoral adviser, program director, department chair and associate dean. This petition **MUST** include: (1) a clear rationale for why the student has been unable to complete the degree within the allotted time; (2) a detailed description of the student's new timeline for degree completion, including all key doctoral milestones; and (3) a statement of support from the doctoral adviser, endorsing the fact that the new timeline is reasonable *and* confirming the adviser is confident the student can finish within that timeline.
5. A student who encounters challenges to completing his or her doctoral degree that are outside his/her control --such as job changes, health or personal issues and the like-- may petition for *up to a total of two years* of leave of absence. If granted, such leaves automatically extend the student's time-to-completion clock by the amount of the granted leave and a student already admitted to candidacy is not required to register for maintenance of candidacy while on leave.

Whenever possible, students should apply for such leaves *prior* to taking time away from doctoral study, although in unusual circumstances, a student may apply for such a leave retroactively. Students on leaves of absence are NOT ALLOWED to register or to work with faculty on doctoral work or completion of required doctoral tasks.

E. Concentrated Learning

1. Each Ph.D. or Ed.D. candidate must satisfy Lehigh's concentrated learning requirement. This requirement is intended to ensure that doctoral students spend a period of concentrated study and intellectual association with other scholars. To fulfill this requirement, the student must complete either two semesters of full-time Lehigh graduate study or 18 credit hours of Lehigh graduate study, either on or off campus, within a fifteen-month period.
2. Individual doctoral programs in the college may have specific concentrated learning requirements that exceed these minimums. For this reason, each student should confirm the specific requirements of the doctoral program in which he or she is enrolled.

F. Withdrawals and Incompletes

1. Course withdrawals with a grade of W are permitted only during the first nine weeks of classes during the regular academic year. During a summer session, such withdrawals must occur before half of the session has elapsed. After these points, instructors may assign a mark of either WP or WF, depending on the performance of the student in the course to that point.
2. If the student withdraws from all courses, the withdrawal must be processed through the College of Education Graduate Admission Office to the Registrar.
3. Graduate students have one calendar year to remove an incomplete unless an earlier deadline is specified by the instructor. Incomplete final marks that are not removed within one year, either devolve to the parenthetical mark originally submitted by the instructor or to an F if no such parenthetical mark was submitted. One exception to this timeline is removal of incompletes in courses designated as research courses. Such courses maintain the N mark until such time as the instructor submits a *Change of Final Mark* form.

G. Academic Performance Expectations and Policies

1. Doctoral students are governed by university, college and academic program policies related to academic performance. College policies may be more stringent than university policies and academic program policies may be more stringent than college policies.
2. Applicable college policies related to student academic performance are described in the *Education and Human Services Department Handbook* and include:
 - College Policy on Adequate Academic Progress
 - College Academic Integrity Policy
 - Academic Scholarship Requirements for College of Education Programs
3. In addition, students should review the program manual for their academic programs to identify any relevant program policies related to program expectations and requirements for student academic performance.

III. GENERAL EXAMINATION

- A. The general examination (comprehensive examination) for the doctorate is designated to test both the student's capacity and proficiency in his/her major and minor fields of study. The examination is not necessarily confined to the content of courses that have been taken at Lehigh University or elsewhere.
- B. This examination is administered near the completion of formal coursework. It must be passed *no less than seven months prior to the date of graduation* and upon completion of at least 30 semester hours of post-master's work. The student may be scheduled for the examination with the consent of the major adviser and program director.
- C. Academic programs employ varying approaches to the general examination and may have different requirements. The program faculty define the format and evaluation process of the examination, which may include such components as sit-down essays, take-home examinations, portfolio presentation, formal presentation, oral presentation and/or follow-up oral examination.
- D. Should a candidate fail any part of the general examination, he/she may be permitted by petition to the program faculty to undertake a second examination *not earlier than five months after the first examination*. If the results of the second examination are also unsatisfactory, no additional examination is scheduled and the student may no longer pursue the doctoral degree.
- E. The program director notifies the student of the outcome of the general examination. In the case of a second failure, the program director also notifies the Chairperson of the Department and the Dean of Education of this fact.

IV. DISSERTATION PROPOSAL

- A. Soon after the course work begins, and no later than mid-way through the program of study, the student and his/her adviser should begin consultations on a proposal for the student's research. The sooner these consultations begin the better, since the remainder of the student's coursework should be designed in part to prepare him/her to carry out the proposed research. It is the student's responsibility to become sufficiently immersed in his/her field so as to be able to propose research that is both timely and significant.
- B. Students are required to pass their general examination prior to formally proposing their dissertation. However, it is recognized that exceptional circumstances occasionally arise in which students may propose their dissertation prior to passing their general examination. Students need to submit an internal petition through their dissertation chair and the program director to the department chair for variance to this requirement.
- C. It is the student's responsibility to propose research that is of interest to, and can be directed by, the faculty of the program.
- D. When the proposal is sufficiently advanced to be examined by a special committee, the adviser, through the Department Chair, appoints a special committee to examine the proposal and, if that proposal is found acceptable, to act as the student's dissertation committee while the candidate conducts the study. It is the student's responsibility, with the assistance of the adviser, to present his/her proposal to, and acquire the commitment of, prospective committee members.

- E. The following rules govern membership on this committee:
1. The minimum number of committee members is four and all members must hold a doctoral degree.
 2. Of these, three, including the committee chair, are to be VOTING Lehigh faculty members. With the written approval of the dean of the college, one of the three aforementioned faculty members may be drawn from categories that include departmentally approved adjuncts, professors of practice, university lecturers, and courtesy faculty appointees.
 3. The fourth required member must be from outside the student's department (or outside the student's program if there is only one department in the college).
 4. Committees may include additional members who possess the requisite expertise and experience.
 5. Committee membership must be approved by the University's Graduate and Research Committee; such approval may be delegated to the colleges.
 6. No member of the faculty may serve as a chairperson of a special committee unless:
 - The faculty member has served as a special committee member for at least one successfully completed dissertation in Lehigh's College of Education; and
 - The faculty member has an earned doctorate and holds a full-time regular faculty appointment at the rank of assistant professor or above in the Department of Education and Human Services; and
 - His/her training, expertise and/or prior research experience, including his/her own doctoral dissertation, is in alignment with the dissertation proposal of the student, and
 - He/she is already chairing fewer than four doctoral special committees that are active at that time.
 7. No member of the faculty may serve as a member of a special committee unless:
 - The research proposal being investigated by the student is in alignment with the training, interest, and expertise of at least one faculty person other than the chairperson; and
 - He/she has an earned doctorate and holds a faculty appointment (adjunct or non-adjunct) in the College of Education. Special committee membership may be granted to persons outside the College of Education or the University where the research proposal being investigated by the student is in alignment with the training, interest or expertise of the proposed member. Approval for all such memberships must be obtained by the program coordinator submitting in writing the proposed member's credentials to the Department Chair for transmittal to the Dean of Education for approval.
- F. When the special committee approves the proposal, the soon-to-be-candidate then prepares it for submission to the Dean of Education. The proposal is submitted to the Dean as part of the student's application for candidacy for the doctoral degree (See I-C above).
- G. The candidate may proceed with the dissertation after having been informed by the Dean of Education that candidacy for the doctoral degree is approved. Although the special committee reserves the right to examine the candidate's progress at any time, it is the candidate's responsibility to monitor his/her own progress and to seek advice from any or all of the special committee when necessary.

V. THE DISSERTATION

The dissertation requirement for the doctorate shall be satisfied by the doctoral candidate through completion of one of two types of dissertations:

A. A Traditional Dissertation (Ph.D. or Ed.D.)

This requirement is the traditional research dissertation prevailing in other disciplines.

B. An Analytic Dissertation (Ed.D.)

1. The analytic dissertation is a critical examination of a substantive problem of educational practice. A problem of practice may be concerned with educational processes, outcomes, policies, and/or procedures but not necessarily limited to the above. The purpose of the analytic dissertation, other than satisfying a doctoral dissertation requirement, is to provide a document that might be useful to other educational practitioners faced with the same or similar problems.
2. The analytic dissertation shall define a problem of educational practice, analyze the problem from a theoretical base, and draw a set of analytic specific recommendations for action. The particular kind of inquiry suggested here might be called a decision-oriented inquiry. The process is one of identifying and collecting relevant information for decision-making. The analytic dissertation is not designed to support or refute particular theoretical positions, as would be the case in traditional dissertation research, but rather to contribute recommendations for action.
3. Unlike the traditional research investigation that delimits the research analysis to a level we might call *variable-specific*, and in many cases also *discipline-specific*, the analytic dissertation mode of inquiry is *problem-specific*. Thus, the analytical dissertation employs an eclectic approach that seeks to bring relevant theories and paradigms from related disciplines to bear upon the problem.
4. Methods of analysis appropriate for the analytic mode of inquiry include, but are not limited to, policy analysis, evaluation research, operations research, or other action-oriented research methodologies.

VI. DISSERTATION AND ORAL EXAMINATION

- A. When the dissertation is completed in draft form and approved by and signed by each member of the special committee as being ready for examination, it is submitted to the Dean of Education. The draft should be completed to such an extent that any revisions suggested by the examination be *editorial* in nature and not constitute any *substantial* changes. It is the responsibility of the special committee to withhold approval of the draft until these conditions are met.
- B. After the dissertation draft is approved by the Dean of Education, the Department Chair and the Dean approve the convening of the special committee to conduct the oral examination. That examination is public.
- C. The Chair of the student's special committee is responsible for scheduling the oral examination and must notify the Dean of Education and the faculty of the Education and Human Services Department *at least five working days* prior to the examination. It is the student's responsibility to provide copies of the draft dissertation to examiners and extra copies of the abstract to the program faculty at the time of this announcement. It is the dissertation chairperson's responsibility to withhold scheduling until these documents are made available. In addition, no oral examinations may be scheduled between University

Day (May commencement) and the first day of classes in the fall semester. Students wishing to defend during this period can petition their committee for approval. Successful petitions require the agreement of ALL members of the dissertation committee.

- D. The chairperson of the special committee is responsible for coordinating the examination procedures with both the candidate and the examining committee. These procedures may be tailored to suit those involved but must be agreed upon prior to the examination.
- E. The oral examination is primarily the candidate's defense of the work done in connection with the dissertation, as opposed to the writing of the dissertation. It is the responsibility of the special committee to withhold approval of the dissertation draft until it is in such form that the examination can be conducted in this spirit.
- F. The members of the examining committee vote either *Pass* or *Fail* on the oral defense of the written document. They may NOT vote *Abstain* (since they agreed to serve as an examiner) or *Recess* (since the dissertation defense may not be recessed without taking a vote).
- G. At the time of the oral examination, the members of the special committee also provide final approval to the written dissertation. The only two options for this approval are *Approve – no revisions needed* and *Approve – revisions needed*.
- H. A report of the decision on the oral examination is made on a special form provided by the Program Coordinator's office and sent to the Dean of Education.
- I. In the event the candidate does not pass the oral examination, he/she may be granted a second opportunity on the following conditions:
 - 1. Approval is obtained through internal petition to the Department Chairperson and the Dean of the College of Education, and
 - 2. The initial examining committee conducts the second examination, and
 - 3. Rules governing the first oral examination are applied to the second attempt.
- J. In the event that a candidate does not pass this second oral examination, he/she may no longer pursue the doctoral degree. The candidate may be eligible to take a master's degree instead by completing requirements for that degree.
- K. No later than the date published in the University catalog, a finished copies copy of the dissertation must be deposited with the College Admissions Coordinator (acting for the Dean of Education), in accordance with instructions for the preparation and submission of such documents (see the *Doctoral Dissertations and Master's Theses Preparation/Submission Guidelines* in the EHS departmental handbook).

VII. PETITIONS

Students have the right to petition through the program director, Chairperson, and the Dean of Education via the Registrar to the Committee on the Standing of Graduate Students (SOGS). Unsuccessful petitions to SOGS may be appealed to the full Graduate and Research Committee. The *Grievances* section of the Education and Human Services Department Handbook details the proper procedures to employ for such appeals.

VIII. GRADUATION ACTIVITIES

- A. In order to be eligible to receive the doctoral degree, a student must have met ALL 10 of the following conditions:
1. Completed the required program of study, including the minimum credit degree requirement (either 72 or 48 credits);
 2. Passed the doctoral qualifier;
 3. Fulfilled the concentrated learning requirement;
 4. Passed the general examination;
 5. Been approved for candidacy;
 6. Passed the dissertation oral examination (defense);
 7. Completed all committee-required modifications to the dissertation;
 8. Complied with all electronic requirements for preparing and submitting that dissertation;
 9. Owes no outstanding debts to the university; and
 10. Been cleared by the Registrar.
- B. Students who meet (or expect to meet) all of the above requirements MUST APPLY for the degree by the deadline dates published in the University Catalog.

Doctoral Dissertations & Master's Theses Preparation/Submission Guidelines

The dissertation must conform to guidelines described in this Proquest document:

www.etsdadmin.com/UMI_PreparingYourManuscriptGuide.pdf

For submission information, visit:

www.lehigh.edu/education/assets/pdf/consolidated_guidelines.pdf

1. Illustrations, tables, graphs, etc., shall be consecutively numbered, so that they may be readily referred to in the text.
2. Your document must provide a *Table of Contents* that provides at least the chapter headings, with page numbers.
3. Your document must include an *Abstract* that summarizes the main findings and conclusions of your dissertation.
4. Each copy of the dissertation must include a “vita” or final appendix that provides a short biography of the Candidate. This shall include institutions attended, the degrees received (with dates), honors and awards, titles, publications, teaching and/or professional experience, and other pertinent information.
5. Samples of the *Title Page* and *Approval Page* are attached for your information.
NOTE: The signed approval page is NOT submitted electronically to the Lehigh ETD (Proquest).
6. The material of the complete dissertation shall be arranged, numbered, and LISTED IN THE TABLE OF CONTENTS as follows:
 - a. Title Page (which is page **i** but is not numbered)
 - b. Copyright Page (page **ii**)
 - c. Unsigned Approval Page (which is page **iii**)
 - d. Acknowledgments (if any) (*continues with Roman numerals*)
 - e. Table of Contents (*continues with Roman numerals*)
 - f. List of Tables (if any) (*continues with Roman numerals*)
 - g. List of Figures (if any) (*continues with Roman numerals*)
 - h. List of Illustrations, if any (*continues with Roman numerals*)
NOTE: Roman numeral pagination ends here.
 - i. An Abstract of 350 words maximum (*numbered with Arabic numeral 1*)
NOTE: Arabic numeral pagination starts with the Abstract at page 1 and is continued in consecutive order to the last page of the dissertation.
 - j. Main text of the dissertation, including footnotes, tables and figures
 - k. Bibliography or List of References
 - l. Any Appendices
 - m. Candidate’s “vita” or brief biography (last page)
7. Doctoral dissertations are limited to 400 pages.
NOTE: Manuscripts exceeding this limit will be returned for abridgment.
8. ALL pages of the entire dissertation, including illustrations, tables, graphs, appendices, bibliography, shall be numbered. It is important that every page (except the title page, as noted above) be numbered using the appropriate Roman or Arabic numeral.
9. **Please consult with your adviser** on the APPROPRIATE PUBLICATION STYLE TO USE.
NOTE: You MUST maintain consistency in using the SAME ONE style throughout your dissertation.

(Title of Dissertation)

by

(Your Name)

Presented to the Graduate and Research Committee

of Lehigh University

in Candidacy for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

(Doctor of Education)

in

(Name of Program)

Lehigh University

(Date)

Approved and recommended for acceptance as a dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy/Education.

Date

Dissertation Director

Accepted Date

Committee Members:

Name of Committee Member

Name of Committee Member

Name of Committee Member

Name of Committee Member

Eligibility Criteria for Participation in University Doctoral Hooding Ceremony

Approved by Provost and Graduate Research Committee in 2010.

PURPOSE

The doctoral hooding ceremony takes place on the weekend prior to the May commencement exercises and recognizes the Ph.D. and Ed.D. recipients with the traditional bestowing of the doctoral hood. This policy defines the criteria that determine which students are eligible to participate in the doctoral hooding ceremony.

ELIGIBILITY

A student may participate in the doctoral hooding ceremony if he or she meets any ONE of these criteria. To preserve the integrity and dignity of the ceremony, there will be no exceptions.

1. The student has completed ALL requirements for the Ph.D. or Ed.D. and is cleared by the Registrar for graduation in the May commencement exercises.
2. The student received his or her Ph.D. or Ed.D. on one of the *preceding* fall or winter degree-granting dates.
3. The student has completed ALL requirements for the Ph.D. or Ed.D. *except* for a required internship that will be completed *before* August 31 in the same year as the hooding ceremony (that is, roughly three months after the hooding ceremony). In this case, the dissertation must be defended, signed, and submitted to University Microfilms by the close of business on the last day of classes in the spring semester prior to the hooding ceremony. Such students must petition the Standing of Graduate Students Committee (SOGS) for permission to participate, and SOGS will determine whether the student's circumstances meet the eligibility criteria. The petition must be submitted to the Registrar at least 10 days prior to the May Commencement.

University Dissertation Award Processes

There are two university-related dissertation awards that are awarded annually, the Elizabeth V. Stout Dissertation Award and the Council of Graduate Schools/ University Microfilms International Distinguished Dissertation Award. This document discusses each award and presents all relevant information on which dissertations are eligible, how they are nominated and how recipients are selected. While it incorporates all university requirements and processes, it focuses specifically on how dissertations completed in academic programs in the College of Education may be nominated and selected for these awards.

ELIZABETH V. STOUT DISSERTATION AWARD

One Stout Dissertation Award may be awarded in each of the four colleges each year to recognize significant scholarly achievement in a dissertation project. Stout Dissertation Awards are university-level awards, selected by the colleges. Recipients receive an honorarium, a citation, and recognition at the doctoral hooding ceremony.

Eligibility

In order to be eligible, a dissertation must be completed *after* the last day of classes of the previous year and *before* the last day of classes of the current year. For example, for consideration for the 2013 Stout Award, a dissertation must have been completed after April 27, 2012 (last day of classes, spring 2012) and before April 27, 2013 (last day of classes, spring 2013). If all committee-required revisions have not been completed and approved *and* all necessary graduation paperwork submitted prior to the last day of spring classes, a dissertation is not eligible. However, in the case of academic programs where internship licensure requirements may be completed following the submission of the dissertation (such as Counseling Psychology and School Psychology), the program should consider dissertations for students who have submitted the dissertation to the registrar and have completed all other degree requirements except for internships related to licensure requirements.

Nomination Process

In January of each year, all COE program directors will be notified by email that nominations for the Stout Award for the college will be due no later than the last day of classes in the spring semester. That email will include this document as an attachment.

Each of the five academic programs in the COE may nominate *one* dissertation for the award. If, in any given year, a program does not have an eligible dissertation or feels no completed dissertation is worthy of consideration that year, that program may decline to submit a nomination and will inform the associate dean of that fact.

COE academic programs may develop their own procedures for selecting this single nominee but they must ensure that all eligible dissertations receive due consideration at the program level.

Prior to nomination, each program must confirm that the author of the dissertation to be nominated (the “nominee”) is willing to have his/her dissertation nominated and agrees to prepare the required nomination packet (see next section).

In cases of interdisciplinary doctoral dissertations, the relevant COE academic program(s) should work with all academic programs involved to promote the nomination of a worthy dissertation, whether the involved academic programs are all in the COE or are located in different colleges. When more than one college is involved, the nomination must come from college in which the author of the dissertation is enrolled.

Nomination Packet

The nominee prepares a narrative synopsis of the dissertation, not to exceed 10 pages, double-spaced using 10- or 12-point type with at least 1" margins on all four sides.

Appendices that contain non-textual material (for example, charts, tables, maps, illustrations, and the like) may be attached after the synopsis. Each item must be numbered and include the name of the nominee.

The nomination packet must include three letters of reference that evaluate the scholarly significance and quality of the dissertation. One of these three letters must be from the nominee's dissertation supervisor, one letter must be from another member of the nominee's dissertation committee, and the final letter may be from any other person the nominee chooses.

Lastly, a copy of the nominee's vita must be provided at the same time as the nomination packet.

Submission Process

At or before 5:00 pm on the last day of classes in the spring, the program director forwards the nomination packet to the COE associate dean with a cover letter, addressed to the selection committee, in which the program director endorses the nomination on behalf of the COE academic program. The full nomination packet, which now includes this cover letter, should be submitted electronically as a PDF.

As noted above, if a COE academic program does not choose to submit a nomination, its program director should notify the associate dean of this fact no later than 5:00 pm on the last day of spring classes.

Only complete nomination packets submitted by the deadline will be considered.

Selection Process

All nominations are considered by an award selection committee consisting of four members. Three of these members are voting members chosen in rotation to assure equal representation across academic programs over a six-year cycle (see Appendix A). The fourth member is the COE associate dean who serves as chair, coordinating committee logistics and facilitating its deliberations, but who is not a voting member.

The committee chair distributes the PDF nomination packets to the committee electronically and provides a copy of the evaluation instrument (see Appendix B). Each committee members is asked to use the evaluation instrument to rank the nominations before the selection committee meets.

The chair schedules a meeting to discuss these ranking and to come to consensus on a *single* college nomination for the Stout Dissertation Award to submit to the COE dean at least two weeks prior to the May commencement date. The COE dean endorses the committee's selection and forwards to the Provost's Office the name of the person selected to receive the Stout Dissertation Award for the COE. The dean then sends congratulatory emails to the recipient, as well as nominees who were not selected, and the dean publicly announces which individual will receive the award.

The Provost's Office administers the Stout Awards, as selected by the four colleges.

COUNCIL OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS/UMI DISTINGUISHED DISSERTATION AWARDS

Each year the university nominates outstanding dissertations for consideration for the Council of Graduate Schools/University Microfilms International Distinguished Dissertation Awards (CGS/UMI awards) in an appropriate discipline, based on the CGS schedule for recognition in specific discipline areas. CGS follows a two-year cycle in four discipline areas, recognizing two discipline areas per year.

In odd-numbered years, one award is presented in *Humanities and Fine Arts (including history and literature)*, and one award is presented in the *Biological and Life Sciences*. In even-numbered years, one award is presented in the *Social Sciences (including Education)*, and one award is presented in *Mathematics, Physical Sciences, and Engineering*.

Eligibility

In order to be eligible for the CGS/UMI award, a dissertation must be associated with a doctoral degree granted in the 20-month period preceding the last day of classes in the spring semester. For example, for consideration for the 2014 CGS Award, the doctoral degree would have to have been awarded *after* May 2012 or be scheduled *to be awarded* at commencement in May 2014. This includes dissertations successfully defended with degrees conferred in fall 2012, spring 2013, fall 2013 and spring 2014. If all aspects of a doctoral degree have not been completed prior to the last day of spring classes and all necessary graduation paperwork submitted, a dissertation is not eligible.

Nomination Process

In January of even-numbered years, the email call for program nominations for the Stout Award will also note that nominations for the CGS/UMI award are due in the same timeframe (no later than the last day of classes in the spring semester). As noted earlier, that email will include this document as an attachment.

Each of the five academic programs in the COE may choose to nominate the same person the program nominates for the Stout Award, or that program may choose to nominate a second *single* dissertation for the CGS/UMI award. The major reasons for a program's choosing to nominate a dissertation other than the one they choose to nominate for the Stout Award would likely be that the CGS/UMI award's broader eligibility allows a program to nominate a dissertation that either (1) would be ineligible for the present year's Stout Award or (2) was stronger than the program's nominee for that Stout Award.

If, in any given year, a program does not have an eligible dissertation or feels no completed dissertation is worthy of being considered for selection as the university's one CGS/UMI award nominee that year, a program may decline to submit a CGS/UMI award nomination and will inform the associate dean that they will not be submitting a nomination.

COE academic programs may develop their own procedures for selecting their single CGS/UMI award nominee but they must ensure that all eligible dissertations receive due consideration at the program level.

As noted earlier, prior to nomination, each program must confirm that the nominee is willing to have his/her dissertation nominated and agrees to prepare the required nomination packet (see next section).

In cases of interdisciplinary doctoral dissertations, the relevant COE academic program(s) should work with all academic programs involved to promote the nomination of a worthy dissertation, whether the involved academic programs are all in the COE or are located in different colleges. When more than one college is involved, the nomination must come from college in which the nominee is enrolled.

Nomination Packet

The nomination packet is identical to the packet described under the Stout Dissertation Award. That is,

- The nominee prepares a narrative synopsis of the dissertation, not to exceed 10 pages, double-spaced using 10- or 12-point type with at least 1" margins on all four sides.
- Appendices that contain non-textual material (for example, charts, tables, maps, illustrations, and the like) may be attached after the synopsis. Each item must be numbered and include the name of the nominee.
- The nomination packet must include three letters of reference that evaluate the scholarly significance and quality of the dissertation. One of these three letters must be from the nominee's dissertation supervisor, one letter must be from another member of the nominee's dissertation committee, and the final letter may be from any other person the nominee's chooses.
- A copy of the nominee's vita must be provided at the same time as the nomination packet.

Submission Process

At or before 5:00 pm on the last day of classes in the spring, the program director forwards the nomination packet to the COE associate dean with a cover letter, addressed to the selection committee, in which the program director endorses the nomination on behalf of the COE academic program. The full nomination packet, which now includes this cover letter, should be submitted electronically as a PDF.

If a COE academic program is submitting *separate* nominations for the CGS/UMI Distinguished Dissertation Award and the Stout Dissertation Award, those packets must be self-contained PDFs, including separate cover letters. They must not be a single combined PDF file with a single cover letter.

As noted above, if a COE academic program does not choose to submit a nomination for the CGS/UMI award, its program director should notify the associate dean of this fact no later than 5:00 pm on the last day of spring classes.

Only complete nomination packets submitted by the deadline will be considered.

Selection Process

In even-numbered years, the same four-person selection committee (described above under the Stout Dissertation Award) selects the college's single nominee for the CGS Dissertation Award.

If academic programs submitted *additional* nomination packets for the CGS/UMI Distinguished Dissertation Award, the chair will have distributed those packets with the Stout Award nomination packets and the committee will have followed the same deliberation process (see above) to arrive at a single college nomination for consideration for selection as the university's CGS/UMI award nominee and the committee chair will notify the dean of the nominee's name.

If no additional CGS/UMI award nomination packets were submitted, the recipient of the Stout Dissertation Award automatically becomes the college's nominee for the CGS/UMI Distinguished Dissertation Award and the chair so notifies the dean.

In either case, the dean's office sends the CGS/UMI award nomination packet for that individual to the Provost's Office at the same time as providing the name of the individual selected to receive the Stout Award for the college.

At the university level, if there is more than one dissertation nominated in a currently active CGS/UMI award discipline area, a committee designated by the Provost will select the single university nominee and the Provost's Office will forward each discipline-area nomination to CGS for inclusion in their recipient selection process.

Dissertation Award Selection Committee Program Representation Rotation

Each year's selection committee is to be made up of three members, each to come from one of our five academic programs and no two to come from the same academic program. The committee is to be chaired by the associate dean, who is to coordinate committee logistics and to facilitate its deliberations, but who is not a voting member.

YEAR	Member 1 Program	Member 2 Program	Member 3 Program
2012	CIE	TLT	SchPsych
2013	CPsych	SpEd	CIE
2014	EdL	SchPsych	SpEd
2015	SchPsych	EdL	CPsych
2016	SpEd	CPsych	TLT
2017	TLT	CIE	EdL
2018	EdL	TLT	SchPsych
2019	TLT	SchPsych	SpEd
2020	SchPsych	SpEd	CPsych
2021	SpEd	CPsych	EdL
2022	CPsych	EdL	TLT
2023	EdL	TLT	SchPsych
2024	TLT	SchPsych	SpEd
2025	SchPsych	SpEd	CPsych
2026	SpEd	CPsych	EdL
2027	CPsych	EdL	TLT

DISSERTATION AWARD EVALUATION RUBRIC

Award (Check 1 or both): ☐ Stout ☐ CGS/UMI

YOUR RANKING

Dissertation Title:				
Nominee Name:				
Nominating COE Program:				
CRITERION	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	
Potential impact of dissertation study on the field	Dissertation appears highly likely to have major impact on the field, changing theory and/or practice. Letters of recommendation very supportive, endorsing work and confirming or documenting its impact.	Dissertation appears likely to have some impact on the field, influencing theory and/or practice. Letters of recommendation were supportive, endorsing work and confirming or documenting some impact.	Dissertation appears less likely to have impact on the field, changing theory and/or practice. Letters of recommendation were less supportive in endorsing work and/or confirming or documenting impact.	
Quality of research methodology employed	Study employed rigorous and sophisticated methodology that was well matched to problem under study. Letters of recommendation very supportive, clearly confirming or documenting rigor.	Study employed somewhat rigorous and sophisticated methodology and that methodology was fairly well matched to problem under study. Letters of recommendation were supportive, confirming or documenting rigor to a lesser degree.	Study employed less rigorous and sophisticated methodology and/or methodology was less well matched to problem under study. Letters of recommendation addressed rigor of work to a much lesser extent.	
Relative originality and independence of work	Study exhibited relatively more originality and creativity in design and execution. Exhibited much independence and new direction from faculty advisor's work.	Study exhibited some originality and creativity in design and execution. Research, while complementing chair's research, exhibited some measure of independence and new direction.	Study exhibited relatively less originality and creativity in design and execution. The research was largely extension of chair's research, and exhibited less independence and new direction.	
Quality of abstract: Completeness	Abstract provides excellent condensation of relevant literature and a detailed summary of what was done and found.	Abstract provides good condensation of relevant literature and a fairly detailed summary of what was done and found.	Abstract provides less effective condensation of relevant literature and less detailed summary of what was done and found.	
Quality of abstract: Logic	Abstract does an excellent job of connecting the need for the study, methods, findings, conclusions or interpretations, and recommendations. Logical connections among elements of dissertation are clear.	Abstract does a very good job of connecting the need for the study, methods, findings and conclusions or interpretations, and recommendations. Logical connections among elements of dissertation are generally clear.	Abstract does less well at connecting the need for the study, methods, findings, conclusions or interpretations, and recommendations. Logical connections among elements of dissertation less clear.	
Quality of abstract: Clarity and Expression	Abstract is very well written and easy to follow and understand.	Abstract is well written and generally easy to follow and understand.	Abstract is less well written and not always easy to follow or understand.	
GENERAL COMMENTS:				

Resource Allocation Policies and Procedures

Minimal Faculty Resources

(Reviewed, Spring 2000; edited May 2013, expanded December 2017)

In times of shrinking resources, there is pressure to eliminate resources or restrict their flow only to those persons or programs that are deemed most productive. Faculty are, therefore, often called upon to justify why they should receive the resources they request. It is important to note, however, that there are some resources so basic to accomplishing the mission of the College and department that every faculty member should receive them without having to present any justification. Among these resources are included:

1. An adequate computer system

Each faculty member should have in his or her office a microcomputer system capable of meeting everyday needs. Such a system should be equipped, at the very least, with:

- a recent version of its operating system,
- office productivity software,
- sufficient memory to support the software being used,
- a hard disk large enough to store files created and used routinely by the faculty member,
- a reasonable size monitor,
- a computer mouse or trackpad,
- removable storage in the form of CDs, DVDs and/or flash drives,
- access to a laser-quality printer.

Clearly, different faculty members need computer systems of differing complexity and sophistication; teaching, scholarship, and service may make differential demands on faculty members' systems. An adequate system for one faculty may not meet the more sophisticated needs of another. Thus, "meeting everyday needs" is a phrase that must be matched to the demands of the everyday activities of the faculty member.

Computer Provision & Replacement Policy (Revised October 2017)

The College will provide new faculty with a computer up to \$2,000

Computer Replacement for all COE faculty (including POPs) and staff:

- Replacement of a PC computer every four years. Up to \$2,000.
- Replacement of a Macintosh computer every four to five years. Up to \$2,000. A determination if the faculty Macintosh computer needs replacement should be made in consultation with the COE computer consultant. The key determinant is if a 4-year old office Macintosh computer is meeting the faculty member's needs.

All new computer purchases must include a minimum of a one-year warranty.

The expectation of grant-active faculty is to use RIF money from active grants with indirect costs to purchase their computer. Faculty RIF accounts with less than \$10,000 should have their computers replaced by the College.

When a computer is replaced, the faculty member can opt to keep the computer for file storage purposes or that computer can be sent to the graduate student computer pool.

Proposed annual computer budget is \$20,000.

Unused funds in the computer budget will be rolled-over into the next year.

2. Secretarial support

All faculty should be provided with secretarial services including:

- phone support
- typing/word-processing support
- duplication/collating services

3. Appropriate office space

Faculty offices should also be appropriately equipped. They should:

- be private with a locking door,
- contain a desk, chair, and client chair,
- provide a telephone, file cabinets, and bookshelves.

4. Travel support

Faculty should be supported in participating in their professional organizations and making presentations as much as possible. This is particularly important for pretenure faculty working towards tenure and promotion.

5. Materials

Faculty should be provided with the normal sorts of office supplies necessary to do everyday business, including their teaching, scholarship, and service. These include:

- pads and paper,
- pencils and pens,
- removable computer storage.

Resource Allocation Recommendations

(Reviewed, Spring 2000; edited May 2013)

Supplies

We recommend that:

1. The chair inventory the faculty at the start of each semester to determine their anticipated needs for the semester and use this formal process as a way to gauge more effectively the demands on the departmental budget.
2. All faculty members be made aware of the appropriate procedures for requesting supplies and materials. New faculty need particularly to be made aware of the appropriate procedures as soon as they join the faculty.

Equipment

The department has access to much equipment, both audiovisual and computer equipment. Much of this equipment has been supplied, however, by outside sources rather than by the university. In addition, some equipment supplied by the university is aging rapidly. Computer equipment becomes quickly outdated as new devices and programs demand greater processing speed, memory, or storage. Recognizing these facts, we recommend:

1. Members of the department attempt to share equipment resources as much as possible, within the limitations of their external funders and the demands on that equipment of the projects on which they are presently working.
2. The chair use periodic inventories of anticipated faculty needs to determine departmental needs regarding equipment (audiovisual and computer hardware and software).
3. The chair be proactive in helping to assure that classrooms on the Mountaintop be appropriately equipped with instructional technology for teaching.

Staff

Effective organizations recognize that people are both resources and participants; when people play an active role in shaping their work environments, they are more likely to be creative, satisfied, and effective. We suggest, therefore, the Department Chair and Dean be proactive in keeping the departmental and college staff informed. We recommend the Dean and/or the Department Chair convene meetings of the departmental and college staff as needed or requested, and use these meetings to discuss upcoming issues or decisions that may affect them and to discuss any concerns they raise.

Allocation of Vacant Faculty Slots

(Reviewed Spring 2000; revised Summer 2003; edited May 2013)

Assumptions

Faculty positions in the College of Education are considered departmental positions and are not permanently attached to specific academic programs. As such, vacated faculty slots are not automatically retained by an academic program.

The rationale for this is twofold: (a) There are needs in the department that may cross program lines, and (b) Future needs may not be met by the current distribution of faculty. Given that the department is unlikely to obtain new faculty positions in the near future, current and future needs must be met through careful allocation of current faculty slots to best meet the needs of the department.

Procedures

1. The Chair's Council will be notified as soon as possible of upcoming vacancies in faculty positions.
2. Members of the Chair's Council will be provided an opportunity to present proposals for discussion at the council meeting on how the slot will be filled. Proposals for filling vacant faculty slots should:
 - demonstrate consistency with the College of Education Mission Statement.
 - include a description of how the faculty position will impact each of the areas of teaching, research, and service.
 - include a description of how the faculty position will impact the program, accrediting agency, and College.
3. Based on these presentations, a vote by members of the Chair's Council may be conducted (advisory only). The final decision will be made by the Dean in consultation with the Department Chairperson.
4. A similar presentation will then be made to the university administration by the Dean.

Allocation of Available University-supported Lectureships

(Reviewed Spring 2000; revised Summer 2003; edited May 2013)

Assumptions

Any university lectureship positions made available to the College of Education should be allocated within or among academic programs with the greatest demonstrated need for additional *teaching* resources. It is anticipated that any such lectureship positions will be in addition to current regular faculty slots.

Lectureship positions are fixed-term contracts with individuals who are expected to devote virtually all of their time to teaching rather than research or university service. Thus, such resources should be primarily directed toward academic programs currently experiencing high demands on regular faculty in terms of course load and class size. These lectureship positions would alleviate teaching overloads for regular faculty, allowing those faculty to direct the proper proportion of their energies to research and service activities.

Procedures

1. On an annual basis, members of the Chair's Council shall be provided with an opportunity to present a proposal for use of a lectureship position within their respective programs. Such proposals would then be forwarded to the Dean for submission to the Provost for consideration.
2. The Chair's Council would be notified immediately of lectureship positions awarded to the College of Education.
3. The Chair's Council would consider the priorities listed below in making recommendations to the Dean for the use of these positions. It is possible that the Chair's Council might recommend that one or more available position(s) be shared between or among academic programs.
4. The final decision on the allocation of such positions would be made by the Dean in consultation with the Department Chair.

Priorities

Lectureship positions within the College should be assigned to individual academic programs according to the following priority considerations:

1. Consistency with the College of Education Mission Statement.
2. Persuasive rationale for how the available lectureship position would be used to facilitate the teaching function within an academic program, as well as how such a position would enhance the ability of regular faculty to fulfill the full range of their responsibilities.
3. Degree to which the lectureship position would positively impact the academic program, program accreditation, and the College.

Allocation of University-supported Graduate and Research Assistantships

(Revised Spring 2000, Summer 2003; edited May 2013)

Assumptions

Currently, graduate/research assistantship positions within the College are a result of generation of funds from external sources. It is possible that in the future, the university will fund and support graduate assistants. In light of such support, it could be stipulated that each academic program in the College is assigned a graduate assistant to conduct various research- or teaching-related activities. However, it is possible that each academic program has differing needs (for example, APA accreditation) within a year, requiring more than one graduate assistant or none at all. As such, graduate/research assistantship positions should be allocated within and among academic programs based both on demonstrated needs and a recognition of the source from which those funds are generated. In addition, it is important the role of the graduate assistant be clearly defined. Because graduate assistants are usually, but not necessarily limited to, doctoral candidates, their skills must be optimally utilized. This would entail ensuring that tasks that can be effectively and efficiently completed by others (for example, work-study students, program coordinators) are carefully reviewed before being assigned to graduate assistants.

Procedures

1. Once each year, the Department Chair solicits requests for graduate/research assistantships from each program in the College.
2. Graduate assistantship requests are made in writing to the Department Chair. Each request should provide a description of the needs (research or teaching) of the faculty in the program and an estimate of how much of the graduate assistant's time will be utilized during the semester.
3. The Department Chair scrutinizes proposals and determines assignments using the criteria outlined below and then makes the allocations.
4. The dean approves these allocations
5. Each program director is informed of GA allocations to the program and the program director, in consultation with the program faculty, makes the final determination of which students will receive such assistantships.
6. Program directors are welcome to discuss the rationale for their allocation with the Department Chair.

Allocation Criteria

1. Pretenure faculty generally receive highest priority because (a) these individuals are most likely to require research assistance in the absence of external funding and (b) they may have been promised half-time GAs in their job offers. On occasion, in consultation with the program directors, the department chair may assign GAs to selected associate professors.
2. How well the proposal meets the primary mission of research, teaching, or both.
3. Impact on the professional development of the faculty member
4. Impact on the professional development of the student.

Allocation of Available University Scholarships

(Revised Spring 2000, Summer 2003; edited May 2013)

Assumptions

University scholarships are available for graduate students. These scholarships are made available to both full- and part-time students, and to doctoral and non-doctoral students. However, at the recommendation of the program directors and the acceptance of the faculty, preference in making such awards will be in the following order:

- doctoral over non-doctoral students
- full-time over part-time students.

Directors are required to provide clear justifications for recommendations when part-time students are being recommended over full-time students.

Currently, the College receives a specific number of scholarships determined by the Dean. These scholarships are not necessarily shared equally among academic programs.

Procedures

1. The availability of graduate tuition scholarships and the procedures for application is announced publicly to faculty and students early in the spring semester.
2. Before the deadline set by the Dean (usually mid-February), the Department Chair solicits requests for graduate tuition scholarships from each of the academic programs in the Department.
3. Working with the program faculty, program directors rank order the students by the criteria determined within the academic program and supply this ordering to the Department Chair along with a one-paragraph rationale for each student's candidacy.
4. The Chair makes a determination of how many tuition credits to assign to each program based on their submitted needs.
5. This decision is reviewed and approved by the Dean.
6. Each program director is informed of the program's allocation and program directors make the final determination of which students receive tuition credits.
7. Program directors are welcome to discuss the rationale for their allocations with the Department Chair.

Criteria

1. Academic achievement (as indicated by GPA).
2. Academic program needs.
3. Degree sought (with preference given to doctoral students).
4. Student status (full-time versus part-time)
5. Multicultural diversity.
6. Special justification related to the individual.

Allocation of Faculty Travel Support for Professional Meetings

(Reviewed Spring 2000, Summer 2003)

Assumptions

It is reasonable to assume there will be more faculty requests for travel support to professional meetings than funds available for this purpose. As a result, it is important that priorities be articulated and used in making decisions about the allocation of travel support. In addition, faculty should make every effort to secure travel funds through external funding sources. The priorities for supporting faculty travel may change over time and should be reviewed on an annual basis. Although travel for purposes other than professional meetings is important for the welfare of the College (for example, recruitment activities), it is assumed that other forms of funding must be sought for these activities.

Procedures

1. As soon as possible after July 1 each year, the Department Chair will solicit requests for travel support from the College faculty.
2. Travel support requests must be made in writing to the Department Chair. Each request should include a description of the professional activity (for example, presentation, workshop, poster, etc.) and an itemized budget. Faculty will be asked to anticipate their travel support needs for the entire fiscal year (through June).
3. The Department Chair will act on each faculty request using the priorities outlined below.

Priorities

Every possible effort will be made to provide travel support to pretenure faculty making presentations at national and international conferences. All other faculty travel will be considered a lower priority for receiving travel support. Specific priorities for allocation of travel support include the following:

1. Pretenure faculty will be given priority over tenured faculty.
2. Travel to make professional presentations will be given priority over poster sessions; posters will be given priority over simply attending a meeting.
3. Travel to national and international conferences will be given priority over travel to regional conferences; regional conferences will be given priority over local conferences.

Allocation of Space

(Reviewed Spring 2000, Summer 2003; edited May 2013)

Assumptions

In light of our history of how space needs emerge, it would be naive to suppose that all requests for such needs could be placed before some decision-making body on an annual basis and subsequently put into priority order and addressed. Consequently, such needs will have to be addressed in serial fashion.

In addition, space usage changes over time, as does the rationale for the original allocation. A periodic review of space utilization needs to be conducted.

Finally, the priorities list that appears below should be taken only as a set of *guidelines*, understanding that the timing and the merits of individual requests may justify a violation of the suggested order.

Procedures

1. Space-related requests should be made in writing to the Department Chair through the requestor's Program Director.
2. The Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean of the College and the Office of Physical Planning, will act on the request in light of the priorities listed below.
3. The Department Chair, as always, has the option to consult with the Chair's Council. Whether or not such consultation is sought, the Department Chair will inform the Chair's Council of the request and the subsequent action.
4. The Department Chair will conduct an annual review of space utilization within the Department with the objective of identifying potential reallocations.

Priorities

1. Private offices for full-time faculty, the administrative assistant to the Dean and the administrative assistant to the Department Chair
2. Office space for other administrative assistants/secretarial staff
3. Research/laboratory space for funded projects
4. Non-registrar scheduled instructional space
5. Full-time graduate student offices (potentially shared)
6. Research/laboratory space for unfunded projects
7. Retired faculty offices (potentially shared)
8. Adjunct faculty offices (potentially shared)
9. Social space

College Policy on Indirect Cost Recovery Sharing

The College policy on sharing indirect cost recovery (ICR) proceeds, like the university policy, is designed to reward initiative in landing external funding.

Based on the university formula, 80% of the net ICR over the college's base amount/target is returned to the college. Of these funds, 16% is distributed on a monthly basis across three categories:

- 9% goes to the dean's account,
- 4% goes to the departmental account (or the center account if the project was run through a center), and
- 3% goes to the account of the principal investigator (PI) --or is split between/among the accounts of multiple PIs (if there are more than one PI).

The remaining 64% goes to the dean's account, minus a 4.5% university administrative fee. Of this final amount, the dean distributes 60% to the PIs in the college, in proportion to the extent to which their funded projects contribute to the total ICR. When a project has co-PIs, the amount is divided evenly between/among them. The formula employed in this calculation is

$$\frac{\text{Total of PI's ICR for funded projects}}{\text{Gross ICR total for the COE}} = \text{PI's \% of ICR return from the 60\%}$$

A sample application of these calculations:

Imagine the actual total net ICR recovery at the university level were \$1,000,000 and the college's target were \$500,000. (These are not the actual numbers, just nice round figures to make things easier to see.). The excess ICR over target would be \$500,000, therefore, and \$400,000 (80%) would be returned to the college. Of this amount \$64,000 (16%) would be distributed monthly across twelve months, as follows:

- \$36,000 (9%) to dean's account
- \$16,000 (4%) to departmental or center account
- \$12,000 (3%) to PI accounts

This leaves \$336,000 (64%) for year-end distribution. The university takes \$15,120 (4.5%) in administrative fees, reducing the total to \$320,880. Of this amount, \$192,520 (60%) goes to the PIs in the COE, with each PI receiving a proportion of this amount based on how much his or her funded project(s) contributed to the total ICR.

College Emergency Response Plan

Emergency Response Plan

December 1, 2010, updated July 2019 with names of individuals

INTRODUCTION

The College of Education is one of the four Colleges at Lehigh University. The emergency response plan of this unit of the University is intended to cover specific aspects of potential emergencies that would relate to the College. The College's emergency response procedures outlined in this document have been designed to support the much broader Lehigh University response to any given situation. Thus, the following plan exists only as a portion of an overall Lehigh University Emergency Response Plan.

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY EMERGENCY RESPONSE LEADERSHIP

The role of the College in any specific emergency is first and foremost to notify and support the University Emergency Response Officer (UERO) as events occur. At Lehigh, the Chief of the University Police Department has been designated to serve in this capacity. This individual is Jason Schiffer who can be reached at 47 - 321 E. Packer Ave, **(610) 758-4200**.

DISASTER LEVELS

Level I (minor emergency) – Any incident that has a minor effect on the operations of the University and the members of the University community. All minor emergencies **must be reported** to the Lehigh University Police Department. This plan would not be in effect for minor emergencies.

Level II (major emergency) – Major emergencies are any emergency incidents, actual or potential, that may affect entire buildings, the personal safety of members of the University community, or disrupt the overall operation of the University. This may require organizational resources in addition to those already available. The Chief of Police will notify the President through the Vice Provost for Student Affairs.

Level III (disaster) – Disasters are emergency incidents, natural or human-made, that may cause serious injury to death to individuals or seriously impairs or halts the operations of the University. Casualties and severe property loss may be expected. A coordinated team effort will be required of various campus services to effectively handle this contingency. Outside emergency services will be required.

COLLEGE INVOLVEMENT IN RESPONSE TO EMERGENCIES

The University Emergency Response Officer will rely on the assistance and cooperation of members of the COE as specific emergency situations are addressed. Specific areas where assistance may be required include:

- Communications and Awareness to the College Community
- Basic Services Continuation
- Workforce Restoration
- Restoration of Classes

In these and other areas, members of the COE will be required to provide valuable and necessary assistance. As situations are addressed, decisions and communications within the COE will be made in a manner consistent with the College's organizational structure, which is explained below.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The College of Education is organized as shown in Appendix A. The College is led by Dr. William Gaudelli who serves as the Dean. The Dean is assisted at the College level by the Associate Dean, the Department Chair, and the Associate Chair for Faculty. The academic units of the COE consist of five programs: *Counseling Psychology*; *Educational Leadership*; *School Psychology*; *Special Education*; and *Teaching, Learning, and Technology*; as well as the *Centennial School* (which is located off-campus and has its own emergency response plan); the *Global Distance Office*; the *Center for Promoting Research to Practice*; and the *Center for Developing Urban Educational Leaders*. Each program or unit is led by a director as identified in Appendix A.

DECISION RESPONSIBILITY HEIRARCHY

While the University Emergency Response Officer will be the primary decision-maker during emergencies, the response to any particular situation is likely to require that decisions be made at the College level. When such input is necessary, the hierarchy of those responsible will be as shown in Appendix B. When available, Dean Gaudelli will make all required decisions. In the event of his absence, the Associate Dean will serve in this role, followed by the Department Chair, and then the Associate Chair. If all four of these individuals are not available, program directors should be consulted in the order shown. Contact information for each of these individuals is included in Appendix B.

EVACUATION SITE

When a decision has been made to evacuate all or part of Iacocca Hall, those persons occupying the structure at that time should immediately exit at the nearest door, proceed to the nearest exterior door and then proceed to ***the Staff Parking Lot to the North of Iacocca Hall*** in single file and in an orderly fashion to await further instructions. Elevators should not be used during an evacuation.

LOCKDOWN PROCEDURES

A lockdown can occur when there is a perceived or actual threat from outside the building. Lockdowns can be put in place by the **UERO** or by anyone within the College of Education's response hierarchy.

When it is determined that a lockdown is necessary, a number of steps will be taken. First, outside doors will be secured by the building monitors. Then, student, staff, and faculty will move to offices and classrooms that can be locked from the inside and will secure the rooms. If there are shades or blinds to cover windows through the door to the room, these should be used to prevent someone outside the room from seeing in. Then, the UERO will be contacted.

EMERGENCY CONTACT NUMBERS

An emergency is defined as a condition requiring prompt action. Please make clear at the start of your call that there is an emergency.

Ambulance-Fire-Police-Sheriff.x84200

College of Education Building Monitors

In case of any emergency, please contact a Building Monitor:

Arpana Inmanx84443

Carla Kologiex85648

Medical Emergencies

Hospital Emergency Care

St. Luke's Hospital, Lehigh Valley Hospital, Poison Control 911

ACTIVE SHOOTER SITUATIONS

The following information is not intended to frighten; it is intended to inform and to enhance personal safety. “Active Shooter” is the term used to describe a person who appears to be actively engaged in killing or attempting to kill people in a populated area. In most cases, active shooters use firearms and there is no apparent pattern or method to their selection of victims. An active shooter can be anyone, young or old, so avoid stereotypes. These situations are dynamic and evolve rapidly, demanding immediate deployment of law enforcement resources to stop the shooting and mitigate harm to innocent victims. However, past experience shows us that these situations are usually over very quickly and you need to be prepared to protect yourself before law enforcement can get there.

This document provides guidance to members of the University community who may be caught in an active shooter situation, and describes what to expect from responding police officers. The Lehigh University Police Department has adopted nationally accepted law enforcement response procedures to contain and neutralize such threats. Other area law enforcement agencies will provide assistance as needed.

Guidance For Faculty, Staff and Students

In general, how you respond to an active shooter will be dictated by the specific circumstances of the encounter, bearing in mind there could be more than one shooter involved in the same situation. If you find yourself involved in an active shooter situation, try to remain calm and focused. Use these guidelines to help you plan a strategy for survival.

- If you hear what sounds like gunshots or popping, immediately assume they are gunshots and do not investigate. Instead, quickly consider your options as suggested below.
- You need to quickly decide on one of three courses of action:
 1. Can you stay where you are and secure yourself from the shooter? If so, take action to secure yourself and, if it is safe, immediately call **84200** (first choice) or 911 (if cannot get through to 84200).
 2. Can you escape the building or get to an area where you are secure from the shooter (or at least some place where the shooter can not see you)? Get to a secure area if possible, and immediately call 84200 (first choice) or 911.
 3. Are you unable to escape from the shooter? If you are unable to escape, you need to assess the situation to see if you can shield yourself or if you need to prepare to take aggressive action to protect yourself.

The information below will aid in deciding on which course of action might be your best option.

- If an active shooter is **outside** your building, proceed to a room that can be locked if possible. Close and lock all the windows and doors and turn off all the lights. If possible, get everyone down on the floor and ensure that no one is visible from outside the room. One person in the room should call **84200** (first choice) or 911. You may hear multiple rings but stay on the line until it is answered. Advise the dispatcher of what is taking place and inform him/her of your location. Remain in place until the police or a campus administrator known to you gives the “all clear.” Unfamiliar voices may be the shooter attempting to lure victims from the safe space; do not respond to any voice commands until you can verify with certainty that they are being issued by a police officer.

- If an active shooter is *in* the same building you are, determine if the room you are in can be locked and if so, follow the same procedure described in the previous paragraph. If your room cannot be locked, determine if there is a nearby location that can be reached safely and secured, or if you can safely exit the building. If you decide to move from your current location, be sure to follow the instructions outlined below. If the room cannot be locked, barricade the door with heavy furniture such as desks, tables, and bookcases if possible. If you determine that escape is possible, run and attempt to alert others as you exit the area/building. As you exit, warn others about the danger of entering the area/building.
- If an active shooter *enters your office or classroom*, try to remain calm. Dial **84200** (first choice) or 911, if possible, and alert police to the shooter's location. If you cannot speak, leave the line open so the dispatcher can listen to what is taking place. This will help because sometimes the location of an emergency call can be determined without you needing to speak. If there is absolutely no opportunity for escape or hiding, attempt to shield yourself with any available object (for example, a desk, book bags, computers, etc.) It might be possible to negotiate with the shooter. If you and others decide there is no other choice but to make an attempt to overpower the shooter, realize this will involve significant risk and cannot be accomplished half-heartedly. If you decide to confront and attempt to overpower the shooter, experts recommend spreading out and not standing in a group. It may be possible to disorient the shooter by yelling and throwing items. Remember, this will involve significant risk and may involve final attempts to preserve innocent lives. If the shooter leaves the area, proceed immediately to a safer place and do not touch anything that was in the vicinity of the shooter.

No matter what the circumstances, if you decide to flee during an active shooting situation, make sure you have an escape route and plan in mind. Do not attempt to carry anything while fleeing. Move quickly, keep your hands visible, and follow the instructions of any police officers you may encounter. Do not attempt to remove injured people; instead, leave wounded victims where they are and notify authorities of their location as soon as possible. Do not try to drive off campus until advised it is safe to do so by police or a campus administrator. Law enforcement authorities will want to speak with you to obtain information.

What to Expect from Responding Police Officers

Police officers responding to an active shooter are trained to proceed immediately to the area in which shots were last heard. Their goal is to stop the shooting as quickly as possible.

The first responding officers will normally be in teams of four (4) or possibly fewer. They may be dressed in regular patrol uniforms or they may be wearing external bullet resistive vests, helmets, and other tactical equipment. The officers may be armed with rifles, shotguns, or handguns, and they might be using pepper spray or tear gas to control the situation.

Regardless of how the officers appear, remain calm. Do exactly as the officers tell you and do not be afraid of them. Do not ask questions but provide important information (such as the location of the shooter) if you are certain of such information. In an active shooter scenario, police officers may not be able immediately to distinguish a shooter from a non shooter if the weapon is hidden. Sometimes an assailant will attempt to blend in with the crowd to avoid detection. The police officer's verbal commands will be loud and extremely insistent. Do not be offended. Put down any bags or packages you may be carrying and keep your hands visible at all times. If you

know where the shooter is, tell the officers. The first officers to arrive will not stop to aid injured people. Rescue teams composed of other officers and emergency medical personnel will follow the first officers into secured areas to treat and remove injured persons. Keep in mind that even once you have escaped to a safer location, the entire area is still a crime scene. Police will usually not let anyone leave until the situation is fully under control and all witnesses have been identified and questioned. Until you are released, remain at whatever assembly point authorities designate.

FIRE SAFETY

A fire may include visible flames or strong odors of burning.

- I. For the person discovering the fire:
 - a. Extinguish the fire only if you can do so safely and quickly.
 - b. If you cannot extinguish the fire, immediately call **84200** (first choice) or 911 (if you cannot get through to 84200) and perform the following tasks:
 - Confine the fire by closing the doors.
 - Pull the nearest fire alarm.
 - Alert a building monitor.
- II. For persons evacuating from the immediate fire area:
 - a. Feel door from top to bottom. If door is hot DO NOT proceed!
 - b. If door is cool, crouch low and open the door slowly. Close door quickly if smoke is present so you do not inhale it.
 - c. If no smoke is present, exit the building by means of the nearest stairwell or exit.
- III. For building occupants not in the immediate fire area:
 - a. Avoid smoke-filled areas.
 - b. Follow Emergency Evacuation Procedures.

EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURES

The purpose of the Emergency Evacuation Procedures is to prevent loss of life and minimize injury and property damage. It is essential all College personnel know these procedures well.

1. Direct and assist the evacuation of faculty, staff, students, and guests in need of assistance.
2. REMAIN CALM. When panic occurs, the potential for personal injury and property damage is significantly increased.
3. If time permits, sign off and turn off all computers. Unplug the power cord if possible. Power strips should be unplugged or switched off.
4. Close all doors (office doors, department doors, conference room doors, etc.)
5. DO NOT USE ELEVATORS. Use the closest stairway to exit the building.
6. Employees should take all personal items as if they were leaving for the day.

7. Walk out of the building in a brisk manner. DO NOT RUN! Running causes panic. Report to the **designated** area for emergency evacuation, even if the weather is bad. Do not cluster under the overhang of the Wood Dining Room. This is not a safe area.
8. A Building Monitor will be stationed at each entrance to prevent entry into the building by unauthorized or non-emergency personnel.
9. Await the arrival of the fire and/or police department. Re-enter the building ONLY upon the direction of the building monitors or fire/police department personnel.

DANGEROUS & DISRUPTIVE PERSONS

If confronted by an angry person, you may try the following strategies to attempt to calm the situation before it escalates to violent behavior. IF YOU SEE EVIDENCE OF A WEAPON, IMMEDIATELY CALL **84200** (first choice) or 911 (if you cannot get through to 84200).

1. Do not ignore peers, employees, students, or guests who are exhibiting angry or violent behavior. Workplace violence rarely occurs without warning.
2. Be conscious of your attitude when dealing with a dangerous or disruptive person. Do not demean him/her or trivialize his/her concerns.
3. Listen and give the person time to run down or vent, but not so much time that he or she becomes more agitated. Usually one to two minutes is long enough.
4. Sympathize or empathize with the person, but always be truthful. Do not make statements that are obviously false. For example, "I agree with you, you deserved an A. I'll get on the computer and change all your grades to A's."
5. REMAIN CALM. Speak in a controlled, moderate tone even if the person raises his/her voice. Use his/her name when speaking to him or her. Offer creature comforts such as a beverage and a seat.
6. Offer to help only if you can. Do not leave an issue unresolved. If you are not the appropriate person to help with a problem, offer to help set up an appointment with the right person.
7. If you feel the situation is escalating and you want assistance, but there is not an immediate threat, call LU police at 84200 or ask a co-worker to do so for you.

If an angry/disruptive person with a weapon is in the building, a broadcast message will go out over the telephone speakers. It will most likely ask all personnel to close and lock doors and remain inside. REMAIN CALM AND DO NOT RUN FROM THE BUILDING. If an evacuation is necessary, you will be notified by a Building Monitor or a designee.

BOMB THREAT

- I. Action to be taken **while receiving** a call or notification of a bomb threat.
 - a. REMAIN CALM. Do not hang up, even after the caller hangs up.
 - b. Do not put the caller on hold.
 - c. Keep the caller talking – make a special effort to continue the conversation with the caller.
 - d. Signal another employee either with a note or other predetermined signal to notify a supervisor that a bomb threat is being received. The supervisor will then notify the police and a building monitor.
 - e. Complete the Bomb Threat Caller Survey (attached).
 - f. Do not interrupt the caller. Do not upset the caller.
 - g. Ask the caller to repeat statements, instructions and answers.
 - h. If the caller makes a demand, state that you will comply.
 - i. Write the message in its entirety using the caller's exact words.
 - j. Play on the caller's mercy. Remind the caller that Iacocca is open and many people may die.
 - k. The decision to evacuate the building will be based on the information provided in the bomb threat. It is critical that the employee receiving the threat quickly complete a Bomb Threat Caller Profile (see attached).
 - l. Do not discuss the threat with other employees.
- II. Action to be taken **after** a bomb threat has been made:
 - a. If the bomb threat is determined to be valid, local police and fire departments will conduct a search of the building.
 - b. Evacuation of the building will be ordered immediately upon discovery of a bomb or suspicious package and may be ordered before a bomb is found if less than 15 minutes remain before a bomb is set to go off. The order to evacuate will be communicated verbally by a Building Monitor and by emergency personnel through the telephone speaker system and/or e-mail.
 - c. NO RADIOS, CELL PHONES, OR PAGERS CAN BE USED WHILE A SEARCH IS BEING CONDUCTED. These items can cause a bomb to explode.
 - d. If a building evacuation is ordered, all employees should follow the Emergency Evacuation Procedures.

Bomb Threat Survey

Attempt to ask the caller the following questions during your conversation. The caller's answers to the questions may help police. Write the answers verbatim.

Time call started: _____

Time call ends: _____

1. Where is the bomb located?

2. When is it set to go off?

3. What does the bomb look like?

4. Is the bomb disguised?

5. Is the bomb in the open?

6. What kind and size is the bomb?

7. How was the bomb brought into the building?

8. Why was the bomb put there?

Bomb Threat Caller Profile

Identify as many of the following characteristics of the bomb threat call as soon as possible.

1. Name of caller

2. Sex of caller (male, female or unknown)

3. Age of caller- child, teen, adult

4. Voice characteristics

Accent (for example, southern, foreign)

Speech impediment (for example, lisp or stutters)

Manner of speech (for example, loud, soft, fast, slow)

5. Peculiar characteristics (such as disjointed sentences or evidence of intoxication)

6. Attitude of caller (for example, calm, excited, emotional, rational, irrational, righteous, angry, sarcastic)

7. Background noises heard during the call (for example, street traffic, machines, television, airport noise, factory noises, music, other voices, moving water)

APPENDIX A**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
EMERGENCY DECISION-MAKING HIERARCHY**

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	TITLE	CAMPUS PHONE	EMERGENCY CELL
Gaudelli	Bill	Dean	610-758-3221	
Inman	Arpana	Associate Dean	610-758-4443	
Liang	Christopher	EHS Chair	610-758-3253	
Al	Bodzin	Associate Chair	610-758-5095	
Columba	Lynn	Program Director, Teaching Learning & Technology	610-758-3237	
Hojnoski	Robin	Program Director, School Psychology	610-758-3268	
Dennis	Minyi	Program Director, Special Education	610-758-4793	
Caskie	Grace	Program Co-Director, Counseling Psychology	610-758-6094	
Woodhouse	Susan	Program Co-Director, Counseling Psychology	610-758-3269	
Beachum	Floyd	Program Director, Educational Leadership	610-758-5955	
Kern	Lee	Director, Ctr for the Promotion of Research to Practice	610-758-3267	
Fogt	Julie	Director, Centennial School	610-266-6500	
Chase-Mayoral	Audree	Interim Director, Global Online Office	610-758-3564	

IMPLEMENTATION

BUILDING MONITORS (IACOCCA, A WING)				
Inman	Arpana	Associate Dean	610-758-4443	
Kologie	Carla	Coordinator, Office of Teacher Certification	610-758-5648	
FLOOR MONITORS				
Ball	Donna	3 rd floor	610-758-3241	
Deutsch	Cindi	2 nd floor	610-758-3250	
Toothman	Donna	1 st floor	610-758-3230	