

**THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.**

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
NOVEMBER 14, 2003 IN THE MARVIN CENTER, ROOM 310**

Present: Vice President Lehman, Registrar Geyer, Parliamentarian Pagel; Deans Futrell, Phillips, and Tong; Professors Briscoe, Castleberry, Duff, Friedenthal, Griffith, Gupta, Harrington, Klarén, Marotta, Packer, Paratore, Robinson, Shambaugh, Simon, Swiercz, Wilmarth, and Wirtz

Absent: President Trachtenberg, Deans Frawley, Harding, Katz, Scott, Whitaker, and Young; Professors Cordes, Englander, Gallo, Garris, Lee, Paup, Sell, Watson, and Zaghoul

The meeting was called to order by Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman at 2:20 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the October 31, 2003 meeting were approved as distributed.

RESOLUTIONS

I. RESOLUTION 03/5, "A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE CODE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY (03/5)"

Professor Salvatore Paratore, Chair of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students introduced Resolution 03/5 by saying that the proposed amendment to the Academic Integrity Code had been suggested by the administration. Removing the application for admission from the Code would seem appropriate, because all of the other academic documents referenced in the Code appear to be generated after a student is enrolled.

Vice President Lehman called on Academic Integrity Director Tim Terpstra. Mr. Terpstra said that he thought the purpose of the amendment was to shift the responsibility for adjudicating falsified application cases from the Academic Integrity Code back to the individual schools and departments. While he did not go into any particular detail, he said that the University is presently involved in a case where an application was falsified and the view of the University was that it should have been handled through administrative channels. The view of the accused was the opposite, that the case should be handled under the Academic Integrity Code. He added that language appears in the University bulletin warning that disciplinary action may be taken against persons furnishing false information on application forms, and such action might include registration revocation or even expulsion.

Professor Griffith said that he took the thrust of the amendment to be elimination of the requirement for hearing before imposition of a sanction in these cases. Mr. Terpstra

responded that he did not think this was the purpose of the amendment, but it would allow schools to deal directly with students who had falsified their applications.

Professor Harrington observed that the Academic Integrity Code says that University applications may be, but not necessarily must be, documents whose falsification fell under its jurisdiction. Thus, even if the Code reference pertaining to admissions applications was deleted, this document might still be considered an academic document for purposes of the Code.

Professor Wilmarth spoke in opposition to the Resolution, saying that he had a number of concerns about the proposal. The principal reason for the proposal appeared to be that individuals accepted but not yet admitted to the University might be swept up in the Academic Integrity process. He agreed with that concern, he said, but rather than remove the admissions application from the purview of the Academic Integrity Code, it would be simpler to define who a student was for purposes of the Code's jurisdiction. A person who is never admitted, he added, would not be considered a student under his suggested definition.

Professor Wilmarth said that a major problem with the proposed amendment was that it completely removed these false application cases from the Code's jurisdiction, even when the false information remained undiscovered for some time after a student had enrolled. In this scenario, these cases would be handled administratively on an ad hoc basis, and sanctions imposed without a hearing.

Professor Gupta said he agreed very much with Professor Wilmarth. He also agreed with Professor Harrington's observations about the Code's language.

Professor Wirtz asked if it were possible that two schools might impose different sanctions in cases with identical fact patterns, and asked Mr. Terpstra to give an example of this. Mr. Terpstra said he could not, but observed that when the Code was created, it was overlooked that application forms state that if false information was furnished, basically admission would not be granted. The University's General Counsel's Office, he added, took the view that it would be better to have the application statement stand alone, and not add a second process under the Code with which to deal with these cases. Professor Wirtz then asked if that meant that a sanction was pre-ordained in the event of an application falsification and that, therefore, there was really no discretion to be exercised in handling these cases. Vice President Lehman confirmed that this was the University's opinion in the current case, and in general.

Discussion followed on whether or not an individual falsifying an application would be entitled to a hearing, or whether this might be at the discretion of the individual schools. Professor Griffith said that he certainly could not agree that dismissal, in cases where students had falsified an application and then enrolled, was mandatory. Vice President Lehman reiterated that the important thing was removing a second avenue of jurisdiction for these cases. Professor Duff said that he agreed with Professors Harrington and Gupta and their previous observations on the use of the word "may include" in the Code.

Professor Wilmarth again stated his preference for having the Code be clear about the persons to whom it applied, and said that he thought these issues were too difficult and serious to be handled outside of a well-established and fair hearing procedure which resulted in relatively consistent decision-making. His suggested approach would prevent these cases from being settled on an ad hoc basis through the exercise of administrative discretion.

Further discussion followed between Professor Griffith and Mr. Terpstra. Professor Swiercz said that he agreed with Professor Wilmarth and opposed the Resolution, as defining the word "student" for the purposes of the Code would be sufficient to solve the problems under consideration.

Professor Friedenthal advised that he would support the Resolution as written. This should be an admissions decision, he asserted, and an administrative one. Why someone who lied on an application and was quickly found out would be treated in one way, when another who lied and was not caught for some time after enrollment would be entitled to a hearing confounded him, even though in general he favored due process when appropriate.

Discussion followed between Professors Griffith, Packer, Robinson, and Vice President Lehman upon what process might be appropriate in somewhat analogous cases where faculty members had falsified credentials.

Professor Griffith reiterated his position that, once a student had become part of the University community, he or she should be entitled to due process and a hearing before sanctions were imposed. Professor Wirtz said that he had been persuaded by Professor Friedenthal's remarks, and that a student falsifying an application should revert to the status he or she was in prior to the fabrication, without additional due process protections.

Professor Wilmarth respectfully disagreed, observing that while a denial of admission generally bore no stigma, a student who was expelled from the University would have that sanction noted on a permanent record. He added that the Law School, which has a separate Academic Integrity process, provides a hearing to students accused of similar offenses after the date of their matriculation.

Professor Friedenthal said that it seemed to him, given this line of reasoning, the University might find itself in the position of providing due process for everyone who challenged an administrative decision, such as a decision to deny admission.

Professor Packer said he would agree completely with Professor Friedenthal if the sanction imposed in these cases was de-enrollment, or a retroactive refusal of admission, rather than imposition of an expulsion which would generate a record which would follow the individual.

Further discussion followed between Professors Duff, Griffith, Wilmarth, Simon, Klarén, and Wirtz.

Professor Wilmarth then suggested an amendment to the Preamble of the Academic Integrity Code which would add the words, "To this end, we have established the Code of Academic Integrity, which shall apply to all currently and previously enrolled students." Discussion then followed by Professors Wilmarth, Simon, Klarén, Wirtz, Griffith, and Vice President Lehman concerning the University's definition of "enrollment" and "matriculation."

Following this discussion, Professor Griffith offered a substitute amendment to the Resolving Clause of the Resolution which would remove the words " 'the application for admission' be deleted from," and add the words "if such falsification be discovered after the student is enrolled" following the phrase "the application for admission" in Article II, Section 1, Paragraph b, Subparagraph 4, of the Code of Academic Integrity. Professor Wilmarth withdrew his amendment and concurred with Professor Griffith's proposal.

Professor Paratore said he did not see the need to amend the resolution, and that he agreed with Professor Friedenthal.

The question was called on the amendment, a vote was taken, and the amendment failed by a vote of 8 in favor, and 9 opposed.

The question was called on the Resolution, a vote was taken, and the Resolution was adopted with 11 in favor, and 6 opposed. (The Resolution is attached.)

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

GENERAL BUSINESS

1. NOMINATION FOR APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT TO ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES

Professor Robinson moved the nomination for the appointment of Professor Mamoon Hammad to the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students. The nomination was approved.

2. INTERIM REPORTS OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Professor William Briscoe, Chair of the Senate Research Committee, apologized for his absence from the October 31st Senate meeting due to a conflicting departmental obligation.

Professor Briscoe reported that the Senate Research Committee had met three times thus far this year, and had formed subcommittees to study i) the effect of the proposed changes to the academic calendar on faculty research; ii) the current University Policy on Patents and Copyrights and implementation of that policy; iii) University support of faculty research in light of the 2001 Strategic Plan for Research; and iv) review of the research program at the Virginia campus.

Professor Briscoe advised that item i) has been completed and a full report has been transmitted to the Senate Executive Committee and is available to the entire Senate. He then urged the Senate to read the entire report. To summarize the final conclusion, Professor Briscoe said while the Research Committee sees some opportunities for faculty and student research at GW that can result from these alternative calendar programs, it also sees a host of real problems that can result from hasty implementation without thorough planning and full faculty concurrence. Therefore, the Committee strongly recommends that before the University decides to adopt these programs, sufficient time be taken to plan them well, and faculty approval of the resulting plans should be obtained. The Report was written by a subcommittee of Professor Barry Berman, and the Committee's student representative, Alfredo Lagos. The Senate Research Committee discussed the Report at length and submitted corrections and additions before the Committee accepted the entire Report. A Summary of the Committee's discussions was also forwarded to the Senate Executive Committee. Professor Briscoe concluded by saying the Committee will report on other matters at the Senate's April meeting. (The Report is attached.)

3. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Report of the Executive Committee by Professor Robinson, Chair, is enclosed.

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Vice President Lehman conveyed President Trachtenberg's regrets and apologies for his absence from the meeting, due to illness. He added that he thought the President was feeling somewhat better at this point than he had the day before.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 3:19 p.m.

Dennis L. Geyer
Dennis L. Geyer
Secretary

A Resolution to Amend the Code of Academic Integrity (03/5)

WHEREAS, the Code of Academic Integrity was adopted to promote academic integrity among the students, faculty, librarians and administration of The George Washington University; and

WHEREAS, the Code specifically addresses "Falsification and forgery of University academic documents" (Article II, Section 1, Paragraph b, Subparagraph 4) by students of the University; and

WHEREAS, such falsification and forgery of a University document prior to an individual's matriculating in a course of study at the University may be, and has been, challenged as falling under the jurisdiction of the Code of Academic Integrity; and

WHEREAS, both the paper and electronic applications for admission to the University require the applicant to acknowledge that all of the information provided on the application is "factually correct and honestly presented;" and

WHEREAS, it is expressly stated in the University Bulletin that "If a student knowingly makes a false statement or conceals material information on an application for admission or any other University document, the student's registration may be canceled. If such falsification is discovered after the student has matriculated at the University, the student may be subject to dismissal from the University" (Undergraduate Bulletin, 2002-2003, p. 49; Graduate Bulletin, 2002-2003, p. 36); and

WHEREAS, the University does exercise its right to dismiss students who have made false statements or have concealed material information on their applications for admission from the University; NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the phrase "the application for admission" be deleted from Article II, Section 1, Paragraph b, Subparagraph 4, of the Code of Academic Integrity.

**Joint Committee of Faculty and Students
September 19, 2003**

Adopted November 14, 2003

Report of the Faculty Senate Research Committee on the Alternate Academic Calendar Study Group Report

October 22, 2003

The Faculty Senate Research Committee was asked by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to comment on our understanding of (1) the salient points of the report of the Alternate Academic Calendar Study Group (AACSG) that affect faculty research and (2) the potential difficulties that we foresee in the implementation of either of the principal programs outlined in that report. We are well aware that there are many issues outside this area that might affect faculty, students, and others in the GW community that are considered in the report, many of which are controversial, but here we have been charged specifically to focus our attention on research matters, particularly as they affect the faculty.

It is important to understand what these two proposed programs would do and not do. The first program would require that rising juniors attend a special summer session in which they would be brought into their major discipline by special courses or programs, perhaps including research programs, organized by their Department; then they would be required to spend one of the next four semesters off campus (they would have some choice here), possibly to pursue further work in their discipline, possibly to graduate early, or possibly just to earn money. This means that there would be the same numbers of students (and faculty) on campus in the fall and spring as there are now (although the mix would change), and there would be an additional number of students (roughly 1/4 of the total) on campus during the summer, requiring a proportionate number of faculty to teach them. The number of faculty actually on campus during the summer would be considerably fewer than during the fall and spring semesters.

The second program would change the normal course schedule for undergraduates from the present five 3-hour courses per semester to four 4-hour courses; under this program, the fraction of their total studies allotted to their major, to the GCR program, and to electives (roughly Yz:Y4:Y4) would not change-only the number of courses, trading breadth for depth. It is argued by some, including most of the Ivy League schools, that the (4x4) program is pedagogically superior. We do not address this deep question here, but only wish to examine its possible effect on research for faculty and students.

Either of these two programs could be instituted separately, or both could be done together. It is important to bear this distinction in mind-the first (summer) program would increase the number of GW undergraduates by as much as 12.5%, and hence generate additional tuition revenue, while the second (4x4) is in itself revenue-neutral. Either program would have widespread implications across the entire fabric of education at GW, with many attendant problems as well as opportunities. The mismatch of undergraduate and graduate courses and the faculty who teach both immediately comes to mind.] We only wish to report here on those aspects of these programs that seem to us to most directly affect the research enterprise at GW.

1. Advantages for Research

A. More Research Faculty

We understand that one of the principal advantages of the mandatory summer program for rising juniors is, by utilizing our classrooms and dormitories year-round, that we can admit more students, derive more tuition, and help the overall budget situation in this way. We assume that the number of faculty will remain proportional to the number of students, in roughly the same mix of tenure-line and adjunct faculty that we have now. Thus, if the student body increases by 10-12%, then so will the number of faculty. Then, with substantially more faculty to be hired, GW can see to it that these new faculty are research-active and are put largely into departments and programs where they are most critically needed to enhance the research enterprise at GW. This will give an enormous impetus to research at GW over a short time, without having to wait for natural attrition; and since these new faculty will be mostly assistant professors, they will, in the short run, cost less than the average of the existing faculty. [The fraction of current operating expenditures devoted to faculty salaries and benefits is 25%.] As we see it, this would provide the most important advantage of the summer program to scholarly research and creativity at GW. But we emphasize that *if the University Administration does not agree with this proportionate growth in tenure-line faculty, then we believe the entire idea to be fatally flawed.*

B. Flexibility of Research Time

Both the mandatory summer plan and the switch of most undergraduate degree programs from a 3x5-course structure to a 4x4 structure offer advantages to many research faculty. By having the option to teach in the summer instead of the fall or spring, one can put together two consecutive semesters to conduct research either at GW or elsewhere instead of having two (non-consecutive) summers. Since many areas of research, such as doing experiments at National Laboratories or writing books, benefit more from having a larger period of time away from teaching than from two smaller periods (referred to as a "lumpy good"), this could enhance research productivity. Of course we realize that this is not necessarily the case for all fields of research, but it certainly will help in many areas.

Similarly, although not quite as dramatic, a switch, for example, from teaching four 3-hour courses per academic year (two each semester) to teaching three 4-hour courses per academic year (2-1 or 1-2) will make it easier to do research during the semester with the lighter teaching load. [Even though the total amount of time spent teaching remains the same--once again, the "lumpy-good" argument applies.] We emphasize that *this assumes that the overall teaching load as measured in semester-hours remains the same*, so that research-active faculty are not merely burdened with teaching the same number of courses, each of which is more time-consuming than at present. *If the number of courses taught per year does not decrease proportionately, this potential benefit will become a significant liability.*

C. Potential Research Benefits for Students

A well-crafted summer research experience in the discipline for rising juniors can, and should, play a major role in promoting a research culture and a research-friendly atmosphere at GW. Some departments and research groups already have undergraduate research programs in place, and it is generally agreed that these programs are successful and should be emulated-witness the new Gamow and Luther Rice Undergraduate Research Fellowships. Likewise, placement of juniors and seniors in research programs and research laboratories elsewhere, possibly abroad, during their fall or spring semester away from GW, can be a very positive experience. We view such programs as a recruiting tool-an unusual opportunity to promote GW to excellent prospective students.

Another opportunity, afforded in some cases by the 4x4 system, is to incorporate a small research project or paper, perhaps in the professor's field of expertise, into the expanded advanced-level courses. We note in this connection the statement in the AACSG report that "courses would delve deeper into their present topics, but perhaps with a big gain in intellectual excitement and student engagement, as students approached the research frontiers inhabited by their teacher. "

Of course, this will depend critically on the ability and willingness of Departments to put such programs and courses in place, and we recognize that it will be difficult for certain disciplines to do so, for a variety of reasons. But what we want to avoid is to treat the summer program as merely "more of the same" courses taught during the fall and spring, to treat the 4-hour courses as just "more of the same" material in the same format as before, and to ignore the opportunity of adding a significant research component to both summer programs and advanced courses.

2. Potential Difficulties for Research

A. Summer Grants

Some research grants, as well as summer faculty research appointments, are available only in the summer. This indeed would be a problem for the researchers involved in summer teaching. Whether funding agencies would be flexible enough to allow funds to be spent during another time of year is a point that requires further investigation.

B. Summer Conferences

Because research faculty at most universities are off during the summer, many conferences are held at that time. This can cause some disruption, but should not cause significant harm-one can usually get a colleague to give a lecture or two, and in fact many international conferences in foreign countries take place during the normal (for us) academic year. However, there are situations which would make it more difficult to do this in the summer, such as if the colleague most qualified to give one's lectures is not on campus at that time.

C. Sabbatical Leaves

We presume that the normal sabbatical research leave would continue to be two consecutive semesters (at 60% salary) [or one semester at full salary], and one of these can just as well be a summer as a fall or spring semester. We see no decrease in flexibility .

D. Course Buyouts

Some research-active faculty, particularly in engineering, business, and the social sciences, have grants that buyout part of their teaching time, at the current rate of 1/6 academic-year salary per 3-hour course. If most courses were changed to 4 hours, then buyout of a course would cost the funding agency 4/3 as much (2/9 per course). Some funding agencies may balk at the increased price, even though the researcher would be able to put in proportionately more time. For others, the total grant is fixed, and if more goes to salary , then less goes to other worthy expenditures, some of which cannot be traded for researcher time. Insofar as this situation pertains, it is a problem, and could be a severe one. We recommend further investigation to find out which fields or disciplines would be seriously affected and how widespread this problem would be.

E. Opportunities for Collaboration

Some research-active faculty collaborate with colleagues at other universities who may be available only in the summer; summer teaching would disrupt such collaborations. This would be a real problem for some, while for others some other accommodation, electronic perhaps, could be found. Since this applies to collaborations with other faculty at GW (usually within a department) as well as at other universities, this problem might be widespread. In any case, it is clear that face-to-face collaboration is usually best, and enhances productivity the most. Again, we recommend further investigation to see how widespread and severe this problem would be.

F. Competitiveness in Hiring New Faculty

Summer teaching might be seen as a significant disadvantage by prospective faculty. One would hope, of course, that this would not be the determining factor in one's decision to come to GW, and that the Department in question would try to accommodate the candidate as much as possible. However, it may turn out that the Department Chair, with no matter how much good will, cannot guarantee that the new hire (or anyone else, for that matter) would never have to teach during the summer. Thus, there remains the distinct possibility that this could be a problem for some, depending on collaborations, family situation, *etc.*, which could then impact our ability to attract the best candidates.

G. Disruption to Graduate-Student Research

Graduate students perform significant research during the summer, and if their faculty advisors are away from GW, this could slow them down. This might not be a major problem for most doctoral candidates, partly because for most advanced graduate students research is a year-round enterprise, and partly because most faculty advisors are conscientious and would maintain whatever contact with their students is necessary. However, for Master's students, especially in certain disciplines, their main research output occurs during the summer, and if their principal mentor were heavily engaged in teaching, or away from campus, it could impact their research negatively. Among the areas of research most affected would be those disciplines that depend heavily on seasonal fieldwork, which may be difficult or impossible to carry out at other times of the year.

H. Temporary Disruptions

The transition to either of these plans (junior summer or 4x4) inevitably will require considerable time and effort and cause some problems. [Creating sufficient *new* space for additional faculty and research laboratories immediately comes to mind.] We would hope that the University Administration, including Department Chairs, would try to smooth the way, especially for the newer research-active faculty. There are many services that could be provided to help, and to try to insure that these kinds of problems are solved in a timely way and do not recur.

I. Morale of the Faculty

Finally, we would like to comment that we see considerable and widespread dissatisfaction among the faculty at this time, partly because of their suspicion and distrust of the University Administration. Shortly after being informed that their salary increase has been delayed for half a year (again), it is hard for many to believe that their teaching load will not be *increased* under either of these programs: if the summer program brings in more students and proportionately more faculty are not hired, or if the courses they teach are made more time-consuming and their total number is not reduced proportionately. Thus, if either of these programs were instituted by Administrative fiat without considerable faculty input, we believe that the morale of the faculty (including research-active faculty) would suffer severely, and research productivity would suffer along with it.

In conclusion, we see significant opportunities for research at GW that can result from the programs discussed in the AACSG report, but we also see a host of real problems that can result from their hasty implementation. Therefore, we strongly recommend that *before* the University decides to adopt either or both of these programs, that sufficient time be taken to plan them well, and that the faculty approve the resulting plans in order to avoid, as much as possible, the onerous and deleterious consequences that might derive from exacerbating an already serious problem. We ask the Faculty Senate to adopt a resolution to this effect.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Lilien F. Robinson, Chair

November 14, 2003

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Following the Senate meeting on October 31, 2003, the Executive Committee forwarded the Resolution on the Alternative Academic Calendar and the accompanying report of the Educational Policy Committee to President Trachtenberg. As the proposed alternative academic calendar and the 4 x 4 curriculum are of great concern to the entire University, the Executive Committee felt it was important to have the faculty's view, as expressed in the unanimously adopted Resolution and the report, provided to the President for his timely consideration and response.

MATTERS BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Recognizing that a subcommittee of the Appointment, Salary, Promotion Policies Committee is preparing a more detailed report for distribution at a later date, the Executive Committee notes with concern that the latest issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education, reports that George Washington University's highest administrative salaries represented salary increases of 20 to 42 percent in a single year, 2001-2002. As colleagues have pointed out to us, this is especially discouraging to a faculty whose far more modest salaries have been increasing by 3 and 4 percent, and whose salaries are presently frozen for another six months, and who have been repeatedly advised of the University's allegedly pressing financial needs.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Please note that the Report of the Student Association on the Alternative Academic Calendar has been received and is being distributed to the Senate this afternoon.

The next Executive Committee meeting will be held on November 25, 2003. Resolutions, reports, and other items of business should reach the Committee before that date.