

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

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON  
MARCH 14, 2003 IN THE ALUMNI HOUSE**

**Present:** Vice President Lehman, Registrar Geyer, Parliamentarian Pagel; Deans Frawley, Futrell, Southby and Tong; Professors Briscoe, Cordes, Divita, Duff, Friedenthal, Gallo, Griffith, Gupta, Haque, Kennedy, Maggs, Robinson, West, Wilmarth, and Zaghloul

**Absent:** President Trachtenberg, Harding, Phillips, Williams, Whitaker, and Young; Professors Balla, Castleberry, Cawley, Glascock, Harrington, Klarén, Paratore, Pelzman, Sell, Simon, and Wirtz

The meeting was called to order by Vice President Lehman at 2:15 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on February 14, 2003 were approved as distributed.

**INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS**

No resolutions were introduced.

**REPORT ON THE COLUMBIAN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES**

William J. Frawley, Dean of the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, presented a Report on the current state of the College as well as its future directions. He began his presentation by comparing and contrasting statistics about Columbian College for the past ten years, noting that in some ways the College has not changed, but that in other important ways, it has. Over this period there has been a substantial increase in enrollment and in double majors; the law school acceptance rate for graduates has also risen. There have also been significant increases in faculty, [including minority faculty], and in named professorships. The budget has increased substantially, from some \$33 million in 1992 to \$53 million presently. Dean Frawley then compared the total enrollment of the College with other Schools of the University at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Dean Frawley then outlined five directions for the future of the College, which he said were the result of taking into account all stock-taking documents that have appeared in the College, including strategic plans and department updates. Dean Frawley said he also has initiated a series of ongoing conversations with department chairs concerning the College's future. The result of these deliberations has been agreement on five core areas: (1) promoting challenge, discovery, engagement, and focus in the undergraduate experience; (2) providing visible, well-defined, and well-supported programs at the graduate level; (3) investing in the academic environment for and accomplishments of faculty; (4) providing alternative deliveries and tools for Self Management via technology;

and (5) improving the College's internal and external position through efficient, effective, and principled conduct of business.

Dean Frawley then briefed the Senate in detail on each of these areas. In the area of Undergraduate Excellence, 50 new Dean's seminars for 1,000 students will be offered, and freshman advising will be restructured. New opportunities for undergraduate research will be made available, and integrated core competencies will be fostered by the freshman writing seminars and a related program focusing on Writing in the Disciplines. Multicultural competency will also be encouraged by means of the establishment of global living-learning communities organized around content areas of international peace. Also in the near future for the College is a strategic initiative to engage sophomores and juniors, with a view toward ultimately providing a curriculum for this group which would include fellowships.

In the area of Graduate Excellence, Dean Frawley noted that the College has inventoried, reallocated, increased, and extended graduate support packages, including travel support. This initiative is in addition to funding provided by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. In the area of Selective Excellence, the College is supporting new graduate teaching assistants (GTA's) for Hominid Paleobiology, Political Science, History, and Public Policy. In a second area of Selective Excellence, GTA's have been reallocated for Museum Studies, Anthropology, Women's Studies, Forensic Sciences and Sociology. A Science initiative is also underway and support for conferences in Museum Studies, and Psychology will be provided. An International Writer's series in conjunction with local embassies is also planned.

Dean Frawley continued by describing the College's investment in academic environment and accomplishment for faculty. Nearly 30 searches have been initiated, and of this number approximately 18 are tenure-track, and 23 non-tenure track. The College has been successful in recruiting its first choice candidates, and this success is due in part to the provision of start-up in all cases, even in the humanities and the social sciences. At least two senior appointments will also be made.

Another major initiative in the College has been the development of the research/teaching environment. Under the Columbian Research Fellow program, four positions have been afforded funds for a complete release from teaching in order to allow faculty to complete research projects. Faculty Travel Support has been increased by 50%, as have Junior Scholar Incentive Awards. The College is also working very hard to provide salary support for major fellowship winners.

In order to further the University's goal of becoming a first class research university which attracts the very best faculty, Columbian College has established a Science Advisory Committee which meets regularly with the Dean to discuss issues such as facility development, equipment plans, the curriculum, and grant planning and management; the possibility of establishing a unified science major is under consideration as well. The College hopes to increase its press visibility by providing a series of background briefings by science faculty on Saturdays. Finally, the College is working very hard to generate external funds and encourage the faculty to generate and follow up on funding proposals. Toward that end, the College will host a visit by the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) in April. Discussions are also underway with the National Science Foundation

(NSF) in an effort to establish agency fellowships, where NSF directors would exchange their duties with faculty to come to GW to teach for 6 months.

In the area of Technology, Dean Frawley said that the College is working to develop an environment that maximizes its ability to responsibly manage its own affairs. One effort underway is a working group on visualization of data spearheaded by Professor Briscoe which seeks to use research technology in an instructional context. Another area to which the College is committed is in its use of administrative technology. Dean Frawley took a few moments to preview for the Senate the new website which has been developed and will be launched soon to promote a more academic environment in the College. He also previewed the new "Digital Shelf" which gives users quick access to virtually any sort of information about the College, from bylaws and minutes of the Council of Chairs meetings, to details of scholarly proposals and achievements. Taken together, these technology initiatives will provide the College with tools necessary for it to achieve Strategic Excellence.

Next, Dean Frawley reviewed the College's move from a hierarchical structure to one that utilizes distributed management. Two new Assistant Deans have been hired, and the College hopes to establish a new position for an Executive Director for Advancement. (A copy of Dean Frawley's powerpoint presentation is attached.) In terms of new units, the College anticipates the creation of a school of Public Policy. The establishment of an Organizational Sciences program and a Center for Language Teaching and Learning are also under development.

Dean Frawley then described new relationships with several local embassies, including assistance in obtaining language teachers by the Italian Embassy, participation by the Indian Embassy in the International Writers' Series, and development of a major conference on Living with Terrorism in conjunction with the University of Haifa.

In concluding his Report, Dean Frawley outlined what he termed the College's twelve challenges. These challenges lie in the undergraduate, graduate, and faculty areas as well as the manner in which the College is managed and conducts business. (Dean Frawley's Report is attached.)

#### ANNUAL REPORT ON THE COLLEGE OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES

Donald R. Lehman, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, distributed the first annual report on the College of Professional Studies (CPS), and gave an overview of its growth and development since its inception. He began by reminding the Senate that the creation of the CPS had been approved by the GW Board of Trustees in October, 2000, and its core mission is to make available lifelong learning opportunities through the offering of associate, bachelor, and master's degrees in Professional Studies. The College launched its first year of operation in 2001-02.

Vice President Lehman told the Senate that one of the first tasks accomplished was to establish the governance structure of the College, which was done by formation of a Dean's Council composed of one tenured faculty member from, and elected by faculty of each College or School of the University that participates in or may be affected by off-campus program offerings; three chairs of departments with faculty participating in off-campus program offerings [appointed by the Dean of the CPS] and three non-tenure

accruing faculty from among those participating in the off-campus programs or current offerings of the CPS, also appointed by the CPS Dean. Members of the Dean's Council are appointed so that members serve staggered three-year terms.

The Dean's Council held its first meeting in January, 2002, and has met monthly from September to May of each year since that time. The attendance rate has been very high at these meetings, Vice President Lehman added, approaching the 85 to 90% rate. The Dean's Council also elected Professor Christopher Sterling to serve as Chair.

Among officials actions taken by the Dean's Council was the development of bylaws for the College. These are now complete except for a section still under consideration dealing with the issues of appointment and promotion of any faculty who are directly associated with the CPS. [Membership of the Dean's Council is listed in Appendix A of the Report, and the CPS Bylaws are set forth in Appendix B.]

An important development in the administration of the College is the recent acceptance of a report submitted by the CPS to the Middle States Commission in November. Acceptance of this report by the Commission at its meeting in March, 2002, indicates that the CPS is now included within the scope of GW's accreditation. CPS Dean Roger Whitaker also appointed two Associate Deans after a national search and these individuals are looking at new program possibilities, working with external audiences, and trying to achieve the ultimate goals of the CPS – to move from an open enrollment approach in GW's off-campus programs to one where the University collaborates and forms alliances and partnerships with external organizations. [The College of Professional Studies Description and Staff appears in Appendix C of the Report.]

The CPS also continues to carry out the function of its predecessor, the Office of Academic Development and Continuing Education and has assumed oversight of the Graduate Education Centers at Virginia Square, Hampton Roads, and Alexandria.

Vice President Lehman then discussed the financial picture of the CPS contained in Appendix D of his Report. The overall revenue of the CPS for FY '02 exceeded projections by some \$1.9 million, and the net figure of revenues after expenses for that same period was some \$1.25 million above the \$3.68 million budgeted. Thus, the CPS produced very good results for its first year of operations.

Vice President Lehman then briefly summarized some of the elements of the section of the Report entitled "Academic Programs" and then moved on to describe pending issues for the CPS. One of these issues is faculty resources, as both the Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees specified at the time the CPS was created that the College would have no tenured faculty. However, he added, it will not be possible to staff the College's programs entirely with part-time and temporary faculty, so the question of what alternative career paths will be open to the CPS faculty arises, as well as the criteria to be used to select, compensate and promote them. These questions are under active consideration by the College's staff and its Dean's Council.

Another pending issue, he continued, has to do with the issue of the degree of flexibility to be applied in admissions and the assessment of prior learning. The question of whether or not to give some sort of credit for work experience is a very difficult one, he

added, and while the Dean's Council is discussing the issue, no decision on this has yet been reached.

In conclusion, Vice President Lehman described some of the very exciting prospective partnership opportunities for the CPS outlined in the Report, which include possible curricular co-development with partner organizations such as Virginia Tech (VPI&SU), the Graduate School of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Navy Fleet Information Warfare Center (FIWC), D.C. Metropolitan Area Law Enforcement Agencies, the National Air Traffic Controllers Association (NATCA), and the National Football League Players Association (NFLPA). (The Report is attached.)

Professor Wilmarth inquired about the status of GW Solutions, and Vice President Lehman told the Senate that it is a for-profit entity which is completely independent of the CPS, and the books are kept completely separate. He added that originally, non-credit activity was housed in the Center for Professional Development, and all of these programs were moved into GW Solutions, along with the Conference and Events Management group, and GW TV. It was anticipated that GW Solutions would establish broad alliances and partnerships for the University, except its specific offerings would be non-credit only.

The establishment of GW Solutions came at an unfortunate time, Vice President Lehman continued, in that corporations which usually are the primary clients for non-credit education have cut back their spending in this area. In this market, he said, clients are interested in credit, rather than non-credit programs.

Professor Griffith asked Vice President Lehman to estimate the size of the subsidy for GW Solutions this year, and Vice President Lehman responded that he did not have this information with him, but would be happy to provide it. Although the budget approved for GW Solutions projected a deficit for the first two years of operation, with a breakeven budget in 2004, the loss in 2002 approached \$2.8 million. The projected deficit for the current year is comparable, he added, even though the deficit in the second year of operation was projected to be smaller. In response to this development, Dean Whitaker, who is also the CEO of GW Solutions, has taken significant cost-cutting measures which include reductions in staff. He has been working closely with the Board of Directors, which includes three members of GW's Board of Trustees, to ensure that GW Solutions will be able to run at a breakeven or better level by June 30, 2004.

Professor Briscoe asked about the fate of the Conference and Events Management part of GW Solutions, and Vice President Lehman said that this had been eliminated as it was a cost center for the University which was not bringing in a positive return.

#### ANNUAL REPORT ON THE RECRUITMENT AND APPOINTMENT OF WOMEN FACULTY AND FACULTY OF COLOR

Vice President Lehman distributed the Report and noted with his thanks that it was prepared by Ms. Peggye Cohen, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research, and her Associate Director, Joe Knop, as well as Ms. Annie Wooldridge, Assistant Vice President for Faculty Recruitment and Personnel Relations.

Vice President Lehman began by saying that again this year, the University has had significant success in recruiting women faculty and faculty of color. He then turned to highlights of the Report.

Last year, the University conducted 265 authorized faculty searches, 158 of which were national searches for regular faculty and 67 modified searches for visiting faculty. A total of 158 hires were made, consisting of 99 regular full-time, and 59 visiting faculty. Some 28.3% of the new hires in full-time faculty positions, and 16.9% of hires in new visiting positions, were minority candidates. This year, for the first time, two Native Americans are among the newly-hired faculty.

Over a fourteen year period, between Academic Years 1988-89 and 2002/03, the total number of faculty members has increased by 187, or approximately 20%. Overall, the number of white male faculty has decreased somewhat, while there has been a significant increase in white female faculty, for a net increase of 87. An additional 33 black faculty have been hired, in a 2 to 1 female to male ratio. In terms of Asian faculty, 66 additional faculty have been hired, with more than twice as many men as women. Eleven Hispanic faculty have also been added, all women. In sum, a total of 112 faculty have been added in the minority categories, and the ratio of men to women faculty is roughly equal in the minority hires.

Vice President Lehman then briefly reviewed the data contained in the report concerning faculty promoted and awarded tenure in Table 5 of the Report.

In terms of faculty retention, over the period from October 2001 through September, 2002, 51 regular, active-status faculty left the University for a variety of reasons, including a significant number who retired, and a number who completed temporary appointments of one type or another. A certain number were not re-appointed, and some moved to part-time service for various and sundry reasons. A very, very small number of faculty were denied tenure. Of the faculty of color who left the University, all 7 resigned.

In examining the University faculty as a whole, 67% of the regular, active-status faculty are men, however, they occupy 73% of the tenure-track positions, and 55% of the non-tenure-track positions. Women comprise 33% of the faculty and hold 27% of the tenure or tenure-track positions, and what is certainly a disproportionate number of the non-tenured faculty positions, namely 45%. The senior faculty in the Medical Schools actually consist currently of 22% women and 78% men, no change from last year. The senior faculty in the non-medical schools consist of 25% women and 75% men, a slight increase over the percentage of women over last year. An interesting point, also made last year, was that the distribution of junior faculty in the Medical and non-medical schools also differs. The junior faculty in the Medical Schools consists of 56% women and 44% men, reflecting at some level that many more women are going into medicine and related areas. Junior faculty outside the Medical School currently consist of 48% women and 52% men. Looking at senior faculty in both the Medical and non-medical schools, approximately 14% are people of color, while 25% of the Medical junior faculty and 23% of the non-Medical faculty are not.

Turning to the percentages of faculty by group, Vice President Lehman said that the percentage of Asian faculty has not increased in recent years. For a number of years, the number of black faculty has remained constant, but that percentage is now moving up. The

percentage of Hispanic faculty has also remained constant. Vice President Lehman added that he, the President, and Ms. Wooldridge had recently met with Hispanic faculty at the University in order to discuss recruitment efforts. As a direct result of this meeting, the University will be initiating both short and long term strategies to improve recruitment practices.

Vice President Lehman concluded his report by noting that the bi-annual Salary Equity Review Committee had been constituted and would begin meeting very soon, with Professor Michael King from the Chemistry Department chairing the group. Mses. Cohen and Wooldridge will also work on this project, and Professor Philip Wirtz will serve as statistical consultant. Vice President Lehman then commended the entire Report to the Senate's scrutiny and said he would be happy to answer questions.

Professor Griffith asked about compliance with the Faculty Code-mandated proportion of tenure-track to non-tenure-track appointments over the total faculty population at the University, consisting of 1061 faculty members, with 700 tenure or tenure-track, and 361 non-tenure-track. Vice President Lehman reminded the Senate that both the Medical and Law Schools are exempt from the provisions of the Faculty Code with regard to the condition that no more than 25% of the faculty be in non-tenure track positions. He added that the overall numbers could therefore be misleading. He said it is true that the School of Public Health and Health Services as well as the Graduate School of Education and Human Development were not in full compliance with the Code, and that one other School was right on the edge of compliance, but that the other Schools were compliant. Professor Robinson asked if an overall number could be given, and Vice President Lehman replied that the University does keep track of these statistics but he did not have them handy in connection with the recruitment report. He then said he thought that, overall, the University has 552 tenure-track and 175 non-tenure track faculty [for a total of 727] excluding the Medical and Law schools, or about 25% contract faculty. On the basis of the numbers presented, Professor Gupta said he thought that the percentage of non-tenure-track faculty was below the 25% level. Vice President Lehman then offered to obtain this information for the Senate, and said he would be happy to respond to e-mails on the subject. (The Report is attached.)

#### UPDATE ON THE WRITING PROPOSAL

Professor Paul Duff, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) gave a preliminary report on the Academic Excellence Committee's Writing Proposal as follows:

In September, 2002, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate asked the EPC to examine the writing proposal put forth by the Academic Excellence Committee. The EPC began its examination of the writing proposal as soon as the school year began. A number of EPC members raised questions concerning the viability of certain elements of the proposal. Because of this and other concerns, the Committee thought it would be helpful to learn more about the development of the Writing Proposal. Our report on this will be listed in section 1 below. Following that, we will comment on the work of the Writing Task Force in section 2.

**Although the EPC was troubled by the process, nevertheless, it is quite pleased with the work that the Writing Task Force has done this past year.**

**I. The Writing Proposal of the Academic Excellence Committee  
(Fall 2001-Spring 2002)**

**The EPC spoke with Vice President Lehman and the three Columbian College of Arts and Sciences (CCAS) participants on the Academic Excellence Committee about the Academic Excellence Committee's Writing Proposal.**

**Based upon these conversations and discussions that followed, the EPC found the following procedural problems with the development of the Academic Excellence Committee's Writing Proposal:**

- 1) The CCAS faculty had insufficient opportunity to choose its representatives to the Academic Excellence Committee. Because the Academic Excellence program was rushed and there was insufficient time for the CCAS faculty to elect representatives, that College's representatives to the Committee were chosen by the CCAS Dean's Council. This procedural issue is especially noteworthy since CCAS is the School that would be most affected by any change in the writing program.**
- 2) There was no attempt (by the Academic Excellence Committee or the administration) to judge the effectiveness of the current freshman writing program before suggesting that it be replaced.**
- 3) The report was produced without consultation with outside experts in the field of writing and composition. Nor did anyone consult with the Chair of the English Department, the Deputy Chair, the Director of the Writing Program, or the Director of the Writing Center. The failure to consult with experts in the field is significant since English Composition is a serious academic discipline with a significant body of scholarly literature. The failure to consult with the appropriate persons in the English Department is particularly troublesome since that department would be likely, either directly or indirectly, to help implement any writing program.**
- 4) The 1999 WAC (Writing Across the Curriculum) proposal put forward by the GW English Department was ignored. This proposal addressed many of the same concerns as the Academic Excellence Committee's proposal. Vice President Lehman informed the EPC that he was unaware of the existence of the 1999 WAC proposal. (Upon investigation, Vice President Lehman discovered that the former Dean of CCAS did not send this proposal forward to the Council of Deans as he had indicated he would to the EPC.) Nevertheless, if the English Department had been consulted during the deliberations of the Academic Excellence Committee, the existence of this proposal would**

have been uncovered. The Academic Excellence Committee would then have had the benefit of that earlier proposal.

- 5) There was some confusion (at least among the CCAS representatives of the Academic Excellence Committee) about the mission of the Committee vis-à-vis the Writing Proposal. Some representatives were under the impression that the proposal was a first draft that would be further discussed by the faculty (in which case, the lack of consultation with experts in English Composition is less problematic). But others thought that the writing proposal would go directly to the curriculum committees of the various schools when it left the Academic Excellence Committee. Further clarity on this should have been provided to the Committee.
- 6) There was also confusion among the CCAS representatives to the Academic Excellence Committee about their freedom to discuss the writing proposal with other members of the university community while it was under discussion. Although some felt that they were permitted to speak about the Committee's activities in general terms, overall most thought that the Committee's deliberations were to be kept secret.

As a result of the way that the proposal was generated, there was considerable suspicion among faculty when the Academic Excellence Committee's Writing Proposal was finally made public. Faculty suspicion was intensified by the announcement that the Writing Program would be launched in the fall of 2003. It is the EPC's opinion that a great deal of energy will, as a result, have to be put to the task of allaying such faculty suspicion before the program is fully implemented.

#### Concluding Comments on the Process:

Since the faculty of the university are those who are ultimately responsible for the curriculum of the university as well as for implementing and teaching any writing program, it is necessary that faculty be adequately included in the planning of new curricula. It is also vital that such planning processes be as transparent as possible.

#### II. The Task Force (Fall 2002-Spring 2003)

Following the announcement of the writing proposal by the Academic Excellence Committee, Vice President Lehman convened a Task Force whose mission was to implement the proposal. Included on the task force were three members of the English Department (including the Deputy Chair and the Director of the Writing Center) and a representative of the EPC. The Task Force was immediately divided into three committees. Two of the committees dealt with curricular matters. One of these curricular committees

was charged with the first year program, the other, the writing component for sophomores and juniors.

When the Task Force began its work, it was unclear, at least to some of its members, what its specific task was. Did “implementation” mean closely adhering to the proposal that the Academic Excellence Committee had created? How much revision was desirable or possible? After the first few meetings, it became clear that the majority of the Task Force thought that some parts of the Academic Excellence proposal were either undesirable or unworkable. Since that time, the Task Force took it upon itself to rewrite the proposal to the extent that it deemed necessary.

Because of the rapid progress of the Task Force (which insured the obsolescence of at least some parts of the original proposal) the Educational Policy Committee thought it would serve no useful purpose to examine in any detail the proposal that Academic Excellence Committee had produced. Instead, the EPC decided to follow the progress of the Writing Task Force.

A summary of the Task Force’s proposed Freshman writing course follows:

#### University Writing 20

- Required of all students
- Limited to 15 students or fewer
- Taught by Full Time faculty (to the extent possible)
- Focus on academic writing
- Framing questions
- Constructing arguments
- Using evidence
- Focus on revision
- 25-30 pages of finished writing developed through pre-draft preparation and drafts; at least 70% of final grade based upon written work
- Rhetoric handbook will also be employed

Professor Duff concluded by saying that, overall, the Educational Policy Committee was very pleased with the description of the first year course that the Task Force produced. The EPC thought that the proposal was well thought out and well crafted. It was also pleased that the proposal emphasized critical thinking as well as writing and that the Task Force proposal set a fixed amount of writing but, nevertheless, it still allowed some room for flexibility among the individual sections.

Professor Kennedy asked how instructors and course content would be chosen for these writing sections, and Vice President Linebaugh said that had not been fully determined to his knowledge. Vice President Lehman said that hopefully, within a week an acting director and an acting deputy director would be appointed, and these faculty would hire the writing seminar instructors. The goal is to hire only full-time faculty. A total of 700 students selected randomly, will be enrolled in the new course, 300 during the fall term, and

**400 in the spring term. Each section will have a maximum of 15 students with the possibility that some sections will have only 12 students.**

**Professor Griffith asked Professor Duff to tell the Senate what the process would be from this point forward. He added that he had never seen such a top-down proposal come to the faculty, changing coursework that is essentially under its direction. Though he said he was unclear on the details, it was his understanding that the new writing program would not be part of the English Department but would somehow be an independent, free-standing sort of organization. Professor Duff confirmed that the writing program would not be housed in the English Department, but the directors would report to the CCAS Dean. He added that the current proposal is simply for a pilot program, so it will only go to the curriculum committees of the various colleges. Vice President Lehman added that once the whole program is put together, it will include a segment on writing across and within disciplines at which point it would be overseen by an elected advisory board. Professor Duff then said that a second subcommittee is currently investigating the sophomore and junior "writing in the disciplines" segment of the program.**

**Professor Gupta said that he had read The Hatchet article about the writing program the day before and asked if the CCAS Curriculum Committee and faculty as a whole did not have to approve a course to be instituted in Fall, 2003, as currently English 10 and 11 are part of the General Curriculum Requirements (GCR), and the new course would either replace them [or students would have to take both sets of required courses]. Professor Duff said that he thought initially that students taking the writing courses in the pilot program would be exempted from the current composition requirement by their dean. Ultimately though, he added, CCAS faculty will have to vote on the new program, as it is part of the GCR. Vice President Lehman confirmed the pilot nature of the program for Fall, 2003 and said that work is underway to supplement the main program description with model syllabi which would be distributed to the five undergraduate schools, as curriculum committees in those schools will all have to approve the writing program as well.**

**Professor Cordes asked how the program would be formally evaluated. Vice President Linebaugh said that details have not been finalized, but that assessment would be ongoing. Professor Robinson asked when the first assessment would be done, and if the Writing Task Force would still be meeting prior to the time the faculty is asked to approve the new program. Vice President Linebaugh confirmed that students randomly selected for the program would be assessed at the beginning of the Fall, 2003 semester, and that the students would be followed through their years at the University in what the Vice President termed a vertical curriculum assessment. Vice President Lehman confirmed that the Writing Task Force would continue its work next year, and added that he expected to have the model syllabi ready for distribution to and approval by curriculum committees of the undergraduate schools shortly after the end of the spring break.**

**Professor Gupta then said that, although he was a born optimist, he wondered about the worst case scenario where the new writing program would prove a failure. He said he wondered when the faculty would know it was a failure. Vice President Lehman said it would really take four years to evaluate the new program and discussion followed by Professors Duff, Griffith, and Vice President Lehman on this point.**

Professor Gallo asked what the experience with this sort of program has been at other schools. Professor Duff said that the Task Force had held a day-long retreat at which they heard from directors of quite similar programs at Duke and Missouri. Faculty at those institutions, he added, have found the programs beneficial. Vice President Lehman said that he thought what the faculty has to do is somehow institute a learning culture – the program is about writing, but it is also about core University values such as critical thinking and scholarship.

Professor Kennedy asked if the English Department's report could be made available and Professor Duff said he had not looked at it for some time, but that he would attach a copy to his subcommittee's final report.

#### UPDATE ON THE REGULATORY COMPLIANCE HELP AND REFERRAL LINE

Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr. gave a progress report on the Regulatory Compliance Help and Referral Line (the Referral Line). Professor Wilmarth reminded the Senate that this Compliance/Referral Line had come to the Senate's attention at several meetings in the past year, and that there had been considerable concern as to whether or not this Line would have an impact on the professional responsibilities or legal obligations of faculty. A Subcommittee of three faculty had been established to work with the University's General Counsel's Office and the Office of the Treasurer in order to see if the Compliance/Referral Line procedures could be revised in ways that would address the faculty's expressed concerns. Professor Wilmarth then thanked Professors Robert Park and David Robinson of the Law School, and Michael Castleberry of the GSEHD for their work on this subcommittee.

As a result of this subcommittee's work, the general guidelines for operation of the Compliance/Referral Line were significantly changed, the more important of which are detailed on page two of the Compliance Line document distributed to the faculty with the Senate's March meeting agenda. Professor Wilmarth pointed out that the Referral Line is not meant to duplicate, circumvent, or replace complaint procedures already in place and approved by the Senate. Most important, he said, was that an allegation received through the Referral Line, but not substantiated via established procedures, could not be used as grounds for taking adverse actions against anyone. Careful attention had also been paid, he said, to the issue of anonymous complaints, and the subcommittee had come to the conclusion that anonymous complaints could not be barred, but that callers should be asked to identify themselves, and should be advised that their failure to do so could impair the University's ability to respond effectively to their complaint.

Professor Wilmarth then reported that the Compliance Committee had been formed and had held a meeting, the minutes of which were included in the Compliance Line Report distributed with the Senate agenda. Professor Wilmarth said that he was one of the Faculty Senate's two representatives. Although he was out of town and not able to attend this meeting, the agenda and minutes were quite extensive.

Professor Wilmarth then briefly reviewed the section of the Report entitled "Reported Compliance Issues." which he said gives a list of 29 different possible allegations of wrongdoing and indicates the scope of issues covered by the Compliance Line. This section of the report also indicates the assigned priority for different kinds of complaints,

and then gives an idea of how quickly follow-ups are made on various complaints. This section also indicates which departments are responsible for various kinds of complaints. Also appended to the report are a number of information sheets which he understood were used by the Pinkerton telephone operators in recording Compliance Line allegations. Operators at the Pinkerton Alert Line follow the instructions given, which include a classification for an alleged violation and suggested questions for the operator to ask. Quite a number of the issues listed refer to financial and administrative compliance issues, and a number of them relate to research compliance issues, he noted. Probably this latter category, he added, was the most numerous and of most interest to faculty. Professor Wilmarth then encouraged each Senate member to review the information presented in the Report, with particular attention to the Alert Line sheets, with a view toward determining whether or not the guidelines set forth raise potential problems or concerns or have a significant upon a faculty member's work.

In conclusion, Professor Wilmarth said he thought the subcommittee's view, which he shared, was that given legal requirements, the University's decision to establish a Compliance Line was an appropriate one, and that if the Line is now operated in the way described, simply as a referral clearing house to refer individual complaints to the responsible department or office, and if those offices handle these complaints according to already-established procedures, then faculty should not feel threatened by the Compliance Line. As matters stand now, it appears that the Compliance Line is not an alternative complaint, investigative, and resolution process which circumvents established procedures under the Faculty Code. Professor Wilmarth then invited questions about this Report.

Professor Friedenthal asked if the subcommittee had assigned the priorities for handling complaints contained in the report. Professor Wilmarth said that he thought this came from administrative offices in consultation with the University's General Counsel's Office rather than from the subcommittee. Professor Friedenthal then asked what faculty might do if they disagreed with the priority assigned to a particular type of complaint, and Professor Wilmarth replied that he thought that information should be conveyed to the General Counsel's Office. Vice President Lehman said he would be happy to transmit this information. Professor Gallo asked if the priorities set forth in the report were irrevocably set before complaints were received, or if a complaint was analyzed and then assigned an urgency rating. She added that it seemed to her that in many cases, the urgency of a situation should be taken into account before a priority is assigned. Professor Wilmarth said that it looked to him as if the priorities assigned to particular kinds of complaints were presumptively allocated, but those presumptive priorities would be changed if the circumstances of the individual complaint indicated that a higher priority should be given.

Professor Robinson asked if there would be future meetings of the Compliance Line Committee, as this issue of the assignment of priorities was exactly the sort of issue in which faculty should be involved. Professor Wilmarth said that he had not been notified of any additional meetings, but that if he did not receive notice of another meeting within the next couple of weeks, he would call the General Counsel's Office with the suggestion that another follow-up meeting be held. (The Report was attached to the meeting agenda for the Senate's March 14<sup>th</sup> meeting and is currently available on the Senate Website at: [http://www.gwu.edu/~facsen/faculty\\_senate/pdf/complianceRpt.pdf](http://www.gwu.edu/~facsen/faculty_senate/pdf/complianceRpt.pdf) and at: [http://www.gwu.edu/~facsen/faculty\\_senate/pdf/AlertLineInfo.pdf](http://www.gwu.edu/~facsen/faculty_senate/pdf/AlertLineInfo.pdf).)

**UPDATE FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY**

**Professor Paul Duff reported on the work of the subcommittee composed of representatives from the Educational Policy Committee, the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, and the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee on the prospective establishment of a school of Public Policy. Since the subcommittee began meeting, he said, they have reviewed the Public Affairs Task Force Report and the response to that Report by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs; discussed the proposal with Professors Kathryn Newcomer, Joseph Cordes, and Harold Wolman; asked the relevant deans to inform the subcommittee of any concerns that they might have about the proposal, and the subcommittee has consulted with them about the processes envisioned for obtaining faculty approval for establishment of the school. The subcommittee has received a report that the SBPM Dean's Council had no objections to the move, and the proposal has been discussed with the Columbian College Dean's Council as well as with affected faculty. Finally, the subcommittee met with the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.**

**Among the issues of concern to subcommittee members, as representatives of the Faculty Senate, are whether or not calling the entity a "school" is a fair way to represent it to faculty, students, and the public at large, especially since it would be a school within a school as an issue addressed by Senate Resolution 96/14. A related issue is, assuming that the school of Public Policy merged into Columbian College, whether there might be a different name that would be more appropriate for the educational unit such as "Center" or "Institute." Another important issue, he added, is the protection of the rights of untenured faculty or those who will be facing promotion after the move as well as whether or not the affected schools (CCAS and SBPM) are content with the proposed financial arrangements.**

**In conclusion, Professor Duff said that at the suggestion of the subcommittee, the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs has asked that Professors Newcomer, Cordes, and Wolman prepare a final document on this matter, to be presented to the Senate at its May meeting.**

**Professor Wilmarth asked if there had been any significant expression of concern by faculty who would be moved to the new school, and Professor Duff said he thought the reaction was quite the opposite. Professor Wilmarth then asked if he thought there might be an adverse financial impact on Columbian College or the School of Business and Public Management, and Professor Duff replied that the deans concerned seemed to be content that they could work out financial details satisfactorily. Professor Griffith added that he thought this issue had been negotiated with great care.**

**Professor Robinson asked what process would be followed in order to provide for full faculty involvement in the decision to establish the new school. Professor Griffith said that he expected that Dean Frawley would present the proposal to the Columbian College faculty for their approval once budget negotiations were concluded. Professor Robinson then asked if the subcommittee intended to present a resolution on the matter, and Professor Duff confirmed that the subcommittee would make a final report with recommendations, and possibly a resolution, at the Senate's meeting in May. Professor Griffith noted that the subcommittee thought that if either the Columbian faculty, or Business School faculty failed to approve the proposal, the matter would be a moot issue as far as the Senate was concerned.**

Professor Wilmarth asked if it was certain the new entity would be called a school, and Professor Duff confirmed that there had been a lot of discussion about this issue. Discussion followed, with Professor Cordes pointing out that because of the propinquity of the disciplines involved, and for the purpose of administrative organization, it would make a lot of sense for the entity to be called a school. He also named a number of other institutions at which this model was followed. Professor West asked how many faculty would be involved in the new school, and Professor Cordes responded that approximately 14 faculty would be actually budgeted to the unit. Professor Cordes also confirmed that there would be another arrangement, similar to a joint appointment, where there would be a number of other faculty who would be full voting faculty members of the unit for purposes of choosing directors, approving the curriculum, and voting on hiring decisions, but whose budget lines would be administered by another unit.

Professor Friedenthal asked if this unit would be completely within Columbian College, and Professor Cordes said that it was. Professor Friedenthal then observed that CCAS is a College, not a school, and that a school within a College seems perfectly appropriate. Vice President Lehman concurred with this observation. The discussion concluded with Professor Cordes confirming that the proper name of the new school would be "School of Public Policy and Public Administration." Professor Robinson then thanked Professor Duff for his willingness to take on so many tasks this semester.

## GENERAL BUSINESS

### I. NOMINATIONS FOR ELECTION TO THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE 2003-04 SESSION

Professor Robinson moved the nominations of the following individuals to the Nominating Committee for the Executive Committee for the 2003-04 Session: Professors Lynda L. West (GSEHD), Convener; Diane M. Brewer (CCAS), Linda L. Gallo (SMHS), Charles A. Garris (SEAS), John F. Lobuts (SBPM), Robert E. Park (GWLS), and Michael J. Sodaro (ESIA). The entire slate was approved.

### II. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Robinson presented the Report of the Executive Committee, which is enclosed.

## BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Vice President Lehman said he wished to brief the Senate on developments concerning the University budget before a letter from the Executive Vice President and Treasurer reached them the next week. The purpose of conveying this information in advance, he added, was to ask for the faculty's commitment to these measures, which will be instituted in order to facilitate continued funding of the University's programs, especially in the Strategic Planning activities already underway.

Vice President Lehman then noted that a large number of state and private universities have found it necessary to announce large tuition increases while at the same

time slashing their budgets in order to stay financially sound. GW has not been immune to the decline in the stock market and in this segment of the University's endowment. For the fiscal year 2002, Vice President Lehman reported that the drawdown on the endowment has been reduced by approximately \$5 million, and an even larger reduction, possibly as much as an additional 15 percent, is anticipated in FY '03. This additional reduction will be somewhere in the neighborhood that the total percentage will be 26%, or approximately \$10 million, he added.

In order to adjust to these new fiscal realities, Vice President Lehman continued, two primary steps will be undertaken. The first is the institution of controls (not a freeze, he emphasized) on the hiring and classification of faculty and staff positions across the University. These will in the future all need to be approved by the appropriate Vice President before the University Budget Office or the Human Resources Office will move forward in the hiring process. In terms of the Academic Affairs area, Vice President Lehman said that he had settled on criteria that would underlie his decision-making on these requests. The first criterion would be considering whether or not the position to be filled is any way related to revenue generation at the University. If so, he said, it would be approved, and if not, it would not. The Vice President added that he might find it necessary to delay filling certain positions for a period of time. The second criterion used to evaluate requests would be that of necessity, with essential positions receiving approval because they are absolutely critical for the academic operations of the University.

The second step taken to address the new fiscal reality will be eliminating any merit pay increases for the next academic year so that University faculty and staff will not be considered for the usual January merit increase. This increase will be delayed until the beginning of the fiscal year in July, 2004. This will return the University to the schedule adhered to some years back, before merit increases were delayed from July until January. Merit increases will now once again coincide with the beginning and end of each fiscal year. This last step is important, he said, because a six month delay will save the University somewhere on the order of \$4.5 million (assuming the normal 4% merit increase pool), and this is not trivial when considered alongside the \$10 million that needs to be conserved.

Vice President Lehman concluded by saying that discussions are underway at all levels, including the Council of Deans, with regard to strategic objectives and implementing the Strategic Plan thoroughly. Overall, he added, compared to circumstances at other colleges and universities, GW's situation is very mild. So long as enrollments continue to be healthy, GW should weather the storm. At the moment, the prospects for maintaining undergraduate enrollments look very good. Of some concern is a recent accounting for average tuition hours taken by the students as projected for graduate enrollment in some schools.

Professor Griffith, Chair of the Fiscal Planning and Budget Committee (FP&B) reported that his Committee wished to register a complaint, in that it has been very frustrated this year following its report to the Senate that the University's endowment payout would be sharply reduced both this year and next. Because it was clear that this development would have a good many implications for the operating budget as a whole, the Budget Office was asked to keep the Committee up to date on planning for these budgetary implications. Unfortunately, the Committee has not been able to get any significant flow of information from the Budget Office, or from the Treasurer's Office, and thus, it has not been able to

report, as is customary, on the impact of these financial developments on the operating budget. Professor Cordes echoed Professor Griffith's sentiments, saying that although it was his first year of service on the FP&B, it has been a struggle to obtain necessary information.

Professor Maggs asked Vice President Lehman to elaborate on the two criteria of revenue-generation and necessity he had mentioned in evaluating faculty hiring requests. Vice President Lehman clarified that those criteria will be applied to staff positions rather than faculty positions, which will be evaluated according to their link to strategic objectives for each of the Schools. While a concerted effort will be made to see that only the very best faculty are found to fill open positions, he said he would be involved in these decisions more than he had in the past.

Professor Gallo asked if these new measures would apply equally across all the Schools of the University, and Vice President Lehman confirmed that the Medical Center would have its own guidelines, perhaps more stringent than those in other Schools, but the other Schools would be bound by University guidelines. He would continue, he added, to review faculty hires as he usually does, in the Medical Center.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, a motion to adjourn was made and seconded, and Vice President Lehman adjourned the meeting at 4:52 p.m.

Dennis L. Geyer  
Dennis L. Geyer  
Secretary

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
**Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chair**  
**March 14, 2003**

**Executive Committee Actions**

Pursuant to the Senate's discussion of the University's plans for future construction, the Executive Committee has requested that the Educational Policy Committee address the matter of faculty participation in the construction of new academic buildings, and, in that context, the adequacy of our present science facilities.

The Executive Committee also requested that the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom review the matter of participation of part-time faculty members on Senate Standing Committees with respect to the requirements of the Faculty Organization Plan and established practice.

As a follow-up to questions raised at the February Senate meeting with respect to the designation of Louis Katz as simply "Executive Vice President," the Executive Committee is pursuing this matter further, via a memorandum to President Trachtenberg.

**Other Matters**

The election of the Chair and the members of the Executive Committee for the 2003-04 session will take place at the April meeting of the Senate.

At its April meeting the Executive Committee will prepare the list of nominees for membership, including Chair, on the Dispute Resolution Committee.

Please note that two items have been distributed to you today. These are the Faculty Senate report to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees and an update from the Academic Calendar Committee. The Board of Trustees has also authorized the re-publication of the Faculty Code and the Faculty Organization Plan.

Please also note that the annual photograph of the Senate will be taken at the April meeting.

**Executive Committee Meeting**

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is on March 28. Resolutions, reports, and items of business should reach the Committee prior to that date.