

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, DC

The Faculty Senate

November 30, 2005

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, December 9, 2005, at 2:10 p.m. in the Alumni House, 1925 F Street, NW, First Floor

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of November 11, 2005, as distributed
3. Resolutions
 - (a) **A RESOLUTION TO ENDORSE THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY STATEMENT OF ETHICAL PRINCIPLES (05/3); Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr., Chair, Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (Resolution and Statement attached)**
 - (b) **A RESOLUTION TO ENDORSE TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE DISCLOSURE FORMS FOR FACULTY MEMBERS AND INVESTIGATORS UNDER THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY POLICY ON CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND COMMITMENT (05/4); Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr., Chair, Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (Resolution and Forms attached)**
4. Introduction of Resolutions
5. Remarks by Walter L. Strong, Ph.D., Vice President for University Advancement, Dillard University
6. Biennial Faculty Salary Equity Report; Professor Murli M. Gupta, Chair Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies Committee (Report attached)
7. Update on the 4 x 4 Task Force; Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman
8. General Business:
 - a) Report of the Executive Committee: Lilien F. Robinson, Chair
 - b) Interim Reports of Senate Standing Committees
9. Brief Statements (and Questions)
10. Adjournment

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

**A RESOLUTION TO ENDORSE THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
STATEMENT OF ETHICAL PRINCIPLES (05/3)**

WHEREAS, the University Administration has proposed to adopt a “Statement of Ethical Principles” covering trustees, senior officials, faculty, staff and others acting on the University’s behalf, and the Administration has requested the Faculty Senate’s recommendations on the proposed Statement; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate understands that the Statement of Ethical Principles is intended to set forth aspirational guidelines for conduct and is not intended to provide an independent basis for imposing sanctions or taking other disciplinary actions against faculty members; and

WHEREAS, the Statement of Ethical Principles expressly refers to established policies and procedures adopted by the University with the Faculty Senate’s advice and endorsement;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate understands that the Statement of Ethical Principles is not intended to supersede or modify any of the established policies or procedures of the University, including without limitation the Faculty Code, the Faculty Organization Plan and the Faculty Handbook; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate’s Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom has reviewed the proposed Statement of Ethical Principles and has endorsed the Statement (with modifications) in the form attached to this Resolution as Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that it would be desirable for the University to adopt a Statement of Ethical Principles in the form attached hereto as Exhibit A, subject to the Faculty Senate’s understandings set forth above concerning the intent and application of the Statement; **NOW, THEREFORE**

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

- (1) That the Faculty Senate endorses the “The George Washington University Statement of Ethical Principles,” in the form attached to this Resolution as Exhibit A, as a statement of aspirational guidelines for the conduct of trustees, senior officials, faculty members, staff and others acting on the University’s behalf; and
- (2) That the Faculty Senate expresses its specific understandings that
 - (a) the Statement of Ethical Principles does not provide an

independent basis for imposing sanctions or taking other disciplinary actions against faculty members, and (b) the Statement of Ethical Principles does not supersede or modify any of the established policies or procedures of the University, including without limitation the Faculty Code, the Faculty Organization Plan and the Faculty Handbook; and

- (3) That the Faculty Senate understands and expects that any proposal to make substantive changes to the Statement of Ethical Principles will be presented to the Faculty Senate for its review and recommendations in keeping with the procedures leading to the adoption of this Resolution.

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
November 1, 2005

Exhibit A

PEAF Committee Proposed Draft 11/1/05

[DRAFT--DISCUSSION DOCUMENT
GW STATEMENT OF ETHICAL PRINCIPLES]

STATEMENT OF ETHICAL PRINCIPLES

The George Washington University dedicates itself to furthering human well-being. To do this, GW must maintain the confidence of the local, national, and worldwide communities. For GW to maintain this confidence, trustees, senior officials, faculty, staff and others acting on behalf of The George Washington University should strive to maintain the highest level of ethics in all of their actions on behalf of the University, and must comply with GW policies as well as external laws and regulations. This Statement of Ethical Principles sets forth standards of ethical conduct to which all persons acting on the University's behalf should aspire. The Statement should be used as a general guide in making ethical decisions in all situations, especially those where the "right" answer is not always clear.

These standards are intended to provide a summary of ethical principles of conduct and to encourage each of us to maintain heightened awareness of their existence. These Principles are also stated, clarified and implemented in several separate policies and procedures of the University. Violations of GW policies will be subject to disciplinary action as provided in those policies. Please see www.policy.gwu.edu for the latest full listing of GW policies.

Integrity and
Respect

The GW community is diverse -- in race, background, age, religion, and in many other ways. The personal actions of each community member establish and maintain the culture of tolerance and respect for which we strive. The University is committed to free inquiry, free expression, and the vigorous discussion and debate on which the advancement of its educational mission depends. At the same time, faculty and staff should respect the rights and dignity of others regardless of their differences, and must conscientiously comply with nondiscrimination policies adopted by the University. Harassment along sexual, racial, or political lines has no place in our community.

Responsibility and
Accountability

GW faculty, staff and officials should assume and exercise responsibility appropriate to their positions and roles. We are accountable to each other, to the University, and to ourselves for our actions and our decisions not to act. When roles or responsibilities are unclear, we should take it upon ourselves to obtain clarity. We should exercise sound business judgment in the performance of our responsibilities, to the best of our ability.

Conflicts of Interest and Commitment	All executive officers, faculty, principal investigators, staff, student employees, and others acting on behalf of the University hold positions of trust, and should conduct their activities accordingly. Activities that impair or appear to impair the ability to perform our duties or affect independence and objectivity of judgment in the discharge of our responsibilities to the University should be avoided. We should demonstrate sensitivity in identifying potential conflicts of interest, whether of a financial, personal, or professional nature. Conflicts of interest must be disclosed, reviewed, and appropriately managed or eliminated, in accordance with the reporting and other provisions of applicable University policies.
Harassment and Abuse of Power	GW supports an environment in which harassment of others is not tolerated. Executive officers, faculty, principal investigators, staff, student employees, and others acting on behalf of the University may not use positions of authority to violate or to influence others to violate laws, regulations or University policies.
Stewardship	As stewards of University resources, all executive officers, faculty, principal investigators, staff, student employees, and others acting on behalf of the University have a responsibility to ensure that all University resources are used prudently, ethically, and for their designated purposes. We have a responsibility to contributors to the University, including federal, state, and local governments, to treat University property with care, and to expend funds prudently. We should avoid waste and improper use, and should not use tangible or intangible University assets, funds, property, or facilities for our personal benefit or for the benefit of a non-University organization without proper approval. Our acts should reflect the recognition of a special obligation to use University property responsibly and consistent with the tax-exempt status conferred on the University in light of its educational, research, and service missions. It is imperative that those with access to confidential, proprietary, or private information not make unauthorized disclosures or use of this information.
Reporting	All executive officers, faculty, principal investigators, staff, student employees, and others acting on behalf of the University are expected to report violations of laws, regulations or University policies to appropriate University officials, e.g., the employee's dean, department chair or other supervisor, senior University administrator, University Compliance & Privacy Office, or Office of General Counsel. Confidentiality of

individuals reporting violations of these standards will be maintained to the extent possible.

Portions of this Statement of Ethical Principles were derived from similar statements adopted by Cornell University and Yale University, and are used with their permission, which GW gratefully acknowledges.

A RESOLUTION TO ENDORSE TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE DISCLOSURE FORMS FOR FACULTY MEMBERS AND INVESTIGATORS UNDER THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY POLICY ON CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND COMMITMENT (05/4)

WHEREAS, in Resolution 04/6 the Faculty Senate endorsed the University's adoption of two revised disclosure forms to be submitted, pursuant to the University's Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment, by (1) faculty members and Investigators in connection with their annual reports to the University, and (2) faculty members and Investigators in connection with proposals for external funding (hereinafter "Disclosure Forms"); and

WHEREAS, the University Administration has proposed certain technical amendments to the Disclosure Forms, particularly with regard to gifts received by faculty members and Investigators from persons who may have business dealings with, or may be competitors of, the University;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom has reviewed and endorsed (with modifications) technical amendments to the Disclosure Forms as shown on the forms attached to this Resolution as Exhibits A and B; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that the technical amendments to the Disclosure Forms shown on Exhibits A and B are consistent with the best interests of the University and its faculty; **NOW THEREFORE**

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

- (1) That the Faculty Senate hereby endorses technical amendments to the Disclosure Forms submitted by faculty members and Investigators pursuant to the University's Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment, as shown on the forms attached to this Resolution as Exhibits A and B; and
- (2) That the Faculty Senate understands and expects that future proposed amendments to the Disclosure Forms and the Policy will be presented to the Faculty Senate for its review and recommendations in keeping with the procedures followed in connection with the adoption of this Resolution.

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
November 1, 2005

PEAF Committee Proposed Changes 11/1/05~~5~~

Annual Faculty Member and Investigator Financial Interest Disclosure Form

Pursuant to The George Washington University Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment for Faculty and Investigators (May 14, 2004)

The Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees approved an updated University-wide *Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment for Faculty and Investigators* in May 2004. The full policy is available at my.gwu.edu/files/policies/ConflictofInterestandcommitment.pdf. The policy requires that each faculty member and investigator complete this form yearly.

The purpose of this form is to assist faculty, investigators, and the University in the identification of potential and actual conflicts of interest and to support compliance with applicable government regulations. Because of the complexities of The George Washington University, it is not unusual for an employee to respond affirmatively to one or more of the following questions. An affirmative response in no way implies that a conflict of interest necessarily exists or, if it does, that it cannot be managed. Please be assured that responses to this questionnaire may be submitted on a confidential basis and will be held strictly in confidence. Responses requiring further clarification will be brought to your immediate attention.

Faculty Member or Investigator Name: _____

Department/Unit: _____

College/Unit: _____

PART I (To be completed by all Faculty and Investigators)

A. Definitions

The term *significant financial interest* means

(1) any stock, stock option, or similar ownership interest in an outside entity by the Faculty Member or Investigator that, alone or together with interests of immediate family members, is valued at least at the lesser of \$10,000 or five percent of the total ownership interests in the outside entity, excluding any interest arising solely by reason of investment by a mutual, pension, or other institutional investment fund over which neither the Faculty Member, Investigator nor any immediate family member exercises control; or

(2) receipt, individually or collectively by a Faculty Member, Investigator and immediate family members of, or the right or expectation to receive, income, whether in the form of a fee (e.g.,

consulting), salary, allowance, forbearance, forgiveness, interest in real or personal property, dividend, royalty derived from the licensing of technology or other processes or products, rent, capital gain, real or personal property, or any other form of compensation, or any combination thereof, that over the last 12 months exceeded or over the next 12 months is expected to exceed \$10,000 in income of all types; or

(3) that the Faculty Member, Investigator, immediate family member or close family member provides services as a principal investigator for, or holds a management position in, an outside entity; or

(4) that a close family member holds an ownership interest in an outside entity or has a right to receive income from an outside entity, if such ownership interest or right to receive income would be treated as a “significant financial interest” with respect to a Faculty Member or Investigator under (1) or (2), above.

Significant financial interest does not include: (1) salary, royalties or other remuneration from the University; (2) income from seminars, lectures, or teaching engagements sponsored by public or non-profit entities; or income from service on advisory committees or review panels for public or non-profit entities.

The George Washington University (and University) means The George Washington University and any entity owned in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, or controlled by the University, including the Medical Faculty Associates (MFA) and any joint venture.

Gifts are gratuities of money, property, services, or out-of-home entertainment. *Gifts* do not include honoraria (e.g., remuneration or gifts-in-kind) received in connection with (1) participation in seminars, lectures, or teaching engagements sponsored by public or non-profit entities, ~~or~~ (2) service on advisory committees or review panels for public or non-profit entities, or (3) reviewing or other advisory services provided to publishers. Usual and customary business dinners, lunches, and outings are not considered gifts provided there is a business, educational, or non-profit fundraising component. Small items marked with corporate logos also are not considered gifts. Gifts of money can never be accepted.

Immediate family member includes an employee’s spouse/domestic partner and dependent children.

Close family member includes an employee’s non-dependent children, as well as father, mother, sisters and brothers of the employee and the employee’s spouse/domestic partner.

Material conflict of interest means a conflict of interest that has the potential (i) to influence a person’s decisions or conduct or (ii) to have a non-trivial impact on the financial situation of a person or an entity in which that person or an immediate family member has a significant financial interest.

To your knowledge means your actual knowledge or knowledge that you should reasonably be expected to have based on information that has been provided to you or is in your possession. *To your knowledge* does not imply a duty to make inquiries to discover facts

that are not known to you or to obtain information that has not been provided to you or is not in your possession.

B. Certification as to Employee and Immediate Family Members

1. Do you have, or does any immediate family member have, any of the relationships, transactions, activities, or financial interests described below in subparagraphs (a) through (h)?

(a) An outside entity in which you have or an immediate family member has a significant financial interest has made, or will make, a gift to The George Washington University of cash or property that will be under your control or will directly support your teaching or research activities.

(b) You have or an immediate family member has a significant financial interest in the proposed or current sponsor of, or a proposed or current subcontractor, vendor, or collaborator for, a sponsored project involving The George Washington University.

(c) You have an actual or proposed technology licensing or commercialization arrangements with an outside entity in which you have or an immediate family member has a significant financial interest and where those arrangements might reasonably be perceived as involving or creating the appearance of a material conflict of interest with your appointment at The George Washington University.

(d) You are or will be personally involved in, or you have or will have the ability to influence the formation or implementation of, a transaction in which The George Washington University, directly or indirectly, is procuring or will procure property, goods or services from an outside entity in which you have or an immediate family member has a significant financial interest.

(e) The design, conduct or reporting of your current or proposed externally funded research at The George Washington University does impact or will foreseeably impact a significant financial interest that you hold or an immediate family member holds in an outside entity.

(f) You are or an immediate family member is a director, officer, sole owner, partner, employee, agent, consultant, or advisor of a business enterprise that to your knowledge supplies The George Washington University with any property, goods, or services.

(g) You have or an immediate family member has a significant financial interest in a business enterprise (excluding any investment representing less than 1

percent of the total equity of a publicly traded entity) that to your knowledge supplies The George Washington University with any property, goods, or services.

(h) You are a director, officer, sole owner, partner, employee, agent, consultant, or advisor of, or you have a significant financial interest in, a business enterprise (other than The George Washington University) that to your knowledge engages in the business of higher education or the delivery of patient care services.

Yes _____ No _____

2. In the past 12 months, to the best of your knowledge, have you or has any immediate family member received a loan of money, property, or services in the amount of \$250 or more (excluding any loan from a bank or other financial institution), or received a gift of money; in any amount or a gift of property, services, or out-of-home entertainment with a value exceeding \$~~100~~250, from a business enterprise that to your knowledge supplies property, goods, or services to The George Washington University?

Yes _____ No _____

3. In the past 12 months, to the best of your knowledge, have you received a loan of money, property, or services in the amount of \$250 or more (excluding a loan from a bank or other financial institution), or received a gift of money; in any amount or a gift of property, services, or out-of-home entertainment with a value exceeding \$~~100~~250, from a business enterprise (other than The George Washington University) that engages in the business of higher education or patient care services?

Yes _____ No _____

4. Do you have, or does any immediate family member have, any other relationships, transactions, activities, or financial interests that might reasonably be perceived as involving, or creating the appearance of, a material conflict of interest with your appointment at The George Washington University?

Yes _____ No _____

If your answer to any of the above Questions 1-4 is Yes, please give details, including identifying the business enterprise(s) and describing your or your immediate family member's relationship to it, as well as the approximate value of any income or financial interest, loan or gift. (Where more space is required for your answers, please attach additional pages to this questionnaire.)

C. Certification as to Employee and Close Family Members

1. To your knowledge, do you have or does any close family member have any of the relationships, transactions, activities, or financial interests described below in subparagraphs (a) through (g)?

-

(a) An outside entity in which a close family member has a significant financial interest has made, or it will make, a gift to The George Washington University of cash or property that will be under your control or will directly support your teaching or research activities.

(b) A close family member has a significant financial interest in the proposed or current sponsor of, or a proposed or current subcontractor, vendor, or collaborator for, a sponsored project involving The George Washington University.

(c) You have an actual or proposed technology licensing or commercialization arrangements with an outside entity in which a close family member has a significant financial interest and where those arrangements might reasonably be perceived as involving or creating the appearance of a material conflict of interest with your appointment at The George Washington University.

(d) You are or will be personally involved in, or you have or will have the ability to influence the formation or implementation of, a transaction in which The George Washington University is procuring or will procure property, goods, or services from an outside entity in which a close family member has a significant financial interest.

(e) The design, conduct or reporting of your current or proposed externally funded research at The George Washington University does impact or will foreseeably impact a significant financial interest that a close family member holds in an outside entity.

(f) A close family member is a director, officer, sole owner, partner, employee, agent, consultant, or advisor of a business enterprise that to your knowledge supplies The George Washington University with any property, goods, or services.

(g) A close family member has a significant financial interest in a business enterprise (excluding any investment representing less than 1 percent of the total equity of a publicly traded entity) that to your knowledge supplies The George Washington University with any property, goods, or services.

Yes _____ No _____

2. In the past 12 months, to your knowledge, has a close family member received a loan of money, property, or services in the amount of \$250 or more (excluding any loan from a bank or other financial institution), or received a gift of money in any amount or a gift of property, services, or out-of-home entertainment with a value exceeding \$~~100~~250, from a business enterprise that to your knowledge supplies The George Washington University with any property, goods, or services?

Yes _____ No _____

3. To your knowledge, does a close family member have any other relationships, transactions, activities, or financial interests connected to The George Washington University that might reasonably be perceived as involving, or creating the appearance of, a material conflict of interest with your appointment at The George Washington University?

Yes _____ No _____

If your answer to any of the above Questions 1-3 is Yes, please give details, including identifying the business enterprise(s) and describing your close family member's relationship to it, as well as the approximate value of any income or financial interest, loan or gift. (Where more space is required for your answers, please attach additional pages to this questionnaire.)

I certify that all of the foregoing information in **PART I** is true and complete to the best of my knowledge.

Signature

Date

Full Name (Printed)

Position Title

PART II (To be completed by University officials)

Department Chair/Unit Head – Comments and Recommended Actions

_____ To the best of my knowledge, there is no perceived or inappropriate activity or conflict.

_____ I have reviewed this disclosure and recommend the following actions be taken:

Printed Name and Signature

Date

College Dean/Director – Comments and Recommended Actions

_____ To the best of my knowledge, there is no perceived or inappropriate activity or conflict.

_____ I have reviewed this disclosure and recommend the following actions be taken:

Printed Name and Signature

Date

Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs – Comments and Approval

_____ To the best of my knowledge, there is no perceived or inappropriate activity or conflict.

_____ I have read the Financial Interest Disclosure and, if provided, the plan to manage, reduce or eliminate any actual, potential, or apparent conflict of interest. I approve of the Management Plan.

Printed Name and Signature

Date

Exhibit B

PEAF Committee Proposed Revisions 11/01/05

Proposal-Specific Investigator Financial Interest Disclosure Form

Pursuant to The George Washington University Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment for Faculty and Investigators (May 14, 2004)

The Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees approved an updated University-wide *Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment for Faculty and Investigators* in May 2004. The full policy is available at my.gwu.edu/files/policies/ConflictofInterestandcommitment.pdf. Pursuant to the policy, persons responsible for the design, conduct, or reporting of University sponsored programs (hereinafter "Investigators") must complete this form for each proposal submitted for external funding.

The purpose of this form is to assist faculty, Investigators, and the University in the identification and management of potential and actual conflicts of interest and to support compliance with applicable government regulations. Because of the complexities of The George Washington University, it is not unusual for an employee to respond affirmatively to one or more of the following questions. An affirmative response in no way implies that a conflict of interest necessarily exists or, if it does, that it cannot be managed. Please be assured that responses to this questionnaire may be submitted on a confidential basis and will be held strictly in confidence. Responses requiring further clarification will be brought to your immediate attention

Faculty Member or Investigator Name: _____

Department/Unit: _____

Sponsor: _____

Title: _____

PART I (To be completed by all Investigators)

A. Definitions

The term *significant financial interest* means

(1) any stock, stock option, or similar ownership interest in an outside entity by the Faculty member or Investigator that, alone or together with interests of immediate family members, is

valued at least at the lesser of \$10,000 or five percent of the total ownership interests in the outside entity, excluding any interest arising solely by reason of investment by a mutual, pension, or other institutional investment fund over which neither the Faculty Member, Investigator nor an immediate family member exercises control; or

(2) receipt, individually or collectively by a Faculty Member, Investigator and immediate family members of, or the right or expectation to receive, income, whether in the form of a fee (e.g., consulting), salary, allowance, forbearance, forgiveness, interest in real or personal property, dividend, royalty derived from the licensing of technology or other processes or products, rent, capital gain, real or personal property, or any other form of compensation, or any combination thereof, that over the last 12 months exceeded or over the next 12 months is expected to exceed \$10,000 in income of all types; or

(3) that the Faculty Member, Investigator, immediate family member or close family member provides services as a principal investigator for, or holds a management position in, an outside entity; or

(4) that a close family member holds an ownership interest in an outside entity or has a right to receive income from an outside entity, if such ownership interest or right to receive income would be treated as a “significant financial interest” with respect to a Faculty Member or Investigator under (1) or (2), above.

Significant financial interest does not include: (1) salary, royalties or other remuneration from the University; (2) income from seminars, lectures, or teaching engagements sponsored by public or non-profit entities; or income from service on advisory committees or review panels for public or non-profit entities.

The George Washington University (and University) means The George Washington University and any entity owned in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, or controlled by the University, including the Medical Faculty Associates (MFA) and any joint venture.

Gifts are gratuities of money, property, services, or out-of-home entertainment. *Gifts* do not include honoraria (e.g., remuneration or gifts-in-kind) received in connection with (1) participation in seminars, lectures, or teaching engagements sponsored by public or non-profit entities, ~~or~~ (2) service on advisory committees or review panels for public or non-profit entities, or (3) reviewing or other advisory services provided to publishers. Usual and customary business dinners, lunches, and outings are not considered gifts provided there is a business, educational, or non-profit fundraising component. Small items marked with corporate logos also are not considered gifts. Gifts of money can never be accepted.

Immediate family member includes an Investigator’s spouse/domestic partner and dependent children.

Close family member includes an Investigator’s non-dependent children, as well as father, mother, sisters and brothers of the Investigator and the Investigator’s spouse/domestic partner.

To your knowledge means your actual knowledge or knowledge that you should reasonably be expected to have based on information that has been provided to you or is in your possession. *To your knowledge* does not imply a duty to make inquiries to discover facts that are not known to you or to obtain information that has not been provided to you or is not in your possession.

B. Certification as to Investigator and Immediate Family Members

1. Do you have, or does any immediate family member have, any of the relationships, transactions, activities, or financial interests described below in subparagraphs (a) through (g)?

(a) An outside entity in which you have or an immediate family member has a significant financial interest has made, or will make, a gift to The George Washington University of cash or property that will be under your control or will directly support this sponsored project.

(b) You have or an immediate family member has a significant financial interest in the proposed or current sponsor of, or a proposed or current subcontractor, vendor, or collaborator for, this sponsored project.

(c) You have or an immediate family member has an actual or proposed technology licensing or commercialization arrangement with the proposed or current sponsor of, or a proposed or current subcontractor, vendor, or collaborator for, this sponsored project.

(d) You are or will be personally involved in, or you have or will have the ability to influence the formation or implementation of, a transaction to procure property, goods, or services for this sponsored project from an outside entity in which you have or an immediate family member has a significant financial interest.

(e) The design, conduct or reporting of this sponsored project does impact or will foreseeably impact a significant financial interest that you hold or an immediate family member holds in an outside entity.

(f) You are or an immediate family member is a director, officer, sole owner, partner, employee, agent, consultant, or advisor of a business enterprise that to your knowledge supplies or will supply The George Washington University with any property, goods, or services for this sponsored project.

(g) You have or an immediate family member has a significant financial interest in a business enterprise that to your knowledge supplies or will supply The

C. Certification as to Investigator and Close Family Members

1. To your knowledge, do you have or does any close family member have any of the relationships, transactions, activities, or financial interests described below in subparagraphs (a) through (f)?

(a) An outside entity in which a close family member has a significant financial interest has made, or will make, a gift to The George Washington University of cash or property that will be under your control or will directly support this sponsored project.

(b) A close family member has a significant financial interest in the proposed or current sponsor of, or a proposed or current subcontractor, vendor, or collaborator for, this sponsored project.

(c) You are or will be personally involved in, or you have or will have the ability to influence the formulation or implementation of, a transaction to procure property, goods, or services for this sponsored project from an outside entity in which a close family member has a significant financial interest.

(d) The design, conduct or reporting of this sponsored project does impact or will foreseeably impact a significant financial interest that a close family member holds in an outside entity.

(e) A close family member has an actual or proposed technology licensing or commercialization arrangement with the proposed or current sponsor of, or a proposed or current subcontractor, vendor, or collaborator for, this sponsored project.

(f) A close family member is a director, officer, sole owner, partner, employee, agent, consultant, or advisor of, or has a significant financial interest in, a business enterprise that to your knowledge supplies or will supply The George Washington University with any property, goods, or services for this sponsored project.

Yes _____ No _____

2. In the past 12 months, to your knowledge, has a close family member received a loan of money, property, or services in the amount of \$250 or more (excluding any loan from a bank or other financial institution), or received a gift of money, in any amount or a gift of property, services, or out-of-home entertainment with a value exceeding \$~~100~~250, from: (a) a business enterprise that to your knowledge supplies property, goods, or services to the George Washington University, or (b) the sponsor of, or a subcontractor, vendor, or collaborator for, this sponsored project?

PART II (To be completed by University officials)

Department Chair/Unit Head – Comments and Recommended Actions

_____ To the best of my knowledge, there is no perceived or inappropriate activity or conflict.

_____ I have reviewed this disclosure and recommend the following actions be taken:

Printed Name and Signature

Date

College Dean/Director – Comments and Recommended Actions

_____ To the best of my knowledge, there is no perceived or inappropriate activity or conflict.

_____ I have reviewed this disclosure and recommend the following actions be taken:

Printed Name and Signature

Date

September 23, 2005

To: Donald R. Lehman
Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

From: Peggye Cohen
Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research

Michael King
Professor of Chemistry

Ralph Mueller
Professor of Educational Research

Annie Wooldridge
Assistant Vice President for Faculty Recruitment & Personnel Relations

Maria Cecilia Zea
Professor of Psychology

Re: 2003-2004 Faculty Salary Equity Report

Please find attached the 2003-2004 Faculty Salary Equity Report. Your charge to us came in the late spring of 2003 and the Committee began by outlining the parameters of its task for the following academic year beginning in June 2003. Committee members devoted a considerable amount of time over the course of the 2003-2004 academic year and the following summer, completing the major initial review in September of 2004. The remainder of the past academic year focused on the tedious, but critical task of reviewing substantial data excerpted from annual reports for a select group of faculty. Satisfactory completion of the project is a testament to the hard work and commitment of all of the members of the Committee (particularly the administrative representatives) as well as the cooperation from the offices we approached for additional information.

We trust the report and the recommendations therein will inform decisions regarding future appointments and salary reviews and that the issues referred for further study will be resolved quickly. Needless to say, we are all relieved to complete this important, but time-consuming project. With the submission of this Report, we conclude the task assigned to us. We will also be transmitting a copy of the report to the Faculty Senate Committee on Appointments, Salary and Promotion Policies for consideration on the Senate's agenda if desired. We will be happy to discuss any questions that might arise as a result of our recommendations.

Introduction

This is a report prepared for the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs on salary equity for regular full-time faculty in the George Washington University. A copy of this report will also be transmitted to the Faculty Senate Committee on Appointments, Salary and Promotion Policies for appropriate referral.

Historical Perspective — General

The University has monitored faculty salary equity since 1973 when, in accordance with the Equal Pay Act of 1962, a major adjustment was made to equalize salaries of women faculty members¹. Traditionally, the EEO Officer for Faculty and the Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research have been delegated the responsibility of monitoring faculty salaries and salary reviews, and reporting any documented inequities to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs for review and action. The Faculty Senate participates through the appointment by its Executive Committee of a subcommittee from the Committee on Appointments, Salary and Promotion Policies (ASPP) to advise on these reviews. The general results of the salary review process are then reported to the Faculty Senate through the ASPP Committee. Salary equity reviews are conducted on a regular basis.

For the past 30+ years, salary equity committees have provided oral and/or written reports on the results of their reviews to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate. The most recent written reports were filed in February of 1998 (covering the 1995/96 salaries) and March of 2001 (covering the 1998-1999 salaries). The latter report (March, 2001) presented historical perspectives, which we have attached as appendices, rather than repeat the material here. Generally, we have followed the format employed in that report.

Perspective — The 2003-2004 Reviews

Following consultation with the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Executive Vice President Lehman convened a new Salary Equity Review Committee to conduct the 2003-2004 reviews. The Faculty Senate representatives were Ralph Mueller (GSEHD) and Maria Cecilia Zea (CCAS), while the EVPAA appointed Michael King (CCAS) to be his faculty representative and to chair the team and Assistant Vice Presidents Peggy Cohen (Institutional Research) and Annie Wooldridge (Faculty Recruitment and Personnel Relations) served as the administrative representatives. The committee also invited (with the concurrence of the EVPAA) the participation of Barbara Marshall (Director of Faculty Personnel) and Joachim Knop (Associate Director, Institutional Research). Philip Wirtz, Professor of Management Science and of Psychology, served as the statistical consultant to the Committee.

At its initial meeting the staff members shared previous reports and a history of the process. The Committee agreed that a "working statement" of our task was to "identify apparent

¹ Based on a February 19, 1988, Office of the Provost report.

disparities in the salaries for full-time, regular active status faculty of two people in the same rank and approximately the same situation at the level of a department or non-departmentalized school and to make recommendations to the administration to resolve the apparent disparities." Additionally the following parameters were agreed upon to guide the review process:

- There would be no initial change in the set of non-discriminatory and discriminatory factors that were used in prior Salary Equity Reviews. Those factors were: age, time at the University, highest degree, time since highest degree, field, type of appointment, race/ethnic origin, and sex. Other factors could be considered later, but would need a strong rationale for inclusion.
- The cohort of faculty would include faculty employed on Jan 1, 2003, and exclude clinical medical faculty and faculty departing the University before July 1, 2003. Also excluded from the cohort would be University Professors and any faculty member, whose "primary responsibility was administrative." This group included the President, Vice Presidents, Associate Vice Presidents, Deans, and Associate Deans. Assistant Deans were included in the cohort of faculty as per previous reviews.
- Salaries considered would exclude administrative and special stipends or adjustments and, if necessary, would be adjusted to a nine-month basis.
- "Outliers" from previous studies would be included in this cohort as subsequent salary changes may have brought them back to comparability (either through adjustments for these individuals or to others in comparable categories.)

The Methodology

Two processes were employed to review salary averages: The Automatic Interaction Detector (AID) program, and a revised visual analysis of faculty profiles. The first of these processes, the AID program, was incorporated into the initial equity review process and has been part of it ever since; the second represents an augmentation recommended in the 1995-96 Biennial Review Report and adopted for the first time in the 1998-99 biennial review.

Pursuant to the process followed in prior biennial reviews, the Committee employed the same list of non-discriminatory factors, which would be expected to influence (to one degree or another) salary levels. The factors were: age, time at the University, highest degree, time since highest degree, field, and type of appointment². These factors, together with the discriminatory factors of race/ethnic origin and sex, were used by the AID program to identify the characteristics of faculty at various salary levels.

² Both rank and years in rank were excluded because these factors are subject to similar decision making processes as those that determine salary and thus their use might mask the discrimination the analysis would attempt to reveal.

The AID program segments a group (in this case, the University faculty) into mutually exclusive subgroups by independent variables (field, type of appointment, etc.) that “explain” the largest variation in a stated dependent variable (in this case, salary). The end product is a “tree” with each branch showing the characteristics of the faculty at given salary levels. The program also provides statistics and individual salaries for the final groups identified by the algorithm. This information is used in two ways. First, if any of the discriminatory factors appears in the definition of any group, that group would be carefully scrutinized for possible discriminatory salary allocation. Second, by studying this information, individuals whose salaries are high or low for their “group” can be flagged for review. Thus, the variation not explained by the AID program can be examined on an individual basis.

The second process entailed a visual analysis of faculty profiles — by department (or non-departmentalized school) and rank within department (or non-departmentalized school). For the previous review, Professor Wirtz wrote a computer program to augment the AID analysis by providing additional sensitivity in isolating “significant” salary differences between faculty who were similar in rank and time-in-rank within department (or non-departmentalized school). The program used a statistical “regression line” as the basis for comparison. For the 1998-1999 report, individuals “of interest” were identified if their salary was more than \$5,000 above or below the “regression line”³. The current committee, having discussed the advantages and disadvantages of this and other means for the review process, decided to continue to use this methodology, but chose to apply the more statistically sensitive standard deviation as the measurement device. After careful review, it was agreed that we would distinguish 1.5 and 2.0 standard deviations from the regression line to flag individuals “of interest.”

Furthermore, to preserve anonymity, the Committee’s visual analysis did not include those cases involving one or two individuals within a given rank in a department. Those cases were reviewed separately by the administrative members of the Committee, AVP’s Cohen and Wooldridge, and cases flagged as possible inequities were brought to the committee for discussion. The review of those cases followed a process parallel to that described above.

It should be emphasized that the domain of the second process (i.e. the visual audit of faculty profiles) was restricted by mandate to within-rank-within-department comparisons. While gross comparisons were made between ranks within department, no attempt was made to compare across departments, across schools, or with similar positions at comparable universities and colleges. Some information of that nature from within the University was a component of the AID analysis as noted below.

For each possible inequity discovered, a thorough review by AVP’s Cohen and Wooldridge of the annual reports (including, and especially, the chairs’ and deans’ comments) was conducted and summarized for the committee. Any cases that still appeared disparate were

³ After consultation with Executive Vice President Lehman, it was agreed that factors which lay outside of those considered in this analysis should not account for more than a \$5,000 difference between the “expected value” and the actual salary level of any given faculty member.

sent to the appropriate deans for review and explanation, and for any of those cases that the deans were unable to explain to the committee's satisfaction, AVP's Wooldridge and Cohen conducted a pairwise analysis for presentation to the committee. Finally, those few cases that still appeared to be inequitable were forwarded to EVPAA Lehman for resolution.

The Review Process — AID Analysis

The salary equity review process began with a discussion of past salary equity reviews, a description of the AID program, a discussion of the new visual analysis program, an overview of the process, the development of a framework for the 2003-2004 salary review process, and an initial analysis of the faculty salary profiles. The decision to include the set of "outliers" from previous studies as well as some growth in the size of the faculty led to a total faculty cohort that was approximately 50% larger than the previous review.

2003 AID Analysis compared to 1998 AID Analysis

1998: 557 faculty, 23 total nodes, 12 final leaves, using field, years since highest degree, tenure code (tenure/ten-track vs. Non-Ten-Track), and highest degree explained 66% of variation in salaries

2003: 840 faculty, 35 total nodes, 18 final leaves, using field, years since highest degree, tenure code, and age explained 65% of variation in salaries

Highest salary leaf—average salary increased 41.5% (but 2003 faculty falling into the highest leaf excluded younger Law faculty):

1998: whole Law faculty (n=31)

2003: Law faculty aged ≥ 46.5 (n=38)

1998: Avg Salary=\$109,900

2003: Avg Salary=\$155,478

Second Highest salary leaf--average salary increased 23.7% (Note that in 2003, Business faculty are included with Engineering):

1998: SEAS faculty with ≥ 20 years since highest degree (n=27)

2003: SEAS & SB faculty with ≥ 31.5 years since highest degree (n=34)

1998: Avg Salary=\$93,210

2003: Avg Salary=\$115,305

Lowest salary leaf—average salary increased 12.5%

1998: NTT CCAS, ESIA, GSEHD with <15 years since highest degree (n=45)

2003: NTT Humanities, Phys Sci, GSEHD with less than 6.5 years since highest degree (n=33)
NTT Humanities, Phys Sci, GSEHD with 6.5-16 years since highest degree was 2nd lowest (n=27)

In 2003, the n was sufficiently large to allow for the additional split.

1998: Avg Salary=\$44,980

2003: Avg Salary (of combined leaves)=\$50,617

Next lowest salary leaf—average salary increased 15.3%

1998: Ten/TT CCAS, ESIA, GSEHD with less than 5 years since highest degree (n=32)
2003: Ten/TT CCAS, ESIA, GSEHD, SPHHS, Basic Sci, younger than 36 with less than 6.5 years since highest degree (n=30)
1998: Avg Salary=\$47,280
2003: Avg Salary=\$54,492

As in the 1998 review, no groups were formed using the discriminatory factors of ethnicity and gender. This suggests that ethnicity and gender are not associated with differences in faculty salaries.

The Review Process — Analysis of Faculty Salary Profiles

The analysis of faculty salary profiles was a “visual” analysis, conducted within rank within department (or non-departmentalized school). The Committee looked for any sizeable salary differences, which escaped identification by the AID program and for which some justification was required. The committee also looked for possible patterns among groups of faculty of the same gender or race.

The Committee began by examining graphs of (anonymous) salaries for each rank within each department (or non-departmentalized school), plotted as a function of time in rank. Each plot also contained the “regression line”, reflecting the “expected salary” based on the entire group of faculty at that rank in that department (or non-departmentalized school). Of particular interest were individuals whose salaries were more than 1.5 standard deviations above or below the regression line. For individual disparities exceeding this threshold, our review included an analysis of the appropriate personnel records by AVP’s Cohen and Wooldridge to determine whether there was a nondiscriminatory explanation for the apparent disparity.

Following the precedent established in the prior review, the Committee also noted those faculty with special considerations that might influence salary. Those considerations include (but are not limited to) the following:

- cases reviewed and documented in previous salary reviews;
- salary offers from other institutions or counteroffers;
- special contractual arrangements;
- other special circumstances (e.g., special hire to fill a unique vacancy/void);
- market factors at the time of hire;
- location or venue issues;
- other factors that might distinguish a particular faculty member from his/her peers.

If the information included in the profile did not provide a reason for a disparity, the name was sent by EVPAA Lehman to the appropriate dean asking for an explanation of the salary variance relative to the faculty norms within the particular department. For those cases that could not be justified to the committee’s satisfaction, a more in depth analysis by the Administrative members of the committee was conducted and brought back to the committee for

discussion. This analysis included a paired analysis, a comparison with another member of the faculty, whose profile was thought to match in terms of discipline, rank and time in rank, etc. Any apparent disparities remaining after this step were forwarded to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs for his consideration.

Results of the 2003-04 Review

The initial within-departments, within-rank visual analysis resulted in the flagging of 155 faculty compared to 140 in the prior review, broken down as follows:

Phase I – Visual Analysis

	1998-9 Review	2003-4 Review
CSAS	44	62
ESIA	6	11
GSEHD	12	21
LAW	15	3
SBPM	26	24
SEAS	17	21
SMHS	15	6
SPHHS	5	7
TOTAL	140	155

AVP Wooldridge examined each of these faculty member’s annual reports and prepared summaries (anonymous) for the Committee. Review of these summaries explained the salary levels of 81 of the faculty, leaving 74 unexplained apparent disparities requiring a review by the relevant dean. For the 1998-99 review, the number of names remaining at this point was 40.

Of the 74 faculty names submitted for further review, the deans provided sufficient information to resolve all but 18 of the apparent disparities. As a result, the Committee recommended a thorough review of those cases by the administrative members of the Committee, AVP’s Cohen and Wooldridge. In addition to the 18 cases identified by the full Committee for further view, there were another 14 faculty - identified by AVP’s Wooldridge and Cohen for additional review from their analyses of situations with only one or two individuals at the same rank in the department. (Of the 40 names identified in the 1998-99 review for submission to the Deans, four cases were left for paired review by the administrative members of the committee.)

2003-04 Review	Phase II	Phase III N > 2	Phase III N < 3	Recom. to EVPAA for Review
-----------------------	----------	--------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------

CSAS	25	10	7	5
ESIA	3	1		1
GSEHD	8	4		1
LAW	3	0		
SBPM	13	1	5	1
SEAS	14	2		
SMHS	6	0		
SPHHS	2	0	2	
TOTAL	74	18	14	8

The Committee met again in spring 2005 to examine the results of the paired analysis reviews by the Administrative members of the Committee and to discuss those observations in the context of the earlier observed disparities. The paired analyses consisted of a process of comparison between the faculty member of interest and an appropriate comparator from the same rank and department (or non-departmentalized school). Of the 32 cases reviewed, the Committee was able to explain the apparent salary disparities for all but 8 of the faculty examined. It is therefore the recommendation of the committee that EVPAA review the data for these 8 faculty and proceed with an adjustment of their salary if warranted.

Although it appears at first sight that the number of cases requiring administrative review has increased since the last salary equity review and therefore might be cause for concern, we note that for this review the Committee chose to include those faculty excluded in the previous report. In the 1998-99 review 221 faculty were excluded from consideration because they had recently been flagged as outliers, reviewed and no disparity found. The decision by the current Committee to include them added substantially to the pool of reviewed faculty. In a number of instances, it became apparent that circumstances had not changed for many of those faculty and continuation of the lower merit increases (or higher salaries) was appropriate. Furthermore, the use of standard deviations as opposed to fixed dollar figures in the visual analysis phase highlighted a greater number of apparent salary disparities compared to the fixed dollar figure used in the previous analysis. We are delighted to report that the Committee found no inequity within specific groups or fields.

While analysis of apparent salary disparities and recommendations for their resolution, by itself, appears to justify the Committee's efforts, the Committee members identified several additional areas in need of remediation for your consideration.

Issue I: Review of Annual Reports by Chairs and Deans

- In a few instances, we found that annual reports were missing or had not been completed. It is incumbent upon the Chairs and Deans to ensure that the reports are prepared and submitted in a timely manner. Where faculty persist in such delinquency, appropriate remarks in their evaluations should be noted and made part of the record. Additionally, it is critical for copies of the Annual Reports and Comments sections to be forwarded to the Office of Faculty Personnel for inclusion in the faculty's permanent files. We note the persistence of this issue and the steps undertaken to remediate it in recent years. Nonetheless, it remains a concern that calls for continued attention.
- The Committee applauds the continued improvement in the quality of the chairs' comments in the Annual Report review process. Meaningful evaluations lessen the need to move the review process forward to the Dean's Office. The Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Deans have stressed (1) the importance of language clarity and consistency in Annual Reports, (2) the use of evaluation tools/measures (if such exist), and (3) the processes for dialogue and mentoring of faculty throughout the promotion and tenure period, and for senior faculty thereafter. Nonetheless, the number of referrals to the Deans for this review was about 85% greater than in the 1998-1999 review.
- The Committee remains concerned about the way in which some of the Tenured and Full Professors' *changing* roles and responsibilities are viewed and valued. Our analysis, like those of the previous committees, suggests that some senior faculty⁴ may have been disadvantaged for the sanctioned assumption of roles requiring reduction in research and teaching responsibilities. As Deans and Chairs have changed, knowledge of these assignments has been lost,, leaving some faculty at-risk in the evaluation process. There needs to be a better mechanism for sharing knowledge among the faculty, chairs, and deans about the impact of faculty roles in areas of school, departmental and/or program administration and service responsibilities.
- As with the previous review, the Committee noted a number of faculty with comparatively low merit adjustments, which were found to be commensurate over multiple years with documented records (as reflected in extensive annual report reviews by the AVP's Cohen and Wooldridge). For some faculty there was little to no remediative effort by the EVPAA, Deans, Chairs, or (most importantly) Faculty of the affected departments to renew energy, build capacity in areas where it is clearly lacking, or find new ways to utilize skills and experience. In other instances there appeared to be no substantive response from the faculty member.

⁴ This issue was not exclusively an issue for senior faculty, but most often apparent in the reports and evaluations of some of the group's members.

Issue II: **Hiring of Faculty**

The Committee detected a number of instances of significant differences in the hiring salaries for new faculty brought in at the same rank in the same department during the same hiring cycle without sufficient documentation in their formal records. A better monitoring and reporting system is needed to (1) document any basis for such apparent disparities (e.g., experience, sub-discipline, publications record, reputation, market issues, etc.), and (2) prevent undefended disparities from occurring. One such opportunity lies in the Chairs' letters of transmittal recommending the appointment to the Dean and from the Dean to the Executive Vice President. It is at these points, when undefended disparities surface, that the Dean or Executive Vice President should act to resolve the matter and, thereby, prevent the need to address a possible problem in a subsequent salary review.

- Where special terms of appointment occur, expectations should be clearly spelled out in appointment letters. Special arrangements must be explainable and defensible and a copy needs to be a part of the permanent record in the Office of Faculty Personnel. Anomalous hiring practices made the review process more challenging. See Issue III.
- During this review of 2003 faculty salaries, we encountered a number of cases involving non-tenure accruing (contract) faculty for which our evaluation was made more difficult due to the lack of information about their role and performance expectations. Because the responsibilities and expectations of faculty on contract tended to differ based on programmatic needs, it would have been helpful as we considered this cohort of faculty if the letter of appointment clearly outlined position responsibilities.

We are therefore delighted that the Administration already has moved forward aggressively to ameliorate this situation. Now, department chairs and Deans are required to clarify expectations with regard to teaching, research/scholarship, and service for each non-tenure accruing (contract) faculty member as contracts come up for renewal or new appointments are made. Future committees (as well as departments and administrators) will find that expectations have been spelled out in each appointment letter, making comparisons and evaluations more straightforward. We applaud that effort and urge its continuation.

Issue III: **Unique Faculty Categories**

During the review process, the committee identified a few faculty who were included in the review cohort whose unique circumstances set them apart from others with whom they were being compared. Rather than treat these faculty as exceptions on an ad hoc basis in future reviews, it seemed to us advantageous to resolve the issues in conjunction with appropriate administrative and faculty units prior to the next review. In essence, there should not be any exceptions to our original cohort defined as "full-time, regular active status faculty." In principle, it should be possible to apply uniform standards to define appropriate peer groups for comparison of faculty throughout the University. This process should be established at the outset of the review so as to minimize the number of exceptions to any particular comparison group.

For example, there were several instances where individuals were hired for their administrative skills to undertake specific responsibilities for the University. Since these individuals also have subject degrees, their portfolio generally included some teaching responsibilities. But they were not generally hired through the usual vetting process applied to other departmentally situated faculty whose status and appointments are defined in the Faculty Code. Nonetheless, over time these individuals whose appointments were anomalous have been included in the cohort of departmentally listed faculty and for the purpose of this study were included with specific departments for review. The status of these apparent “de facto” faculty needs to be clarified and appropriate groupings or categories defined for them.

Issue IV: The Committee Workload

- There is a tremendous amount of work that goes into the review process at all levels. We are grateful for the time invested by our administrative colleagues on the Committee and the diligence of all participants in meeting for long stretches to conclude each phase of the process in a timely manner. Perhaps because we started with a fresh cohort that included all faculty, there was more to review. But, it seems clear that without release time for the participants from some portion of their duties this will continue to be a multi-year undertaking and it should be recognized as such.
- Phase III reviews are particularly tedious, requiring substantial time to collect, collate and expurgate identifying terms in the data from multiple annual reports to present to the faculty members of the committee. If future reviews are ever to be more timely, the personnel involved in this activity must be accorded some reduction in workload during the period of analysis.

Recommendations Regarding Future Reviews

We assume that another Review Committee will be reconstituted in some form as faculty salary equity is an important ongoing issue. In preparing for subsequent committees, we urge that consideration be given to the following:

- The review process seems to have been worked out and should not need too much refinement in subsequent years. We commend the use of the visualization process using the standard deviation paradigm to the next committee.
- Faculty for whom the comparison group was too small (i.e. only one or 2 faculty in the same rank in a particular department) were excluded from initial review by the faculty members of the committee to maintain privacy. To save time in the later phase of the review process, it may be appropriate to submit their names to the Deans during the Phase II review process so that clear issues may be resolved before the Phase III reviews begin.
- The committee found the assistance and knowledge of AVP’s Cohen and Wooldridge and

Professor Wirtz invaluable in completing this task. We also found that including the Director of Faculty Personnel and the Associate Director for Institutional Research added considerable value to our deliberations and recommend that they continue to be a part of the process.

- We also found it *critically* important for our Committee to have breadth and depth with respect to experience in hiring faculty, in reviewing faculty for promotion and tenure, and to have the knowledge that is built on experience of the difficulties chairs and deans encounter related to many of the matters that our work entailed. While reasonable people may disagree about whether the Committee should be composed *exclusively* of Chairs and former Chairs, the experience and background brought to the Committee's task by such individuals was invaluable to meeting the Committee's mandate. While previous experience on the Committee may have been helpful, the workload and time commitment is too great to place this burden on the same faculty on a continuing basis.
- At numerous points along the way, the deans were instrumental in assisting the Committee in achieving its mandate, and we wish to express our appreciation to the many administration officials who provided invaluable information and insights. We must also note, however, what appeared to be wide variance among the deans in understanding and accepting the EVPAA's mandate to the Committee, and in facilitating the work of the Committee. The Committee wishes to convey to the EVPAA the importance of a universal acceptance of and timely cooperation with the EVPAA's mandate to any successor review committee.

Appendix I

Historical Perspective — The 1998/99 Reviews⁵

Following consultation with the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Vice President Lehman requested the same Committee that had conducted the 1995/96 reviews (Professors Freund, Griffith, and Wirtz; Assistant Vice Presidents Cohen and Wooldridge) to conduct the 1998/99 reviews, and all agreed to do so. Following up on a prior Committee recommendation, Vice President Lehman met with the Committee on July 15, 1999, to ensure that everyone was clear about the expectations and the timetable. At this meeting, Professor Wirtz was commissioned to write a computer program that would augment the AID analysis by providing additional sensitivity in isolating “significant” salary differences between faculty who were similar in rank and time-in-rank within department (or non-departmentalized school). The Committee met once again with Vice President Lehman on September 16, 1999 to finalize procedures for the 1998/99 review.

Who is Reviewed

As in the past, the 1998/99 salary equity review included faculty from across the University. It excluded clinical medical faculty⁶ and faculty departing the University before July 1999. All salary figures were adjusted to a nine-month basis.

The Methodology

Two processes were employed to review salary averages: The Automatic Interaction Detector (AID) program, and a revised visual analysis of faculty profiles. This first of these was determined some years ago by the EEO officer for faculty, in collaboration with a committee of faculty members; the second represents an augmentation recommended in the prior Biennial Review Report and adopted for the first time in the present biennial review.

Pursuant to the process followed in the prior biennial review, the Committee employed the same list of non-discriminatory factors, which would be expected to influence (to one degree or another) salary levels. The factors were: age, time at the University, highest degree, time since highest degree, field, and type of appointment⁷. These factors, together with the discriminatory factors of race/ethnic origin and sex, were used by the AID program to identify the

⁵ That report was based on 1998/99 salaries in order to use the most recent salary data available at the initiation of this effort.

⁶ The structure of clinical medical salaries made it extremely difficult to analyze them for equity purposes.

⁷ Both rank and years in rank were excluded because these factors are subject to similar decision making processes as those that determine salary and thus their use might mask the discrimination the analysis would attempt to reveal.

characteristics of faculty at various salary levels.

The AID program segments a group (in this case, the University faculty) into mutually exclusive subgroups by independent variables (field, type of appointment, etc.), which “explain” the largest variation in a stated dependent variable (in this case, salary). The end product is a “tree” with each branch showing the characteristics of the faculty at given salary levels. The program also provides statistics and individual salaries for the final groups identified by the algorithm. This information is used in two ways. First, if either of the discriminatory factors appears in the definition of any group, that group is to be carefully scrutinized for possible discriminatory salary allocation. Second, by studying this information, individuals whose salaries are high or low for their “group” can be flagged for review. Thus, the variation not explained by the AID program can be examined on an individual basis.

The second process entailed a visual analysis of faculty profiles — by department and rank within department — using the statistical “regression line” as the basis for comparison. Of particular interest were those individuals who are more than \$5,000 above or below the “regression line”⁸. When feasible, a pairing methodology was employed to further locate possible inequities.

For each possible inequity discovered through either of these two processes, a further review — which in all cases included a thorough review by AVP's Cohen and Wooldridge of the annual reports (including, and especially, the chairs' and deans' comments) and in some cases included consultation by AVP's Cohen and Wooldridge with the appropriate dean — was conducted, the results of which were reported to the full committee. If this review failed to explain the disparity by reasonable application of University compensation policies, an adjustment in salary was recommended to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, provisional on better justification for the anomaly.

It should be emphasized that the domain of this second process was restricted by mandate to within-rank-within-department comparisons: while gross comparisons were made between ranks within department, no attempt was made to compare across departments, across schools, or with similar positions at comparable universities and colleges.

The 1998/99 Review Process — AID Analysis

The 1998/99 iteration of the salary equity review process began with a discussion of past salary equity reviews, a description of the AID program, a discussion of the new visual analysis program, an overview of the process, the development of a framework for the 1998/99 salary review process, and an initial analysis of the faculty salary profiles.

Following the precedent established in the prior biennial review, the Committee decided to

⁸ After consultation with Vice President Lehman, it was agreed that factors which lay outside of those considered in this analysis should not account for more than a \$5,000 difference between the “expected value” and the actual salary level of any given faculty member.

identify and document for this and future reviews those faculty with special considerations that might influence salary. These considerations include (but are not limited to) the following:

- cases reviewed and documented in the 1995-96 salary reviews;
- salary offers or counteroffers;
- special contractual arrangements;
- other special circumstances (e.g., special hire to fill a unique vacancy/void);
- market factors at the time or hire;
- other factors that might distinguish a particular faculty member from his/her peers.

Based on University records, approximately 221 faculty were removed from consideration following the Committee’s analysis of the AID results and prior to the visual review of individual ranks within departments, broken down as follows:

Exclusions based on 1995/96 review documentation	137
Exclusions based on obvious 1998/99 reasons (approximate)	<u>84</u>
	<u>221</u>

The 1998/99 Review Process — Analysis of Faculty Salary Profiles

The analysis of faculty salary profiles is a “visual” analysis, conducted within rank within department, during which the Committee looked for any sizeable salary differences that escaped identification by the AID program, but which we thought called for some justification.

The Committee began by examining graphs of (anonymous) salaries for each rank within each department (or non-departmentalized school), plotted as a function of time within rank. Each plot also contained the “regression line”, reflecting the “expected salary” based on the entire group of faculty at that rank in that department (or non-departmentalized school). Of particular interest were individuals whose salaries were more than \$5,000 above or below the regression line. For individual disparities exceeding this threshold, our review included an analysis of the appropriate personnel records by AVP’s Cohen and Wooldridge followed, when necessary, by consultation with the appropriate dean, in order to determine whether there was a nondiscriminatory explanation for the apparent disparity. If the information included in the profile did not provide a reason for a disparity, a recommendation was made to the VPAA for salary adjustment.

This within-departments, within-rank visual analysis resulted in the flagging of 140 faculty, broken down as follows:

CSAS	44
ESIA	6
GSEHD	12
LAW	15
SBPM	26

SEAS	17
SMHS	15
SPHHS	<u>5</u>
Total	<u>140</u>

Out of this review came the list of approximately 40 unexplained, apparent disparities requiring a review by the relevant dean.

Results of the 1998-1999 Review

The Committee sent each of the (approximately) 40 cases noted above to the relevant dean for explanation. The deans provided better justification for all but four cases. As a result, a thorough peer comparison review was conducted for those four.

Each of the final four cases reviewed (all of whom were male) has now been resolved by the administrative members of the Committee. In two cases, better justification established that the faculty member was paid equitably vis-à-vis his counterparts; one faculty member under review retired from University service; and the fourth faculty member received a salary adjustment.

In light of the information gleaned from the two most recent University-wide salary equity reviews, we suggest that the faculty and administration should find satisfaction in the relatively small number of apparent inequities uncovered by our scrupulous investigations, and in the fact that these have all been resolved to the satisfaction of the Office of Academic Affairs.

While discovery of these anomalies, by itself, appears to justify the Committee's efforts, the Committee members identified several *procedural* areas in need of remediation.

Issue I: Review of Annual Reports by Chairs and Deans

- The Committee was quite concerned about the apparent differences in the existing Annual Report review process (language used, separate letters from a dean to faculty members) for faculty whose salaries were in question. After a significant number of blind reviews, the Committee wishes to convey the importance that the Vice President (and others) in the scheduled *new* Chairs (initial and ongoing) training meetings and in the *new* Deans mentoring sessions, identify for the leadership (1) the importance of language clarity and consistency in Annual Reports, (2) use of evaluation tools/measures (if such exist), and (3) processes for dialogue and mentoring for faculty throughout the promotion and tenure period, and for senior faculty thereafter.
- The Committee wishes to underscore its concern that numerous instances were uncovered where, in the determination of salary increases, far more weight appeared to have been placed on scholarship than on any of the other vital functions performed by Faculty (as set forth in Sections IV.B and IV.C of the Faculty Code, which could legitimately be interpreted by Faculty as bases for salary advances.). This de-facto policy puts those who keep the University running at a distinct disadvantage, and needs *thorough* review by the

President, VPAA, and Deans.

- The Committee is quite concerned about the way in which some of the Tenured and Full Professors' *changing* roles and responsibilities are viewed and valued. Our analysis suggests that some senior faculty⁹ may have been penalized for the sanctioned assumption of roles requiring reduction in research and teaching responsibilities. As deans and chairs changed, knowledge of such assignments and agreements about such responsibilities was not well conveyed, leaving some faculty exposed and at-risk in the evaluation process. Faculty, chairs and deans need a better mechanism for developing and sharing knowledge about the impact of senior faculty roles in areas of school, departmental or program administration and service responsibilities/oversight.
- The Committee also uncovered a number of instances where faculty whose comparatively low salary adjustments were commensurate over multiple years with documented records (as reflected in extensive annual report reviews by the AVP's Cohen and Wooldridge). To the best of the Committee's knowledge, there has been no systematic effort by the VPAA, Deans, Chairs, or (most importantly) Faculty of the affected departments to renew energy and build capacity in areas where it is clearly lacking.

Issue II: **Hiring of Faculty**

- The Committee detected several instances of significant differences in the hiring salaries for new faculty brought in at the same rank in the same department during the same hiring cycle, without sufficient documentation in their formal records. A better monitoring system is needed to (1) document any bases for such apparent disparities (e.g., experience, sub-discipline, publications record, reputation, etc.), and (2) prevent undefended disparities from occurring. Where undefended disparities *have* occurred, a better mechanism is needed to quickly remediate the problem in subsequent salary reviews.

Issue III: **The Model and the Committee**

- A great deal of the Committee's efforts were focused on identifying and articulating the University's/school's *model* of establishing and maintaining salary equity. In fact, the schools within the University vary widely in the model they are pursuing, and there appears to be no communication about the model between faculty and the deans and department chairs. This leads to rampant misunderstandings, low morale, and (perhaps most perniciously) lack of motivation to achieve shared University objectives.

Recommendations Regarding Future Reviews

⁹ This issue was not exclusively an issue for senior faculty, but most often apparent in the reports and evaluations of some of the group's members.

We assume that a Review Committee will be reconstituted in some form: faculty salary equity is an important ongoing issue. In preparing for subsequent committees, we urge that consideration be given to the following:

1. A clear statement of the task(s) should be provided to the Committee members.
2. A clear and reasonable timeline for the work needs to be established and agreed to by all.
3. A support staff for the AVP's Cohen and Wooldridge needs to be created: there is simply too much work for two people, especially in the context of their other responsibilities.
4. A formal reporting mechanism needs to be established to the VPAA, to the Faculty Senate, and to the ASPP committee.
5. We found it *critically* important for our Committee to have breadth and depth with respect to experience in hiring faculty, in reviewing faculty for promotion and tenure, and to have the knowledge that is built on experience of the difficulties chairs and deans encounter related to many of the matters that our work crossed. While reasonable people may disagree about whether the Committee should be composed *exclusively* of Chairs and former Chairs, the experience and background brought to the Committee's task by such individuals was invaluable to meeting the Committee's mandate.
6. At numerous points along the way, the deans were instrumental in assisting the Committee in achieving its mandate, and we wish to express our appreciation to the many administration officials who provided invaluable information and insights in the process. We must also note, however, what appeared to be wide variance among the deans in understanding and accepting the VPAA's mandate to the Committee, and in facilitating the work of the Committee. Recognizing that different schools in the University may be pursuing different models of compensation policy, and recognizing that an articulation and understanding of these differences is very much in the collective best interest of the University, the Committee wishes to convey to the VPAA the importance of a universal acceptance of and timely cooperation with the VPAA's mandate to any successor review committee.

Appendix II

Historical Perspective — The 1995/96 Reviews

In February 1995, former Vice President for Academic Affairs Roderick French asked the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to designate a Senate member and one or two of the faculty to work in cooperation with representatives from Academic Affairs to conduct the 1995/96 review of faculty salaries. The Executive Committee named Professors William Griffith (CSAS) and C. Dianne Martin (SEAS) from the ASPP Committee to represent the faculty. The review was to get underway during the spring of 1995. However, for various

reasons it was postponed until late 1996¹⁰.

The initial mandate of the Committee was to ensure University compliance with the Equal Opportunity Program in terms of the salaries of the Regular Fulltime (excluding Clinical Medical) faculty. With the assistance of the “AID” computer program (which is described in more detail below), the committee identified “outlying observations” (defined as salaries which were more than two standard deviations from the mean of their group) and employed a pairing methodology to further examine situations where potential inequities had been detected.

The review process began in earnest in May 1996. By agreement between the Senate Executive Committee and Professor Griffith, then Chair of the ASPP Committee, and the individuals involved, Professor Martin (by then on sabbatical) was replaced by Professor Maxine Freund (GSEHD) and Professor Philip Wirtz (SBPM) was added as a faculty representative. The remainder of the Committee was comprised of Assistant Vice President Peggys Cohen, Director of Institutional Research, and Annie Wooldridge, Assistant Vice President for Faculty Recruitment & Personnel Relations.

The 1995/96 Review Committee filed its final report with the Vice President for Academic Affairs on February 20, 1998, and Professor Griffith presented a summary of that report to the Faculty Senate on March 13, 1998. In brief, the 1995/96 Review Committee:

- Noted that the AID Program “is probably adequate to identify any gross salary disparities ... but is not sufficiently sensitive to isolate moderately large salary differences between faculty roughly similar in educational credentials, rank, and time-in-rank.”

In his March 10, 1998, response, Vice President Lehman requested recommendations from the Committee for additional analytical approaches and computer tools that would assist in achieving the Committee’s mandate.

- Reflected concern that too often the record seemed to justify a higher salary for faculty member X over faculty member Y almost entirely in terms of a stronger publication record, with little attention to other reasonable “merit” factors.

In his March 10, 1998, response, Vice President Lehman noted that “I cannot disagree with you that research/scholarship productivity many times becomes the central deciding factor relative to salary standing . . . I would argue that we must always keep in mind that our primary mission here at the University is teaching, followed by research and scholarship. It is not unusual, however, at research universities, to have a cadre of extremely productive research scholars who have salaries that are somewhat higher than those other faculty who are not as productive...this is a very difficult and sensitive area, one where the department

¹⁰ Assistant Vice Presidents Cohen and Wooldridge were committed to a salary review in GSEHD, Dr. French was stepping down as Vice President for Academic Affairs in August 1995, and a newly-appointed Interim Vice President assumed office.

chairs and Deans must weigh in. At the same time though, we must be sensitive to it.”

- Recommended that each School’s Dean be provided with a list of remaining cases of potential salary disparity for further review and any final decision as to salary adjustments (following any salary adjustments made by the Vice President for Academic Affairs).

In his March 10, 1998, response, Vice President Lehman concurred with this recommendation.

- Recommended that, relative to each year’s faculty-merit-increase process, each Dean be provided with printouts of departmental salaries ordering faculty by rank and time in rank.

In his March 10, 1998, response, Vice President Lehman expressed “no problem with that recommendation. My only comment goes back to [an earlier recommendation], that it is a very complex process and this is only one piece of the overall picture.”

- Noted that, for various reasons, neither the faculty members nor the administrative members of the Committee began the review with a clear idea of exactly what the other members understood the process to entail nor what their expectations were for “where we should be at the end of the day”. Therefore, the Committee recommended that the “Vice President for Academic Affairs should convene a meeting of [the subsequent Committee] to agree on a fairly detailed structure for the review.”

In his March 10, 1998, response, Vice President Lehman fully concurred with this recommendation.

- Recommended that, in order to minimize the consumption of time and delay in reaching conclusions, it “would be highly desirable to establish the period of review in an interval or intervals of the academic year (e.g. in May-June-July) when closely-sequenced meetings might be more easily arranged so that concentrated attention could be paid to working through the data and establishing appropriate conclusions within a few months.”

In his March 10, 1998, response, Vice President Lehman concurred with the recommendation, and noted that he would “pay attention to that particular aspect, setting deadlines over appropriate time periods, in order to assure that everything gets done in a timely manner.”

Date: Tue, 30 Aug 2005 15:40:53 -0400 (EDT)
From: Donald Lehman <lehman@gwu.edu>
To: Michael King <kingm@gwu.edu>, Peggye Cohen <peggye@gwu.edu>, Annie Wooldridge <abwool@gwu.edu>, Ralph Mueller <rmueller@gwu.edu>, Maria-Cecilia Zea <zea@gwu.edu>
Cc: Phil Wirtz <pww@gwu.edu>
Subject: ~~2003-04 Faculty Salary Equity Report~~

Michael, Peggye, Annie, Ralph, and Maria:

I want to begin by thanking you for the extensive and diligent work you put into producing the most recent GW Faculty Salary Equity Report. I have read the entire report in detail and can appreciate the thoroughness and meticulousness of your efforts. Including the historical perspective in itself adds significantly to understanding the framework of this particular report. In addition, I do want to thank Phil Wirtz for serving as the statistical consultant to this project. I am sure that Phil's contributions were significant in other ways as well.

I consider the document you sent to me an almost FINAL DRAFT, so I shall comment on your recommendations and ask for one addition/clarification. After you include my addition/clarification, I would appreciate receiving an electronic version of what you consider to be THE report.

With regard to the addition/clarification, please refer to Page -10- of the report, in particular, the last bulleted item. In that bulleted paragraph, you state that "...are aware that this situation is an issue of continuing concern throughout the University and that some steps have been undertaken to address it (has it?)." The answer is that for ALL non-tenure accruing (contract) faculty appointments, no appointments are made without the department chair and dean clarifying what are the expectations with regard to teaching, research/scholarship, and service. Each appointment letter to each contract faculty member now has these expectations spelled out. There are some contract faculty members who are still under previous appointments of more than three years, typically five, where they have not yet been considered for renewal and are still working under an appointment letter that did not specify the expectations. If they are reappointed, these specifications are being spelled out. As a consequence, I would be grateful if you would clarify this particular bulleted point and state what is being done.

In order to address the "recommendations" of this report, it means that I must also address the "issues" section of the report beginning on page -9-. I shall take them one by one.

Issue I: Review of Annual Reports by Chairs and Deans

There is no excuse for the annual reports in a given faculty member's file being missing. There are a few rare instances where faculty members have not completed the reports. In some instances, the reports have been filed in the school and not forwarded to Academic Affairs. Great effort has gone into trying to get everything that exists into the central files. Obviously, this requires continued and persistent attention and it will get it.

I appreciate the Committee's reporting to me that more cases had to be referred to the deans for review than previously. Judging from the Committee's preceding comments, it appears that even though the evaluation comments are improving, they still do not provide the depth that is necessary to resolve differences. Again this year at the New Chairs' Orientation, I spent considerable time discussing the importance of this work and how it should be done. I plan to make visits to the schools this year to meet with department chairs to remind them of their responsibilities in this task.

With regard to your remaining two bulleted points under this Issue I, the key seems to be for everyone to appreciate how careers evolve and how they

can have different emphases over the years. In addition, it is important for all of us to realize that they are faculty members that do not respond to constructive development when their performances fall just below even a marginal normative standard, let alone cases where performances are below par. All of us must continue to work together as a team to bring everyone up to their highest level of performance within the context of their current responsibilities. When these levels are attained our colleagues must be rewarded for that performance.

Issue II: Hiring of Faculty

I have partially addressed this Issue above. With regard to hiring salaries being disparate if all things are equal, we must assure that this does not occur. On the other hand, the key in this statement is "if all things are equal." Rarely is the latter the case. Nevertheless, explanation and justification must be given when disparities are warranted.

Issue III: Unique Faculty Categories

I would appreciate being given all these cases by name so that I can clarify the situation. I am disappointed that the Committee did not discuss this with me during the review itself.

Issue IV: The Committee's Workload

I am very well aware of the points you make in this section. In parallel, I am sure that you are aware that I am extremely grateful for what all of you have accomplished in accepting this assignment and completing the project in such a complete and detailed manner. Before we start the next review, I shall remind myself of your recommendations in this realm.

Recommendations Regarding Future Reviews

I accept all the recommendations you have put forward concerning future reviews. I especially note that there "...appeared to be wide variance among the deans in understanding and accepting the EVPAA's mandate to the Committee, and in facilitating the work of the Committee." In the future, I shall make sure that the deans fully comprehend their role and my expectations in University-wide salary equity reviews.

In closing, I would like to convey to you that the 8 cases you recommended to me for review have all been handled and appropriate adjustments are being made consistent with the information provided to me by the Committee. These adjustments become effective on 1 January 2006 and are part of the base for the merit-pay increases being recommended as I write.

Again, my sincere thanks to each of you for the outstanding work you did on this report.

Don

Donald R. Lehman
Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
and
George Gamow Professor of Theoretical Physics
The George Washington University
Rice Hall 813
2121 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20052

Phone: (202) 994-6510
FAX: (202) 994-0709
E-mail: lehman@gwu.edu

Date: Sun, 02 Oct 2005 13:34:42 -0400
From: Michael King <kingm@gwu.edu>
To: Donald Lehman <lehman@gwu.edu>
Subject: Re: 2003-04 Faculty Salary Equity Report

Dear Don,

Attached please find the final revision of the Committee's report. A copy has been sent to Murli Gupta, Chair of the ASPP Committee of the Faculty Senate. His committee will begin review of the report during one of their scheduled meetings this fall.

With respect to the 5 concerns/issues you raised in your review of the penultimate draft report, there is little to add at this point.

1. Your concern regarding the clarification of contractual arrangements was addressed in our clarification of the particular bulleted item noting how the administration has been addressing this matter in the last couple of years.

2. Annual reports—We are all in agreement here. As you are aware, while guidelines exist for the handling of annual reports, not all schools have handled them in a manner consistent with your requests. Your continuing efforts to ensure that materials do get to the central files will reduce this issue. I also clarified language in one of the bullets regarding the evolution of careers and continuing to engage our colleagues in the University's mission.

3. Hiring of Faculty—We all agree that "not all things are equal." The problem we found was that the information was not always part of the record. We trust your attention will help to ensure that "explanation and justification" will be part of the record.

4. Unique categories—Because of the way we operated, I cannot give you specific names. However, I discussed the issue with Annie and she will be able to forward names to you to help clarify the issue as it came up in our discussions. I can however mention some categories where these issues arose. I believe the matter arose because we often looked at these individuals as part of a departmental cohort, when in fact their hiring and duties often were unlike those of other "regular" full-time faculty in said department. These "faculty" were often hired outside of regular faculty search process normally associated with departments. They include the Women in Leadership, Honors, Offcampus programs, Mount Vernon, etc. Perhaps these individuals should not be considered in future reviews as part of the departmental cohort, but as a separate unit.

You also mentioned in your note that we did not raise the issue with you as it came up. You are correct that this was a matter that may well have been handled by some discussion. My only comment here is that in some ways we operated in a very autonomous manner, relying on precedent and the advice of our administrative colleagues, who, we know, kept you generally apprised of our work. One thing that did not happen that you may want to consider for future committees, is that we never met as a team with you directly. Perhaps you might consider convening the next committee when they start out and meeting for an interim report as the process moves forward to discuss issues as they arise.

5. Workload—Enough said.

Although the workload was heavy, I think we all appreciated the opportunity to participate in this activity and found the process and materials we reviewed fascinating. We all came away with a deeper appreciation for the unique nature and complexity of the University and of our colleagues in other units.

Best, Michael

Michael M. King, Professor and Chair
Department of Chemistry
George Washington University
725 21st St., N.W.