

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

The Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, May 11, 2007, at 2:10 p.m. in the Alumni House, First Floor, 1925 F Street, N.W.

**AGENDA**

1. Call to order
2. Introduction of new members
3. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of April 13, 2007, as distributed
4. Introduction of Resolutions
5. Update on the School of Engineering and Applied Science:  
Dean Timothy W. Tong
6. Update on the Budget Working Group: Professor William B. Griffith
7. General Business:
  - (a) Approval of dates for regular Senate meetings in the 2007-08 Session recommended by the Executive Committee as follows: May 11, 2007, September 14, 2007, October 12, 2007, November 9, 2007, December 14, 2007, January 18, 2008, February 8, 2008, March 14, 2008, and April 11, 2008
  - (b) Nomination for election of Chairs and members of Faculty Senate Standing Committees for the 2007-08 Session (list to be distributed)
  - (c) Nomination for election to the Dispute Resolution Committee for a three-year term commencing May 1, 2007: Larry R. Williams
  - (d) Nomination for appointment by the President to the following Administrative Committees: Joint Committee of Faculty & Students: Alan G. Wade, Faculty Co-Chair; John M. Artz, Dorothy E. Holmes, Amy J. Mazur, David Truncellito Harry E. Yeide, and Jason M. Zara; Student Grievance Review Committee: Heidi H. Bardot, Linda Bland Stewart, Andrea B. Brassard, Molina B. Dayal, , Juliet Lee, Susan F. LeLacheur, Allena K. Opper, Edward M Robinson, Michael G. Seneff, and Eva A. Vincze

- (e) Nomination for appointment by the Board of Trustees to the following Committees: Trustees' Committee on Academic Affairs: Lilien F. Robinson; Trustees' Committee on Student Affairs: Alan G. Wade; Trustees' Committee on External Affairs: Lisa Benton-Short; Trustees' Committee on Information Technology: Philip W. Wirtz
  - (f) Report of the Executive Committee
  - (g) Annual Reports from Senate Standing Committees: Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management; Athletics and Recreation; Physical Facilities (the Reports are attached)
8. Brief Statements (and Questions)
  9. Adjournment

*Elizabeth A. Amundson*

Elizabeth A. Amundson

Secretary

**Faculty Senate Committee on Admissions Policy, Student Financial  
Aid, and Enrollment Management**  
**Final Report**  
**April 17, 2007**

During the Academic Year 2006/07 the Committee met three times.

At its first meeting on December 13, 2006 the Committee agreed to continue discussions from the previous academic year on the following issues:

1. Study the problem of retention of students between the sophomore and junior years.
2. Obtain data on enrollment patterns across the University, with particular emphasis on international students.
3. Study the correlation between discount rates and enrollment in specific schools and departments.

The Committee also received a preliminary report on applications for the academic year 2007/08 from Kathy Napper, Director of Undergraduate Admissions.

At its second meeting on February 28, 2007 the Committee discussed the impact of the elimination of EFL courses at GWU on foreign student enrollment.

At its third meeting on April 10, 2007 the Committee received a report from Kathy Napper on undergraduate applications and admissions for the academic year 2007/08. The Committee also considered the impact of a shift in student financial aid from merit-based to need-based criteria.

Eugene Abravanel, Elizabeth Amundson, Crystal Belk, Geoffrey Carter, Robert Chernak, Nancy Greenawald, Hermann Helgert (Chair), Donald Lehman, Charles Leizear, Susana Mendez, Kathryn Napper, Geri Rypkema, Robert Rycroft, Tim Shea, Daniel Small, Joseph Ward, Kristin Williams

**REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS AND RECREATION  
(And Minutes of the Committee Meeting on February 28, 2007)**

A meeting of the Committee was held on February 28, 2007, at the Smith Center. In attendance were the following:

**Committee Members:**

John Banzhaf	Law
Don Dew	Education
Patrick McHugh	Human Resources
Charles Toftoy	Business
Jack Friedenthal, Chair	Law

**Athletic Department Officials**

Jack Kvanz  
Aubre Jones  
Mary Jo Warner

The meeting discussed a wide range of matters of interest to the athletic administration and the committee members. At the outset it is important to note that the committee members were very favorably impressed with the general operations of the department, both as to intercollegiate athletics and recreational activities.

Issues can be divided into those requiring additional university funding and those that primarily involve other matters.

**1. Major Funding Issues**

As is true throughout the University, additional funding is generally needed by the Department of Athletics. However, several matters require specific attention as set out in the following recommendations:

A. The University should provide funds for a pilot, in-house, random drug testing of those athletes who have a substantial chance of participating in NCAA championships. That will involve some 75 to 90 student athletes.

Many other academic institutions have such in-house testing. It would have a substantial advantage in providing a reason for athletes to refuse peer pressure to use drugs. The cost of drug testing is high. The pilot program is designed to keep costs down by including only those athletes who are subject to testing at championship events. For the same reason, the tests would be limited to street drugs and would not include

tests for anabolic steroids, etc. Of course it would be desirable to test all intercollegiate athletes for all types of improper drug usage if funds could be made available.

B. The University must provide funds, as a regular annual line item, for the repair and replacement of exercise equipment in the Lerner Health and Wellness Center (LHWC).

The LHWC is a highly successful operation. It has “spread” the campus across 23rd street and has involved students, and to a lesser extent faculty, in a morning to night use of the facilities. The exercise machines are in constant use. They need maintenance and replacement if the Center is to continue its high level of activity. The benefits of the Center are very high in terms of health and morale.

C. The University should provide funds to set up lights around the Mount Vernon soccer field so that students can continue activities into the evening hours.

The need for more hours regarding the soccer field, for soccer, flag football, frisbee, etc., is clear. Lights would provide opportunities that are not available. Unfortunately, it will take more than funds for this to be operational because a few neighbors take exception to installation of lights, fearing that it would interfere with the use of adjacent properties. Focused lighting is available to keep such interference at a minimum. The university needs to negotiate with the ANC to obtain the agreement needed to get this project on board.

## 2. Non-Funding (or Lesser Funding) Issues:

There are a number of matters that are of concern to the Department of Athletics and users of the athletic facilities as follows:

### A. NCAA Requirements

The University is fortunate that it faces no serious NCAA issues regarding rules violations. Compliance control is excellent. However, the NCAA member colleges and universities have adopted a comprehensive academic reform package designed to improve the academic success and graduation rate for all student-athletes. The centerpiece of the academic reform package is the development of a real-time assessment of the academic performance of each team’s members. A team may be subject to a reduction in the number of scholarships normally permitted if a member of the team is not retained in school or not eligible in any given semester. Our coaches want to recruit great players. However, not all these potential recruits entertain academic aspirations. The Department of Athletics and the Admissions Office are working closely together to do their best to ensure that all athletes admitted are academically fit for the University and its rigorous academic programs. This relationship

has ensured that, to date, no scholarship penalties have been imposed on any of George Washington's teams.

### B. Wellness Center Usage

Although there has been an increase in the use of the Wellness Center by faculty and staff, it is hoped that the numbers will continue to grow. There tend to be too few faculty involved as of now. The President's Club, the special area set aside for members from faculty and staff, is underused. It is somewhat costly to join (\$1000 initiation fee) and has an annual fee of \$750. Although there are a large number of special amenities, one member of the Committee has expressed concern that there appear to be some things that were promised but not provided.

### 3. Long-Range Problems

Several matters of concern are on the table but have no immediate or obvious solution. These include the need for a place for the baseball team to practice and play its games. There are no places in the District of Columbia available. Other local institutions have to go long distances to find ball fields. The current field, in Virginia, has no public transportation, virtually no parking facilities, and no place to store equipment. The team can play its games but must do so largely without student support.

The crew needs its own boathouse. Fortunately a plan is on the table and some money has been pledged, but for now the lack of a decent facility is a problem.

The Mount Vernon gymnasium where much activity could take place is a forbidding venue at this time. In the summer there is no air conditioning. In the winter it is cold. At some future time, it should be rebuilt or replaced. Currently it is used for intramural and recreational sports clubs, indoor practices for softball and lacrosse teams, pick-up basketball, and, in addition, it is occasionally rented to outside groups.

### CONCLUSION

The above report lists a number of problems and hopes for remedial action. However, the University must not lose sight of the basic fact that the Department of Athletics and Recreation is doing a remarkable job of promoting its programs for all members of the campus community. The difficulties that do exist pale in light of the department's accomplishments and its expansion of opportunities for all concerned. Athletic Director Kvanz and his staff must be commended for the excellent job they have done overall.

**ANNUAL REPORT**  
**PHYSICAL FACILITIES COMMITTEE**  
**April 13, 2007**

The Physical Facilities Committee has met six times since the submission of the annual report in May 2006. The meetings of June 7, August 16, and October 11 focused on the major work of the Committee over the past year—that is the identification of the most pressing academic needs with respect to future construction of new/expanded facilities from a list developed by the University administration. The list included four schools (GSEHD, SEAS, Law, SPHHS) and two centers (Cancer, Science/Engineering). As the Deans and their faculties are best qualified to prioritize academic need through data gathering and rational discussion, the Committee sought their help in this determination. Answers to a series of questions drafted by the Committee and aimed at assessing programmatic need, were received from the Deans in April and compiled into a spreadsheet for comparison. A discussion of the Dean's responses led to the conclusion that SEAS (remained in contention in the event of its exclusion from the planned science/engineering complex), GSEHD, and SPHHS had the greatest programmatic needs, but the Committee was unable to prioritize among the three. Thus, at a meeting on June 7 the Committee drafted an additional set of questions for the Deans in GSEHD, SEAS, and SPHHS with the purpose of gaining more quantitative information to aid in distinguishing the level of need of the each school for a new facility. On August 16, after receipt of the Dean's responses to the set of additional questions and their compilation into the spreadsheet, the Committee met and determined that the greatest programmatic need was in SEAS and that the programmatic needs in GSEHD and SPHHS were both great but not distinguishable. The Committee's conclusions were incorporated into a draft Resolution on Construction of New Academic Facilities and the content of the final draft of the Resolution determined at a meeting on October 11 (see attachment 1, Interim Report, Jan 16, 2007). Resolving clause 5 in the final draft, challenged by the Vice President for Advancement, was revised by the Committee at a meeting on November 29. The revised clause was less binding in terms of directing the use of advancement funds for new academic facilities.

At the November 29 meeting, the Committee also heard a review from Eve Dubrow, Associate Vice President Operations, on GW facilities performance and on major renovation projects both in progress and planned (see attachment 2, Interim Report, Jan 16, 2007).

At the February 14 meeting, Elliot Hirshman, Chief Research Officer, reported on the work of the Academic Program Committee (19 selected researchers and administrators) appointed by EVP Lehman to study and recommend the academic programs that should be housed in the 300,000 sq. ft. of assignable space in the anticipated new Science/Engineering Complex. In January, 2007, the Committee recommended the following be housed in the space: all SEAS departments; CCAS departments of biology, chemistry, physics, biological anthropology, and possibly mathematics if space allows; alternative model space that promotes efficiency and enhances inter-disciplinary collaborations such as reserved space that allows flexible reconfiguration to

accommodate e.g., investigators in different departments with the same functional needs or researchers from different departments who are working on a common problem. Such space could be reallocated with emergence of new projects and the completion of old projects; core research facilities open to all university researchers; undergraduate instructional labs and formal ( 250-300 seat auditorium and 50-75 seat science media center) and informal (break rooms and alcove seating throughout the building) space for gatherings. In response to the question as to whether professional planners of such complexes had been involved at this stage of the planning, the answer was no.

At the April 11, 2007 meeting, John Petrie, Asst VP, Office of Public Safety and Emergency Management reported on emergency preparedness. While that office from all indications has worked diligently to develop mechanisms to inform the GW Community in the event of an emergency and have encouraged departments, schools, and other entities to develop and submit local plans (contingency and continuity of operation) to meet emergencies, it appears this goal is somewhat far from being reached (194 entities with 107 contingency and 82 continuity plans submitted). There appears to be two deficiencies. Either the entity (department, school, other) has not developed a local plan or the entity has a plan that has not been communicated to the segment of the university population (students, faculty, staff) for whom the information is intended. As an example of the problem, not a single faculty member on the Physical Facilities Committee knew if their entity had developed a local plan for emergencies, ten members of the Medical School faculty spoken to at random lack this information, and only three or four Faculty Senate members indicated knowledge of a local plan for their entity. Even Senators who were informed that their entity had a local plan were unaware of the plan. This is a risky state of affairs that calls for a quick solution.

Submitted on behalf of the Committee by Linda L. Gallo, Chair.

Committee members: Professors Helgert, Junghenn, Murphree, A. Robinson, Schwallie-Giddis, Sodaro-Spomer, Turley, Wahlbeck, Windsor. Ex officio: Biles, Drew, Dubrow, Linebaugh, Pec and student representative Shea.