AGENDA

1. Call to order

2. Introduction of new members

3. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting held on May 12, 2006, as distributed

4. Introduction of resolutions

5. Response of Administration to Senate Resolutions for the 2005-06 session
   (Administration's Response and Resolutions are attached)

6. Update on recent building and renovation activity on campus during the summer months: Executive Vice President and Treasurer Louis H. Katz

7. Update on classroom scheduling/availability: Associate Vice President Craig W. Linebaugh

8. General Business
   (a) Nominees for appointment by the President to Administrative Committees: Committee on the Judicial System: Professor Kerr-Jia Lu (for a two-year term)
   (b) Nominees for election to Senate Standing Committees:

   Joint Committee of Faculty and Students: Professor John M. Artz, Faculty Co-Chair (as replacement for Professor Sylvia A. Marotta); Physical Facilities Committee: Professors Young-Key Kim-Renaud, Edward L. Murphree, and Catherine L. Turley
   (c) Report of the Executive Committee
   (d) Annual Reports of Senate Standing Committees: Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management; Honors and Academic Convocations; Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom; Joint Committee of Faculty and Students (The Reports are attached)
(e) Tributes to retiring faculty

9. Brief Statements (and Questions)

10. Adjournment

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

Attachments
TO: Lilien F. Robinson, Chair (2005-06)
FROM: Stephen Joel Trachtenberg
SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Resolutions: 05/3 – 05/8
DATE: August 21, 2006

Lilien: I am in receipt of your May 8 memorandum providing a tabulation of resolutions acted upon by the Faculty Senate during its 2005-06 session. As you requested, I am pleased to attach the response of the Administration to these resolutions for inclusion in the Faculty Senate Annual Report.

SJT/h
cc+: Don Lehman
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>Title of Resolution</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Response of Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/3</td>
<td>12/9/06</td>
<td>A Resolution to Endorse The George Washington University Statement of Ethical Principles</td>
<td>Adopted, with the Statement of Ethical Principles (Exhibit A) as amended</td>
<td>Accepted as amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/4</td>
<td>12/9/05</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/5</td>
<td>1/20/06</td>
<td>A Resolution on Procedure With Respect to Deliberation and Decision on the 4 x 4 Curriculum</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/6</td>
<td>3/10/06</td>
<td>A Resolution on Establishing Criteria for Appointments, Reappointments and Promotion of Regular, Active Status Faculty Serving in Non-Tenure-Allocating Appointments</td>
<td>Adopted, as amended</td>
<td>To be brought before the Board of Trustees for approval at the October 2006 meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Number</td>
<td>Date of Meeting</td>
<td>Title of Resolution</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Response of Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/7</td>
<td>4/14/06</td>
<td>A Resolution on Library Endowment Funds</td>
<td>Adopted, as amended</td>
<td>This needs further study; the Administration will be glad to elaborate in the coming year Agreed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

Adopted, with the Statement of Ethical Principles (Exhibit A) as amended,
December 9, 2005
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

Adopted, December 9, 2005
To view the attachments to Resolution 05/4 adopted December 9, 2005, visit the Senate Website at:

http://www.gwu.edu/%7Efacsen/faculty_senate/pdf/Minutes12-9-05.pdf

The attachments may be viewed beginning on page 17.
A RESOLUTION ON PROCEDURE WITH RESPECT TO DELIBERATION AND
DECISION ON THE 4X4 CURRICULUM (05/5)

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Faculty Code, the regular active-status faculty shares with the administration responsibility for effective operation of the University and the formulation of policy and planning decisions affecting the quality of education, and

WHEREAS, consideration of a four credit hour/four course academic program is of central significance to the academic mission and reputation of the University and thus of major concern to the faculty, and

WHEREAS, it is the understanding of the Faculty Senate that the Task Force on the 4x4 program will produce a report during the Spring 2006 semester on their findings and recommendations on the efficacy of conversion of the GWU programs to a 4x4 system, and

WHEREAS, in keeping with Faculty Code prescribed principles of shared governance, it is the understanding of the Faculty Senate that the faculty will be fully involved in decisions pertaining to the 4x4; NOW, THEREFORE,

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

That the report and recommendations of the Task Force on the 4x4 be submitted concurrently to School faculties and the Faculty Senate for their full review, debate, and recommendation as soon as the Task Force completes its report.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee
January 10, 2006

Adopted, January 20, 2006
A RESOLUTION ON ESTABLISHING CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENTS, REAPPOINTMENTS, AND PROMOTION OF REGULAR, ACTIVE-STATUS FACULTY SERVING IN NON-TENURE-ACCRUING APPOINTMENTS (05/6)

Whereas, Article IV of the Faculty Code and Part B of the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code confer upon the faculty of each school the responsibility to establish and publish criteria on which regular, active-status faculty appointments, reappointments and promotions will be based, and require the faculty of each department to establish and publish any additional criteria; and

Whereas, Part B.2 of the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code requires that recommendations for faculty appointments, reappointments and promotions shall be made by the faculty members of the appropriate rank in each department or nondepartmentalized school, acting either as a committee of the whole or through a duly elected standing committee; and

Whereas, Article IV.B.1 of the Faculty Code stipulates that “promotion shall be dependent upon professional competence as evidenced by teaching ability, productive scholarship, participation and leadership in professional societies, service to the University, and public service”; and

Whereas, the Faculty Code offers no guidance as to whether regular, active-status faculty holding non-tenure-accruing appointments must be judged by criteria identical to those applied to faculty holding tenure-accruing appointments of the same rank within the same department or within a nondepartmentalized school in connection with decisions regarding appointment, reappointment, or promotion; and

Whereas: it is in the best interests of all regular, active-status faculty to have explicitly-stated criteria governing appointments, reappointments and promotion; and

Whereas, in the absence of such guidance in the Faculty Code, several schools of the University have proposed the creation of new position titles to provide for school-specific teaching and program development needs; and

Whereas, it is in the best interests of the University that a universal set of faculty titles and ranks, as specified in Article I.B of the Faculty Code, be applicable across all academic units of the University; and

Whereas, it is in the best interests of the University, as an integral part of the academy, to expect that all regular, active-status faculty will generate productive scholarship and disseminate existing knowledge through their teaching; and

Whereas, teaching loads and service assignments for all regular, active-status faculty, including faculty holding non-tenure-accruing appointments, should be structured so that during the term of each appointment, consistent with the University’s needs, each regular, active-status faculty member has a reasonable opportunity to generate evidence of teaching ability and productive scholarship; and

Whereas, it is not appropriate to appoint faculty members to regular, active-status positions with the accompanying faculty governance rights unless they are expected to be actively engaged in all of the key areas of teaching, productive research, and service to the University, professional societies and the public; and
Whereas, a number of universities have appointed “professors of practice” to meet teaching and specialized programmatic needs, and at least one school in the University has appointed a small number of “professors of practice” for similar purposes; and

Whereas, the title of “professor of practice” (at assistant, associate and full professor levels) a new category of “special service” faculty designations should be authorized under the Faculty Code for full-time faculty members who are hired to meet special teaching or program administration or development needs within a department or school but who are not expected to be actively engaged in the generation of productive scholarship, and such faculty members should be recognized as “special service” faculty without should not be granted faculty governance rights (similar to the status treatment of research faculty, who do not possess faculty governance rights under Article I.B.4. of the Faculty Code); NOW THEREFORE

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

(1) That the Faculty Code be amended by adding the following new subsection at the end of Article I.B.:

5. Special Service: Special service faculty may be appointed, upon recommendation of the appropriate faculty and officers of the administration, as teaching professor or program administrator or professor of practice, associate professor of practice, and assistant professor of practice, or with such other special service faculty designation as may be approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, in order to fulfill special teaching or program administration or development needs. Such appointments do not provide tenure, and special service faculty are not expected to generate productive scholarship.

(2) That the Faculty Code be further amended by adding the following new section after Article IV.A.5:

6. Criteria and Procedures for Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotion of Regular, Active-Status Faculty Serving in Non-Tenure-Accruing Appointments

Each school and each department (except in the case of nondepartmentalized schools) shall take the following actions with regard to appointments, reappointments, and promotion of regular, active-status faculty serving in non-tenure-accruing appointments:

a) In accordance with this Article IV and Part B of the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code, the faculty of each of the foregoing units shall approve and publish the criteria to be applied in making decisions regarding appointments, reappointments, and promotion of regular, active-status faculty serving in non-tenure-accruing appointments. These criteria shall be based on the purpose(s) of the non-tenure-accruing appointments. Each letter of appointment for a regular, active-status faculty member serving in a non-tenure-accruing appointment shall include appropriate references to the criteria and purpose(s) applicable to such appointment.

b) Decisions regarding appointments, reappointments, and promotion of regular, active-status faculty for non-tenure-accruing positions at a rank lower than the rank of professor may be based on published criteria that assign different weights to the factors of teaching ability, productive scholarship, and service to the University, professional societies and the public than the published criteria that would be applied to faculty members serving in tenure-accruing appointments in the applicable department or nondepartmentalized school; provided, however, that
1) none of the foregoing factors shall be assigned a weight of zero, and each regular, active-status faculty member serving in a non-tenure-accruing position shall be expected to generate evidence of teaching ability and productive scholarship; and

2) the weights to be applied to the foregoing factors shall be based on the purpose(s) of the particular non-tenure-accruing appointments, and such weights shall be explicitly stated in the applicable letters of appointment or reappointment; and

c) Decisions regarding appointments, reappointments, and promotion of regular, active-status faculty for non-tenure-accruing positions at the rank of professor shall be based on published criteria that are substantially comparable (though not necessarily identical) to the published criteria that would be applied to faculty members serving in tenure-accruing appointments in the applicable department or nondepartmentalized school.

d) Teaching loads and service assignments for all regular, active-status faculty in a department or nondepartmentalized school should be structured so that during the term of each appointment, consistent with the University’s needs, each regular, active-status faculty member in that department or school has a reasonable opportunity to generate evidence of teaching ability and productive scholarship.

Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies
February 24, 2006

Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
February 24, 2006

Adopted, as amended, March 10, 2006
The Joint Subcommittee on Appointments, Reappointments and Promotion of Contract Faculty (“Joint Subcommittee”) was commissioned by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in accordance with the three following memoranda:

1. On February 4, 2004, Professor Lilien Robinson (Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee) wrote to Professor Charles Garris (Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policy, “ASPP”) to request the ASPP Committee’s consideration of, and recommendations for (among other issues), “formulation of policies on reappointment and promotion of contract faculty in programs without departmental affiliation.”

2. On March 3, 2004, Professor Robinson wrote to Professor Garris as well as to Professor Ernest Englander (Chair of the Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, “PEAF”) noting that “upon further discussion, our colleagues have come to the conclusion that it would be very helpful to have both the PEAF and ASPP Committees address this matter. Accordingly, the Executive Committee recommends that you appoint a joint subcommittee to take on this project.”

3. On July 16, 2004, newly-elected Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee Professor Arthur Wilmarth, Jr., wrote to Professor Englander and Professor Sylvia Marotta (newly appointed Chair of the Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policy), with the request that the ASPP and PEAF Committees “form a joint subcommittee to consider issues related to the appointment, promotion, reappointment, and general status of full-time contract faculty members. One particular issue is how status decisions should be made with respect to contract faculty who are not supervised by department chairs...It would be ideal if the subcommittee could include a mix of tenured and contract faculty...”

It was agreed by the Chairs of the ASPP and PEAF Committees that the Joint Subcommittee need not be composed exclusively of ASPP and PEAF members, but that there needed to be at least one member from each of the two Committees on the Joint Subcommittee. Professors Englander and Marotta canvassed the University Faculty to identify Faculty members who were interested in serving on the Joint Subcommittee. These included: Professors Englander and Marotta (co-chairs), and Professors Carayannis (GWSB), Chalofsky (GSEHD), Cherian (GWSB), Lornell (CCAS), Hilliard (GWSB), Mueller (GSEHD), Williams (GWSB) and Zink (University Writing Program). In consultation with EVPAA Lehman, two administrative Committee members were appointed: Dr. Jean Folkerts (representing the EVPAA) and Mr. Richard Weitzner, Associate General Counsel.

On October 11, 2004, Executive Committee Chair Wilmarth wrote Professors Englander and Marotta: “The Executive Committee has been advised of concerns that some contract faculty members are being hired with the expectation of carrying out primarily teaching and/or administrative duties while holding the same title (e.g., professor, associate professor, or assistant professor) as tenure-line faculty members or contract faculty members who are expected to fulfill a
significant research component as part of their overall responsibilities. This practice has raised difficulties when contract faculty members who are appointed with such expectations are later considered for reappointment or promotion by faculty committees. Could you please ask your subcommittee to consider whether a separate designation should be used for full-time contract faculty members who are expected to devote most of their efforts to teaching and/or administrative tasks?"

“We understand that [one school of the University] designates contract faculty members as “professors of practice” if they are hired “primarily for their ability to contribute to the teaching programs of the School”. Should a title similar to “professor of practice” (including instructor, assistant and associate ranks) be added to Article I.B.1 of the Faculty Code to designate a regular, active-status contract faculty member who is expected to devote most of his or her efforts to teaching and/or administrative tasks?”

The Joint Subcommittee met throughout the Fall 2004 and Spring 2005 semesters and produced a draft resolution and an accompanying statement of legislative history. The Joint Subcommittee was reconstituted in October 2005, and its members included: Professors Murli Gupta (CCAS, and ASPP chair) and Wilmarth (PEAF chair), as co-chairs, and Professors Artz (GWSB), Chalofsky, Gamber (Univ. Writing Program), Hamner (SEAS), Mueller, and Wirtz (GWSB). On November 30, 2005, the Joint Subcommittee agreed on a proposed resolution and statement of legislative history, which built upon the excellent work done by the Joint Subcommittee during 2004-05. In December 2005, the ASPP and PEAF Committees met separately to discuss the Joint Subcommittee’s proposal. As a result of those discussions, the ASPP and PEAF Committees held a joint meeting on January 24, 2006, to develop a consensus on these matters. As a result of these and subsequent deliberations, the ASPP and PEAF Committees reached the following conclusions:

1. Regular, active-status faculty holding non-tenure-accruing (“NTA”) appointments constitute more than one-fifth of the University’s full-time faculty and are needed by the University to meet a variety of programmatic needs. In 2005, the University’s 730 regular, active-status faculty members included 165 faculty members serving in NTA positions. Because of concerns about financial flexibility and the great dependence of the University on enrollment-related revenues, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman advised the participants that neither the Administration nor the Board of Trustees would accept a resolution requiring that all regular, active-status faculty must be appointed to tenure-accruing positions. Professor Walter Kahn (SEAS) noted that Article I.B.1 of the Faculty Code recognizes the legitimacy of regular, active-status faculty holding NTA appointments by providing that up to 25 percent of the regular, active-status faculty of any school, and up to 50 percent of the regular, active-status faculty of any department, may consist of NTA faculty. The Law School, School of Medicine and Health Sciences, and the College of Professional Studies are exempted from these Code requirements. Professor Art Wilmarth expressed his concern that the Graduate School of Education and Human Development and the School of Public Health and Health Services are not even close to complying with these Code requirements and both Schools have made little or no progress toward increasing their percentages of tenure-accruing faculty during the past several years. Other participants agreed with this concern and felt that the Faculty Senate should address these departures from the Faculty Code.

2. The Joint Subcommittee and the two Committees actively deliberated on whether separate titles should be designated for regular, active-status faculty members who are expected to devote most of their efforts to teaching and/or administrative tasks. After extensive discussion and review of the individual schools’ needs, as well as a thorough review of the current provisions in the Faculty Code (notably Article IV, “Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure”), the Joint Subcommittee and the two Committees concluded that it would be far more advisable to draw on the current language of Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code, which is sufficiently broad to allow the multiplicity of school-based needs to be met through existing titles, than to augment the Faculty Code with what would be a
proliferation of new titles for regular, active-status faculty to accommodate the multiple, non-overlapping current needs (as well as unforeseen future needs) of the individual academic units.

3. The Joint Subcommittee and the two Committees were sensitive in their deliberations to the consequence of the foregoing conclusion -- namely, that identical titles (e.g., Assistant Professor) might carry different predominant responsibilities among regular, active-status faculty members across and within academic units. It was agreed that this flexibility is generally a strength (permitting dynamic response to the University’s evolving needs on an academic unit basis) with respect to NTA positions below the rank of full professor. At the rank of full professor, however, it was agreed that there should be a closer similarity between tenure-accruing and NTA faculty. Accordingly, it was determined that the criteria for appointments, reappointments and promotion to the rank of full professor for NTA faculty should be “substantially comparable (though not necessarily identical) to the criteria that would be applied to faculty members serving in tenure-accruing appointments in the applicable department or nondepartmentalized school.”

4. The Joint Subcommittee recognized that, in promoting the flexibility of responsibilities for regular, active-status faculty holding NTA positions, as recognized in the accompanying Resolution, it is essential that academic units identify and articulate, in advance, the responsibilities of every regular, active-status faculty member serving in an NTA position, as is already done for tenure-accruing faculty (through the Bylaws of the individual academic units). Accordingly, the faculty of each academic unit must establish and publish the criteria for appointments, reappointments, and promotion of regular, active-status faculty holding NTA positions in accordance with Article IV of the Faculty Code and Part B.2. of the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code.

5. As reflected in the accompanying Resolution, every regular, active-status faculty member should contribute to the fulfillment of all areas of faculty responsibility within his or her respective department or nondepartmentalized school, including the areas of teaching and productive scholarship. Accordingly, the Resolution provides that, in making decisions regarding appointments, reappointments and promotion of regular, active-status faculty members in NTA positions, none of the areas of faculty responsibility should be assigned a weight of zero and each such faculty member should be expected to generate evidence of teaching ability and productive scholarship. In addition, the Resolution provides that teaching loads and service assignments should be structured so that during the term of each appointment, consistent with the University’s needs, each regular, active-status faculty member has a reasonable opportunity to satisfy the foregoing expectations for teaching and scholarship.

6. The ASPP and PEAF Committees agreed that a faculty position should not be classified as a regular, active-status position unless it includes an expectation of generating productive scholarship. In this regard, the two Committees concurred that faculty members should not receive faculty governance rights as regular, active-status faculty under the Faculty Code unless they are actively engaged in all of the key areas of teaching, scholarship and service. This conclusion is consistent with (i) Article I.B.4. of the Faculty Code, which does not grant “regular” status or the accompanying faculty governance rights to research faculty, because research faculty are not expected to engage in teaching, and (ii) Article IV.B.1. of the Faculty Code, which provides that promotion of regular, active-status faculty members “shall be dependent on professional competence as evidenced by teaching ability, productive scholarship, participation and leadership in professional societies, service to the University, and public service.”

7. The ASPP and PEAF Committees It was agreed that a new title of “professor of practice” (at assistant, associate and full professor levels) a new class of special service faculty designations should be authorized in the Faculty Code for full-time faculty members who
are hired to fulfill special teaching or program administration or development needs in a department or school but who are not expected to generate productive scholarship. These special service faculty members would be similar to the “professors of practice” who have been appointed for one or two three-year terms in the Elliott School of International Affairs. Such special service faculty should not be appointed to regular, active-status positions and should not receive faculty governance rights. Accordingly, it was agreed that a new category of “Special Service” faculty should be authorized under Article I.B. of the Faculty Code, and that this new category should include the “professor of practice” teaching professors” and “program administrators” designations and should also permit additional such other special service faculty designations that are recommended by the faculty of a department or nondepartmentalized school and approved by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Joint Subcommittee also looked carefully into the question of possible “formulation of policies on reappointment and promotion of contract faculty in programs without departmental affiliation”. In collaboration with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Joint Subcommittee determined that the faculty associated with one Program -- the University Writing Program in the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences -- was, initially, without adequate protection under the Faculty Code. In the Joint Subcommittee’s opinion, the Columbian College bylaws have since been amended to provide rights and protections for the faculty in that Program that conform to the rights and protections offered to all regular, active-status faculty under the Faculty Code. The Joint Subcommittee did not, therefore, recommend additional policies on appointment and promotion of contract faculty in programs without departmental affiliation.

Murli M. Gupta.  
Chair, ASPP Committee

Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr.  
Chair, PEAF Committee

February 24, 2006
A RESOLUTION ON LIBRARY ENDOWMENT FUNDS

Whereas, The George Washington University aspires to “move solidly into the ranks of first-tier educational institutions” (Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence, Goal 1); and

Whereas, the University further seeks to “strengthen GW’s infrastructure, including the University’s libraries” (Goal 5); and

Whereas, neither goal can be attained without first-tier library resources; and

Whereas, both endowments and university allocations are vital sources of funding for the libraries; and

Whereas, funding for the Gelman Library System from both endowments and university allocations are significantly lower than libraries at peer institutions (see attachment # 1); and

Whereas, surveys of faculty and students have consistently shown dissatisfaction with the depth and breadth of the collection of the Gelman Library (see attachment # 2 for faculty responses); and

Whereas, it is in the interest of the Faculty Senate and the University that library resources available for research and instruction be of the highest quality;

NOW THEREFORE

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

1. That the University Administration request that the University Librarian provide a 5-year plan through which, by gradual increases in the library collection budget beginning in FY 2008, the collection budget will reach a level equal to the mean level of ARL libraries in GW’s market basket group; and

2. That the University Administration prepare an annual report for the Faculty Senate on its progress in meeting the goals set out in the 5-year plan provided by the University Librarian; and

3. That the University Administration further makes the Gelman Library System a high priority in fundraising in order to increase both funds for current use and the endowment for it so as to help meet the goals set out in Resolving Clause 1.

Faculty Senate Committee on Libraries
March 31, 2006

Adopted, as amended, April 14, 2006
A RESOLUTION REGARDING THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET FOR FY 07 (05/8)

WHEREAS,

Current University budget projections estimate a “gap” between revenues and expenses of $8.2m for FY 07 and slightly larger gaps for FY 08 AND FY 09, indicating that the University is currently on an unsustainable path; and

WHEREAS,

These gaps have been the subject of intense and helpful discussions between the Faculty Senate and Administrative Officers; and

WHEREAS,

It seems appropriate to focus on closing the gap for FY 07, where the estimates are less speculative than for later years, noting that the gap is small relative to the total University revenue budget of some $467m; and

WHEREAS,

There are a number of options for closing this gap, including devising enhanced revenues and/or changes in assumed/projected expenditures in different areas, including capital expenditures, general administrative expenses, student financial aid, and academic programs; and

WHEREAS,

The University faculty is deeply committed to improving or at least maintaining the quality of education provided to University students, and is troubled by recent trends in full-time faculty resources growing at a much slower rate (17%) than enrollments (60% for undergraduates) over the last ten years; and

WHEREAS,

Additional reductions in support for academic programs in FY 07 would inevitably lead to a reduction in the quality of education for University students, especially undergraduate students; and

WHEREAS,

Current projected transfers from the operating budget to capital expenditures and debt service for FY 07 exceed the amounts required by current University commitments,

NOW, THEREFORE
BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

1. That the revenue/expense gap in the University budget for FY 07 should be closed without a reduction in support for academic programs, and

2. That non-academic cuts in expenses by which the gap in the University budget for FY 07 may be closed include:

   A. Reducing projected transfer of funds from current revenues to capital spending and debt service by $5 m

   B. Deriving another $3.2 m from:

      1) reductions in expenditures in Administrative Offices reporting to the Executive Vice President and Treasurer, and from

      2) increasing net revenues from Auxiliary Services

      3) reducing projected expenditures in the Office Student and Academic Support Services, including possible reductions in the discount rate for incoming students

3. That the projected university budget gaps for FY 08 AND FY 09 should be addressed:

   ▪ Beginning in May 2006, by a budget process that includes full and active participation by representatives of the faculty designated by the Faculty Senate

   ▪ Such process should include, starting in October, 2006 and continuing thereafter on a regular basis, reports to the Faculty Senate by the faculty representatives and the University Administration, covering both the status of the University budget for future years and the advantages and disadvantages of possible options to address any gaps in future years

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
April 12, 2006

 Adopted, April 14, 2006
Faculty Senate Committee on Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management

Final Report
May 19, 2006

During the Academic Year 2005/06 the Committee met four times.

At its first meeting the committee agreed to pursue the following agenda for the remainder of the academic year:

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.
4. Study the impact of changing enrollment patterns on service departments.
5. Obtain information on the history and experience of the honors program.
6. Continue the investigation into how and to what extent the emerging Europe-wide higher education standards degrees and degree requirements known as the Bologna Process will impact the enrollment of foreign students at GWU.

At its second meeting the committee discussed evidence of serious problems in the graduation rate of doctoral students. It appears that a substantial number of such students fail to complete the dissertation and discontinue their study. The committee also identified problems in scheduling courses by certain service departments due to uncertainties in freshman enrollments.

At its third meeting the committee continued its consideration of the impact of the Bologna Process on graduate enrollment at
GWU. It appears that at present there exists insufficient data to draw meaningful conclusions. The committee also discussed ways and means for positively influencing graduate students retention. The university will make available certain information gained from exit interviews and will develop a set of recommendations based on this data.

At its fourth meeting the committee considered the impact of changing enrollments on service departments. It also reviewed discount rates across the university and the status of applications for 2006/07.

Respectfully submitted,

Hermann J. Helgert

Members: Eugene Abravanel, Elizabeth Amundson, Crystal Belk, Geoffrey Carter, Robert Chernak, Nancy Greenawald, Hermann Helgert (Chair), Donald Lehman, Stephen McGraw, Susana Mendez, Kathryn Napper, Geri Rypkema, Robert Rycroft, Daniel Small, Daniel Ullman, Kristin Williams
The Honors and Academic Convocations Committee met twice during the 2005-2006 academic year. The first meeting, held on November 17, 2005, was in–person. The second was conducted through email.

Summary of the Meeting of November 17, 2005

Committee members Sullivan, Glickman, Miller and Khamooshi expressed uncertainty about the Committee’s role in the nominations process and the policies involving nominations, the Board of Trustees and the President. Professor Miller asked the Committee whether the Honors and Academic Convocations Committee should be decommissioned, given its apparently weak role in the nominations process. Professor Sullivan pointed out that decommissioning would mean the loss of any input at all by the faculty.

Upon the Committee’s request, Professor Kasle {University Marshal} clarified the nominations process. She said that nominations are received throughout the year. These nominations are transmitted to the Honors and Academic Convocations Committee for vetting. The Committee reviews the nominations and sends its recommendations to the President, who makes his recommendations to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, which makes its recommendations to the full Board. The Board has the final word. It is possible for a nomination to be rejected at any step along the way (for example, if the Honors and Academic Convocations Committee strongly objects to a nomination). Only during a “once-in-a-lifetime opportunity” is the process “accelerated.” In such cases, the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, the Chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee, the President and Professor Kasle make a decision, bypassing the Honors and Academic Convocations Committee.

Professor Kasle said that there are currently 80 names on the list that has been approved by the Honors and Academic Convocations Committee and the Board of Trustees. Following the implementation of a Three-Year Rule, names that were still on the list after three years and were inactive were taken off. Professor Kasle mentioned, however, that names that were taken off the list due to the rule were put back on, except for individuals who had since died. It was agreed that Professor Kasle should send Honors and Academic Convocations Committee members the current list of approved nominations for honorary degrees and the list of individuals who were taken off the list due to the Three-Year Rule and then put back on.

Professor Kasle stressed that the Honors and Academic Convocations Committee serves an advisory function and that the nominations process begins with the Committee. Professor Glickman suggested that the Chair of the Honors and Academic Convocations
Committee should be included in meetings during an accelerated nomination. Professor Kasle expressed that this was a good idea and agreed to propose it.

Professor Kasle proposed that, because she receives honorary degree nominations continuously, the Committee’s work would be more effectively accomplished using e-mail instead of in actual meetings. Professor Glickman expressed his concern that such a process would eliminate the benefits of discussion, exchange of ideas and consensus. Professor Khamooshi noted the importance of looking at all the issues pertaining to a nomination such as his or her relationship to GW. The Committee agreed to experiment with “virtual/e-mail” meetings to consider nominations as they come in to Professor Kasle and also to have at least one in-person meeting per year.

Committee members inquired about the annual process of decision-making at the Board level, given the fact that the 2006 awardees were decided without input from the current membership of the Honors and Academic Convocations Committee. Professor Kasle pointed out that, in fact, all the honorary degree recipients for the May 2006 commencement were already on the approved list before the current members of the Committee took office.

Professor Kasle said that the Board of Trustees meets three times a year: October, February and May. Only during October and February does the Board talk about nominations. She mentioned that, during the October 2005, meeting the Board saw a list of nominations to be added to the approved list before the Honors and Academic Convocations Committee members did. Although the Board approved the nominations, the votes were put on hold until the Honors and Academic Convocations Committee was able to approve them.

The Committee discussed how to most effectively vote on nominations. Committee members decided that the current system of ranking nominations was unnecessary because it has no impact on the Board and other higher-up decision-makers. Instead, the Committee should simply approve or reject nominations. The Committee unanimously approved the adoption of Professor Miller’s nominations voting sheet with the emendation that a yes/no column be added to the sheet and the numeric scoring be abandoned. The Committee agreed to e-mail meetings for upcoming nominations with Committee members having a week to reply or make a decision by e-mail on a nomination.

Other decisions and concerns:

1. Professor Kasle will propose that the Honors and Academic Convocations Committee Chair, Professor Miller, be included in meetings related to accelerated nominations. Professor Kasle will call or e-mail Professor Miller to notify her of such a meeting.

2. Professor Miller will report to the Honors and Academic Convocations Committee on any meetings or discussions about “accelerated” nominations.
She will convey to the Committee how she voted on the nomination and whether the nomination was approved.

3. Professor Kasle clarified that whether or not the Honors and Academic Convocations Committee endorses a nomination, the nomination will be passed on to the Board of Trustees for its consideration and vote. The Honors and Academic Convocations Committee vote on all nominations will be conveyed to the Board and the President.

4. Given the Honors and Academic Convocations Committee’s clarified understanding of the Board’s annual cycle regarding nominations, it plans to meet, preferably in person, in August or September, prior to the October meeting of the Board.

Virtual meeting of February 2006

In February 2006, the Honors and Academic Convocations Committee had its first “virtual” meeting. Committee members voted on three nominations.

Respectfully submitted by Professor Barbara D. Miller
August 25, 2006
TO: Prof. Lilien F. Robinson, Chair, Faculty Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Prof. Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr., Chair (2005-06), Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF)

RE: Annual Report of the PEAF Committee, 2005-06

DATE: June 19, 2006

On behalf of the PEAF Committee, I am pleased to submit this report of the Committee’s activities during the 2005-06 academic year. During the past year, our Committee held seven meetings and dealt with four matters that were referred to us by the Executive Committee. The PEAF Committee took action on those four matters as described below.

1. Adoption of GWU Statement of Ethical Principles (Resolution 05/3)

The University’s Board of Trustees requested that the Administration and the Faculty Senate prepare a joint written statement of ethical principles. The University’s Office of General Counsel (OGC) prepared an initial draft of a proposed Statement of Ethical Principles, which the OGC submitted to the PEAF Committee. The PEAF Committee worked with members of the OGC and other members of the University Administration in preparing a significantly revised draft of the Statement. The PEAF Committee also prepared a proposed draft of Resolution 05/3, which expresses the Faculty Senate’s understanding that the Statement of Ethical Principles (i) 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 action against faculty members; and (ii) 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. The Faculty Senate adopted Resolution 05/3 and endorsed the Statement of Ethical Principles (with amendments) at its meeting on December 9, 2005.

Subsequently, as Chair of the PEAF Committee, I reviewed a proposed draft of a revised edition of the Compliance Line Brochure. The University’s Compliance Office prepared the revised draft of the brochure in order to incorporate references to the Statement of Ethical Principles. With the assistance of Professor Elliot Hirshman, the University’s Chief Research Officer, and Professor Lilien Robinson, Chair of the Executive Committee, I persuaded the Compliance Office to make a number of modifications to the revised brochure. My requested modifications were intended to ensure that the description of the Statement of Ethical Principles in the revised Compliance Line Brochure will be consistent with the actual text and scope of the Statement of Ethical Principles as endorsed in Resolution 05/3.

2. Revisions to the Conflict of Interest Disclosure Forms (Resolution 05/4)
In conjunction with the OGC, the PEAF Committee also prepared revisions to the Disclosure Forms that faculty members and investigators are required to file under the University’s Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment (the “Policy”). Those revisions dealt primarily with the receipt of gifts from persons who have business dealings with the University or who may be competitors of the University. The PEAF Committee also prepared conforming amendments to the Policy and a proposed draft of Resolution 05/4. At its meeting on December 9, 2005, the Faculty Senate adopted Resolution 05/4 and endorsed the proposed changes to the Disclosure Forms and the Policy.

3. Adoption of a Resolution Establishing Criteria Governing the Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion of Regular, Active-Status Faculty Members serving in Non-Tenure-Accruing Positions (Resolution 05/6)

During the fall semester, a joint subcommittee consisting of representatives of the PEAF Committee and representatives of the Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policy (ASPP) prepared a draft resolution to amend the Faculty Code to establish criteria for appointments, reappointments, and promotion of regular, active-status faculty serving in non-tenure-accruing positions. The joint subcommittee’s work built upon a draft prepared by its predecessor subcommittee during the 2004-05 academic year.

On January 24, 2006, the ASPP and PEAF Committees held a joint meeting to review the work done by the joint subcommittee and to reach consensus on a proposed resolution. As a result of that joint meeting and subsequent deliberations, the ASPP and PEAF Committees agreed on the text of Resolution 05/6 and an accompanying statement of Legislative History. At its meeting on March 10, 2006, the Faculty Senate adopted Resolution 05/6 and endorsed the accompanying statement of Legislative History, together with instructions directing the Chairs of the ASPP and PEAF Committees to prepare technical revisions to both documents. The Chairs of both Committees prepared the revisions requested by the Faculty Senate, and those revisions were reviewed and endorsed at the Faculty Senate’s meeting on April 14, 2006.

4. Review of Efforts by Two Schools to Achieve Compliance with Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code

The Executive Committee asked the PEAF Committee to determine whether the Graduate School of Education and Human Development (GSEHD) and the School of Public Health and Health Services (SPHHS) were making progress with regard to compliance with Article I.B.1 of the Faculty Code. Article I.B.1 provides that at least 75% of the regular, active-status faculty members of each school – except for the Law School and the School of Medicine and Health Sciences – must hold tenure-accruing (TA) appointments. In addition, at least 50% of regular, active-status faculty members in each department of every school (with the same exceptions) must hold TA appointments.

Members of the PEAF Committee met with Dean Mary H. Futrell and Associate Dean Janet C. Heddesheimer of GSEHD on April 17, 2006. Attached to this report is a memorandum dated May 1, 2006, which summarizes our meeting with Dean Futrell and Associate Dean
Heddesheimer. As indicated in our May 1 memo, the percentage of regular, active-status faculty serving in TA positions at GSEHD has remained at about 60% during 1992-2005, with fluctuations between a low of 56% and a high of 64%. One positive note is that each of GSEHD’s three departments achieved the required 50% ratio for TA faculty in 2004 and 2005.

In 2003, GSEHD developed a seven-year plan to bring its regular, active-status faculty into full compliance with Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code. However, GSEHD was not able to implement that plan due to budget constraints imposed by the University Administration. As reported on page 2 of Dean Futrell’s memorandum attached to our May 1 memo, Executive Vice President Lehman stated last fall that he does not expect GSEHD to achieve compliance with Article I.B.1. within the foreseeable future, due to “the financial state of the School” and his concerns about “the level of risk associated with the funding of tuition for students through training grants and the size of the School’s operating margin.” Dean Futrell stated that the Administration’s budgetary constraints on TA faculty positions at GSEHD have undermined the School’s efforts to recruit the most promising candidates for new faculty positions and to retain its most talented junior faculty members. In addition, GSEHD’s faculty recruitment and retention efforts are hampered by the relatively low salaries paid to its faculty, which have consistently fallen below the 60th percentile in AAUP surveys.

As explained in more detail in our May 1 memo, the PEAF Committee believes that the University Administration should (i) give greater recognition and rewards for the GSEHD’s achievements during the past decade (culminating in a national ranking of 21st among graduate schools of education in the most recent U.S. News survey); and (ii) support GSEHD’s efforts to attract and retain highly-qualified faculty by expanding the number of TA faculty positions and by increasing the average salaries for regular, active-status faculty to at least the AAUP’s 60th percentile. The PEAF Committee also recommends that the University Administration should establish a firm target date, of not later than June 30, 2013, for GSEHD’s full compliance with Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code.

In Resolution 01/11, adopted on April 12, 2002, the Faculty Senate determined that SPHHS was not in substantial compliance with Article I.B.1 of the Faculty Code. On that date, less than 40% of the regular, active-status faculty at SPHHS held TA appointments. Resolution 01/11 called upon SPHHS to achieve compliance with Article I.B.1 of the Faculty Code by the beginning of the Fall 2007 semester. In its response to Resolution 01/11, the University Administration stated that the “Administration accedes in principle and will endeavor to achieve the outcome requested but believes that a 10 year horizon [viz., Fall 2012] is more plausible”.

The PEAF Committee met with Dean Ruth J. Katz of SPHHS on May 8, 2006, to review SPHHS’ progress in achieving compliance with Article I.B.1. Attached to this report is a memorandum dated May 29, 2006, which summarizes our meeting with Dean Katz. As explained in our May 29 memo, the number of regular, active-status faculty members at SPHHS has increased from 37 to 50 during 2002-06, while the number of TA faculty has grown from 13 to 20. As a result, the percentage of TA faculty has risen from 35% to 40% but remains far below the 75% requirement established by Article I.B.1. Additionally, in six of SPHHS’ seven
departments, the percentage of TA faculty is less than the 50% departmental requirement specified by Article I.B.1. Two departments currently have no TA faculty.

Dean Katz reported that five of SPHHS’ seven departments had acting chairs when she arrived at the School in the fall of 2003. She has focused a great deal of her faculty recruitment efforts on appointing new chairs to head those five departments. To date, three new department chairs have been appointed and nationwide searches are in process for the other two chairs. However, PEAF Committee members were disappointed to learn that only one of the three new department chairs has been appointed with tenure. In the Committee’s view, department chairs cannot provide the requisite academic leadership and cannot operate with the desired independence within the University’s framework of shared governance if they are not deemed worthy of tenure and are not given the protections of tenure.

Dean Katz stated that the financial position of SPHHS limits the School’s ability to appoint faculty to TA positions. She also explained that the School’s top priority is to construct a new wing on Ross Hall in order to provide SPHHS with a unified facility for its educational and administrative functions. While SPHHS plans to recruit twelve new faculty members during the next 3-4 years, Dean Katz could not make any firm prediction as to the number of these new faculty members who will be appointed to TA positions. Even if all twelve of these projected new faculty members were given TA appointments, the percentage of TA faculty at SPHHS would be only slightly higher than 50%. PEAF Committee members noted that this 3-4 year period would end at about 2010, eight years after the adoption of Resolution 01/11 and only two years before the end of the “10 year horizon” which the University Administration suggested as a “plausible” time period for compliance with Article I.B.1.

Dean Katz did not offer any prediction as to when SPHHS could reasonably expect to comply with Article I.B.1. PEAF Committee members concluded that such compliance will not occur within the foreseeable future unless there is a very significant shift in the current trajectory of faculty hiring at SPHHS. In this regard, members expressed concern about the evident lack of any hiring plan with specific goals and benchmarks for increasing the percentage of TA faculty at SPHHS. In addition, SPHHS has significantly increased its reliance on adjunct faculty during the past five years. According to Executive Vice President Lehman’s report to the Faculty Senate in February, the number of limited-service faculty teaching at SPHHS (excluding research and visiting faculty) rose from 180 to 232 during 2001-05. On both a numerical and percentage basis, SPHHS recorded the largest growth in limited-service faculty during that period. PEAF Committee members expressed concern that this large increase in limited-service faculty, viewed in combination with the relatively low percentage of TA faculty, could potentially raise questions about the overall commitment to top-quality teaching at SPHHS.

I would like to express my personal appreciation and gratitude to the members of the PEAF Committee for their dedicated service on behalf of the Committee and the Faculty Senate this year.

A.E.W., Jr.
cc: Professor Philip W. Wirtz (incoming Chair for the 2006-07 academic year)
Ms. L. Sue Campbell, Faculty Senate Coordinator
MEMORANDUM

TO: Prof. Lilien F. Robinson
Chair, Faculty Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Prof. Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr.
Chair, Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics
and Academic Freedom (PEAF)

RE: Meeting with Dean Mary H. Futrell, Graduate School of Education
and Human Development (GSEHD)

DATE: May 1, 2006

As requested in your memorandum dated February 21, 2006, members of the PEAF Committee met with Dean Mary H. Futrell and Associate Dean Janet C. Heddesheimer on April 17, 2006. The primary purpose of the meeting was to discuss plans by the GSEHD to achieve compliance with Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code. Dean Futrell and Associate Dean Heddesheimer were extremely helpful and provided the PEAF Committee with the following documents, which are attached to this memorandum: (1) a memorandum from Dean Futrell, dated April 17, 2006; (2) a chart entitled “History of Lines” showing the percentages of GSEHD faculty serving in tenure-accruing (TA) and non-tenure-accruing (NTA) lines during 1992-2005; (3) a chart entitled “Proposed Searches”, prepared by GSEHD in 2003 as a blueprint for achieving compliance with Article I.B.1. during a seven-year period; and (4) a chart entitled “Margin Comparison”, showing trends in the operating margins of GSEHD from Fiscal Year (FY) 2002 through FY 2007 (projected).

As shown by the “History of Lines” chart, the percentage of full-time GSEHD faculty serving in NTA positions has remained at about 40% during 1992-2005, with fluctuations between a low of 36% and a high of 44%. One positive note is that each of GSEHD’s three departments achieved the required 50% ratio of TA faculty in 2004 and 2005. In 2003, GSEHD developed a seven-year plan to bring its full-time faculty into full compliance with Article I.B.1., as shown in the “Proposed Searches” chart. However, as explained in Dean Futrell’s memorandum, GSEHD was not able to implement this plan due to budget constraints imposed by the University Administration. As reported on page 2 of Dean Futrell’s memorandum, Executive Vice President Lehman stated last fall that he does not expect GSEHD to achieve compliance with Article I.B.1. within the foreseeable future, due to “the financial state of the School” and his concerns about “the level of risk associated with the funding of tuition for students through training grants and the size of the overall School’s operating margin.”

Dean Futrell’s memorandum indicates that GSEHD currently has three vacant TA lines and four vacant NTA lines. GSEHD has not been able to fill these lines due to budget pullbacks ordered by the University Administration over the past three years. If all of those lines were filled, GSEHD would have 45 TA faculty and 29 NTA faculty,
which would leave the school with a 61%/39% ratio. Dean Futrell reported that, during its most recent accreditation review, GSEHD received a very positive evaluation but the accrediting body concluded that GSEHD needs about 10-12 additional full-time faculty to meet the reasonable requirements of its current student body (including support for the research conducted by its Ed.D. and Ph.D. candidates).

GSEHD has been consistently ranked among the top 25 graduate schools of education over the past decade and was rated 21st in the most recent rankings. As shown by the “Margin Comparison” chart, GSEHD’s operating margin has moved from deficits in FY 02 and FY 03 to increasingly positive results in FY 04, FY 05 and FY 06. In recent years, GSEHD has also obtained annual support of $17 - $20 million from research grants and other external funding. In remarks to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on April 28, 2006, Executive Vice President Lehman said that (i) GSEHD is not yet able to cover the overhead costs allocated by the University Administration to the school’s activities, and (ii) he has proposed the creation of a commission to review GSEHD’s current operations and to develop a plan to streamline the school’s programs and improve the school’s financial position.

Dean Futrell explained to our committee that the current constraints on the GSEHD’s ability to offer TA positions has undermined the school’s efforts to recruit the most promising candidates for faculty positions and to retain its most talented younger faculty members. In addition, GSEHD’s faculty recruitment and retention efforts are hampered by the relatively low salaries paid to its faculty, which fall below the 60th percentile in AAUP surveys. Our committee members believe that the University Administration should (i) give greater recognition and encouragement for the successful results achieved by GSEHD over the past decade and (ii) support GSEHD’s efforts to attract and retain highly-qualified faculty by expanding the number of TA positions and by increasing average full-time faculty salaries in GSEHD to at least the AAUP’s 60th percentile. We recognize that a period of up to seven years will be required for GSEHD to achieve compliance with Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code, but we urge the University Administration to establish full compliance as a firm objective to be accomplished not later than June 30, 2013. We also encourage the University’s Development Office to work closely with GSEHD’s development staff in identifying additional sources of external financial support for GSEHD’s programs.

Please let me know if you have any questions concerning this memorandum.

A.E.W., Jr.

cc: Dean Mary H. Futrell and Associate Dean Janet C. Heddesheimer
Members of the PEAF Committee
Date: April 17, 2006

To: Arthur E. Wilmart, Jr.
Chair, PEAF Committee

From: Mary H. Futrell, Dean
The Graduate School of Education and Human Development

Re: Request for Information Re: GSEHD Plan to Come into Compliance with Code Requirement for Ratio of Contract to Tenure Accruing Lines

I appreciate the opportunity to brief the members of the Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF) on GSEHD’s plan to come into compliance with the Article I.B.1. The article requires each school have no less than 50% of its faculty lines allocated to tenure accruing or tenured faculty and at the school level no less than 75% of its lines allocated to tenure accruing or tenured slots.

As dean, I have made concerted efforts since 2003 to move ahead with bringing The Graduate School of Education and Human Development (GSEHD) into compliance with the code requirement regarding tenure accruing lines. This initiative was prompted by a review of a history of our faculty lines going back to 1992. Over 11 years our school had consistently remained at a ratio of approximately 60% contract and 40% tenure accruing lines. I recognized that in an increasingly competitive market for new faculty and at a time when we began to raise the level of expectations for faculty scholarship we must be committed to increasing the number of tenure accruing lines. Thus, I approached the department chairs with the request to submit a plan for bringing us into compliance with the code. I have provided you with a copy of that initial plan.

Our attempts to fulfill that plan are documented in the faculty search plans for AY 2003-2004, 2004-2005, and 2005-2006. For each of those three academic years, V.P. Lehman has denied my requests to convert contract lines to tenure accruing, to grant us new lines, or to provide funds to support tenure accruing lines.

As we move into AY 2006-2007, our ratio shows no improvement. We will be at 42 TT or tenured lines vs. 25 NTT or non tenure accruing lines. The ratio of lines is 62% TT and 38% NTT in position control.

I acknowledge that we have three vacant tenure accruing lines to the added in AY 06-07. Not withstanding these vacant lines, we do not have the fiscal resources in the school to cover all three of these lines. The shortfall in available funds is a direct result of the numerous pull backs we have experienced in our budget over the past 3 years. Even if we were to fill these
lines along with the vacant contract lines—assuming our current searches are successful—we would still be out of compliance with the code on ratio of tenure accruing to non-tenure accruing lines. We have 74 lines in Position Control—45 TT and 29 NTT. This leaves us with a ratio of 61% TT and 39% NTT. Working from a base of 74 lines we would need to have 56 lines assigned to TT faculty, an increase of 11 from our current allotment, and a corresponding reduction of NTT lines—drop from 29 to 18.

The stance of VP Lehman is that he acknowledges that the school is out of compliance with the Faculty Code standard of a School having more than 75% of the regular-active-status faculty members in tenured + tenure accruing lines. This past fall he indicated that he does "...not expect the 75% standard being achieved owing to the financial state of the School." More specifically he expressed concern about "...the level of risk associated with the funding of tuition for students through training grants and the size of the overall School's operating margin..."

Our position is that we have made excellent progress in bringing our financial house in order. We have moved from a negative margin in FY 02 (-2.8%) and FY 03 (-1.5%) to a positive margin of 21.0% in FY 04 and 18.3% in FY 05. Our external funding expenditures were $16,166,515 in FY 05 indicating we remain very successful competing for external funding. Moreover, the prospect for remaining competitive is extremely high. For over a decade, GSEHD has been ranked continuously among the top 25 school of education in the country.

While we have made excellent progress in addressing the fiscal challenges in GSEHD and have continued success in securing external funding, we find that the limited number of tenure accruing lines continues to hinder our ability to maintain and improve the stature the school. In our recent NCATE visit, our Board of Examiners asked me about the number of lines needed to strengthen our programs. We have consistently lost faculty in contract lines who are moving to institutions where they can secure tenure accruing lines. Our most recent loss was a talented professor who was recruited to another university. The faculty member indicated that if we can secure a tenure accruing line, the person would apply to return to GWU.

My growing frustration as dean is that GSEHD appears to be consistently overlooked in our efforts to come into compliance with requirement of the Faculty Code to achieve a 75%/25% ratio of TT to NTT lines. The arguments put forth by denying us the opportunity to increase the number of tenure accruing lines in the school seem to apply only to our school. Other schools on campus have faced a mounting debt but are not similarly penalized with a lack of tenure accruing lines. We have a distinguished record of generating external funds—research as well as training funds—yet these are not considered when looking at the financial contributions of the school. We also have a distinguished record in being consistently ranked among the top 25 graduate schools of education. I am simply looking for equity for our school. Additional tenure accruing lines will provide an important tool to continue the progress we have made to date in creating a stellar school.

As dean, I have worked diligently to bring our case to the administration. To date, those efforts have met with no success. Any assistance the PEAF can provide with making a case for our coming into compliance would be much appreciated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>OLL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data received from Office of Institutional Research
School no more than 25% contact
Department no more than 50% contract
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DEL</th>
<th>CHOS</th>
<th>TPSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03-04</td>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>HRD</td>
<td>SED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEA</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>Delta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TT conversion/CFCF</td>
<td>TT conversion</td>
<td>CFCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFCF Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>ETL</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TT conversion</td>
<td>HRD</td>
<td>FL-ESL-BISPED Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TT conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TT conversion/CFCF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TT conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-06</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TT Conversion/CFCF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TT - refill line after retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TT conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4/17/06
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY02</th>
<th>FY03</th>
<th>FY04</th>
<th>FY05</th>
<th>FY04</th>
<th>FY07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Campus Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td>5,463,841</td>
<td>5,460,949</td>
<td>5,362,547</td>
<td>9,407,070</td>
<td>9,885,391</td>
<td>7,041,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Campus Summer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Campus Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td>5,944,042</td>
<td>5,551,386</td>
<td>7,242,169</td>
<td>7,034,167</td>
<td>8,574,545</td>
<td>5,724,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Campus (base)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Base Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TUITION &amp; FEES</strong></td>
<td>11,407,883</td>
<td>11,012,335</td>
<td>13,104,716</td>
<td>16,441,237</td>
<td>21,423,106</td>
<td>19,067,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Campus</td>
<td>9,163,816</td>
<td>9,281,405</td>
<td>9,518,599</td>
<td>10,491,237</td>
<td>10,415,402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Campus</td>
<td>3,191,262</td>
<td>3,158,507</td>
<td>3,152,069</td>
<td>3,125,665</td>
<td>4,518,601</td>
<td>3,058,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Campus (base)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>12,355,078</td>
<td>12,439,912</td>
<td>12,650,608</td>
<td>13,617,302</td>
<td>17,932,214</td>
<td>16,546,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROSS MARGIN (excl/sum)</strong></td>
<td>944,095</td>
<td>1,472,577</td>
<td>456,108</td>
<td>3,024,935</td>
<td>4,230,886</td>
<td>2,473,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Margin % (excl/sum)</td>
<td>-30.3%</td>
<td>-12.9%</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>-12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROSS MARGIN Variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance Prior Year ($)</td>
<td>477,582</td>
<td>1,876,685</td>
<td>2,570,127</td>
<td>1,206,651</td>
<td>(1,557,411)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance Prior Year (%)</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>131.9%</td>
<td>566.0%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>-41.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance 5-year ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance 5-year (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance 6-year ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance 6-year (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Revenue</td>
<td>1,785,779</td>
<td>2,165,265</td>
<td>2,241,684</td>
<td>2,032,272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Expense</td>
<td>420,947</td>
<td>400,384</td>
<td>352,628</td>
<td>360,572</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMER MARGIN</strong></td>
<td>1,364,832</td>
<td>1,764,881</td>
<td>1,889,056</td>
<td>1,671,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-End Close Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARGIN SURPLUS/DEFICIT</strong></td>
<td>944,095</td>
<td>(1,222,577)</td>
<td>1,819,940</td>
<td>3,024,235</td>
<td>4,230,886</td>
<td>2,473,048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REVENUE**
- Non-Base (Other)
- Non-Base (Virginia Campus)

**EXPENSE**
- Non-Base (Other)
- Non-Base (Virginia Campus)

**GROSS MARGIN (Non-Base)**
- 620,864
- 1,259,301
- 934,425
- 17,041

**MARGIN (Total Return)**
- -2.8%
- -1.5%
- 21.0%
- 18.3%
- 0.0%
- 0.0%
MEMORANDUM

TO: Prof. Lilien F. Robinson
Chair, Faculty Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Prof. Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr.
Chair, Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF)

RE: Meeting with Dean Ruth J. Katz, School of Public Health and Health Services (SPHHS)

DATE: May 29, 2006

As requested in your memorandum dated February 21, 2006, members of the PEAF Committee met with Dean Ruth J. Katz on May 8, 2006. The principal purpose of the meeting was to discuss plans by SPHHS to achieve compliance with Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code. Faculty Senate Resolution 01/11, adopted on April 12, 2002, called upon SPHHS to develop a plan to bring that School and each of its departments into compliance with Article I.B.1. not later than the beginning of the Fall 2007 semester. The University Administration’s response to Resolution 01/11 stated that the “Administration accedes in principle and will endeavor to achieve the outcome requested but believes that a 10 year horizon is more plausible”. Copies of Resolution 01/11 and the response of the Administration are attached to this memorandum.

Dean Katz provided a chart showing the number of regular, active-status faculty at SPHHS and its seven departments from 2002 through 2006. That chart (copy attached) indicates that the total number of regular, active-status faculty members at SPHHS has increased from 37 to 50 during 2002-06. During the same period, the number of faculty in tenure-accruing (TA) positions has grown from 13 to 20. As a result, the percentage of TA faculty has risen slightly from 35% to 40% but remains far below the 75% school-wide requirement established by Article I.B.1. In addition, the percentage of TA faculty in six of SPHHS’ seven departments is less than the 50% departmental requirement established by Article I.B.1. Two departments currently have no TA faculty.

When Dean Katz arrived at SPHHS in the fall of 2003, five of the seven departments had acting chairs. She has focused a great deal of her faculty recruitment efforts on appointing new chairs to head those five departments, because she believes that new chairs will serve as catalysts for attracting talented new junior faculty members. Thus far, three new department chairs have been appointed, and nationwide searches are in process for the other two chairs. However, only one of the three new chairs was given tenure, and the other two chairs were appointed to non-tenure-accruing (NTA) positions. Members of the PEAF Committee expressed disappointment that all three chairs did not receive tenure. In the Committee’s view, department chairs cannot provide the requisite academic leadership and cannot operate with the desired independence within the
University’s framework of shared governance if they are not deemed worthy of tenure and are not given the protections of tenure.

Dean Katz stated that the financial position of SPHHS limits the School’s ability to appoint faculty to TA positions. The School currently derives about two-thirds of its funding from tuition and the remaining third from research grants. More than three-quarters of the full-time faculty are supported in whole or in part by research grants. Dean Katz explained that SPHHS has adopted a conscious strategy of working closely with public health agencies in the Washington metropolitan area. Several SPHHS faculty members currently work with the D.C. Department of Public Health under contracts with that agency. The work of those faculty members is expected to produce experiential databases in the fields of HIV/AIDS, Medicare, Medicaid, and other areas. Dean Katz believes that the generation of these databases will support the work of SPHHS’s research-active faculty. SPHHS is currently considering the establishment of clinical faculty positions to increase the School’s involvement in such partnerships with public health agencies. Dean Katz also explained that the top priority of SPHHS is to move forward with plans to construct a new wing on Ross Hall in order to provide SPHHS with a unified facility for its educational and administrative functions.

Looking forward, Dean Katz said that SPHHS currently plans to recruit twelve new full-time faculty members during the next 3-4 years. Dean Katz stated that she could not make any firm predictions as to the number of these new faculty members who will be appointed to TA positions. If all twelve of the projected new faculty members were appointed to TA positions, the percentage of TA faculty in SPHHS would be slightly higher than 50% (32 TA faculty compared to the existing 30 NTA faculty). Of course, that percentage would be lower if some of the new faculty members were appointed to NTA positions. The Committee notes that this 3-4 year period would end at about 2010, eight years after the adoption of Faculty Senate Resolution 01/11 and quite close to the “10 year horizon” suggested by the University Administration as a time period for compliance with Article I.B.1.in its response to Resolution 01/11.

Dean Katz did not offer any prediction as to when SPHHS could reasonably expect to comply with the requirements of Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code. Committee members concluded that such compliance will not occur within the foreseeable future unless there is a very significant shift in the current trajectory of faculty hiring at SPHHS. In this regard, members expressed concern about the evident lack of any hiring plan with specific goals and benchmarks for increasing the percentage of TA faculty in SPHHS. Committee members also noted that the reliance of SPHHS on teaching by adjunct faculty appears to have increased significantly during the past five years. According to Executive Vice President Lehman’s report to the Faculty Senate in February, entitled “State of Academic Affairs,” the number of limited-service faculty teaching at SPHHS (excluding research and visiting faculty) increased from 180 to 232 during 2001-05. On both a numerical and percentage basis, SPHHS recorded the largest increase in limited-service faculty during this period. Committee members are concerned that this large increase in limited-service faculty, viewed in combination with the relatively low
percentage of TA faculty at SPHHS, could potentially raise questions about the overall commitment to top-quality teaching at SPHHS.

cc:  Dean Ruth J. Katz
     Executive Vice President Donald R. Lehman
A RESOLUTION TO BRING THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND HEALTH SERVICES INTO COMPLIANCE WITH THE FACULTY CODE WITH RESPECT TO TENURED AND TENURE-ACCRUING APPOINTMENTS FOR REGULAR, ACTIVE-STATUS FACULTY (01/11)

WHEREAS, the Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure (1940, as amended), adopted jointly by the Association of American Colleges and Universities and the American Association of University Professors, recognizes that tenure ensures “freedom of teaching and research” and is therefore “indispensable to the success of an institution [of higher education] in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society”;

WHEREAS, Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code requires that no fewer than 75% of the regular, active-status faculty members in each school must be either tenured or have tenure-accruing appointments, except for (i) faculty in the Law School and (ii) faculty in the Medical Center who are “stationed at affiliated institutions”; and

WHEREAS, Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code requires that no fewer than 50% of the regular, active-status faculty members in each department must be either tenured or have tenure-accruing appointments, except for (i) faculty in the Law School and (ii) faculty in the Medical Center who are “stationed at affiliated institutions”; and

WHEREAS, the foregoing provisions of Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code are intended to ensure that most faculty members will have the opportunity to obtain tenured status and, accordingly, will have strong incentives to achieve excellence in teaching, engage in research and produce scholarly works while maintaining appropriate standards of scholarly rigor, independence and objectivity; and

WHEREAS, the School of Public Health and Health Services (“SPHHS”) is a school that is subject, without exception, to the requirements of Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code; and

WHEREAS, the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (“PEAF”) of the Faculty Senate has studied the composition of the regular, active-status faculty of SPHHS; and

WHEREAS, the PEAF Committee has determined that SPHHS and almost all of its departments are out of compliance with the foregoing provisions of Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code, because at present (i) less than 40% of the regular, active-status faculty members of SPHHS are tenured, (ii) none of the regular, active-status faculty members of SPHHS has a tenure-accruing appointment, and (iii) except in one department, a majority of the regular, active-status faculty members in each of the departments of SPHHS do not have either tenured or tenure-accruing appointments;
WHEREAS, the PEAF Committee has determined that SPHHS and almost all of its departments have been out of compliance with the foregoing provisions of Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code since SPHHS was established in 1997;

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

1. That the Dean of SPHHS shall take immediate steps to develop a plan that will bring SPHHS and each of its departments into compliance with Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code.

2. That such plan shall be developed in consultation with the faculty of SPHHS and shall be completed and adopted by SPHHS not later than the end of the Fall semester of 2002.

3. That such plan shall bring SPHHS and each of its departments into compliance with Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code not later than the beginning of the Fall semester of 2007.

4. That, beginning in January 2003, the Dean of SPHHS shall provide annual reports to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate regarding the progress made by SPHHS and each of its departments in achieving compliance with Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code in accordance with this resolution.

Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom of the Faculty Senate
March 5, 2002

Adopted, 4/12/02
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>Title of Resolution</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Response of Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/8</td>
<td>3/8/02</td>
<td>Resolution to Establish a GW Film Festival</td>
<td>Adopted 3/8/02</td>
<td>Okay subject to external funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/9</td>
<td>3/8/02</td>
<td>A Resolution Regarding the Administration’s Establishment of a “Compliance Line”</td>
<td>Adopted 3/8/02</td>
<td>See Resolution No. 01-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/10</td>
<td>4/12/02</td>
<td>A Resolution to Develop a Revised Student Evaluation of Courses</td>
<td>Adopted, as amended 4/12/02</td>
<td>We accede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/11</td>
<td>4/12/02</td>
<td>A Resolution to Bring the School of Public Health and Health Services into Compliance with the Faculty Code with Respect to Tenured and Tenure-Accruing Appointments for Regular, Active-Status Faculty</td>
<td>Adopted 4/12/02</td>
<td>Administration accedes in principle and will endeavor to achieve the outcome requested but believes that a 10 year horizon is more plausible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12</td>
<td>4/12/02</td>
<td>A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Code of The George Washington University with Respect to the College of Professional Studies</td>
<td>Adopted, as amended 4/12/02</td>
<td>Okay - Approved by Board of Trustees May 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/13</td>
<td>4/12/02</td>
<td>A Resolution Requesting Administrative Action on the Implementation of the Faculty Senate’s Resolution on the Establishment of a “Compliance Line”</td>
<td>Adopted 4/12/02</td>
<td>Faculty/Administration drafted document, completed and submitted to the Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Tenured / Tenure-Track 2002</td>
<td>Tenured / Tenure-Track Nov 2004</td>
<td>Tenured / Tenure-Track July 2006 (projected)</td>
<td>Total Faculty with Regular Appointments 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental and Occupational Health</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiology and Biostatistics</td>
<td>3 / 0</td>
<td>3 / 0</td>
<td>4 / 0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Science</td>
<td>Not a Department in 2002</td>
<td>1 / 0</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>Not a Department in 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Health</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Policy</td>
<td>Not a Department in 2002</td>
<td>3 / 0</td>
<td>4 / 1</td>
<td>Not a Department in 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services Management and Leadership</td>
<td>5 / 0</td>
<td>2 / 1</td>
<td>2 / 0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention and Community Health</td>
<td>4 / 0</td>
<td>4 / 2</td>
<td>4 / 4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13 / 0</td>
<td>15 / 4</td>
<td>15 / 5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report date: 5/5/06
The Joint Committee of Faculty and Students (JCFS) met six times during the fall 2005 and spring 2006 semesters. The following items were addressed:

STUDENT REPRESENTATION ON THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The JCFS discussed the possibility of a resolution advocating the addition of a student Trustee to the GW Board of Trustees. The Student Senate passed a resolution with its position on this issue, and asked support for it from the JCFS and from the Faculty Senate. The resolution was adopted by the JCFS and was sent to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. The resolution came to the floor at the May meeting of the Faculty Senate, where it was not supported by the faculty.

GW NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY

Members of the GW Out Crowd attended meetings of the JCFS and brought information regarding the inclusion of gender identity in the language of the current university nondiscrimination policy. The April meeting included a discussion with the General Counsel’s office. The District of Columbia passed an amendment to the Human Rights Act including the term gender identity or expression, and the university will make a similar amendment to conform to the District’s revised legislative language.

TASK FORCE ON 4 X 4 CURRICULAR CHANGE

JCFS members participated in discussions of the university task force studying the possibility of a 4 x 4 curricular change. They reported back to the JCFS throughout the year. A final report was pending when the academic year ended.

JCFS STUDENT LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT SCHOLARSHIP

JCFS members participated in drafting criteria for applications for the scholarship, and provided feedback for improving the implementation of the application review and award process.

OTHER ISSUES DISCUSSED

- Possible major in Africana Studies. Sent for further discussion to the Elliott School of International Affairs Curriculum Committee.
- Academic Bill of Rights was discussed with no action taken.
- Review of the Academic Code of Integrity was remanded to next year.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEXT YEAR:

- Follow-up on 4 x 4 task force
- Follow-up on amendment to nondiscrimination policy
- Review the Code of Academic Integrity