CALL TO ORDER

The Assembly was called to order by President Knapp at 4:05 p.m. He welcomed all of the members of the Assembly and extended a special welcome to the new faculty members present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular Faculty Assembly meeting held on September 10, 2007, were approved as distributed.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION (FA 08/1), “A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN WITH REGARD TO THE COMPOSITION OF THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE”

On behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr., Chair, introduced Resolution FA 08/1. He noted that the text of the Resolution proposes a technical change to Article III, Section 5, subsection (b) of the Faculty Organization Plan and conforms the language of the fourth sentence of this section so that the subsection’s language reflects the present size of the Executive Committee, which consists of eight (rather than seven) faculty members. This change was approved by the Faculty Senate at its meeting on September 12, 2008 by the adoption of Resolution 08/3 and the change now requires approval by the Assembly. Professor Wilmarth moved adoption of the Resolution, and, there being no discussion on or questions about the Resolution, a vote was taken, and Resolution FA 08/1 was adopted by unanimous vote. (Resolution FA 08/1 is attached.)

INTRODUCTION OF NEWLY APPOINTED FACULTY MEMBERS

Donald R. Lehman, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, welcomed faculty members new to the University, and called upon those present by School to introduce themselves to the Assembly, asking that they describe their appointment and say a few words about their interest in scholarship, research, and/or teaching at the University.

ANNOUNCEMENT AND PRESENTATION OF THE BENDER TEACHING AWARDS

Before presenting the Awards, Vice President Lehman informed the Assembly that the Bender Teaching Awards, endowed by friend of the University Morton Bender,
recognize teaching excellence at GW. Recipients receive a $500 prize to be used for travel to a professional meeting, the purchase of equipment, or some other activity related to faculty development. The recipients are selected by a committee of faculty each spring semester based on letters of support from students and faculty, student teaching evaluations, and examples of teaching materials and completed student work. The following faculty members each received a Bender Teaching Award in the indicated category and the text of the citations appears below.

Michael King, Chemistry
Award Category: Innovative Use of Technology

Michael King has led the Department of Chemistry at The George Washington University as Chair since July of 1996, and has worked as a Professor at GW since 1973. He received his B.S. in Chemistry from the Illinois Institute of Technology in 1966 followed by a Master of Arts and Ph.D. in Chemistry from Harvard University which he earned in 1967 and 1970, respectively. His research focuses largely on the organic synthesis of molecules of biological interest and applications of stereo population control. King was a recipient of the Trachtenberg Prize for Service in 2003 and has served as a CCAS Marshal for over 14 years.

Among the many praises of Professor King, a departmental colleague writes that he “has been inspiration to us as faculty members, he has also ‘led by example’ in his ability to maintain a top-notch commitment to teaching while chairing a department through a period of unprecedented change.”

Professor King is also highly respected and well-liked by his students. One student writes that, “he pushed me to challenge myself intellectually and in the end I had not only a grade to prove my comprehension, but fundamental knowledge I could carry with me to other science classes.” Another writes that, “Professor King truly cares about his students, and knows all of those that come to him by name – not an easy feat, by any means. This is a professor who I will never forget as long as I am here at GW.”

Alumni who have moved on to study medicine at The George Washington University School of Medicine agree. As one student wrote, “Professor King’s devotion to his students is quite remarkable. To this day, we still appreciate his interest and dedication towards the quality of education inside and outside of the classroom. Students across the country should be as fortunate to have a professor like Michael King”.

Steven Kelts, Department of Political Science
Award category: General Teaching

Steven Kelts received his A.B. in Government in 1994 from Harvard College and completed his Ph.D. in Political Science in 2002 at Stanford University. He has been an Assistant Professor of Political Science at The George Washington University since 2003 and is the Director of the Residential Politics and Values Program. Professor Kelts specializes in theories of liberty, and his research spans historical and contemporary philosophies of self-government, especially non-liberal conceptions of liberty. He is also active in Student Life. Last year he led a group of students to New Orleans on "Alternative Spring Break" to assist Hurricane Katrina victims.
Kelts’ colleagues speak of his commitment to his students and incessant enthusiasm. One writes: “To say that he has done an outstanding job since his arrival at GW would be quite the understatement. His students love him. He cares enormously about them. And he directs the program in a rigorous but humane fashion that all programs at GW would do well to emulate.” Another applauds Kelts’ writing: “He applies the highest standards to himself and conveys these to his students. He injects an enormous amount of energy and discipline into his classes, though with grace and humor. Balancing both rigor and seriousness of purpose and a kind of playfulness so that students feel like they want to be there in the class learning is a remarkable talent, and Steven has this talent in abundance.” In regard to his teaching methods and his students, “Steven is utterly in command of the material and effortlessly weaves together legal reasoning across numerous cases and broader issues of political moral judgment.”

Kelts’ students express no less enthusiasm than his colleagues. One student writes, “At the beginning of the course, Politics and Values, he tells students, that by the end, they will be able to write at a master’s level and he will help them in any way he can, with whatever they want to do in life. I have never heard truer words from another teacher. His class was very challenging, but in the four semesters I have been at GW so far, no one has made a greater or more positive impact on my education.” Another student writes, “What I believe truly sets Professor Kelts apart from other professors is his tireless commitment to students…He is much more than just a professor, he is a mentor for students. His classes are excellent, but his commitment to students goes above and beyond excellence.”

Lauren Sallinger, University Writing Program
Award Category: Part-Time Teaching

After receiving a B.A. from Harvard University in English and American Literature and Language in 1995, Lauren Sallinger earned her M.A. in nonfiction writing from the Writing Seminars at Johns Hopkins University in 2002. Lauren began teaching at GW as an Adjunct Instructor in Writing in the University Writing Program in the Fall of 2006. Her central research is on Middle East politics, particularly the intersection of religion and politics.

One of Lauren’s colleagues notes that “Lauren’s students were genuinely attached to her. Her classroom persona is much like her personality outside of class: Lauren is sincere, sweet-natured, and patient with her students. She treats her students with respect, and they respect her in turn. The class atmosphere was trusting and amicable; they all clearly have a good rapport with Lauren and with each other.” Another colleague writes: “Her teaching is engaging and thoughtful; her class exercises a focus on making the relevance of what she is teaching visible to the students; and her student evaluations have consistently been among the strongest in the program.” And still another colleague writes that “Lauren’s University Writing 20 class, “Imagining America; Social reflection and the Politics of Place,” encourages students to look at the way that activists use language to try to change the world….it encourages students to study writing not only as readers and critics but also as aspiring writers themselves: the skillful use of language is the object of study, the method through which the object is studied, and the goal.”
One student writes that, “Professor Sallinger is a rare type of professor who goes beyond classroom basics and fully educates her students, not just through books but through first-hand experience as well. She encouraged us to explore this cultural Mecca that is Washington, D.C. She shared stories of her travels to the Middle East and her personal experiences with protests, showing us that the outside world is an exciting place and that we can all make a difference if we make our voices heard…She has left a lasting impression on me that will positively influence my future, and I am sure that many of her other students share my sentiments.”

Maria De La Fuente, Romance Languages  
Award Category: Innovative Use of Technology

A native of Spain, María de la Fuente earned her B.S. and M.A. at the University of Salamanca in Spain before graduating from Georgetown University in 1988 with a Ph.D. in Spanish and Second Language Acquisition. Her research focuses in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), in particular classroom or instructed SLA, and instructional technology; the results of her research can be found in academic journals such as The Modern Language Journal and Studies in Second Language Acquisition. She has been working at GW since 2006 as an Associate Professor of Spanish and is also the Deputy Director of the GW Language Center.

Professor de la Fuente has astounding accomplishments both with her students, and colleagues. She has involved herself not merely in teaching, but also administrative and publishing aspects of the department such as effectively linking the Language Center and Spanish Program, overhauling the entire curriculum, teaching workshops on state-of-the-art pedagogy, and publishing her research and a Basic Spanish textbook, Gente, which is already in its second edition.

On de la Fuente’s innovative use of technology, one colleague describes class with, “IPods, ITunes, computer-based class management programs, digitalized video materials, and cultural Power Points...she is able to exploit all these diverse technologies in a relevant, substantive, and meaningful way that genuinely benefited the students’ motivation and their learning of Spanish. Her distinctive mastery of both teaching and technology allows her to reach the technological world the students live in and bring its infinite possibilities to the foreign language classroom.” One colleague lauds de la Fuente, writing that “in all my years teaching Spanish, both at GW and elsewhere, I have never worked with a professor more dedicated, rigorous, generous, and passionate as Professor de la Fuente.”

Students agree with de la Fuente's colleagues regarding her teaching style, “Professor Maria de la Fuente clearly spends a significant amount of her time and energy looking for new approaches to classical problems of education and sets the example for teachers looking to employ the abundant resource of technology.” Another student writes “Professor de la Fuente has made Spanish culture much more interesting and easier to understand and relate to because we frequently watch video clips on the different aspects of culture in the South American countries.”
Alexander Dent, Anthropology
Award category: General Teaching

Alexander Dent received his B.A. in Anthropology in 1993 from Princeton University before
earning his M.A. in 1998 and Ph.D. in 2003 from the University of Chicago, also in
Anthropology. Since 2005, Professor Dent has been an Associate Professor of Anthropology
and International Affairs at GW. He specializes in popular culture, language and the media,
ethnography of performance, and intellectual property. He has also done extensive
fieldwork in Brazil, and comparative work in the United States in New Jersey, Oklahoma,
Chicago, and Washington, DC.

Of Professor Dent's numerous commendable qualities, one colleague writes that, “Alex's
innovative cutting-edge interests in new media technology and in intellectual property
issues strike a chord with our students. He has an unusual ability to relate classic theory to
contemporary issues, leading students to seek his mentorship on their own original research
projects.”

One of Professor Dent's students writes of his course, Peoples of Central and South
America, “Professor Dent was amazing! He is one of my favorite professors at GW. I
enjoyed the course and was very impressed with his knowledge about everything that is
“Latin America.” He answered every question very clearly, and if he did not know the
answer he looked it up between classes and brought it up during the next lecture. Trust me,
not many professors do this.” Another writes, “This is the best class I've taken at GW.
Professor Dent is amazing. He is intelligent, insightful, accessible and interesting. Our
class met once a week for two and a half hours, and I never felt the urge to check my watch.
You can tell that Dent is a great person through and through and that his students are of
utmost importance to him.”

Current alumni: “Alexander Dent is a dynamic and effective teacher who cultivates
rewarding intellectual relationships with his students that transcend his courses,” writes one
alumnus. Another observes, “Professor Dent's enthusiasm for teaching has solidified my
dedication to the discipline and has made me want to seriously pursue anthropology as a
career. He is an excellent example of how professors should inspire their students and
encourage them to meaningfully explore their interests.”

Unfortunately, Alex is unable to be here today, but noted, “My absence from the ceremony
does not jibe with my happiness at receiving this award.” Accepting the award on his behalf
is Chair of the Anthropology Department, Catherine Allen.

Derek Malone-France, University Writing Program
Award Category: Full-Time, Non-Tenured Teaching

Derek Malone-France has been working at GW since 2005 as an Assistant Professor of
Writing teaching in the University Writing Program. Professor Malone-France received his
B.A. in Philosophy in 1995 from Wofford College and his Ph.D. in Religion from the
Claremont Graduate University in 2001. He has published many articles, in addition to his
first book, Deep Empiricism: Kant, Whitehead, and the Necessity of Philosophical Theism,
which was published in 2006. He has just completed the first volume of a two-volume
edited anthology of *The Global Literature of Political Dissent*, to be published in spring of 2009.

Comments and reviews from colleagues and students alike convey a glowing and enthusiastic picture of Derek Malone-France. His teaching is described by a colleague as “innovative, challenging, and rigorous,” while a student’s evaluation states that, “Professor Malone-France is the ideal professor: knowledgeable caring, challenging, and fair.”

Another colleague observes, “Professor Malone-France is not just an exemplary professor, he also embodies the very qualities he asks of his students – diligence with care, intellectual rigor with curiosity, and dedication with discovery – to show through truly authentic example, as the best teachers in our lives do, the excitement and deep value that can come of the active life of the mind...knowledge is a great gift to students.

Student praise does not lag behind that of colleagues as one student writes, “Despite the innate difficulty of studying the subject, Philosophical Explanations of Religion, Professor Malone-France makes his students want to come in and participate day after day. He does this by recognizing and respecting his students as intellectuals.” Students continuously praise his innovative and motivating University Writing-20 course and his personal integrity. One student writes of his “respect for Professor Malone-France not only as a professor, but also as a person...his quality of character is truly admirable.”

REPORT ON MIDDLE STATES REACCREDITATION

Vice President Lehman presented his report on the University’s successful reaccreditation process. (The report is enclosed.)

BRIEF REMARKS AND INTRODUCTION OF EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND TREASURER LOUIS H. KATZ

Before introducing Executive Vice President and Treasurer Katz, President Knapp made several brief remarks. In response to Vice President Lehman’s Report, President Knapp thanked the many colleagues who were involved in producing an outstanding report for the Middle States accreditation process. He said he thought the issue of the assessment of learning standards is of particular importance, and is one in which the federal government has taken considerable interest. He added that he thought the opportunity to take a serious look at this issue is timely and dovetails nicely with the process begun by the Faculty Senate this year to examine the curriculum thoroughly. This is a faculty-driven process that will allow a system to be designed that closely relates to the faculty’s goals as teachers and researchers.

The President noted that this is an exciting year in the nation’s capital with a presidential election and inauguration looming. In recognition of these important events, GW has adopted the theme of “American Transition” to organize a series of campus events. The kickoff event occurred on September 15, 2008, when five former Secretaries of State -- Madeleine K. Albright, James A. Baker, III, Warren Christopher, Henry Kissinger, and GW alumnus Colin Powell – gathered in Lisner Auditorium to discuss international issues facing the next presidential administration. Christiane Amanpour, CNN’s chief international
correspondent, and GW's Frank Sesno moderated the panel, titled "The Next President: A World of Challenges." The program was attended by over 1,500 people and broadcast by CNN. It was rated number one nationally and internationally. Students lined up at 5 a.m. to collect their tickets a week before the event. This is indicative of the spirit of engagement on the part of GW students who have chosen to pursue their studies here in the nation's capital. Another event which was received favorably was a forum held in the Marvin Center to discuss the presidential campaigns. This was presented by faculty in the Graduate School of Political Management as part of the finale of Alumni Weekend, and it was very well received.

President Knapp touched briefly on two themes that were prominent in his first year at the University – sustainability and public service. Upon his arrival at GW, President Knapp reported that he had appointed a Sustainability Task Force under the leadership of Professor Mark Starik from the School of Business. He led a very strong team of students and staff to examine best institutional practices, explore GW’s opportunity for improving its own processes, and ways to reduce energy and the University's carbon footprint while at the same time developing new academic opportunities. One result of the Task Force’s report was the creation of the Sustainability Office. This Office is operating with a skeleton staff while a search for a director is in progress.

President Knapp also said that he was the first university president to sign the American College & University College Presidents’ Commitment on Climate Change, which pledges participants to do an inventory of all the ways in which institutions can reduce greenhouse gases. Other notable sustainability initiatives include the launch of the Institute for the Analysis of Solar Energy in Columbian College, which garnered both corporate and individual support. GW’s also performs work related to alternative fuels at the Virginia campus, and its programs in environmental law already address sustainable development. Also in the near future, a symposium will be held at which the University and the District of Columbia government will discuss environmental initiatives and taking a leadership role in urban sustainability. Sustainability is a global issue to which nearly every field of inquiry at the University relates, and it is a subject about which students are passionate.

In the area of public service, the President observed that GW offers an extraordinary range of opportunities for students. Research conducted at GW addresses real-world problems, and the faculty is educating future leaders who will address those problems. President Knapp pointed with pride to the GW Law School, which has just established a newly created position of Associate Dean for Public Interest and Public Service Law. A generous gift of $3 million from the Annette M. and Theodore N. Lerner Family Foundation has endowed this new position, which will help GW build on the long-standing tradition of the Law School’s involvement in establishing free clinics and other opportunities to systematically develop new pathways for students to enter careers in public service and public interest law while they are studying here.

All of these initiatives, and there are many others, serve GW’s largest aspiration, which is to continue the pursuit of academic excellence and become the premier research University at the center of the larger capital region. President Knapp announced that a search is currently underway for a Vice President for Research, a position which will give
cabinet level status to a function which is critical to the aggressive pursuit of this goal. The University seeks someone at the top of the organization to look at the research enterprise strategically across the entire University. This includes the entire range of fields in which GW scholars are intellectually active and in which creative contributions are made, not just in the “hard sciences.”

An inseparable piece of the effort to improve the excellence of GW’s academic programs in all of their dimensions includes the caliber of students who are selected and choose to study at GW. President Knapp said that information had just been compiled about the University’s admissions strategy. A summary report was distributed at the Assembly on this topic (the report is attached). President Knapp said he thought it was evident in the information presented about GW undergraduates that applications have increased significantly over time, and there have been dramatic increases in test scores and class standing, all of which speak to the steadily improving quality of the student body.

In conclusion, the President reported that in the last six months, GW received two of the largest monetary gifts the University has ever received, and he expressed his enormous appreciation for the donor's generosity. The first, from the Smith and Kogod families, is a $10 million challenge grant for the renovation of the Charles E. Smith Center, which serves not only as an athletic facility but is also a gathering place for commencement ceremonies and many other events of communal importance during the academic year.

Dr. Cyrus and Myrtle Katzen very generously provided $10 million for the creation of the Katzen Cancer Research Center, a most welcome and timely gift. President Knapp said that Dr. Katzen was explicit in remarking that part of the inspiration for his decision to provide this very substantial donation was the example of the Smith and Kogod families.

UPDATE ON THE UNIVERSITY’S CAMPUS PLAN

Vice President Katz presented his report, which is enclosed.

REMARKS BY THE CHAIR OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

On behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr., Chair, presented his report to the Assembly. (The report is enclosed.)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Assembly, President Knapp adjourned the meeting at 5:55 p.m. after inviting everyone to the reception immediately following in the Brady Art Gallery.

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary
A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN WITH REGARD TO THE COMPOSITION OF THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (FA 08/1))

WHEREAS, Article III, Section 5, subsection (b) of the Faculty Organization Plan currently provides that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee consists of eight faculty members of the Faculty Senate. However, a technical amendment is needed to conform the text of the fourth sentence of Article III, Section 5(b) to the present size of the Executive Committee; NOW, THEREFORE,

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

(1) That the fourth sentence of Article III, Section 5, subsection (b) of the Faculty Organization Plan be amended to read as follows:

“The Chairman shall be elected first by the Senate; and the Senate shall thereafter elect the other seven elective members of the Executive Committee, subject to the restriction that the Executive Committee may not include two or more members who have been elected to the Senate by the same school or faculty group.”

(2) That the President, as Chairman of the Faculty Assembly, is petitioned to place on the agenda of the Faculty Assembly at its meeting on October 3, 2008, the foregoing proposed amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan.

(3) That, upon approval by the Faculty Assembly, the President is requested to forward the foregoing proposed amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan for final approval by the Board of Trustees as soon as conveniently possible.

THE WORDING OF THE AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY FA 08/1 IS IDENTICAL TO THAT PROPOSED BY SENATE RESOLUTION 08/3, WHICH WAS INTRODUCED AND ADOPTED AT THE SEPTEMBER 12, 2008 MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Adopted by the Faculty Assembly, October 3, 2008
## FRESHMAN CLASS STATISTICS
### 1990 THROUGH 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>6,104</td>
<td>10,356</td>
<td>16,910</td>
<td>19,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Rate</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculants</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>2,292</td>
<td>2,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Average*</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>1277**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in top 10% of high school class</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in top 20% of high school class</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For consistency only math and verbal sections of the SAT averages are compared

** The SAT average for 2008 reflects the new more difficult SAT

Statistics for 2008 are current through September 12, 2008

*Source: Senior Vice President for Student and Academic Support Services/Undergraduate Admissions*
Middle States Reaccreditation

The George Washington University
2008 Reaccreditation Report
and
Action of the Commission

Middle States Commission Action on 26 June 2008
Presentation to the Faculty Assembly
by
Executive VP for Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman
3 October 2008

The components of my talk about our Middle States Reaccreditation review, which took place during this past academic year (2007-08), are the following:

1.) Preparing for the Visiting Team Visit
2.) Developing the Self Study Document
3.) Understanding the MSCHE Standards for Accreditation
4.) Reviewing the Recommendations of the Visiting Team
5.) Conveying the Commission Action
6.) Acting on the Recommendations of the Visiting Team
Preparation for the Accreditation Review

- Background
  * Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE)
  * Last affirmation of accreditation in 2003 through the (midpoint) Periodic Review Report
  * Last decennial review and affirmation of accreditation in 1998

GW is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, which is one of the nation’s regional accreditors.

Last affirmation of accreditation took place after our submission of the required MSCHE Periodic Review Report. The Periodic Review happens in the 5th year of a ten-year accreditation period. Specifically, this review took place for GW in 2003.

The last decennial review took place in 1998, at which time we chose and were approved to use the Self Study format.
Preparation for the Accreditation Review

- Steering Committee (25 members)
- Steering Committee Chair – Forrest Maltzman, Chair and Professor of Political Science
- Co-chairs: Initially – Craig Linebaugh
  From 9/17/07 – Cheryl Beil
- Selected Topics model of the MSCHE

For the current reaccreditation review, we again requested to use the Self Study format and were granted permission to do so. To oversee the project of completing the Self Study project, we formed a University-level Steering Committee. The chair of the Steering Committee was Forrest Maltzman with Craig Linebaugh and Cheryl Beil sequentially sharing the co-chair position of the committee.
Preparation for the Accreditation Review

- Self Study focused on the implementation of the University’s *Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence: Sustaining Momentum, Maximizing Strength (SPAE)*
- Self Study design that mapped the six goals of the *SPAE* against the **four** planning and assessment standards of the MSCHE’s **fourteen** standards
- Six working groups to address each of the six goals of the *SPAE*

The Self Study project focused on the implementation of and the progress made on the goals of the University’s Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence.

Four of the fourteen MSCHE standards were addressed through the work on the six goals of the SPAE.

Each working group produced a detailed report on the goal they were reviewing. These six reports became six chapters in the final Self Study document.
The Self Study document is an extensive review of the progress made on the SPAE. The six core chapters address all six of the goals of the SPAE. The content of each of these chapters is thorough in its depth and frank in its presentation, especially with respect to what has been accomplished, what remains to be done, what needs to be done for future work, and what resources should be provided to fully attain the stated goal and objectives.

Many positive comments were received from the visitation team members about the extensiveness of the Self Study document, especially related to the completeness and directness of the presentation of material.
MSCHE Standards

- The four **applicable standards** addressed by the GW’s MSCHE Self Study
  
  * Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal (2)
  * Institutional Resources (3)
  * Institutional Assessment (7)
  * Assessment of Student Learning (14)

MSCHE has a set of fourteen standards that must be met to be reaccredited. The four standards we addressed through the Self Study document are standards 2, 3, 7, and 14. These four standards are focused on Planning, Resources, and Assessment (Student Learning as well as non-academic metrics).
The remaining ten metrics are given on the current slide [slide 7]. They cover the gamut of what occurs at a major, tertiary educational institution like The George Washington University.
The group of ten standards listed on the previous slide were reviewed by two generalists, who came to GW in mid December to review the prepared documentation for each standard in this group of 10. All conclusions and recommendations with respect to this group of ten standards were reached by the generalists after they thoroughly reviewed the extensive materials provided by GW for each separate standard.

The generalists were Charles Phelps, former Provost at Rochester University, and Brian Byrne, VP for Administration at Fordham University. They were accompanied by Tom Leblanc, the overall visitation team leader, who is Provost at the University of Miami.

Without qualification, the generalists concluded that GW was in compliance with all ten of these standards.

With regard to standard 10 concerning Faculty, the generalists made an important comment with respect to Faculty documents giving greater clarity regarding each faculty member’s role and obligations in assessment processes.
MSCHE Standards addressed within the Self Study

- MSCHE Evaluation Team visit – 30 March 2008 to 2 April 2008
- Focus of the visit on MSCHE Standards 2, 3, 7, and 14
- For each of these standards, the evaluation team found “... that GW meets this standard.” Two summary recommendations were presented as requiring “follow-up action and requirements.”

The visitation team found through the Self Study Report and supplementary materials we provided to them that GW meets the standard for each of the four standards covered by the Self Study Report. Two recommendations were given for follow-up action.

The visitation team was composed of the following individuals:
Tom LeBlanc – Provost, University of Miami
Gloria Donnelly – Dean and Professor at the College of Nursing and Health Professionals, Drexel University
Martin Dorph – Senior VP for Finance and Budget, NYU
Roger Grice – Clinical Professor of Technical Communication, RPI
Perry Molinoff – Special Advisor to the Provost on Research, University of Pennsylvania
Ralph Polimeni – Vice Provost for Accreditation and Assessment, Hofstra University

DC Representative to the team – Robin Y. Jenkins, Education Licensure Commission Manager, Office of the State Superintendent of Education, Office of the Mayor
Recommendation #1 reads as follows:

"The plan (SPAE) provides a lot of detail as to what is intended but it does not include a target timeline or any estimate of cost that will be incurred to accomplish its goals. Specific targets linked to specific goals should be identified. The timeframe over which these goals will be accomplished, and the cost of accomplishing each goal, should be formally and explicitly defined."
“All schools and programs that do not have assessment of student learning in place need to develop and implement such programs as appropriate. ... Assessment of programs and learning outcomes in schools not subject to an external mandated assessment is at a very preliminary stage. In particular, the CCAS and ESIA should focus on the development of formal assessment plans.”

Recommendation #2 reads as follows:

“All schools and programs that do not have assessment of student learning in place need to develop and implement such programs as appropriate. .... Assessment of programs and learning outcomes in schools not subject to an external mandated assessment is at a very preliminary stage. In particular, the CCAS and ESIA should focus on the development of formal assessment plans.”
Commission Action

Action taken on 26 June 2008:

“To reaffirm accreditation and to request a progress letter due by April 1, 2010, documenting (1) a target timeline and the resource allocation strategies implemented to accomplish the goals of the institution’s strategic plan (Standards 2 and 3) and

The written report of the external evaluation team is submitted by the team leader to the MSCHE central office. The team leader, along with team leaders from other accreditation visits, meet with the MSCHE commission members and review their recommendations and the commission members then arrive at the final action with respect to a given reaccreditation review. The MSCHE announced their action with respect to GW on 26 June 2008.

The action of the MSCHE is published on their web site. In our case, they reaffirmed full accreditation and requested specific progress reports that derive from the two recommendations of the evaluation team. The progress reports are due on 1 April 2010. Specifically, they have requested that we document

(1) A target timeline and the resource allocation strategies implemented to accomplish the goals of the institution’s strategic plan – this is associated with MSCHE standards 2 and 3.
(2) Further progress in the implementation of a comprehensive, organized, and sustained process for the assessment of student learning outcomes, including evidence that assessment results are used for improvement (Standard 14). Further documentation on progress in meeting these standards should also be provided in the Periodic Review Report due June 1, 2013.

(2) Further progress in the implementation of a comprehensive, organized, and sustained process for the assessment of student learning outcomes, including evidence that assessment results are used for improvement – this is associated with MSCHE standard 14.

They also indicate that when we do our Periodic Review Report that is due in 1 June 2013, that we further document progress in meeting the three standards – MSCHE standards 2, 3, and 14.
Addressing Item #1

- Implement target timeline and resource allocation strategies to accomplish the goals of SPAE per standards 2 and 3 of the MSCHE. This work must be completed by 31 December 2009 in order to prepare a progress letter to the MSCHE that is due on 1 April 2010.

We have approximately 15 months to complete the work necessary to produce the report they requested from us on the two recommendations from the evaluation team.
Steps to prepare response to Item #1

Academic Affairs

- Extract from Self Study Report the recommendations connected to resource allocations. Develop timelines to achieve these recommendations.
- Review the SPAE’s listed metrics and associated data to determine current state and set baselines for the major metrics.
- Determine the resources needed to achieve the optimal values of the major metrics.
- Develop a multi-year plan using a resources approach within the context of the University’s budget starting with FY 10.
- Use the FY 10 component for the 2008-09 budget process.

The work that needs to be completed to report progress on the first recommendation is as follows:

Each of the core chapters of the Self Study Report has a set of recommendations with respect to next steps in making further progress towards achieving the goal reviewed. Starting from these recommendations, we need to

1) Extract those associated with resources and suggested timelines;
2) Review the SPAE’s listed metrics along with our accumulated data to set new baselines for the major metrics;
3) Determine the resources required to achieve the optimal values of the major metrics;
4) Develop a multi-year plan using a resources-required approach within the context of the University’s budget starting with FY 10;
5) Use the FY 10 analysis within the 2008-09 budget process.
Addressing Item #2

- Document progress in the implementation of a comprehensive, organized, and sustained process for the assessment of student learning outcomes, including evidence that assessment results are used for improvement per Standard 14 of the MSCHE. This work must be completed by 31 December 2009 in order to prepare a progress letter to the MSCHE that is due on 1 April 2010.

The strength of this particular recommendation is that it can serve to drive serious rethinking of our learning goals for undergraduate education at GW, as well as graduate education. Such rethinking of how we assess learning can also have a major impact on how we teach our courses at GW and how we construct our required courses within the first two years of our undergraduate curricula.
Steps to prepare response to Item #2

- Develop and implement a campus-wide, assessment-education program that starts at the program level and filters down to the course level.
- Work with departments and programs within CCAS, ESIA, and CPS to articulate learning objectives for undergraduate students.
- Through the on-going undergraduate curriculum review, implement learning objectives connected to GCRs and define how accomplishment of these objectives will be measured.
- Support course-related assessment programs in the summer.
- Adopt a data collection approach for accumulating assessment data.

Towards that end, we have put together a set of steps towards instituting serious thinking about our aims for student learning across the curriculum and how we shall assess learning outcomes. Implementation of these steps will be led by Cheryl Beil through the component of her office dealing with assessment of outcomes. Cheryl will be assisted in this undertaking by the deans of the schools that have undergraduate students. The plan is to begin with

1) A campus-wide, assessment-education program that begins at the program level and filters down to the course level;

2) Special emphasis will be placed on working with the faculty members of CCAS, ESIA, and CPS to articulate learning objectives for undergraduate students;

3) With the current undergraduate curriculum review work as a base, we need to implement learning objectives connected to General Curriculum Requirements or Core-Course Requirements and define carefully how the accomplishment of these objectives will be measured;

4) In order to aid faculty members accomplish this work, we shall support course-related assessment programs in the summer;

5) Finally, in order to write our progress report for the MSCHE, we shall develop a data collection approach from accumulating assessment data that will be useful for showing how it is aiding in the improvement of learning.
A large thank you!

TO: All who helped bring us to this very positive and constructive conclusion of the MSCHE decennial accreditation review

- The co-chairs and members of the Steering Committee
- The leaders and members of the Working Groups
- The faculty and staff members outside of the Steering Committee and the Working Groups who critiqued and/or edited the Self Study work

In closing, I want to recognize the incredible amount of work that went into producing the Self Study Report. Many faculty members gave generously of their time to bring us to this very successful outcome. Moreover, a number of individuals stepped up to provide leadership and focus to what needed to be accomplished. To all these people, and to Forrest Maltzman, Craig Linebaugh, and Cheryl Beil, I convey to you all a very large thank you.

All who helped us in this major undertaking now know fully that we have entered a new era in accreditation by the national-level, regional accreditation agencies. What they are asking us to do with respect to assessment of our strategic plan progress and our educational learning assessment is what we can expect to see at a more intense level in the future. The good news is that GW was already on a path of assessing outcomes with metrics in our SPAE over the last five years. This effort positioned us well and helped lead us to full reaccreditation with no qualifications or concerns. Clearly, in order to be prepared for the future, we must continue and expand our assessment efforts.
Campus Development Update

Faculty Assembly
October 3, 2008
Building a World-Class University

- **Planning Events** Leading to the 2007 Campus Plan
  - June 2003: *Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence*
  - Summer 2003 to Mid 2004: *Space Needs Analysis*
  - February 2004: *Faculty Senate Committee on Physical Facilities* meets with planners
  - May 2004: *Faculty Senate Resolution* on “Construction of New Science Facilities as the Top Priority Among New Academic Structures”

2007 Foggy Bottom Campus Plan
Building a World-Class University

- Since the start of the **Campus Plan process** in 2003/2004...
  - Ongoing regular updates
    - Faculty Senate
    - Faculty Senate Executive Committee
    - Committee on Physical Facilities
  - 2006/2007: **Academic Program Committee for Science & Engineering Building**
  - Board of Trustees **Special Committee for the Science & Engineering Complex**
  - Faculty Senate Special Committee

2007 Foggy Bottom Campus Plan
Building a World-Class University

- **Needs & priorities** link to **Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence**
  - Need for **growth is not** to accommodate increased enrollment
  - Campus Plan based on **academic facilities needs**
    - State-of-the-art **research labs**
    - Technologically-advanced **classrooms**
    - **Modernized facilities** to support **inter-disciplinary programs**
    - Appropriately-sized **floorplates**
Building a World-Class University

- **Anticipated space** needs over the next 20 years
  - 1.5 million square feet of *academic space*
  - Up to an additional 1,000 *on-campus student beds*
Accommodating the University’s Space Needs

- **Campus Plan** outlines an **integrated development strategy** that **balances** needs for **space and financial resources**

  - *Grow Up, Not Out*: Accommodate **academic & student housing space needs** on campus

  - *Square 54*: commercial development as a mixed-use urban “town center” **generates investment revenues**
Accommodating the University’s Space Needs

- Efforts are interrelated and form an integrated development strategy
  - Revenues from Square 54 helps to fund academic & student housing capital projects
  - As new buildings are built, space frees up in existing buildings for other uses
Larger development footprints to accommodate evolving academic needs

Density concentrated in core of campus away from residential areas

Heights decreased on campus periphery

Development sites removed to retain historic resources

Parking distributed throughout campus

I Street Retail Corridor Concept

2007 Foggy Bottom Campus Plan
Campus Character: The Diversity of “Campus Streets”

I Street: Creating a Vibrant Retail Corridor

G Street: Preserving Historic Character

H Street: Enhancing the Academic Heart of Campus

2007 Foggy Bottom Campus Plan
Foggy Bottom Campus Plan Interim Compliance Report
Foggy Bottom Campus Plan (2007)
Zoning Commission Case Nos. 06-11 and 06-12
(as outlined in Condition C-16)

Parking:
- Student parking restrictions
- New underground parking

Transitioning off-campus properties

Bi-annual compliance reporting

Streetscape & Historic Preservation Plans

Key Campus Plan Commitments

2007 Foggy Bottom Campus Plan
Square 54 at 2200 Pennsylvania Avenue
(Site Plan)
Square 54 at 2200 Pennsylvania Avenue
(View of Office Component from Washington Circle)
Square 54 at 2200 Pennsylvania Avenue
(View of Residential Component - East down I Street)
Square 54 at 2200 Pennsylvania Avenue
(I Street Retail Corridor)
Square 80 Residence Hall
Pelham Redevelopment Project  
(Mount Vernon Campus)

- **Residence hall** project, including **student support space** (including a campus dining facility, performance spaces, and arts practice spaces)
- **278 student beds** in configuration of single rooms with common living area/bathrooms

On schedule for occupancy in **fall 2010**
Key Campus Development Projects in the Planning Stages
Interdisciplinary science and engineering complex
(site 55A – current university parking garage)
School of Public Health and Health Services Building
(Square 39A – 24th/NH Ave & Wash. Circle)

Key Development Projects in Planning
Charles E. Smith Center Renovation Project

Key Development Projects in Planning
Below-grade parking feasibility
(Square 103A – G Street between 20<sup>th</sup>&21<sup>st</sup>)

Key Development Projects in Planning
Find out more – visit the campus development section of GW’s neighborhood website
www.neighborhood.gwu.edu

For more information, go to
www.neighborhood.gwu.edu
In Closing...

- Campus Plan is rooted in the Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence
- Engagement with faculty, staff, students, alumni & members of the community began in 2004 and continues today
- Campus Plan accommodates the University’s space needs over the next 20 years
  - 1.5 million square feet of new academic space
  - Up to 1,000 beds
In Closing...

- Revenue from **Square 54 helps to fund** the most pressing academic priorities of the University
- New developments provide **new facilities** and **free up** existing space on campus for other functions
- For more information, visit the neighborhood website at [http://neighborhood.gwu.edu](http://neighborhood.gwu.edu)
I would like to extend a warm welcome to members of the Faculty Assembly and also to the newly appointed faculty members and the emeriti faculty members who are present today. I would also like to congratulate the recipients of the Bender Teaching Awards. On behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, I offer the following report.

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS

During the 2007-2008 session, the Faculty Senate held eight regular meetings. In addition, the Faculty Senate has held two regular meetings during the current 2008-09 session.

The Faculty Senate considered seven resolutions during its 2007-08 session. Five resolutions were adopted without amendments, and one resolution was adopted as amended. The seventh resolution was remanded to the Standing Committee which originally proposed that resolution. A revised version of the resolution was subsequently presented and tabled. A further revision of the resolution was subsequently presented, and that resolution was approved as amended.

The administration’s responses to the resolutions are attached to this report. Six of the resolutions considered by the Faculty Senate during the 2007-08 session are briefly summarized below.

“A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Organization Plan with Regard to the Composition of the Faculty Senate”

Presented by the Executive Committee, this resolution provides for a second seat on the Faculty Senate for the School of Public Health and Health Services (SPHHS).

The addition of a second seat was made necessary by term limits on the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. One representative from each School is elected to serve on the Executive Committee each year. Members of the Executive Committee are limited to three consecutive one-year terms. Because SPHHS had only one representative on the Faculty Senate, it was forced to replace that representative every three years in order to be assured of continuous representation on the Executive Committee. In order to remove the need for such a forced replacement, the Executive Committee proposed an amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan to give SPHHS two representatives on the Faculty Senate.

The resolution was approved by the Faculty Senate and, as required for changes to the Faculty Organization Plan, it was also approved by the Faculty Assembly.
“A Resolution on Establishing a Steering Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum Review”

This resolution followed up on a previous resolution that the Faculty Senate had adopted in March 2007. In that resolution, the Senate recommended that the faculties of the several schools concerned with undergraduate education should undertake a comprehensive review of their respective undergraduate curricula rather than making any immediate decision on a 4x4 curriculum “scenario” proposed by the Administration.

Presented by the Executive Committee, the new resolution recommended the next step. It proposed a comprehensive review of the undergraduate curriculum by a steering committee including faculty members and deans of the five Schools concerned with undergraduate education (the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, the Elliott School of International Affairs, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, the School of Business, and the School of Public Health and Health Services).

The resolution was adopted by the Faculty Senate. Following the resolution’s adoption, the Steering Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum Review was jointly appointed and charged by the Executive Committee and the Administration and is currently performing the requested review of the undergraduate curriculum.

“A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Code to Provide a Parental Childcare Leave Benefit”

Pursuant to the recommendations of the University’s Parental Leave Task Force, which examined the University’s parental leave policies, a Joint Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF) and the Faculty Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies reviewed the recommendations and presented a proposed resolution to establish a parental childcare leave benefit.

The resolution endorsed the conclusions of the Parental Leave Task Force and proposed an amendment to the Faculty Code to authorize a parental childcare leave benefit. The amendment to the Faculty Code specifies the circumstances, terms and duration of the parental childcare leave benefit that is available to regular, active-status faculty.

The resolution was adopted by the Faculty Senate, and the proposed amendment to the Faculty Code was approved by the University’s Board of Trustees.

“A Resolution Concerning Secondary and Courtesy Appointments for Regular, Active-Status Faculty Members”

Presented by the PEAF Committee, this resolution was drafted to respond to the fact that the Faculty Code did not authorize the granting of secondary or courtesy appointments to faculty members who hold their primary appointments in another school or department. Nevertheless, secondary and courtesy appointments have been made in increasing numbers in response to a general need for and emphasis on interdisciplinary research.

The resolution proposed an amendment to the Faculty Code to authorize secondary and courtesy appointments in departments and schools. The amendment to the Faculty Code distinguishes between (i) secondary appointments, which grant governance privileges within a school
or department as determined by the school’s regular, active-status faculty, and (ii) courtesy appointments, which do not provide any governance privileges.

The resolution was adopted as amended by the Faculty Senate, and the proposed amendment to the Faculty Code was approved by the University’s Board of Trustees.

“A Resolution of Appreciation”

Adopted by acclamation, this resolution was presented to Stephen Joel Trachtenberg, congratulating him upon completion of his service as President of the University.

“A Resolution of Appreciation”

Adopted by acclamation, this resolution was presented to Lilien F. Robinson, congratulating her upon completion of her service as Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

In addition, during the first two meetings of the 2008-09 Session, the Faculty Senate considered three resolutions. Two resolutions were adopted without amendments, and the third resolution was tabled. Following are summaries of the two adopted resolutions:

“A Resolution to Amend the Time Limitation on Reporting of Final Grades by Faculty Members”

This resolution provides for an extension of the previous 72-hour requirement for the reporting of final grades. The resolution proposes that final grades should be reported within five working days after the final examination has been given. The administration has accepted this resolution, and the new time limitation will be observed beginning this academic year.

“A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Organization Plan with regard to the Composition of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee”

This resolution proposes an amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan to correct a technical error that currently appears in the document with respect to the composition of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The Faculty Senate adopted this resolution. As required by the Faculty Organization Plan, the proposed amendment must be approved by the Faculty Assembly in order to be presented to the Board of Trustees.

REPORTS TO THE FACULTY SENATE

During the 2007-2008 session, the Executive Committee arranged for the presentation of seven reports to the Faculty Senate. These included the annual report of the College of Professional Studies (Dean Roger Whitaker), the annual report of the School of Public Health and Health Services (Dean Ruth J. Katz), an annual report on the composition of the faculty (Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman), a biennial report on women faculty and faculty of color (Executive Vice President Lehman), an update on Square 54 and the Science and Engineering Complex as those projects affect the 2008-2009 Budget (Executive Vice President and Treasurer Louis H. Katz), and an update on emergency preparedness (Assistant Vice President for Public Safety and Emergency Management John N. Petrie).
In addition, the Executive Committee continued a process of arranging for school deans to present school status reports on a rotating basis. Accordingly, the Senate received a presentation on the School of Engineering and Applied Science by Dean Timothy W. Tong.

During the first two meetings of the 2008-2009 session, the Executive Committee arranged for the Faculty Senate to receive (i) a report from Professor Joe Cordes, Chair of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, concerning the University’s current and projected operating budgets, and (ii) a report from Associate Vice President Adrienne Rulnick concerning the Administration’s efforts to enhance the quality of its alumni programs.

**STATUS OF FACULTY PERSONNEL MATTERS**

**Nonconcurrences**

The Executive Committee did not receive any administrative nonconcurrences with faculty personnel recommendations during the 2007-2008 academic year.

**Grievances**

During the 2007-2008 academic year, one grievance originating in the School of Engineering and Applied Science was heard by a Hearing Committee of the Faculty Senate’s Dispute Resolution Committee. The Hearing Committee dismissed the grievance, and that dismissal was upheld on appeal by the Dispute Resolution Committee. As of the date of this report, two grievances originating in Columbian College of Arts and Sciences are in the hearing stage.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee greatly appreciates the services provided by members of the Dispute Resolution Committee and its Chair, Professor Kurt J. Darr. Professor Darr and members of the Dispute Resolution Committee have spent countless hours over the past several years in hearing and resolving grievances filed by faculty members against the University. The **Faculty Code**’s dispute resolution procedures for grievances have enabled many claims filed by faculty members to be resolved without the need for costly litigation, thereby saving significant sums for the University.

**MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION BY SENATE COMMITTEES**

**SPHHS Compliance with the Faculty Code**

On May 6, 2008, the Executive Committee sent a memorandum to Dean Ruth J. Katz of the School of Public Health and Health Services (SPHHS). The Executive Committee’s memorandum requested that Dean Katz provide, not later than September 19, 2008, a detailed, comprehensive plan that will bring SPHHS into compliance with Article I.B.1. of the **Faculty Code** within a reasonable period of time not to exceed five years. Article I.B.1. requires that at least 75% of the regular, active-status faculty within a School must hold tenured or tenure-accruing positions, and that at least 50% of the regular, active-status faculty within each department must hold tenured or tenure-accruing positions. The Faculty Senate has been seeking SPHHS’ compliance with Article I.B.1. since April 12, 2002, when the Senate adopted Resolution 01/11 (which called upon SPHHS to develop a plan to achieve compliance by the end of 2007).
On September 24, 2008, Interim Dean Josef J. Reum of SPHHS submitted a plan to bring SPHHS into compliance with Article I.B.1. within the requested five-year period. The Executive Committee has referred this compliance plan to a Special Joint Committee on Compliance by SPHHS with the Faculty Code (which was originally established in December 2006). The Executive Committee has asked the Joint Subcommittee to review and evaluate the compliance plan, and to advise the Executive Committee whether the plan is feasible and is reasonably designed to enable SPHHS to achieve compliance with the Faculty Code by 2013. The Executive Committee has also asked the Special Joint Subcommittee to advise whether the procedures that SPHHS intends to follow for future searches for faculty members and academic administrative officers will comply with Parts B and C of the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code.

Assignments to Standing Committees

In accordance with its customary practice, the Executive Committee has forwarded to the Chair of each Standing Committee of the Faculty Senate a list of assignments for the 2008-09 session. Those assignments include the following requests:

Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management
Consult with the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee regarding the impact of the University’s admissions and financial aid policies on the University’s operating budget.

Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies
Continue discussion of the appropriate weighting of faculty scholarship, teaching and service for purposes of tenure and promotion decisions and salary increases.

Athletics and Recreation
Consider re-establishment of a University-wide Steering Committee to review matters related to intercollegiate athletics.

Educational Policy
Consult on matters related to undergraduate education with the University Steering Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum (Dean Peg Barratt and Professor Gary Simon, Co-Chairs) and the Senate Special Committee on Educational Quality (Professor Donald Parsons, Chair). In addition, consider possible reforms to undergraduate academic advising.

Faculty Development, including Academic and Administrative Support
Consider the institutional involvement of emeriti faculty with GW. In addition, review the type and quality of administrative and technical support currently provided to faculty members at the school level.

Fiscal Planning and Budgeting
Prepare reports on the University’s five-year operating and capital budgets. In addition, (i) review the impact on the University’s budgets of current building projects, including Square 54 and the Science and Engineering Complex, and (ii) participate in the Budget Working Group, which is jointly chaired by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Executive Vice President and Treasurer.
Honors and Academic Convocations
Advise the President on nominations for honorary degrees, and consider procedures for faculty involvement in the approval process for awards given by departments, schools, or other units of the University to individuals other than students or faculty.

Libraries Committee
Consider draft resolution with respect to copyright clearances. In addition, consider (jointly with the Research Committee) the issue of whether the University should adopt a policy, as Harvard University has done, to require faculty members to make their scholarly articles available for free online access through a web portal established by the University.

Physical Facilities
Review the faculty’s involvement in the University’s decision-making procedures for construction of new buildings and implementation of the Campus Plan, including the Science and Engineering Complex. In addition, review the University’s arrangements for cleaning and maintaining facilities and dealing with safety issues and fire and environmental hazards.

Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
Consider possible resolution to amend the Faculty Code with regard to procedures for selecting academic administrative officers within Schools.

Research
Discuss research funding issues with members of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee. In addition, consider (jointly with the Libraries Committee) whether the University should adopt a policy requiring free online access to scholarly articles produced by faculty members.

University and Urban Affairs
Plan and support programs to bring together University faculty members and administrators with D.C. governmental leaders, citizen groups and members of the Foggy Bottom community. In addition, continue to work on expanding opportunities for the involvement of students and faculty members in community outreach and service projects.

Joint Committee of Faculty and Students
Review problems resulting from the scheduling of final examinations outside the authorized dates established by the Registrar’s Office, and consider preparation and distribution of a survey to faculty members on final examination practices.

Appointment of Special Committees
In addition, the Executive Committee has recently established two special committees and has given those committees the following assignments:
Special Ad Hoc Committee on Financial and Operational Planning for the Science and Engineering Complex

In May 2008, the Executive Committee established a Special Ad Hoc Committee on Financial and Operational Planning for the Science and Engineering Complex (SEC). The Executive Committee asked the Special Committee to report back to the Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate after analyzing the following issues:

(i) the projected size and scope of the SEC;
(ii) the projected costs of building the SEC and providing the SEC with the requisite equipment and furnishings;
(iii) the anticipated sources of funding to meet those costs; and
(iv) the projected impact of the SEC on the University’s operational and capital budgets during the next several years.

President Knapp, Executive Vice President Lehman and Executive Vice President Katz met with the Special Committee on June 18, 2008. President Knapp also agreed to appoint two members of the Special Committee – Professor Joe Cordes and Professor Hermann Helgert – to serve on a special committee established by the Board of Trustees to develop plans for the SEC.

The Executive Committee received a progress report from the Special Committee in July. The Executive Committee has asked the Special Committee to present a second progress report to the Faculty Senate at its meeting on November 14, 2008, in conjunction with a report on the University’s operating and capital budgets, which will be presented by the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee.

Special Joint Subcommittee on Educational Quality

Also in May 2008, the Executive Committee established a Special Joint Subcommittee on Educational Quality, chaired by Professor Donald Parsons. As requested by the Executive Committee, the Subcommittee is examining a variety of issues involving the recruitment and retention of highly qualified undergraduate students, including issues related to admissions policies, financial aid, faculty resources and other academic resources that are needed to enhance the quality of GW’s undergraduate academic programs. The Subcommittee will report its findings to the following Committees of the Faculty Senate: the Committee on Admissions Policy, Enrollment Management, and Student Financial Aid, the Committee on Educational Policy, and the Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting.

GENERAL REMARKS

This report lists only some of the activities and accomplishments of the members of the Faculty Senate and its Standing Committees. These faculty members have expended a great deal of time and energy on behalf of their faculty colleagues and the entire University. Since the last meeting of the Faculty Assembly, the Faculty Senate and its Committees, with your assistance and support, have addressed many matters that are important to the continued academic improvement and future success of the University.
Your active support of, and involvement in, the work of the Faculty Senate is essential to our success as a faculty community participating in the shared governance of the University. The level of faculty interest in the work of the Faculty Senate has been extremely high over the last year. Over the past year, it has been gratifying to see a substantial increase in the number of faculty colleagues who have volunteered to serve on Standing Committees, and who have contacted Senate members and the Faculty Senate office to ask questions and offer their views with respect to a variety of University-related matters. In this regard, I would like to share with you some interesting statistics dealing with visits to the Faculty Senate’s website. During 2007-2008, monthly requests for documents available on the website ranged from a low of 11,645 in August 2007 to a high of 12,083 in May 2008. The number of monthly requests has trended sharply upward since the 2004-2005 session, and the number of annual requests has increased by more than 150% between 2004-2005 and 2007-2008. These statistics indicate a significant and encouraging growth of faculty interest in the work of the Faculty Senate.

The Faculty Senate is the faculty’s primary vehicle of participation and expression within the University’s structure of shared governance. In addition, the Faculty Senate is dedicated to protecting the rights and privileges of individual faculty members in accordance with the provisions of the Faculty Code and the Faculty Organization Plan. The Senate has achieved a long and remarkable record of success through the work of generations of faculty colleagues throughout the University. On behalf of the Faculty Senate, I would like to thank you for your past contributions, and I would also like to invite and encourage your continuing involvement and support.

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr.
Chair, Faculty Senate Executive Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>Title of Resolution</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Response of Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/1</td>
<td>A Resolution of Appreciation (for Stephen J. Trachtenberg)</td>
<td>Adopted 5-11-07 Transmitted to President's Office 5/07</td>
<td>Response already received. The sentiments are received with gratitude and reciprocated in kind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/2</td>
<td>A Resolution to Amend the <em>Faculty Organization Plan</em> With Regard to the Composition of the Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Adopted 9-7-07 Transmitted to President's Office 9/07</td>
<td>Administration concurred with Resolution 07/2; thus an identical Resolution, Resolution FA-07/1, was considered and adopted by the Faculty Assembly on 9-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA-07/1 (Faculty Assembly)</td>
<td>A Resolution to Amend the <em>Faculty Organization Plan</em> With Regard to the Composition of the Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Adopted 9-10-07 Transmitted to the Board of Trustees via the President's Office</td>
<td>Approved by the Board of Trustees 10/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/3</td>
<td>A Resolution on Establishing a Steering Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review</td>
<td>Adopted 9-7-07</td>
<td>Resolution 07/3 accepted. The Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the EVPAA appointed and charged the committee by memo on 26 November 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/4</td>
<td>A Resolution Concerning Secondary Appointments For Regular, Active-Status Faculty Members (07/4)</td>
<td>Remanded to Committee with amendments 12-14-07</td>
<td>No response required; included for information only. See Resolution 07/6 below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/5 1-18-08</td>
<td>A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Code to Provide A Parental Childcare Leave Benefit</td>
<td>Adopted as amended 1-18-08</td>
<td>Forwarded immediately to administration. Approved by the Board of Trustees 2/8/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-6 3-14-08</td>
<td>A Resolution Concerning Secondary And Courtesy Appointments for Regular, Active-Status Faculty Members</td>
<td>Tabled, March 14, 2008</td>
<td>Response already received. Forwarded immediately to administration. Approved by the Board of Trustees 5/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-7 4-11-08</td>
<td>A Resolution of Appreciation (Lilien Filipovitch Robinson)</td>
<td>Adopted by acclamation 4-11-08</td>
<td>President Knapp and his senior staff members thank Professor Robinson for her service to The George Washington University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-1 5-09-08</td>
<td>A Resolution to Amend the Time Limitation on Reporting of Final Grades by Faculty Members</td>
<td>Adopted May 9, 2008 At first (May) meeting of the 2008-09 session; forwarded for administrative response with 2007-08 resolutions</td>
<td>Resolution 08-1 is accepted. The time limit for reporting of final grades will be implemented as proposed – “five working days after the final examination.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/1</td>
<td>A Resolution of Appreciation (for Stephen J. Trachtenberg)</td>
<td>Adopted 5-11-07</td>
<td>Response already received. The sentiments are received with gratitude and reciprocated in kind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/2</td>
<td>A Resolution to Amend the <em>Faculty Organization Plan</em> With Regard to the Composition of the Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Adopted 9-7-07 Transmitted to President’s Office 9/07</td>
<td>Administration concurred with Resolution 07/2; thus an identical Resolution, Resolution FA-07/1, was considered and adopted by the Faculty Assembly on 9-10-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA-07/1 (Faculty Assembly)</td>
<td>A Resolution to Amend the <em>Faculty Organization Plan</em> With Regard to the Composition of the Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Adopted 9-10-07 Transmitted to the Board of Trustees via the President’s Office</td>
<td>Approved by the Board of Trustees 10/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/3</td>
<td>A Resolution on Establishing a Steering Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review</td>
<td>Adopted 9-7-07</td>
<td>Resolution 07/3 accepted. The Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the EVPAA appointed and charged the committee by memo on 26 November 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/4</td>
<td>A Resolution Concerning Secondary Appointments For Regular, Active-Status Faculty Members (07/4)</td>
<td>Remanded to Committee with amendments 12-14-07</td>
<td>No response required; included for information only. See Resolution 07/6 below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RESOLUTIONS 2007-08 SESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>Title of Resolution</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Response of Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/5 1-18-08</td>
<td>A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Code to Provide A Parental Childcare Leave Benefit</td>
<td>Adopted as amended 1-18-08</td>
<td>Forwarded immediately to administration. Approved by the Board of Trustees 2/8/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-6 3-14-08</td>
<td>A Resolution Concerning Secondary And Courtesy Appointments for Regular, Active-Status Faculty Members</td>
<td>Tabled, March 14, 2008</td>
<td>Response already received. Forwarded immediately to administration. Approved by the Board of Trustees 5/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-7 4-11-08</td>
<td>A Resolution of Appreciation (Lilien Filipovitch Robinson)</td>
<td>Adopted by acclamation 4-11-08</td>
<td>President Knapp and his senior staff members thank Professor Robinson for her service to The George Washington University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-1 5-09-08</td>
<td>A Resolution to Amend the Time Limitation on Reporting of Final Grades by Faculty Members</td>
<td>Adopted May 9, 2008 At first (May) meeting of the 2008-09 session; forwarded for administrative response with 2007-08 resolutions</td>
<td>Resolution 08-1 is accepted. The time limit for reporting of final grades will be implemented as proposed – “five working days after the final examination.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION (07/1)

WHEREAS, Stephen Joel Trachtenberg has served for nineteen years as President of The George Washington University with imagination and energy during a period of significant growth and transformation for the University, including the construction of new residence halls and academic buildings, a redesign of the Foggy Bottom campus, acquisition of the Mount Vernon campus, and further development of the Virginia Campus, and

WHEREAS, he has announced that he is leaving this position in July 2007 to become a member of the faculty, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees of The George Washington University, in recognition of his achievements, has appointed him University Professor of Public Service; NOW, THEREFORE,

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

That the Faculty Senate expresses its appreciation to Stephen Joel Trachtenberg for his many years of service to The George Washington University and his efforts to promote a wider recognition of the University’s accomplishments throughout the nation and the world, and welcomes him as a faculty colleague.

/s/
Lilien F. Robinson, Chair
Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
May 11, 2007

SEAL

Adopted May 11, 2007
A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN WITH REGARD TO THE COMPOSITION OF THE FACULTY SENATE (07/2)

WHEREAS, the Faculty Organization Plan currently allocates a single seat in the Faculty Senate and on the Senate’s Executive Committee to the School of Public Health and Health Services; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Organization Plan, under Article II, Section 5, subsection (a), currently establishes a three-year consecutive term limit on membership on the Senate’s Executive Committee; and

WHEREAS, limiting the School of Public Health and Health Services to a single seat on the Faculty Senate and on the Senate’s Executive Committee may come into conflict with the above term limit, NOW, THEREFORE

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

(1) That Article III, Section 2, subsection (a) (3) of the Faculty Organization Plan be amended to read:

“The faculty members of the Senate shall be elected by and from their faculties as follows: Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, nine; the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, School of Engineering and Applied Science, School of Business, School of Medicine and Health Sciences, and the Law School, three each; the Elliott School of International Affairs and the School of Public Health and Health Services, two each.”

(2) That the President, as Chair of the Faculty Assembly, is requested to place on the agenda of the Faculty Assembly at its meeting on September 10, 2007 the proposed amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan; and

(3) That, upon approval by the Faculty Assembly, the President is requested to forward at the earliest opportunity the proposed amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan to the Board of Trustees for final approval, to become effective by January 1, 2008.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
August 24, 2007

Adopted September 7, 2007
WHEREAS, During the 2006-2007 academic year the Faculty Senate and School faculties engaged in considerable discussion of the report of the Joint Administration/Faculty Task Force and its recommendation of the adoption of a 4x4 undergraduate curriculum “scenario;” and

WHEREAS, After reviewing a report and recommendations of a Special Committee of the Faculty Senate, which evaluated the Joint Task Force Report, the Faculty Senate adopted Resolution 06/5 on March 9, 2007, which recommended that the faculties of the several Schools should be given “a reasonable opportunity to undertake a comprehensive review of their respective curricula” prior to any decision by the University to adopt the 4x4 “scenario;” and

WHEREAS, Resolution 06/5 further stated that “the Faculty Senate urges the faculties of the several Schools, beginning in the Fall of 2007, to undertake a comprehensive curriculum review in their Schools, in collaboration with the incoming administration of President-elect Steven Knapp;” and

WHEREAS, Resolutions passed by School faculties were basically consistent with the conclusions and recommendations of Faculty Senate Resolution 06/5; and

WHEREAS, President Knapp has expressed the Administration’s support of a comprehensive review of the undergraduate curriculum and its accomplishment as a collaborative effort of the Deans, their faculties and the Faculty Senate; NOW, THEREFORE,

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

That the Faculty Senate recommends the establishment of a Steering Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum Review, which should undertake a comprehensive review and evaluation of the University’s undergraduate curriculum and, based on that review, should issue recommendations for revisions to that curriculum consistent with the University’s stated aspirations for academic excellence, and
That the Steering Committee should consist of:

1. Five Deans (Columbian College, the Elliott School of International Affairs, the School of Business, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, and the School of Public Health and Health Services), one of whom should serve as Committee Co-Chair, and

2. Five faculty members, nominated by the Executive Committee for election by the Faculty Senate, one of whom to be designated as Committee Co-Chair, and

3. Five faculty members, one from each of the foregoing Schools, elected by the faculty of the school and appointed by the Dean of the respective School.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

That the Steering Committee should work in concert with each of the standing or specially established School Committees undertaking the comprehensive review of its School curriculum.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
August 24, 2007

Adopted, September 7, 2007
A RESOLUTION CONCERNING SECONDARY APPOINTMENTS FOR
REGULAR, ACTIVE-STATUS FACULTY MEMBERS (07/4)

WHEREAS, certain schools within the University have granted secondary appointments (sometimes called courtesy appointments) to regular, active-status faculty members who hold their primary appointments in other schools: and

WHEREAS, certain departments within a single school have granted secondary appointments to regular, active-status faculty members who hold their primary appointments in other departments within the same school;

WHEREAS, secondary appointments can encourage and facilitate interdisciplinary collaboration among faculty members from different schools or departments; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Code does not refer to secondary appointments; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that it would be desirable to amend the Faculty Code to provide explicit authorization for secondary appointments; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that a secondary appointment should not confer any of the rights to participate in faculty governance that are provided under the Faculty Code and the Faculty Organization Plan: NOW, THEREFORE

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

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

6. Secondary Appointments: A faculty member holding a regular, active-status appointment in one department or school may be granted a secondary appointment (sometimes called a courtesy appointment) in another department or school for a limited specified renewable term. A secondary appointment shall require the recommendation of the appropriate faculty and officers of administration of the unit granting the appointment and shall comply with rules and procedures for secondary appointments established by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. A secondary appointment does not automatically confer any of the rights provided by the Faculty Code and the Faculty Organization Plan:
Plan to participate in faculty governance in the department or school that granted the secondary appointment, but the granting unit may confer governance rights with the approval of that unit’s voting faculty. A secondary appointment terminates automatically upon expiration of its stated, specified term or upon termination of the faculty member’s regular, active-status appointment.

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
December 5, 2007

Remanded to Committee with amendments December 14, 2007
A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE TO PROVIDE A PARENTAL CHILDCARE LEAVE BENEFIT (07/5)

WHEREAS, the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Chair of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate jointly appointed a Parental Leave Task Force to make recommendations for revising the University’s policies for childbirth and parental leave for regular, active-status faculty members; and

WHEREAS, on July 23, 2007, the Parental Leave Task Force issued a report (the “Task Force Report”) that presented two recommendations; and

WHEREAS, the second recommendation in the Task Force Report was a proposal to amend the Faculty Code and revise the Faculty Handbook to provide each regular, active-status faculty member who is the primary or coequal caregiver for a newborn or newly adopted child with a parental leave benefit, which would consist of one semester’s paid release from teaching and administrative duties, subject to certain terms and conditions; and

WHEREAS, the Task Force Report found that the recommended parental leave benefit was desirable because a full-time faculty member who becomes a parent of a newborn or newly adopted child should be allowed to devote a reasonable period of time to care for the child without suffering a career-related penalty and without incurring the financial cost of taking unpaid leave at a time when the faculty member’s household expenses have risen substantially due to the arrival of a new child; and

WHEREAS, the Task Force Report found that the recommended parental leave benefit was desirable because it would bring the University into line with parental leave policies at numerous institutions of higher education with which the University competes in attracting and retaining full-time faculty members; and

WHEREAS, the Task Force Report concluded that the recommended parental leave benefit was desirable because it would help to assure a family-friendly workplace for full-time faculty members and would encourage a more equitable gender balance within the full-time faculty; and

WHEREAS, the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee referred the Task Force Report to the Faculty Senate Committees on Administrative, Salary, and Promotion Policies (“ASPP”) and Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (“PEAF”), and those Committees appointed a joint subcommittee (the “Subcommittee”) to review the Task Force Report and make recommendations for action by the Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, in response to the second recommendation of the Task Force Report, the Subcommittee prepared a proposed resolution that would amend the Faculty Code to provide a parental leave benefit to regular, active-status faculty members who become parents of newborn or newly adopted children or newly placed foster children;

WHEREAS, the Subcommittee’s proposed resolution was approved by the ASPP and PEAF Committees with the stipulation that the parental leave benefit for adopted or foster children should apply only to minor dependent children;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that the Faculty Code should be amended to provide for the parental leave benefit recommended in the Task Force Report and endorsed (with revisions) by the ASPP and PEAF Committees; 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 section at the
end of Article VI:

D.   Parental Childcare Leave:  A regular, active-status member of the faculty
shall be entitled to parental childcare leave upon certifying that he or she will
provide at least half of the child’s care during the leave period, subject to the
terms and conditions set forth in this section.  Parental childcare leave shall
include release from teaching responsibilities and service responsibilities for one
semester with full salary and benefits, and such leave shall terminate within
twelve months after a minor dependent child is born or adopted or enters the
faculty member’s home under a foster care arrangement.  During such leave,
faculty members shall continue providing thesis and dissertation advising to
students whom they advised prior to the leave unless adequate alternative
arrangements are made.  For faculty members engaged in externally funded
grant or contract related activities, parental childcare leave shall include release
from responsibilities to the University, but shall not include release from
responsibilities to the external funding sources unless alternative arrangements
are approved by such sources.  A regular, active-status faculty member is
entitled to parental childcare leave for a maximum of two minor dependent
children who are born or adopted or enter the faculty member’s home as foster
children after the starting date of the faculty member’s appointment at the
University.  Parental childcare leave under other circumstances or for other
faculty, including leave with full or partial salary, may be granted at the
discretion of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, after consultation with the
appropriate department chair (if applicable) and dean.

(2) That, upon adoption by the University’s Board of Trustees of the foregoing amendment to the
Faculty Code, the Faculty Handbook should be revised to describe the parental childcare
leave benefit set forth in that amendment.

Faculty Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies
January 15, 2008

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
January 16, 2008

Adopted as amended January 18, 2008
WHEREAS, a small number of faculty members in the University hold joint appointments, and each joint appointment (i) provides the faculty member with a regular, active-status appointment in two or more schools or departments, and (ii) is separately budgeted in each school or department granting that appointment; and

WHEREAS, Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code contemplates joint appointments, because the holder of a joint appointment receives a separate regular, active-status appointment from each participating school or department;

WHEREAS, certain schools and departments have also granted appointments that are not regular, active-status appointments to faculty members who hold regular, active-status appointments in other schools or departments within the University;

WHEREAS, such appointments are generally of two types – (i) appointments that confer specified governance privileges in the school or department granting the appointments (hereinafter referred to as “secondary appointments”), and (ii) appointments that do not confer any governance privileges in the school or department granting the appointments (hereinafter referred to as “courtesy appointments”);

WHEREAS, secondary and courtesy appointments can encourage and facilitate interdisciplinary collaboration among faculty members from different schools or departments; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Code does not refer to secondary and courtesy appointments; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that it would be desirable to amend the Faculty Code to provide explicit authorization for secondary and courtesy appointments; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that a secondary or courtesy appointment should not automatically confer any of the rights to participate in faculty governance that are provided under the Faculty Code or the Faculty Organization Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that a secondary appointment should confer one or more specified faculty governance privileges but such privileges should be approved by the regular, active-status faculty of the school or department granting that appointment; and
WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that a courtesy appointment should not confer any faculty governance privileges; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that the terms, conditions, and designations of existing secondary and courtesy appointments should not be changed by the proposed amendment to the Faculty Code; NOW, THEREFORE

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

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

6. **Secondary and Courtesy Appointments:** A faculty member holding a regular, active-status appointment in one department or school may be granted a secondary or courtesy appointment in another department or school for a specified term. A secondary or courtesy appointment shall require the recommendation of the appropriate faculty and officers of administration of the unit granting that appointment and shall comply with rules and procedures for such appointments established by the unit granting that appointment and by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. A secondary or courtesy appointment is not a regular, active-status appointment and does not automatically confer any of the rights provided by the Faculty Code and the Faculty Organization Plan to participate in faculty governance in the unit granting that appointment. Unlike a courtesy appointment, a secondary appointment shall allow the faculty member to exercise one or more specified governance privileges in the faculty unit granting the appointment, but such privileges shall be approved by that unit’s regular, active-status faculty. A secondary or courtesy appointment terminates automatically upon the expiration of its specified term or upon termination of the faculty member’s regular, active-status appointment. This paragraph does not affect the terms, conditions, and designations of secondary and courtesy appointments in existence as of May 1, 2008.

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
March 27, 2008

Adopted, as amended, April 11, 2008
A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION (07/7)

WHEREAS, Lilien Filipovitch Robinson has earned the highest level of respect, gratitude, and admiration of the University community; and

WHEREAS, her term of service on the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate has reached its statutory limit; NOW, THEREFORE

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

That the following citation be issued:

Lilien Filipovitch Robinson has provided distinguished service as a member of the Faculty Senate for twenty-nine years. In addition, she has served on the Executive Committee for sixteen years and has chaired it for the last fourteen years of her service on the Committee. She has performed admirably in managing Senate affairs, providing stellar leadership tempered with great common sense as well as a sense of humor that is much appreciated by her colleagues. As required by Senate regulations, she vacates her seat on the Executive Committee after three years. The members of the Senate applaud her dedication to the concept of a strong faculty’s role in university affairs, her willingness to serve in leadership positions, and her unfailing kindnesses to all of the colleagues with whom she works.

THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

HEREBY EXPRESS ITS DEEPEST APPRECIATION AND GRATITUDE TO

PROFESSOR LILIEN FILIPOVITCH ROBINSON

FOR HER DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

Steven Knapp
President

[SEAL]

Adopted by acclamation, April 11, 2008
A Resolution to Amend the Time Limitation on Reporting of Final Grades by Faculty Members
(08/1)

Whereas, the quality of final examinations and overall course assessments by faculty members are dependent on the availability of adequate time for thoughtful consideration;

Whereas, the University is offering more writing-intensive courses, which require a substantial amount of additional grading time;

Whereas, the Faculty Senate recognizes that timely reporting of final grades by faculty members is essential so that the University can provide important academic and financial assistance services to students; NOW, THEREFORE

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

That the time limit for reporting of final grades by faculty members be changed from “72 hours” to “five working days after the final examination.”

Faculty Senate Educational Policy Committee, April 10, 2008

Adopted, May 9, 2008