

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D.C.

REGULAR FACULTY ASSEMBLY  
October 31, 2005  
Jack B. Morton Auditorium

CALL TO ORDER

The Assembly was called to order by President Trachtenberg at 3:05 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular Assembly of September 20, 2004, were approved as distributed.

PRESENTATION OF THE BENDER TEACHING AWARDS

Vice President Lehman expressed the University's appreciation to Mr. Morton Bender for establishing the Bender Teaching Awards. The Bender Awards provide recipients with \$500 for travel to a professional meeting, the purchase of equipment, or for some other activity related to faculty development.

The following faculty members each received a Bender Teaching Award in the indicated categories. The text of the faculty citations also appears below.

Jocelyne Brant  
German, Slavic, & Romance Languages & Literatures  
Award Category: General Teaching

Jocelyne Brant is an Instructor of French and the Coordinator of the French Language Program. Professor Brant graduated from the University of Caen and Bordeaux. She has spent most of her career in various countries in Africa and Latin America working for the French Ministry of Education. In Ethiopia in 1980, she was in charge of the Language Program for the Economic commission for Africa. While posted in Columbia, Professor Brant was appointed Executive Secretary for the Richelieu International, and she was awarded the Palmes Académiques by the French Minister of Education in 1996.

Professor Brant joined GWU in 1997, and she enjoys teaching courses in French language, Advanced Grammar, and General Readings in French Literature. She has a special interest in foreign languages, medieval literature, and etymology.

Students and professors alike are overwhelmingly positive with regard to Professor Brant's teaching. One student writes of his courses with Professor Brant, "I fondly remember those as some of my most engaging, challenging, and valuable courses of my college career and they remain highlights of my undergraduate education." A colleague writes, "Her love and dedication to her profession are contagious, and she inspires those

who work with her to achieve their very best. To students, she is more than an instructor. She is a mentor, a counselor, a friend, and sometimes a mother as well. To her colleagues, she is a leader, and advisor and a friend.”

**Chris Cahill**

**Chemistry**

**Award Category: Full-Time, Nontenured**

Christopher L. Cahill received his B.S. in Chemistry and Geochemistry from the State University of New York (SUNY) College at Fredonia. He went on to earn a Ph.D. in Chemistry at SUNY-Stony Brook, finishing in 1999. After a one-year post-doctoral position at the University of Notre Dame, he joined GW in July of 2000. Since then he has been active in research involving solid state and materials chemistry, with an emphasis on crystallography. His teaching interests include General Chemistry- typically a student's first science course at GW and Inorganic Chemistry- an advanced, senior level course.

Professor Cahill's students and colleagues alike have wonderful things to say about his teaching. One colleague writes, "(Professor Cahill) has been able to truly 'reach' these students and guide them through the crucial first semester of introductory chemistry. He does this with humor, and extraordinary passion for the discipline and motivation, and an incredible fund of knowledge" Professor Cahill's students echo these sentiments, adding "he demonstrated a willingness to help and a real concern for the students," "you could tell that the 'light came on' for many of the students in his class," "he's a great teacher...who goes out of his way to be there for students," "Professor Cahill really sparked my interest in Chemistry, a subject which used to intimidate me."

**Rob Eisen**

**Religion**

**Award Category: General Teaching**

Robert Eisen is Associate Professor of Religion and Judaic Studies. He received his B.A. at Yale University and his Ph.D. in Jewish thought at Brandeis University. His areas of interest include medieval and modern Jewish philosophy, biblical interpretation, and comparative religion. Professor Eisen serves on the Board of Directors for the Foundation for Jewish Studies which brings lecturers to Washington from academic institutions all over the world. He has also lectured and taught widely in the Jewish and non-Jewish communities in Washington and elsewhere.

Professor Eisen is also active as a consultant on issues of religion and international conflict with a particular interest in fostering better relations between the West and the Islamic world. He has participated in a number of high-level dialogues and consultations in Washington and abroad concerning this issue. He sits on the advisory board of the Center for World Religions, Diplomacy, and Conflict Resolution at George Mason University. He has also worked with such organizations as the United Institute of Peace and Initiatives of Change, formerly known as Moral Re-Armament.

Students have glowing reports of Professor Eisen's teaching as well as his availability to them outside the classroom. One student credits Professor Eisen with connecting her

with her graduate school advisor and mentor. The professor in question had come to speak at GW, and Professor Eisen, who had already introduced the student to the professor's work, arranged to introduce the student to the professor himself. As the student writes, "I...credit Professor Eisen with opening innumerable doors for me, both academically and personally." Another student writes, "I learned much more about my own religion by examining it from a secular, academic viewpoint than I ever could have learned by studying it solely from a religious viewpoint."

C. Dianne Martin

Computer Science

Award Category: Innovative Use of Technology

Dianne Martin is Professor of Computer Science in the School of Engineering and Applied Science; she is on leave through June 2007 while serving as the Dean of the College of Information Systems at Zayed University in Dubai, Saudi Arabia. Professor Martin received her BA in Economics and Mathematics Education from Western Maryland College, her MS in Computer Science from the University of Maryland, and her EdD in Teacher Education from the George Washington University; she has been at GW since 1987. Her areas of research include the design of educational software, the implementation of computer technology in education, e-commerce and internet policy issues, multimedia taxonomy, and the historical, social, and ethical issues of computing.

One colleague writes of Professor Martin, "(She) continues to use her creativity to engage the students in a discussion of the stereotypes for Computer Scientists. In her activity, "Draw a Computer Scientist," students discover unfounded expectations they have for the field and its practitioners. From that moment in computer science, all students are 'hooked' into the discipline, each feeling they have a rightful place to study in the School of Engineering and Applied Science."

Students also report feeling this sense of inclusion, writing that "(Professor Martin's) classes...fostered team building and helped...beginning students decide what interests they might want to pursue...(Professor Martin) makes a special and significant investment of her time and effort with her students."

Dolores Perillán

German, Slavic, & Romance Languages & Literatures

Award Category: Part-Time

Dolores Perillán is Adjunct Instructor in Spanish. She studied at Cambridge University, Georgetown University, and Madrid University and has been at GW since 1998. As an educator, Professor Perillán is devoted "to allow our language (in Octavio Paz's words) to speak through us." Her classes celebrate the individuality of every student and the unique variety each Spanish class creates. Service and community building, core elements of her teaching style, evolve naturally from the love of learning, GW's commitment to academic excellence, and from the many opportunities in the Washington area to combine service and learning in one word.

Professor Perillán's teaching extends far beyond the traditional classroom. As one colleague writes, "(Professor Perillán) helps (her students) tremendously in many ways: in the study of Spanish, in practicing it outside the classroom, and in using it as a service to others. To encourage and motivate students to go beyond the classroom into a real life experience in Spanish, she enrolled students and helped organize 'Big Brothers and Sisters Program,' a Community Participation and Service Learning group...She has also shared her own experiences with the students by supporting and accompanying their peers in their Service Spring Break experiences."

Professor Perillán's students give her teaching rave reviews, saying "(I) took (this class) to fulfill a GCR, but after taking it with Professor Perillán, I'm thinking about pursuing a minor in Spanish," "Your dedication was the greatest I've observed in all of my college experience," and "Thank you for realizing that non-traditional assignments can (and do) create a more robust understanding."

**Rich Robin**

German, Slavic, & Romance Languages & Literatures

Award Category: Innovative Use of Technology

Richard Robin is Associate Professor and Language Program Director for Russian. He received his Ph.D. in Slavic linguistics from the University of Michigan and has been at GW since 1981. He also serves as the Language Center's Technology Specialist. His main interests include Russian phonetics and methodology of Russian language teaching. He also coordinates distance-learning projects using authentic foreign-language materials on the Internet and serves as a senior researcher at the National Capital Language Resource Center. In 1987, The Columbian College of Arts and Sciences awarded Professor Robin its Distinguished Teaching Certificate. Professor Robin was recently selected to be the first recipient of the Language Center Fellowship. This Fellowship constitutes an effort to support faculty development in the area of language pedagogy and research.

Professor Robin is held in very high regard by both colleagues and students. One colleague writes, "(Professor Robin) especially emphasizes the need to provide students with Russian as it is really spoken in everyday situations. For that purpose, he made several trips to Russia and produced and digitalized video recordings that show native speakers in typical situations using 'normal' language." A departmental colleague writes that "His attitude towards language teaching is dynamic and bubbling over with enthusiasm..."

Students echo this assessment, writing, "I have learned more from (Professor Robin's) classes than from any other course I have taken at any school at any level of education. I credit this completely to his teaching ability, his passion for the subject matter, and his desire to help his students learn everything that they can." Other students write, "Aside from the technicalities of Russian, Professor Robin also taught us about the culture and how people actually say things in Russia...His influence caused me to major in Russian and realize my career direction" and "He goes to all lengths to expose his students to Russian culture through music, film, news, food, etc."

Following conferral of the Bender Teaching Awards, Vice President Lehman recognized Mr. Morton Bender who had arrived unexpectedly during the award presentation. Mr. Bender was greeted with a round of applause by the Assembly.

#### INTRODUCTION OF NEW FACULTY

Vice President Lehman said it was his pleasure to welcome new faculty who have joined The George Washington University this year, and he called upon those present to step forward to a microphone in the front of the room to introduce themselves to the Assembly. He asked that each give their name, appointment, and say a few words about their interest in scholarship, research, or teaching at the University. Following the introductions, Vice President Lehman welcomed the new faculty to the University.

#### REMARKS BY THE CHAIR OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chair of the Senate Executive Committee, congratulated the winners of the Bender Teaching Awards, and welcomed new faculty to the University. On behalf of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, Professor Robinson presented his report to the Assembly. (Report by Professor Robinson is enclosed and made a part of these minutes.)

#### REMARKS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Vice President Lehman presented his remarks to the Faculty Assembly, which are attached to and made a part of these minutes.

#### REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

President Trachtenberg presented his remarks to the Faculty Assembly, which are attached to and made a part of these minutes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Assembly, President Trachtenberg adjourned the meeting at 4:34 p.m. He then invited everyone to the reception immediately following.

*ELIZABETH A. AMUNDSON*

Elizabeth A. Amundson

Registrar

Remarks by Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman,  
Faculty Assembly, October 31, 2005

**It is not just the bottom line, it is the mission too!**

Summer ends and the intensity of activity increases as the new academic year begins and evolves at universities and colleges across the United States and elsewhere throughout the world. For students, it is an opportunity to read in depth and to reflect on their readings through mediated discussions, targeted assignments, and collaborations with peers. Faculty members and academic administrators usually find themselves pressed to achieve their day-to-day responsibilities in the time available thus leaving little time for extensive reading beyond that necessary to function. However, before one can imagine, spring has arrived and yet another school year is rapidly coming to a close with the welcome thought of summer before us for catching up with reading that was impossible to achieve during the normal academic year.

For me personally, summer's somewhat slower pace and time for vacation are opportunities for catching up on reading and reflecting on the events of the past year. It is also a time for thinking about the future and what might be as the new academic year opens once again. My summer this calendar year was not an exception.

These days, I continue to like to read books associated with the world of physics. Two books from this past summer that kept me turning the pages were Steven Weinberg's *Facing Up – Science and its Cultural Adversaries* and Michelle Feynman's edited volume *Perfectly Reasonable Deviations from the Beaten Track – The Letters of Richard P. Feynman*. This latter book concerns the personal correspondence of Nobel Laureate Richard Feynman, one of the most creative and original physicists of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, whose self-effacing genius and enthusiasm for understanding nature comes remarkably through in his communications to high-school kids, his peers, and others. It is a fun read! Weinberg's book, which is a compendium of a number of his speeches and "popular" written articles since he won the Nobel Prize in 1979, brings forth his deep commitment to the broader population's understanding what scientists really do and what it means to create and have scientific knowledge.

I can easily keep myself occupied for long periods of time reading about physics and how physics is done. Yet, for more than ten years now, I find that I

continually read articles, reviews, and books about what is happening in the world of higher education.

Two books have caught and kept my attention in the last year or two. The first has been around since at least late 2003: *Shakespeare, Einstein, and the Bottom Line – The Marketing of Higher Education*, by David L. Kirp. The second appeared only recently but had been preceded during the summer by an excerpt published in the *Chronicle of Higher Education: Remaking the American University – Market-Smart and Mission-Centered*, by Robert Zemsky, Gregory R. Wegner, and William F. Massy. Their content is inter-related and of interest in the context of thinking about GW.

Kirp’s book is a compendium of articles, many of which he co-authored, about how different universities around the world have positioned themselves through careful branding and marketing to raise the resources to achieve success. Not all the stories are stories of success but all the stories in one way or another indicate that marketing is a major component of the positioning “game.” The stories cover the gamut from the successes of NYU and the University of Southern California to the challenge and failure of attempting to duplicate the British Open University in the United States. Quickly, one concludes that money is the underlying driver in an ever increasingly competitive marketplace of higher-education. As Kirp points out in his introductory chapter, “market forces lead some schools to forget that they are not simply businesses while turning others into stronger, better places.” Universities at their best possess “values that the market place does not honor.” Without having read Kirp’s book, we in this room can immediately construct the essence of his values list:

- “a community of scholars”
- “openness” or the transparency of sharing knowledge
- pursuit of “truth”
- students as learners “whose preferences are to be formed”

At GW, I believe that we have not lost sight of the essential values of being a university as opposed to a business. I make this argument within the framework of the University’s Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence where our Academic Mission is stated to be “to provide students and faculty with the optimal environment for the creation, acquisition, and dissemination of knowledge and the pursuit of creative endeavors to meet the needs and enrich the experiences of the global society.” This mission statement is augmented by the academic vision for GW “to become one of the pre-eminent urban research universities in the nation

and world, recognized for its excellence in selected areas that are primarily derived from existing programmatic strengths in teaching, scholarship, and externally-funded research across the disciplines.” Both the mission and vision drive the underlying values front and center but there is a market responsive component that has to be addressed. To fulfill our mission, we need to

- Raise the level of academic excellence for which GW is already recognized
- Gain a unique position in the higher education marketplace
- Achieve a high level of operational excellence in all areas of GW

To what extent can GW balance the bottom line “contribution margin” and the achievement of the academic mission and vision?

The reality is that GW has five primary sources of revenue that contribute at various levels to the realization of our strategic goals:

- Tuition revenue – dominates
- Externally funded research – significant
- Endowment payout – not to be ignored
- Annual fund raising – not to be ignored
- Auxiliary enterprises – not to be ignored

Significantly increasing tuition revenue is not a viable option owing to housing constraints at the undergraduate level and pricing sensitivities at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Given this limitation, the pressures are never ending for achieving enrollment targets, increasing our externally funded academic research and scholarship, growing the endowment through major gifts to GW as well as sound investment policies for the corpus, growing annual giving and unrestricted giving to GW, and for developing new auxiliary enterprises. As stated in our Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence, success in these realms requires “a direct link between the identification of strategic priorities and the budgeting process” both through “reallocation of existing resources and the use of new resources generated through development.”

Chapter 4 of *Remaking the American University* by Zemsky, *et al.*, explains clearly that achieving success through resource generation requires continual balancing of the intrinsic mission and the basic values of universities with the demands of the marketplace. Zemsky, *et al.*, look at responsiveness to the marketplace for an institution like GW as occurring through the expansion of

perimeters around a central core. The Columbian College of Arts and Science is GW’s core. Columbian College as GW’s core holds securely to the University’s academic mission and vision, and thus possesses the traditional values of a university. From CCAS, one moves through our professional schools to the College of Professional Studies, where an entrepreneurial approach oriented to the needs of the marketplace is manifest. The College of Professional Studies inhabits “the institution’s perimeter” and has the freedom and flexibility to pursue paths not traditionally followed and to pursue funding streams not normally sought.

Ultimately, at GW, our combined efforts seek to maximize our achievement of academic mission and vision while simultaneously generating a “contribution margin” that will make it possible to realize to the fullest the mission and vision. Such “cross-subsidies” many times derive from those components working in the expanded perimeters of the institution. This approach differs from the for-profit environment in which programs grow only “if the extra revenue from the marketplace exceeds the variable cost of expansion.” If such revenue generation is not possible, the units are closed! For universities, it is clear that it is not just the bottom line, it is the mission too!

In my opinion, Zemsky, *et al.*, have some words of wisdom with regard to making their “mission-centered – market-smart strategy succeed:” “... the institution must commit itself to transparency – and such transparency must mean more than revealing the president’s salary or the athletic department’s deficit. Transparency means, as a minimum, an agreed-upon set of rules and the necessary data to calculate contribution margins – even if, in the process of making those calculations, it becomes obvious that some departments, for example, have lower teaching loads or higher average salaries.” Such transparency is critical for GW as we seek to achieve the goals of our University Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence since our plan is premised on selective academic excellence. Transparency in the end must be coupled carefully with “spending wisely and productively the (contribution) margins generated by being market-smart” as Zemsky, *et al.*, emphasize at the end of their chapter 4.

In closing these remarks, I return to the world of physics and further reading that I did this past summer. This reading involved the three Nobel Lectures by David Gross, David Politzer, and Frank Wilczek and the discovery of asymptotic freedom and the emergence of Quantum Chromodynamics. These lectures can be found in the July 2005 issue of *Review of Modern Physics* (Volume 77). Gross, Politzer, and Wilczek shared the Nobel Prize for Physics in 2004 for providing the theoretical understanding that the quarks permanently confined within the neutron

and proton behave as though they are free particles within their confines when bombarded, for example, with very high-energy electrons. Their work was done in the early 1970s. In talking about what was learned, Wilczek states that the greatest lesson “is a moral and philosophical one.” He states that “It is truly awesome to discover, by example, that we humans can come to comprehend nature’s deepest principles, even when they are hidden in remote and alien realms. Our minds were not created for this task, nor were appropriate tools ready at hand. Understanding was achieved through a vast international effort involving thousands of people working hard for decades, competing in the small but cooperating in the large, abiding by rules of openness and honesty. Using these methods – which do not come to us effortlessly, but require nurture and vigilance – we can accomplish wonders.”

Applying Wilczek’s “lesson” to GW will stand us in good stead. We who are currently responsible for GW’s well being, and that means the Board of Trustees, the Administration, and the Faculties, must be able to execute together as a team at the highest level with respect to the University’s Strategic Goals. The good news is that we have delineated the goals and we have outstanding individuals at all levels to help bring them to realization. Now, we must have dialogue that is candid and reality-based. The right questions must be asked, the right questions must be debated, and great effort must be put forth to find realistic solutions through effective decision making. In making things happen, we must be willing to extend ourselves beyond the normal but with understanding of realistic bounds. Above all, whether it is the work of refining the University’s Unified Budget Model or the work of applying the principle of selective academic excellence to the allocation of resources, we must be committed to transparency in what we are about and abide “by rules of openness and honesty.”

Thank you!

## **Faculty Assembly**

### **“You Can’t Have Progress Without Change”**

Considering the recent and hapless fates of the presidents of Harvard and American Universities, Harry Truman’s words about life in Washington come to mind. It seems to me they apply equally to university presidents: “If you want a friend, get a dog.” Alas, I don’t have one—just a hippo that no longer belongs to me.

Thus, I stand before you a bit hesitant to propose something that may not be attractive to all members of the faculty. I am hesitant because, while we all want progress, many are reluctant to accept change. Yet I believe there is no progress without change.

Let me tell you a story to illustrate my point. It begins with a question: if someone had said to you 25 years ago that there could be part-time tenure-track positions at major universities, would anyone have taken you seriously? I think not. Yet such is the case at Ohio State — and has been since 1996. Harvard is considering permitting junior professors to work part-time for a couple of years in order to postpone their tenure evaluation. There are other plans at other universities. The central object is enable more women who have children to earn tenure, though it would apply to men. I’m not about to ask you what you think of the idea right now — though at another time, I’d be glad to. The point is that it is now a thinkable idea, not a joke. Times have changed, and I see this as progress.

Now, let me tell you another story. When I was a dean at Boston University, I discovered that many retired faculty could no longer afford to live in Boston. Instead, they were moving to rural towns in southern New Hampshire, when land there was very cheap. This happened because BU joined TIAA-CREF late. Salaries in the 1950’s had been low. Contributions to the retirement plan, therefore, were small, and the pension plan BU had was badly managed. I promised myself that if I ever became

a college president, I would not let that happen to my faculty.

When I became president of the University of Hartford, I decided to keep that promise. When I arrived in Hartford, the TIAA-CREF contribution was three or maybe four percent. I could see the future because I had already seen it at BU in the past. I began raising the contribution one percent a year. If, for example, I had seven percent for raises, I gave six percent raises and added one percent to the pension fund. I did this until I got it to nine percent. My aim had been 10 percent, which is normative for places like GW and many other universities. But I never got to that level because I got tired with fighting the faculty every year over the increased contribution to the retirement plan. They wanted all of the raise now — even though the amount as expendable income would be small but much greater if invested over the years.

I finally surrendered, as I said, because the annual fight was wearing me down — and besides, nine percent was better than three. About five or six years after I left Hartford for GW, something happened. The senior professors I had known — and often had fought with — at Hartford were retiring and they started sending me fan mail. Really — I wouldn't dare make that up. The mail went generally like this: Dear Steve, I know I opposed your pension plan, but now that I have retired, I am actually making more money than when I was working.

This was, and still is, gratifying. But I hasten to add that because I was right once I have to be careful to avoid the temptation to believe that I will always be right. I won't be. I have to listen to the faculty, who may be right when I am not. So, that brings us to more recent days. Last spring, we had planned for three percent raises. I didn't like the idea because it's too easy for dean's and department chairs to treat raises, especially small ones, like a pat of butter and spread it evenly over the whole piece of toast — with everybody getting the same. But some deserve more and some less — and that is an idea that came from the faculty.

I do pay attention to the faculty senate's resolutions and I was aware of a resolution that said GW faculty salaries should be in the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile of the AAUP rankings. Associate professors were already in the 83<sup>rd</sup> percentile. Assistant and full professors were lagging. So I proposed waiting until January when we could offer six percent raises, not necessarily across the board or across the buttered toast, and then add about a million more to the kitty to move the lagging — not laggard, mind you — professors up into, or at least nearer to, the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile. The response was nearly unanimously negative. Everyone wanted the raise now. Shades of Hartford!

I followed my previous experience and ignored the senate — perhaps not a model of what any university president should do. But my experience had served me well. When I signed the raise letters a few weeks ago, I saw some raises as high as 24 percent. One professor who got a 14 percent increase thought it wasn't enough. All I could say it was better than three percent. And I couldn't help thinking that perhaps, just maybe, I had got it right again.

Or maybe I didn't get it right, but just did the obvious for the benefit of the faculty as a whole — and on a cue, as I pointed out, from the faculty themselves. I fear too often many on the faculty assume that the administration does not act out of good will or that we have anything but the best interests of our stakeholders at heart. I think the results of the raise strategy should make you pause and perhaps, just maybe, think otherwise.

I hope so, because what I've said so far is prelude. I am worried about the future of American higher education. I worry that costs are going up faster than we can raise prices, faster than the growth in philanthropy, in overhead, and in endowment income. In the next 10 to 15 years — when many of you will still be teaching — both public and private colleges and universities will be facing serious problems of sustainability. Maybe Harvard

won't — and the poor schools will probably have foundered before then. But normative institutions like GW will not be able to maintain the life we now lead and, by and large, enjoy. We need to become more efficient and make changes for the better that will sustain GW and make it thrive, not limpingly survive.

To this end, I have asked EVP Don Lehman to lead a study group to examine the virtues and vices, the feasibility or impossibility of a four-by-four course load. And I am asking you to be open, sympathetic, and reflective when the study group issues its report.

Now, a reminder before I continue. A couple of years ago, I proposed that faculty and administration look at the advantages and disadvantages of going to a three-term calendar that would make fuller use of our physical plant. I did that out of a sense of inevitability: we cannot sustain a university if we fully use its assets only over eight months when there are 12 months in a year. The reluctance of the Faculty Senate — embodied in 17 *Whereases*, all negative — merely to consider the proposal saddened me. It also means that declining to examine the proposal has cost us two years of reflection and debate at leisure. I predict that one day, and soon enough, we and many others will have to come up with a new calendar — and we may have to do it in haste because we did not stop to consider the merits of the case when we had the time. As I said, the proposal rose out of a sense of inevitability and professional concern.

So, when I ask you to look openly at any four-by-four proposal that Don's study group may produce, I am really asking the faculty to work with your administration in transforming GW into a 21<sup>st</sup> century university rather than leaving it a hybrid of a mediaeval and pre-industrial institution.

There are a number of advantages to four-by-four. First, it is responsive to student interests: it allows them a more experiential academic time at GW. One reason so many students apply to GW is that they can bring the outside world into the

classroom and vice versa through internships and other work experiences in Washington. I was delighted — and slightly amazed — to see a student editorial in *The Hatchet* several weeks ago supporting four-by-four.

Four-by-four allows greater depth in courses — after all, students would be taking four rather than five and have more time to devote to each. It also puts us on the way to moving towards universities we admire, like Yale and Harvard.

Most important from the perspective of sustainability is that four-by-four course loads can be more efficient. Some simple arithmetic. A four-course load of three-by-five produces 12 credits. The same load of four-by-four produces 16 credits. Credits are the currency of universities. This is not to dismiss — let alone fail to admire — the importance of research and service. But the coin of the realm in university is the credit. And it is the faculty that produces this wealth. Only you.

A four-by-four system may appear to be more work, but that is not necessarily the case. I propose that you not conflate “seat time” with credit hours. It is possible to design a four-credit course that meets only three hours a week: the instructor could assign more work, the students would have more time to do it with depth and breadth, and the instructor would be teaching no more than he or she had. The schedules of both, moreover, would be more flexible — or at least less cluttered. A couple of nice byproducts would be 20 percent more available classroom space and, perhaps, 20 percent less parking to provide. Faculty and student schedules would be more accommodating.

But there would not be a decrease in the number of faculty because it allows us to retain the four-course system as a more efficient or sleeker product, if you will. The alternative may be awful: as I said, I am worried about the future of higher education. If we cannot induce more efficiency from our system, then teaching two and two, as some senior faculty do, or three and three or four and four — or some combination — may

become a thing of the past. Given a choice of laying off faculty or closing down departments, I — and any future president who had the best interests of GW at heart — would first go to a four-and-four course load. That would pretty much be the end of the life we lead now: sabbaticals, time for research, intellectual leisure to ply your scholarship might be compromised. The room to think and reflect in order to fuel your teaching, research, and service might be less available.

GW has, as I said, 10 to 15 years to transform itself. Since I don't expect to be here in 15 years, I mentioned "any future president." But, as I also said, a good many of you may still be here. You have to have your own best interests at heart — and the interests of future colleagues, as well as the institution.

That's why I ask you to share my concern about the future of higher education in America. It is still the envy of the world, but that can change. Already universities abroad are beginning to compete with us for undergraduates and especially for the most appealing graduate students. If we do not change, if we do not become more sustainable, if we do not find new ways to be even better at what we do, then we will go away — or become, with five-and-five teaching loads, a glorified community college.

A little history. There was once a mighty company called International Harvester. It was one of the Dow 30 stocks. It no longer exists. And when was the last time you saw an A & P supermarket?

We have no guarantees of survival. And I am not trying to convince you that four-by-four alone will make us sustainable. There are many possibilities. And I am not asking for a specific response at the moment. I am simply asking you to await Don's report and look at it with an open mind and, most importantly, with a clear eye toward the future of GW. Your future.

**REPORT TO THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY**  
**Lilien F. Robinson, Chair**  
**Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate**  
**October 31, 2005**

I would like to extend a warm welcome to members of the Faculty Assembly as we begin a new academic year. On behalf of the Faculty Senate, I offer the following report on the Senate's recent activities.

**RESOLUTIONS**

During the 2004-2005 session, under the excellent leadership of Professor Arthur Wilmarth, the Faculty Senate considered and adopted nine resolutions. In addition, on May 13, 2005, at the first meeting of the 2005-2006 session the Senate adopted two more resolutions.

Proposed by Standing Committees of the Senate, these resolutions addressed significant topics of concern to the University community. I would like to focus on a number of them, which I believe you will find important and timely.

***A Resolution to Endorse the Sexual Harassment Policy and Procedures (05/1)***

Pursuant to a Senate Resolution of November 2004, the Senate Executive Committee and the Administration jointly appointed an ad hoc Committee to prepare a new policy and procedures governing sexual harassment complaints. The recommendations of this committee were transmitted to the Senate's Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, which approved and forwarded, with clarifying amendments, the proposed new policy to the Faculty Senate. The resolution was passed without opposition by the Senate.

***A Resolution Recommending Improved Timing of the Budget Cycle to Permit Better Consultation with Faculty (04/7)***

Presented by the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, this resolution states that the Administration's practice over the past several years in requiring annual reductions in the expense budgets of most Schools and the sequestration of funds has provided insufficient time for Deans to consult with their faculties before identifying and reporting to the University Budget Office the expenses that would be cut. The resolution requests modification of the budget cycle to provide more time for decanal consultation, which would also allow faculty to exercise their right under the Faculty Code to participate in budget-driven restructuring of academic programs. Further, the resolution requests that the Administration commit itself to more long range budget planning, especially in planning academic programs in conjunction with the Deans and their faculties. The Faculty Senate unanimously approved this resolution.

***A Resolution on Faculty and Staff Compensation Increases and Compensation Policy (05/2)***

The Faculty Senate held a special meeting on May 9, 2005, attended by about 125 faculty from throughout the University, to discuss with President Trachtenberg and other senior Administration officers the possibility that the Administration might decide to defer the next salary increases for faculty and staff from July 1, 2005 to January 1, 2006 and/or adopt an 18-month cycle

for future salary increases for faculty and staff. Discussion at this meeting included consideration of a report on “Issues of Fiscal and Academic Management at George Washington University,” prepared by the Ad Hoc Committee of Concerned Faculty and a report on top administrative salaries and their comparison with faculty salaries and tuition at George Washington. The subsequent discussions reflected serious faculty concerns about recent non-competitive trends in the University’s fiscal, budgetary, and compensation policies.

At its regularly scheduled meeting of May 13, 2005, the Faculty Senate adopted, without opposition, the resolution cited above, which affirms the shared governance role and responsibility of the faculty in ensuring “the effective operation of the departments and schools of the University” and in formulating “policy and planning decisions affecting the quality of education and life at the university.” The resolution recommends steps to be taken to address the faculty’s budgetary and salary related concerns, including:

- The development of a plan by the Administration and the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee for attaining and maintaining faculty salaries, for all ranks, at the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile and average faculty salaries in each School at no less than the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile AAUP scale.
- More transparent communication by the Administration, on an ongoing and timely basis, with the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee .

The resolution states opposition to the deferral of annual salary increases for staff and faculty and recommends an average compensation of no less than 4%, effective July 1, 2005.

***Resolution on Research Priorities at the George Washington University (04/02)***

Presented by the Committee on Research, this resolution urges the University Administration to institute a plan to fully fund the Research Enhancement Incentive Award program in order to provide principal investigators, departments, and schools with funds proportionate to their sponsored research activities for reinvestment in program expenditures critical to the success of research grant proposals.

***Resolution Requesting Joint Senate and Administration Review of the Recent Classroom shortage (04/05)***

Presented by Professor Griffith, Senate representative from Columbian College, this resolution addresses the problem of scheduling classes in light of increased undergraduate enrollment and a decrease of available classrooms. The resolution requests a high level review and plan to remedy the situation no later than Fall 2005, as well as a program of ongoing reviews.

In response to this resolution, Vice President Lehman appointed a University Task Force, which presented a preliminary report of its findings at the May 13 meeting. Please note that an update on classroom scheduling and classroom availability by Vice President Linebaugh has been scheduled for the November 11 Senate meeting.

**STATUS OF FACULTY PERSONNEL MATTERS**

## **Grievances**

Two grievances are currently in process, one in Columbian College of Arts and Sciences and the other in the School of Business. In the first the mediation process is ongoing. In the second a mediator was recently appointed.

## **Nonconcurrences**

Three Administration nonconcurrences with faculty recommendations on tenure and promotion were received by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. In two cases, the nonconcurrences were accepted by the respective departments. The third nonconcurrency, which rejected a faculty recommendation to **deny** tenure and promotion was not accepted by the recommending department faculty. The case was reviewed by the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee issued its written recommendation to the department faculty and the Administration for a possible resolution. This was rejected by the Administration and the nonconcurrency forwarded to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, which sustained the Administration's nonconcurrency.

## **REPORTS TO THE FACULTY SENATE**

During the 2004-2005 session and at the first two meetings of the 2005-2006 session, in addition to reports accompanying resolutions, the Faculty Senate received thirteen reports on a wide range of subjects, including: update on campus building, efforts to form a union representing the University's part-time faculty, academic information technology security issues, the University's development efforts, development of the old hospital site (square 54), funding classroom renovations, and classroom scheduling.

The Executive Committee continued its practice of inviting Deans to provide reports to the Faculty Senate concerning developments in their respective Schools. The Senate received very informative reports from the Deans of Columbian College, the School of Business, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, and the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.

The Faculty Senate considered and dealt with matters that are important to the University's welfare and crucial to the success of the faculty's role in the governance of the University, as established in the Faculty Code, which speaks to our responsibilities and our individual and collective rights. Dedicated to the protection of those rights, the Faculty Senate is the primary vehicle of expression and action.

Supported by the provisions of the Faculty Code, and because of the dedicated work of generations of faculty colleagues, the Faculty Senate has achieved a long and remarkable record of success. On behalf of our colleagues on the Faculty Senate, I would like to thank you for your past contributions and urge you to continue your involvement through membership on the Senate and its committees. Your participation and support are essential.