

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D.C.

REGULAR FACULTY ASSEMBLY  
September 20, 2004  
Ross Hall, Room 101

CALL TO ORDER

The Assembly was called to order by Executive President for Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman at 3:50 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular Assembly of September 29, 2003, 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, and noted that Mr. Bender was unexpectedly unable to attend the Assembly meeting that day. 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 underlined categories. The text of the faculty citations also appears below.

Zulima Alvarez

Zulima Alvarez is an adjunct faculty member who joined the Department of Romance Languages & Literatures in the fall of 2000. Her areas of expertise include the history and anthropology of Mexico and other Central American countries, as well as International and Labor Law. Professor Alvarez has taught Spanish 4 (Language and Culture), Spanish 9 (Contemporary Institutions), Spanish 10 (Press, Communication, and Politics), and Spanish 30 (Readings in Spanish Literature). Her historical, sociological, and linguistic knowledge has been particularly valuable to the teaching of Spanish 30.

In addition to her direct teaching responsibilities, Professor Alvarez has also contributed to the strength of the department's teaching by assisting in the writing of new course materials, orienting and guiding new instructors, and assisting in the evaluation of placement examinations. Along with Professor Alberto Morón-Pastor, Professor Alvarez has also been writing a manuscript for a Spanish 9 reading-based textbook, for which publication prospects look quite strong.

Student comments about Professor Alvarez' work paint a picture of a dedicated teacher who demonstrates an infectious enthusiasm for her subject as a whole as well as the material covered in class. One student reports that she finds it "refreshing to feel stimulated

and yet comforted in dealing with literature of a foreign language so early in the morning.” This student continues on to say that “the manner with which (Professor Alvarez) shares her thoughts and analysis of the works we cover is always rich with insight and at the same time delightfully sincere.”

### Masha Belenky

Masha Belenky is a tenure-track professor in the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures who joined the department in 2001. Her research and teaching interests include nineteenth-century literature and culture, the novel and narrative theory, aesthetics, cultural studies, autobiography, and *histoire des mentalités* in the nineteenth century. She has published articles on Zola, Balzac, and Rachilde. She teaches French 30 (Introduction to French Literature) as well as 100-level courses on the novel and on different aspects of nineteenth-century French literature. Her recent courses include French 124 (Representations of Revolution, Revolutions of Representation) and French 134 (Writing Paris in the Nineteenth Century).

In a letter of recommendation to the award selection committee, a faculty member noted that Professor Belenky “imparts the same enthusiasm to a first year language class as she does to a literature class...at no time is she solely dependent on the text, and her excellent use of expressive body language always makes for a lively and entertaining class in which the students are fully engaged. This ability to motivate coupled with a keen sense of humor allows her to establish an excellent rapport with the class and successfully achieve the aims of the lesson presented.”

Professor Belenky’s students are similarly enthusiastic about her work. One student writes about the formation of an informal literature group that met outside of class and office-hour time: “She invited the entire class to participate in what would become our Friday afternoon reading rendezvous in her office. She had prepared for us a packet of short stories to read in French, and each Friday she would give up an hour and a half of her time to sit and chat with us about what we had read.” In class, this student reports, Professor Belenky began the semester by having her students “write compositions to get a sense of what kind of knowledge backgrounds we each were coming from, and she used this to format her lessons to cater to areas of difficulty.” Another student writes that Professor Belenky’s “passion for French literature along with her dedication to her students inspired me to go as far as I could with French at GW. Professor Belenky showed me how rewarding it can be to explore beyond what you know.”

### Eric Cline

Eric Cline joined the Department of Classical and Semitic Languages and Literatures in the fall of 2000 and is currently serving as department chair. He holds a joint appointment in the Department of History. His primary fields of study are the military history of the Mediterranean world from antiquity to present and the international connections between Greece, Egypt, and the Near East during the Late Bronze Age.

Professor Cline is an experienced field archaeologist, with 18 seasons of excavation and survey to his credit. He has worked in Israel, Egypt, Jordan, Cyprus, Greece, Crete, and

the United States, including five seasons at the site of Megiddo (Armageddon) in Israel, where he is a Senior Staff Archaeologist and Director of The George Washington University Archaeological Field School. His most recent book, *Jerusalem Besieged: From Ancient Canaan to Modern Israel*, will be published in October 2004.

Of Professor Cline's teaching, a colleague writes that "no matter what their professional aspirations or level of previous acquaintance with archaeology, his students are uniformly enthusiastic about his classes and express genuine excitement at discovering and experiencing genuine scholarship through his lectures, assignments, class discussions, and visual presentations." In addition, he has "negotiated truly meaningful archaeological internship opportunities unique to Washington...after graduation, his students have taken their commitment to archaeology into advanced degree programs in law or archaeology...Cline students' will be making a significant contribution to the field of archaeology...for years to come." His students are equally enthusiastic, noting that "he brings archaeology out of the past and makes it something both comprehensible and engaging to students...it's a true testament to his teaching ability when students plan their academic schedules around what he is teaching, taking every class he offers because they know they are guaranteed to get an exemplary learning experience."

### Ivy Kennelly

Ivy Kennelly is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology who came to GW in 2001. She studies the theoretical interdependencies of race, gender, and class as systems of inequality and oppression. Much of the empirical evidence she has used to examine these interdependencies come from her studies of paid labor markets and her specific focus on gender segregated occupations.

A colleague notes that Professor Kennelly has, over the course of her career at GW, "taught twelve different courses, which speaks to the breadth of her knowledge and abilities. Here at GW, we have primarily relied on her to teach the required courses in classical and contemporary theory, which students at any university often dread taking. Despite the difficult content, Professor Kennelly has developed something of a following for her theory courses, and now even has students from other disciplines taking these required courses as electives...She also requires a great deal of writing in her courses and has recently received approval to teach her Classical Sociological Theory course as a Writing in the Disciplines course for the fall of 2004...The design of this course, which was writing intensive even before receiving this designation, will provide a demanding writing experience for students in what is already one of the most challenging required courses for our major."

Student comments on Professor Kennelly's teaching reveal a knowledgeable, caring, and engaged teacher. One student writes that "independent assignments such as papers and book reviews were geared toward making students figure out how theories could be applied to modern life rather than simply examining them in a vacuum...(her) uncanny aptitude for breaking down multifaceted notions to their core concepts and then restructuring them in understandable models" is particularly impressive. Another student writes that "Professor Kennelly represents the very best of academia: a thoughtful,

committed, and engaged scholar eager to support and further the learning and work of her students.”

### Mark Reeves

Mark Reeves joined the Department of Physics at GW in 1993 and is an Assistant Professor. His research involves measuring and understanding the physical properties of superconductors. His teaching interests involve developing ways of presenting physics concepts that are new to students. Physics is often concerned with the knowledge of the unseeable and of phenomena that are quite unrelated to our ordinary experiences. Professor Reeves feels that a qualitative understanding of these concepts can be obtained through the presentation of effective demonstrations and analogies to these phenomena. Then, having a simple and concrete picture of a physical system, students can effectively use the mathematical models that quantitatively describe and predict its behavior.

Professor Reeves' colleagues speak highly of his ability to execute this philosophy, adding that “along with his deep knowledge of physics, he uses gentle persuasion, genuine humor, intellectual engagement, human concern and support, honest civility, unwavering optimism, and almost astronomical patience and persistence” to teach his students. Another colleague notes a number of important interactive features present in Professor Reeves' teaching, including constant assessment and feedback, problem-based teaching as opposed to lectures, and a Socratic teaching style in which “difficult material will be posed to students in form of questions that they then work on and discuss in the form of solving a problem...He sees no contradiction in having a popular and enjoyable class on the one hand and upholding the highest possible standards on the other hand. His approach is to clearly communicate his high expectations to the students and then provide them with the tools they need to reach his standard.”

Praise for Professor Reeves' teaching comes also from his students, one of whom notes that “instead of reworking the proofs which were already in the book for us to read, (Professor Reeves) challenged us to understand them and use them in the classroom...we felt comfortable expressing our insecurities with the subject material, including our lack of understanding and actual disturbance at some of the consequences of the theory, because he could relate to what we were feeling.” Another student simply states, “Studying under Professor Reeves is a gratifyingly enlightening experience.”

### Robert Savickas

Robert Savickas has been an Assistant Professor of Finance at GW since the Fall of 2000. His research interests include investments, derivatives, mathematical finance, asset pricing, market microstructure, econometrics, numerical optimization, and artificial intelligence. At the undergraduate level, he teaches Financial Management, Advanced Financial Management Case-Study Course, and Mathematical and Computer Modeling in Finance.

Professor Savickas' colleagues speak very highly of his ability to engage his students while still taking his research and his service responsibilities at GW very seriously. One colleague notes several factors contributing to the strength of Professor Savickas' teaching,

including his open-door policy for students and his active use of technology in his teaching as well as in his requirements for student presentations, recognizing the importance of clear communication in business. Another colleague notes that Professor Savickas is “a role model for all faculty. He both entertains and motivates students to apply themselves to understanding difficult material.”

Professor Savickas’ students demonstrate a clear enthusiasm for his teaching skills as well. One student writes that, “from his class, I experience personally how the close involvement of instructor with students can magnify the learning experience.” Another student notes that “(Professor Savickas’) intensity and passion, along with his apparent desire to share his extensive knowledge of finance established a positively exciting tone for an otherwise daunting course.” A third student summarizes the myriad of positive comments by writing, “In class and out, Professor Savickas always made it clear that his students were his first priority.”

### 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.

### PHILLIP AMSTERDAM GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT AWARDS FOR OUTSTANDING TEACHING

Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Carol K. Sigelman presented these awards to three recipients. Following is the text of her remarks:

As faculty members who have worked with Graduate Teaching Assistants appreciate, GTAs make a tremendous contribution, not only to the achievement of their faculty mentors’ instructional goals but to the education and personal growth of GW’s students. As part of our efforts to advance the training and professional development of GTAs, we sought to honor their contributions by establishing a University-wide GTA award.

Thanks to the generosity of GW Board of Trustee member, Philip Amsterdam, we are now able to give three such awards, each carrying a prize of \$2,500. Mr. Amsterdam, you need to know, has a severe learning disability and believes that he might not have graduated from GW without the help of teaching assistants who were willing to go the extra mile in working with him. He was to join us today, but due to a change in plans I am proud to present on his behalf the first winners of the Philip

**Amsterdam Graduate Teaching Assistant Awards for Outstanding Teaching.**

These gifted teachers stood out among the nominees as best meeting the award criteria by showing—

- Enthusiasm, effectiveness, and innovation in the teaching/learning process
- The ability to engage and inspire students
- High standards of professionalism and collegiality
- And commitment to the educational enterprise of the University.

Our first awardee, Kristin Meyer, cannot be here today, as she has graduated and is completing a mandatory job training program in North Carolina. As GTA and then head GTA in the Forensic Sciences program, she was responsible for running the labs. In the process, she established new procedures for ensuring lab safety and chemical hygiene, improved the scheduling of lab sessions, took charge of the training of other GTAs, and proved herself a skilled teacher. Available at all hours of the day, Kristin came to be viewed as a department “institution.”

We were not sure our next awardee, Andrew Thaeler, would make it today, but he is now safely back from China with his newly adopted twins. As a GTA in Computer Science, Andrew was cited by multiple professors for going far beyond the call of duty—for example, for attending all of the course lectures in order to better integrate lecture and lab, for developing helpful PowerPoints and exercises to help his students learn, and for making sure they truly understood the concepts. One of his students said this: “He gave me the ability to find the potential within myself to do the best that I can do.”

Our third winner is Timothy Nixon, the unanimous choice of the Graduate Committee in the Department of English. After serving as a patient and thorough tutor in the University Writing Center, Timothy designed and taught exceptionally creative and engaging sections of freshman English, including one on shipwrecks and shark attacks. He was cited for finding ways to engage virtually all of the students in his courses in discussion and using peer editing techniques very effectively. One of his students said this: “Tim Nixon is a truly wonderful and professional teacher, a great man, and a true asset to The George Washington University.”

Congratulations to the winners of the Philip Amsterdam Teaching Assistant Awards.

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

Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr. congratulated the winners of the Bender and Amsterdam Teaching Awards, and welcomed new faculty to the University. On behalf of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, Professor Wilmarth presented his report to the Assembly. (Report by Professor Wilmarth is enclosed 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 and made a part of these minutes.

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

Due to the lengthy agenda and the late hour, Vice President Lehman ceded his time to Senior Vice President for Student and Academic Support Services Robert A. Chernak so that his report could be received by the Assembly. Vice President Lehman asked that his prepared remarks be published with the Assembly minutes. (Remarks by Vice President Lehman are attached and made a part of these minutes.)

**REMARKS BY THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES**

Senior Vice President Robert A. Chernak gave an abbreviated version of a report on undergraduate admissions he originally presented to members of the Board of Trustees at their summer retreat. Expanding on the President's observation that it was a terrific year for undergraduate admissions, with a record number of over 20,000 applications, Vice President Chernak described the demographics of the potential applicant pool. Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation, Vice President Chernak explained that, of the 2.9 million students comprising the 2004 graduating high school class, only 39% of these would go on to attend four year degree-granting institutions. This pool of potential applicants, approximately 1.7 million graduates, would be further reduced to 1 million, accounting for students from states where GW generally does not recruit on a regular basis. The remaining pool of 1 million potential graduates is further reduced because only about 36% of this group will enroll in private four-year colleges. Of this group of approximately 385,000 students, the pool is further reduced by 19% because, although GW offers an array of 87 undergraduate majors -- which is quite extensive for a university of its size -- these offerings still represent only about 81% of the academic concentrations of interest to college-bound students. Thus, for example, students wishing to study agriculture, forestry, or pharmacy would be unlikely to apply to or enroll at GW. Another factor reducing the remaining pool of 310,000 prospective students is consideration of their academic preparedness as reflected in sufficient ACT or SAT scores and a high school GPA of sufficient strength to be considered for admission. Approximately 87,000 potential applicants then remain. Vice President Chernak said that, at

first blush, this appears a healthy number, but it is important to keep in mind that most prospective students apply to several schools, eight on average last year. Thus, the competition for these applicants is very keen.

Comparing GW's application flow with that of its market basket schools, it now ranks third, behind only two of its major competitors -- Boston University and New York University. However, at both of these schools, the size of the entering class is substantially larger than GW's is. Overall, since President Trachtenberg and Vice President Chernak came to GW, the applicant pool has increased significantly from 5,900 applicants in 1988 to the present record number. In 1988, Vice President Chernak said he had advised the Board of Trustees that GW had not come close to realizing its full potential in its admissions program. That is still the case, he added, and despite the greater than 300% increase in applications, and the expansion in GW's popularity in the past sixteen years, there is still room for reasonable growth in application flow and selectivity.

Vice President Chernak then outlined a few external factors and conditions that verify the validity of the assumption that GW still has not yet reached its full potential in undergraduate admissions. First is the projected number of high school graduates which, for the next eight years, through the year 2012, will increase to about 3.2 million. While demographics of the population will shift, there have been notable improvements in the academic credentials of potential applicants and the economic wealth of many families, trends which will likely enlarge the pool of prospective students for selective schools like GW. There will also be gradual shifts in the racial and ethnic composition of the applicant pool. In the 2004 entering class, the number of deposits received from Afro-American students doubled, and the number of deposits from Hispanic students has also increased significantly.

Vice President Chernak then reviewed statistics concerning freshman students entering fifteen private schools which compete with GW for applicants. GW's entering class this year is the fifth largest in this group. GW succeeded in lowering the acceptance rate for undergraduate admission from a high of 81% in 1988 to just under 37.9% this year, and the yield figure reached another new high of 35%. Vice President Chernak added that he thought it would be possible in time to lower this even further, to approximately 30%. GW's acceptance rate is also below twenty four of the schools in the top fifty of U.S. News & World Report rankings. These are very important trends, and beyond admissions have other implications, such as the University's bond rating, which affects both debt capacity as well as interest rates the University is charged.

Vice President Chernak then commented on SAT scores and class standings of this year's accepted applicants. SAT scores have remained constant to the year before, with roughly a 1275 average. This year's class has a much more normative balance between men and women in the various colleges, from Business to Engineering. While students with the highest SAT scores are enrolled in the Elliott School of International Affairs, the School of Business has seen the most improvement since last year. In terms of class standing, 64% of incoming students graduated in the top ten percent of their high school class, but even more impressive, one of every four graduated in the top five percent of their class. Clearly, GW would like to reach the 70% benchmark, which would place it ahead of Tulane and

Boston College, ranked 43<sup>rd</sup> and 40<sup>th</sup>, respectively, by US News & World Report. But even at 64%, GW is better than nine of the schools in the top 50.

In terms of SAT scores, GW lags a bit behind its peer group. A range (adjusted to the new SAT scoring system due to commence in March, 2005) of about 1240 – 1400 is a worthy goal, and would place GW on a par with Tulane, Boston College, and New York University. While SAT scores are important, they are not the most important factor in admissions decisions. For each ten point improvement in either Math or Verbal scores, 2 to 3% of the potential applicant pool eligible for acceptance is reduced. To move SAT averages upward by 50 points would reduce the pool of students GW could consider accepting by some 11%.

Vice President Chernak then gave a quick profile of the entering class, one of the largest freshman classes in the University's history, at slightly under 2,600 new students. These students will join the Colonials Nation from a variety of places – 49 states and the District of Columbia. Mississippi is the only state not represented this year. 1,556 high schools are represented in the entering class, yet this is a just a very small number of high schools in the U.S. GW continues to be strong in New England and the Mid-Atlantic states, from which 1,600 freshmen will come. The pool of prospective students is also expanding in the southeastern U.S., far west, and the Great Lakes area. This class is extremely well rounded, with 26.5% of the students, or more than one of every four, speaking at least one language other than English fluently. These languages range [alphabetically] all the way from American Sign Language to Yoruba. GW students have a wealth of interests and talents, and tend to have been involved in a variety of activities while in high school, all of which contributes to the vitality of the GW campus. The characteristics of the entering class are a result of GW's simple and straightforward approach to undergraduate recruitment, which is to attract students who are academically prepared and intellectually motivated, but who have also demonstrated leadership potential, good citizenship, and involvement in several activities while in high school.

GW's new pricing policy has proven attractive to potential students. The fixed tuition plan guarantees that expenses will remain constant at \$34,000 per year for most programs. The University also has a guaranteed financial aid policy. When a freshman gets a financial award from GW, even one based on need, GW guarantees that the institutional portion of the award will not be reduced during the four years of that student's attendance. It can go up, but it won't go down. So, although GW's, tuition is a bit higher than that of other selective private schools, GW guarantees both the price and the financial aid at a level certain for those people who qualify. It is the only plan of its type in the country.

Vice President Chernak then reviewed details concerning student financial assistance offered to the entering class of 2004. About 56% of our students are receiving aid, most of that being need-based, and approximately 1,200 students are paying the full retail price. In the merit award area, at the \$20,000 award level, a student not receiving any need-based aid would need to have scored 1450 on the SAT, and be in the top 10% of their high school class. At that award level, our yield is only 18%. At the lower level of a \$15,000 award, students would need to have scored 1350 on the SAT. and have appropriate class standing. In this area, GW's yield is now approximately 30%, approaching the overall yield for the entering class of 35%.

In conclusion, Vice President Chernak outlined key reasons for optimism for continuing success in future recruitment efforts. These include the flexibility to reduce the size of the entering class, new infrastructure which will improve the quality of the GW experience, improving retention, developing relevant curricula, and improving the quality of student life. Creative thinking and calculated risk taking are necessary to sustain momentum, and GW must live up to the expectations of students and families paying premium tuition. Last, but not least, the University has seized the opportunity to introduce unique academic programs into the marketplace. One example is the seven year B.A./M.D. program mentioned by President Trachtenberg, which accepts students directly from high school and guarantees them entrance into the Medical School (following completion of their B.A. degree requirements) without first having taken the MCATS. Among 800 applicants, only 20 are accepted for this program each year. There is a similar proposal for a six-year B.A./J.D. program, subject to the approval of the Law School faculty, which allows students to be accepted into the Law School upon their graduation from high school, without requiring them to take the LSAT. In the School of Engineering and Applied Science this year, almost a third of the students are enrolled in biomedical engineering coursework, which is a program that is only a year old.

These programs are indicative that GW has the potential as an institution to capitalize on its academic strengths, strengths of the faculty, and the strengths of joint programs between undergraduate and graduate admissions. The possibilities for all of these academic linkages makes it more likely that GW will be more attractive than its competition, and that applicants will choose GW because it is unique in terms of its academic program options, as well as unique in its pricing and the financial aid packages it offers. To view Vice President Chernak's PowerPoint presentation, *Riding the Tide to the Future, A Market Situation Analysis for Undergraduate Admissions*, select this link:

[http://gwired.gwu.edu/sasscomm/MgtForum\\_2004-10/TideOfSuccess.pdf](http://gwired.gwu.edu/sasscomm/MgtForum_2004-10/TideOfSuccess.pdf)

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Assembly, President Trachtenberg adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m. He then invited everyone to the reception immediately following.

*Dennis L. Geyer*

Dennis L. Geyer

Registrar

**Faculty Assembly**  
**20 September 2004**  
**Remarks by Stephen Joel Trachtenberg**

Last week a local preacher gave an unusual invocation at a Washington, DC fundraising luncheon. Standing before a packed house of political women supporting one of our national candidates running for high office, the clergywoman said, "Lord, if you have compassion for us, as we know you do, please place the calories from the food we are about to eat into our minds and not on our hips." I always knew the Democrats were interested in redistribution of wealth, but redistribution of weight, now that is a platform position I hadn't yet heard. But as silly as the remark sounds, it got me thinking. How does a university take the assets of weight (brick and mortar) and redistribute them into assets of the mind (intellectual capital)? Yes, divine intervention would help. But I've always been a person who believes that the Lord helps those who help themselves. So you and I have our work cut out for us.

GW has completed a very good year, some would even say even a wonderful year, and in a few minutes, I'll share with you some details of the FY2004 accomplishments. I'm very proud of the administrative team I direct; of the academic power this campus produces; and of the remarkable job we do together – faculty, staff, and trustees – to educate the men and women who will take our nation forward into the next decades of the twenty-first century.

But it is important not to point with pride too loudly or for too long over our successes. For just as the national economy is today in a fragile state of redefinition and reallocation – from the costs of building democracies abroad and putting the arm on terrorism, to caring for the uninsured and uneducated at home, so, too, are universities across the country in a tentative condition. America is redefining the economics of higher education and profound changes are slowly seeping into the ground water of our academic culture. Perhaps the seeds of these changes will not bloom on the GW campus next year or even the year after that, but by 2014 – ten years from now – American higher education in general, and The George Washington University in particular, will look and feel different than how the world knows us today.

As we prepare for our travels that lie ahead, I'm going to ask three simple (but not simplistic) questions: Where are we going? How are we going to get there? And, who's coming along for the ride?

But before I answer the trinity I just posed, let me provide some context for my response by going back to my first comment. GW had a marvelous year and from the well of accomplishments we will draw the strength, expertise and experience to not only weather any unexpected gauntlets put down before us but to lead the way and set a path that other schools can follow. Please don't get alarmed, I'm not suggesting we run ahead of the pack and stick our necks out, but rather what I'm saying is that GW has the ability and the reputation to put innovations in place and have others quickly step-up behind us. We can be the drum major of a remarkable marching band.

Here is a small portion of the roster of FY2004:

- GW has a balanced budget – again. We've had one for sixteen years. This makes planning, and breathing, a lot easier. Getting a balanced budget does not always come easy but we're there.
- One building on the Loudon campus – the NTSB building – is complete and in Foggy Bottom we're well along on Duques Hall.

- Townhouse Row on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street – our housing for students in Greek life- and Ivory Tower are complete and operating. When the new residence hall on F Street opens in 2006-2007, we expect to meet the zoning requirements needed to permit us to enroll as many as 10,714 undergraduates by having over 7500 beds. This exceeds our goal.
- GW is becoming a more desirable and more selective institution. Applications to undergraduate schools reached an unprecedented all-time high this year of 20,116 (Bob Chernak will fill you in shortly).
- This figure, in turn, converts into three important statistics: our selectivity remains strong (at 37.9 percent); the SAT scores of our students remain steady at 1300, and 64% of the incoming freshmen rank in the top 10% of their class.
- Meanwhile, our overall 6-year graduation rate is 75%. I would like to see that improve. We must work to improve our graduation rate. My goal is 85%.
- Complementing the rise in student quality is the extraordinary caliber of our faculty and staff. GW now successfully recruits almost every first choice applicant for faculty and administrative positions on campus. Search committees aim high and are justly rewarded.
- Last year we launched the University Writing Program, one of the dramatic initiatives to come out of the Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence. Eighteen new full-time faculty members have been hired to teach in this program and a new director is now in place. I'm pleased to say that students report the work is "extremely challenging" (that is a *positive* remark).
- The amount of externally funded research and scholarship received by the University went up across the campus last year, here are a few examples: GW's School of Engineering and Applied Science saw their growth in external funding become the highest of any engineering school in the country; and GW showed more growth in the area of funding from the National Institute of Health than did any other institution in the nation, a 241% increase.
- Participation in District life by members of the university and the university "as a corporate entity" continues to be a steady series of active engagements. Some are more visible to the public than others.
- Keeping the university in-front of the public is done through several vehicles: our online "newspaper" – gwnewscenter.org – has had over a million hits this past year; CNN's "Crossfire" has produced over 500 telecasts from the Media and Public Affairs building; this marked the second consecutive year GW has topped the 10,000 mark in print and broadcast mentions; combined with the visibility generated by CNN "Crossfire," and even without a football team, GW now receives more mentions than any other university in the nation; campus events are regularly covered in the press (though not with as often as I believe is warranted); our neighbors come out to listen to concerts, view exhibitions, attend classes, eat at our block parties, and, of course, to testify at our zoning and regulatory hearings!

All in all, 2003-2004 was a banner year. It is clear that the academic quality of GW and the quality of life at GW have both improved dramatically. We are a well sought out entity. We are a first rate, hardworking, international research university. *George Washington* on the Potomac is now a force to be reckoned with.

Even with the growth of our endowment over the past two decades, GW remains a tuition driven university; sensitive to the marketplace and the actions of our peers. Carefully protecting this revenue source is essential to our financial well-being as you will hear Don Lehman elaborate on shortly. Within ten years or so, we will have done almost all we can with GW's tuition structure and student growth. The time will come when we can't raise tuition,

can't freeze it, or can't unfreeze it. The time will come when we can't accommodate a larger student population and that time may already be very near, given the bumper crop of highly qualified freshmen we have just harvested for the coming fall. We can't expand horizontally any more than we can expand vertically – the 1910 Height Act, the Campus Plan and the state of public opinion won't allow it.

If we can't continue to grow the student population, and we cannot continue to boost the tuition, then we must run smarter and leaner and more efficiently. We already economize on the purchase of fuel; we buy supplies in bulk; we are sensitive to the environment and recycle whenever possible and feasible.

Now we must reevaluate how we deliver our primary service -- an education. We must continue to search for ways to become academically efficient without sacrificing quality of instruction and scholarship. We must continue to look hard at our two-semester calendar, the ways we reward faculty, how we design teaching loads, what courses are required for a degree, and so on.

Last year you heard me talk about the need to move away from the traditional calendar of two 14-week semesters. I proposed in its place an enhanced summer term, stretching the time a student could attend class from 28 weeks to 42 weeks. I may have underestimated the political challenge of securing what I proposed. However, the actions of the faculty only served to reaffirm what I knew in the back of my mind and have only now moved up to the front lobe: People like progress. About change, they are less positive.

Obviously, despite this outcome, what I'm looking for is a way to get the maximum capacity and productivity out of what we have in place. Putting our physical facilities and our human capital to work for more weeks and months of the year has the potential to stabilize both our demographics and our finances in the future.

This proposal, however, is part of a longer-range plan. My real goal is to inspire GW to consider awarding a BA degree in three years – at least for most students. There is good reason to consider this seriously. More and more of our students are not expecting their BA to be a terminal degree. They are going on to get Masters degrees, professional degrees in law, medicine, and business as well as going on for doctorates.

At the same time that we shorten the length of time for the BA degree, perhaps we can increase a student's stay at GW by coupling up their degrees. For example, we already admit a handful of students to a 7 year BA/MD degree. Using this model, can we consider that at the end of year three (what we now call 'Junior' year) we admit our very best students to graduate school at the start of year 4. At the end of that year, we could award two degrees—e.g. the BA/MA—upon completion of the advanced degree. A pilot project for this could be an extension of our program currently in place for our most able "honor" undergraduates. Of course, any changes require faculty consultation.

As we go forward with whatever curriculum changes we may make, we need to focus, even more than we do now, on how many classroom seats we have, what rooms those seats are located in, and how many faculty we'll need to take charge of those rooms. What some call

efficiency, others call management integrity. It will require our full attention, no matter what the nomenclature.

We must also study carefully academic integrity – and look at the quality of standards we create and insist on. Those standards talk about what we teach and how we teach.

Campuses are labor intensive environments made up of people living and working in highly complex technical facilities. Both require dollars on both sides of the blackboard. That is to say, to attract and keep our faculty, we must provide competitive salaries; reward their intellectual initiatives with stipends and grants along with providing proper laboratories for science research, art creation, language study, engineering development, medical care and library scholarship.

It costs millions of dollars each year to study hookworm, fight AIDS, analyze crash-resistant materials for airplanes, search for alternative energy sources, un-cover the bones of our ancestors, trace the steps of the Prophets, underwrite a new sonata for a quartet, produce weekly jazz, poll the public, graph the economic indicators. Research, teaching, policy making, art creation all take money.

If we are to continue to remain competitive with these other schools, we must construct the necessary facilities for teaching and research; endow the lines for faculty chairs, salaries and stipends; improve the campus infrastructure – providing technology for education and administration, libraries, online and in print – and student life facilities. “Money is the mother’s milk of education.” Through tuition, gifts, grants and research dollars, each year we raise the funds necessary to operate GW. To push the university forward, however, to grow it from strength to strength, we must raise more than annual dollars. We must find the requisite funds for special undertakings.

We have a compelling case – for we are a great university prepared to be greater yet. We must know what our priorities are, how we intend to use the resources we need. Fundraising is tough work, for the task often appears relentless. It requires teamwork- the Academic VP, the Deans, and I must work together towards the agreed upon goals.

We all know that we must summon our inner strength to go out to our alumni, our friends, our parents, our neighbors, to foundations, businesses and if necessary, to the local lottery. In the end, you as faculty will be called upon to help too.

In conclusion:

- Where are we going? From strength to strength.
- How are we going to get there? With hard work, sharp minds and sharpened pencils, with concrete foundations and wireless gadgets.
- And, who’s coming along for the ride? I hope everyone committed to the success of GW.

Thank you.

**Faculty Assembly**  
**Monday, 20 September 2004**

**Remarks on Academic Affairs**  
**by**  
**Donald R. Lehman, EVPAA**

Welcome

Good afternoon and welcome to the Faculty Assembly of 2004. It is always a privilege to have this opportunity to address the faculty members of The George Washington University. I look at this particular occasion each year as a continuation of our dialogue to define how we can make The George Washington University a top-tier institution academically for all those who have matriculated here: undergraduate students, graduate students, and professional students. Achieving this aim requires us, as faculty members at this remarkable institution, to strive for the highest attainment of academic accomplishment in our teaching and approaches thereto, our research and scholarship undertakings and their integration into teaching and learning, and in our service to GW and the connected external institutions that can benefit from the transfer of our knowledge and problem-solving capabilities. My hope is that this will be the best year ever as our collective success helps us to fulfill the aim more completely than we have done in previous years.

Academic Excellence

Our agenda for continually advancing the standard of academic excellence at GW is given in the University's *Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence: Sustaining Momentum and Maximizing Strength*. Officially, the plan is now more than one year old having been presented to the Board of Trustees in June 2003 and distributed to the GW Community in September 2003 by President Trachtenberg. The plan is defined through the goals and objectives given therein and has built-in accountability through the metrics associated with each goal. Each academic unit, including the schools, has committed to contributing to the advancement of different goals and objectives, and we are now working towards setting the baselines for the metrics. Accepting ownership of the goals and objectives provides the greatest likelihood that all of us will help move GW to the next level of academic excellence. Each year, we shall use the metrics to assess the progress being made in achieving the goals and objectives. We shall provide the Board of Trustees with on-going updates on our progress.

Ultimately, GW's strategic plan is about building prestige, while maintaining our reputation for delivering a quality educational product. Prestige is hard to build **and** it is hard to lose. On the other hand, reputation can be lost quickly if we do not continue to deliver outstanding classroom and other educational experiences. Let me amplify what I mean by this difference between prestige and reputation as

thoroughly explained in Brewer, Gates, and Goldman's book, *In Pursuit of Prestige: Strategy and Competition in U.S. Higher Education*.

In the context of the Brewer *et al.* thesis, The George Washington University is a prestige-seeking institution. We are doing our utmost to invest in two of the three primary measures of prestige: quality students and research. These areas of prestige are noteworthy in that they can be objectively measured. For students, we invest through financial aid (merit scholarships), the recruitment of top faculty to teach, and the development of excellent facilities (residence hall and classroom facilities). Connected to the student investments are the research investments in faculty with records of recognized scholarship and research, and commitments to renovating or building laboratories and related facilities. Progress towards the goals can be measured for the students in admissions selectivity, SAT/ACT scores, and even though we try to dismiss them, *U.S. News* rankings. Progress in the research arena is measured in two main ways: through the standing of the university in the list for federal research expenditures, and the rankings of doctoral programs by the National Research Council. The third area of investment used to build prestige is athletics, an area that GW is not pursuing to the extent that it is the two areas I just mentioned. Brewer, *et al.* consider a university that is investing in *one* of the three areas as investing in prestige.

Reputation is perceived to be more difficult to measure than prestige using either investments or an assessment of outcomes. Brewer, *et al.* consider "every other institutional activity that is connected to an *external* customer (as) a candidate for investing in reputation." The key to their thinking is that unlike prestige, reputation can be eroded much more quickly. Reputation requires continual investment and development in ways that are not always easily quantifiable.

With this background, let me review with you three areas of investment for academic excellence at GW: research, doctoral programs, and the University Writing Program for undergraduates. The first two are directly related to prestige building through recognized accomplishments of our faculty and their doctoral students in the development of new knowledge and understanding through scholarship and research. At the same time, the basic GW experience of the doctoral students during the arduous task of earning their doctorates, whether that be through their collaborative experience with their dissertation directors or the quality of their graduate courses, is more closely connected to our reputation building. The third area of investment, the University Writing Program, is directly connected to reputation building, but is also a marker of expectation for students seeking to attend a top-tier undergraduate educational institution.

Investment in research and doctoral programs at GW through FY 04 has occurred in the seven signature programs named in our Strategic Plan and in graduate-student-support packages. Through FY 04, GW invested \$1.25M in the seven signature programs to help them further reach their fullest academic potential and gain external recognition. This support has included additional faculty lines and

additional Graduate Research Assistant and Graduate Teaching Assistant packages. Judging from the annual reports submitted by each signature program this summer, these investments are being used strategically and can be expected to bring solid returns to GW. In about a week, an additional \$250K of investment beyond that associated with support of graduate students will be allocated to these programs for FY 05.

Outside the seven signature programs, additional funding has been committed to making our graduate-student-support packages more competitive nationally. Our first goal was to raise all stipends (or stipend-salary combination) to a minimum award of \$15,000. This goal has been achieved and a number of packages in specific fields, like the sciences, have been enhanced to be competitive with our market-basket institutions. These investments alone have totaled \$2.2M through FY 04. Simultaneously, we have been strategically allocating limited funding for additional packages to selected departments in the humanities and social sciences for the purpose of committing to five years of support for an entering student provided there is solid academic performance year to year. In FY 05, we added more than \$500K towards selective excellence undertakings in graduate-student support. Departments chosen are some of those whose doctoral programs ranked in the “Top” category of the Doctoral Programs Review or the very top of the “Middle” category.

The work of the Doctoral Programs Review Committee is essentially complete. The deans of four schools have already received their memo describing the outcome of the review for the doctoral programs residing within their school. Those schools are SPHHS, GSEHD, SB, and SMHS (connected to CCAS). The SEAS dean will receive his memo this week. I anticipate that the CCAS dean will receive his memo later this week or early next week. Of GW’s 48 doctoral programs, five were placed in the “Top” category. Most doctoral programs fell somewhere in the “Middle” classification, and several were placed in the “Low” category. All doctoral programs were examined thoroughly against the two sets of criteria used in the evaluation by the members of the Review Committee. The strengths and weaknesses of each program have been delineated. Our aim was to be as thorough and constructive as possible in conveying the status of each program within the framework of the Doctoral Programs Review. The five programs in the “Top” category are American Studies, Hominid Paleobiology, Physics, Political Science, and Psychology.

As emphasized above, scholarship and research are directly linked to doctoral programs. Our growth in externally funded research was 8.18% across the University for FY 04, which translates into \$125.5M in expenditures. The split across the non-medical component of the University and the medical component is \$83.0M (growth of 8.8%) and \$42.5M (growth of 7%), respectively. Some areas that contributed significantly to this growth are the Biostatistics Center, Graduate School of Political Management, Psychiatry, and Biochemistry. Such outstanding growth, made possible by the dedicated efforts of our faculty

members, requires us to continually invest in the University's research infrastructure to facilitate their efforts. Towards this aim, we added \$500K of new monies in FY 05 to begin adding the staff support required to reduce the administrative burden of the individual investigator within those schools with the highest level of sponsored research activity.

The University Writing Program is moving towards full implementation with two-thirds of the freshman class now enrolled in University Writing 20. In parallel, the second step of the University Writing Program has been launched – the Writing in the Disciplines (WID). The approximately 700 freshmen who completed UW 20 last year are now, or will be next semester, enrolled in one of the WID designated courses. In order to make this possible, an additional \$350K for FY 05 has been invested in the writing program beyond the \$350K used to launch the program last year. This total of \$700K is supplemented by existing funds reallocated from the English 10 and 11 instructional budgets as these courses phase out of existence. Along with this basic progress towards full implementation of the writing program in the Fall of 2005, Melinda Knight, formerly of the University of Rochester, has joined GW's faculty as executive director of the University Writing Program. Additionally, the University-wide Writing Program Advisory Committee, composed of faculty from the undergraduate schools, has been formed with Mickey East from the Elliott School of International Affairs and Jennifer Nutefall from the Gelman Library as co-chairs.

### Making it all Happen

Making the Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence at GW a reality requires selective investment and development. In other words, besides making difficult decisions derived from sound criteria used to evaluate our strengths, the resources for the investment and development must be found. What are the sources?

The George Washington University is a tuition dependent institution. We remain dependent on tuition to fund our operations. According to the Budget Office, tuition revenue accounts for approximately 75% of the revenue in our current FY 05 operating budget. If housing and other student revenue is included, over 88% of all operating revenue is driven by enrollment. The remaining contributions come from external funding for research and scholarship, and annual fund raising through our Advancement Office, both of which are essential for us to function as a Carnegie classified Doctoral/Research Extensive University. Nevertheless, the key to our being able to operate at the level of a top-tier research university that delivers quality education programs and generates new knowledge is enrollment.

We, as faculty members of The George Washington University, have a major role to play with regard to enrollment in two ways: the retention of existing students culminating in timely receipt of their degrees, and the recruitment of graduate students, especially students at the master's level. Undergraduate retention from

the freshman to the sophomore year was 92.9% for the class entering in the Fall of 2002. Our six-year graduation rate for the class entering in 1997 was 75.1%. The good news is that we already know that the six-year graduation rate for the class of 1998 will exceed 78%, because the five-year rate is 77.6% and we have been adding approximately a percentage point to the five-year rate for the last four years. GW should be, at least, at the 85% level – the goal just mentioned by President Trachtenberg. This is certainly achievable as we continue to provide greater academic challenge and engagement for our increasingly capable students. It does require us to focus and develop our offerings to the highest possible levels – content-wise and pedagogically.

Recruitment of graduate students at the master's level is an ever increasing challenge owing to the competition within the Washington Metropolitan area and at the national level. Success requires us to work as a team in what is by necessity a decentralized operation. Graduate students are attracted to specific programs that have the reputation of high quality, not to the University per se. Therefore, individual departments and particular faculty members play a major role in recruiting these students to GW through the nature of the programs being offered – their content, their currency, and their overall quality. Students expect nothing but the best when they are paying private university rates. We must differentiate ourselves from the public institutions through our reputation for quality and the prestige of earning a degree from The George Washington University. Bringing the latter into play is where the teamwork through the Graduate Student Enrollment Management Office comes into play with respect to marketing graduate education at GW at the University level. Clearly, this teamwork among the schools and the central offices, all coordinated by Associate VP for Research and Graduate Studies Carol Sigelman, Director of Graduate Student Enrollment Management Kristin Williams, and Dean of the College of Professional Studies Roger Whitaker, who coordinates our off-campus graduate program offerings, appears to be working well as illustrated by this year's tentative enrollment results. After the second week of classes, we had 90 more master's students and 74 more doctoral students enrolled on-campus compared to last year. Off campus, we had approximately the same number of master's students but 136 more students pursuing graduate certificates compared to last year at the same time. For this progress, I commend the faculty and the administrators mentioned above for their continuing, collaborative efforts towards successful graduate-student recruitment.

### Who makes it Happen?

Who makes all that I have mentioned happen? In the end, it is the GW faculty members who make it happen. GW faculty members working collaboratively with the administration, the University's staff members, and with each other to lead us towards the progress and successes we seek. It shall be a continuing challenge to achieve the goals and objectives spelled out in the University's Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence. At the same time, it is a great

opportunity for a terrifically rewarding undertaking as we all pull together to make it happen. Seeing the metrics evolve over the coming years towards the goals we seek will itself be sustenance for continuing effort.

Thank you very much for your attention.

**REPORT TO THE FACULTY ASSEMBLY**  
**Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr., Chair**  
**Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate**  
**September 20, 2004**

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 Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, I offer the following report on the Senate's recent activities.

**RESOLUTIONS**

During its 2003-2004 session, the Faculty Senate considered eleven resolutions proposed by its Standing Committees. The Senate adopted ten resolutions and referred one resolution for further study by a joint subcommittee of the Research Committee and the Faculty Development and Support Committee. In addition, on May 7, 2004, at the first meeting of its 2004-05 session, the Senate adopted two resolutions.

The twelve Senate resolutions referred to above addressed many topics of concern to the University. Two resolutions were adopted in response to a proposal for an alternative academic calendar, which was prepared by a special committee appointed by the administration. Among other things, the proposal would have required all undergraduate students to attend a mandatory summer semester and to live away from the campus during a fall or spring semester. On May 9, 2003, the Senate adopted Resolution 03/1, the first resolution dealing with the alternative academic calendar proposal. Resolution 03/1 requested that the administration take no action on the proposal until the Senate could provide its own views and recommendations. In response to Resolution 03/1, the administration agreed that the Senate could submit its response to the proposal not later than November 1, 2003.

On October 31, 2003, the Senate adopted Resolution 03/4, the second of its resolutions dealing with the alternative academic calendar proposal. The Senate adopted Resolution 03/4 after considering a detailed study prepared by the Educational Policy Committee. The Educational Policy Committee's study and a draft of Resolution 03/4 were circulated within the University community well in advance of the Senate's October 31, 2003 meeting. Resolution 03/4, as adopted, opposed the alternative academic calendar proposal and expressed the Senate's view that the proposal was not in the best academic or financial interests of the University. Resolution 03/4 was approved by a unanimous vote of the Senate and was reinforced by the unanimous passage of similar resolutions in the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Business and Public Management, and the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences. In response to Resolution 03/4, President Trachtenberg stated, in a letter dated December 16, 2003, that he was " ... persuaded by what the campus has said - that it is not agreeable to considering these issues further at this time. ... I accept that the faculty's current judgment is that 2004 is not the year to even study much less implement the changes proposed."

Another important resolution adopted by the Senate during its 2003-04 session was Resolution 03/10. Resolution 03/10 describes the respective roles of the recommending faculty, school personnel committees, and academic administrators in acting on applications by faculty members for tenure or promotion. In particular, Resolution 03/10 calls for all of these University constituents, when acting on

tenure or promotion applications, to observe applicable Faculty Code provisions and guidelines issued by the American Association of University Professors, including:

- Establishing criteria and procedures governing tenure and promotion in each department and school that (i) comply with the Faculty Code and (ii) provide clear, specific, and detailed guidance to faculty candidates regarding standards applied by the applicable department's or school's faculty in making recommendations for tenure and promotion.
- Providing a clear statement of the applicable criteria for tenure and promotion in each appointment letter sent to a tenure-track or full-time contract faculty member.
- Providing accurate, timely, and specific advice in annual evaluations and contract renewals of faculty members who are expected to be future candidates for tenure or promotion, regarding their progress (or lack thereof) toward meeting the applicable criteria for tenure or promotion.

Resolution 03/10 also discusses the principles and procedures applicable to nonconcurrences by Deans or the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs with faculty recommendations for tenure or promotion, including:

- The lack of authority by academic administrators to make de novo reviews of the qualifications of faculty candidates or to substitute their judgment for the judgment of the recommending faculty.
- The requirement that an administrator must provide a detailed statement of "compelling reasons" for a nonconcurrency that are sufficient to overcome the presumption in favor of the specialized professional expertise of the recommending faculty.

Resolution 03/10 expressed the "sense of the Faculty Senate" and did not require an administrative reply. However, in response to Resolution 03/10, the Administration stated that it "understands this [resolution] as a restatement of the status quo ant[e]; this Resolution in no way changes prior conventions about the rules of engagement; [the] Administration fully concurs with the resolving parts 1-4; with respect to 5/5-A-iv, it must be understood as meaning that rigorous review with depth and thoroughness must be conducted by the recommending faculty."

In Resolution 04/01, adopted on May 7, 2004, the Faculty Senate expressed its view that construction of new science facilities should be the top priority for the University in planning for future academic building projects. In adopting Resolution 04/01, the Senate considered a report by the Committee on Physical Facilities, which recommended construction of new facilities that can accommodate the needs of the physical, life and mathematical sciences programs, science programming, and science-related engineering programs conducted in the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences and other Schools. In response to Resolution 04/01, the Administration stated that "[t]his recommendation is fully understood and it is our aim to address it as briskly as circumstances and contingent resources permit; [the] Administration concurs that making the improvement of science facilities for teaching and research a priority at the University is sound."

In addition to the Faculty Senate's adoption of the foregoing resolutions, the Senate presented a proposed resolution to the Faculty Assembly at the Assembly's regularly scheduled meeting of September 29, 2003. This resolution (Resolution FA03/01) proposed amendments to the Faculty Organization Plan to revise the listing of Schools in Article III, Section 2, and to authorize the School

of Public Health and Health Services to elect one member of the Senate and to designate one member of the Executive Committee. Resolution FA03/1 was adopted by the Faculty Assembly on September 29, 2003, and approved by the University's Board of Trustees in May 2004.

## **STATUS OF FACULTY PERSONNEL MATTERS**

### **Grievances**

During the past year, two grievances, both originating in Columbian College, were concluded. In the first case, the Dispute Resolution Committee did not find in favor of the grievant, and the grievant did not appeal that decision. In the second case, the University and the grievant reached a mutually satisfactory settlement.

A grievance is currently pending in the School of Business. The Chair of the Dispute Resolution Committee has asked the grievant to provide a letter describing the general nature and circumstances of the grievance. Upon receipt of that letter, the Chair of the Dispute Resolution Committee will appoint a mediator for the purpose of assisting the University and the grievant in exploring a possible resolution of the dispute.

### **Nonconcurrences**

I am pleased to report that, during the 2003-04 academic year, the Executive Committee was not called upon to review any cases involving administrative nonconcurrences with faculty recommendations for tenure or promotion.

## **REPORTS TO THE FACULTY SENATE**

During the 2003-04 session, in addition to reports accompanying resolutions, the Faculty Senate received fourteen reports from University administrators and its Standing Committees. These reports included a report on the Gelman, Mount Vernon, and Virginia campus libraries, a report on the College of Professional Studies, a report on the recruitment and retention of minority and women faculty, a presentation on the University's Incident Planning, Response, and Recovery Manual, special reports on the University's operating and capital budgets for fiscal years 2004 and 2005, a report on administrative salaries, an update on the campus building plan and recent court decisions related to the University's zoning, an update on the Compliance Help and Referral Line, and a report on the Office of Special Academic Initiatives.

In addition, the Faculty Senate continued a process, begun during the 2001-2002 session, of receiving school status reports by Deans of the various Schools. During the 2003-2004 session the Senate received reports from the Dean of the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences and the Interim Dean of the School of Public Health and Health Services.

At its meeting on September 10, 2004, the Senate received a report on recent building and renovation activities on campus during the summer months, and a report on unionization efforts involving the University's part-time faculty.

## **MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION BY SENATE COMMITTEES**

In accordance with its usual practice, the Executive Committee has forwarded to the Chair of the each Standing Committee a list of assignments for the 2004-05 session. Those assignments include the following requests:

- That the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies (“ASPP”) Committee and the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (“PEAF”) Committee jointly consider issues related to the status, role and treatment of full-time contract faculty.
- That the ASPP Committee review (i) salary equity issues between faculty members and senior administrators, and (ii) the faculty’s role in the selection of chaired professorships.
- That the Educational Policy Committee, the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee and the Physical Facilities Committee jointly evaluate classroom space needs and the administration’s plans to meet those needs.
- That the Educational Policy Committee study issues related to grade inflation and the scheduling of final examinations.
- That the Faculty Development and Support Committee monitor recruitment and retention of minority and women faculty, and to review faculty mentoring programs.
- That the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee (i) prepare a report on the University’s operating and capital budgets, (ii) consider the growth of the University’s endowment and long-term debt, and (iii) review the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty and the ratio of faculty to students.
- That the PEAF Committee consider possible amendments to the Interim Policy and Procedures regarding Allegations of Scientific Misconduct.

At its meeting on August 27, 2004, the Executive Committee referred the following additional matters to Standing Committees: (i) an inquiry from the University Administration regarding the desirability of a University Code of Ethics was referred to the PEAF Committee; and (ii) information regarding the investment options currently offered by TIAA-CREF was referred to the ASPP Committee. In addition, an ad hoc committee composed of faculty members and administrators has been appointed to review and consider possible amendments to the University’s Policy on Patents and Scholarly Works.

## **GENERAL REMARKS**

This report lists only some of the activities and accomplishments of the members of the Faculty Senate and its Standing Committees. They have expended much time and energy on behalf of their faculty colleagues and the entire University. Since the last meeting of the Faculty Assembly our colleagues, with your assistance and support, have addressed many matters that have a significant potential impact on the academic enterprise of our 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 2003-04, monthly requests for documents available on the website ranged from a low of 2053 in August 2003 to a high of 10,586 in October 2003. In contrast, monthly requests during 2002-03 ranged from a low of 1439 to a high of 6262. 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 expression and action in the governance of the University. 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.