

**The George Washington University
Faculty Senate Committee on
Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management
Annual Report (2003-2004)**

Faculty Senate Committee on Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management held four meetings this year. At these meetings we reviewed data on undergraduate and graduate admissions and financial aid. The committee has been greatly assisted by the Director of Undergraduate Admissions, Kathy Napper who has continued to provide valuable information summarized in this report. Financial information has been provided by Daniel Small, Director of the Financial Aid Office. Graduate enrollment and financial aid information has been provided by Kristin Williams, Director of Graduate Student Enrollment Management, and Geri Rypkema, Director of the Office of Graduate Student Assistantships and Fellowships.

The role of this committee is believed to be as a conduit/ liaison between the administration and faculty; this is believed to be the only faculty committee where the officers of the undergraduate and graduate admissions and financial aid offices are *ex officio* members. While this committee has not made any policy decisions or recommendations in the recent years, issues of interest to the faculty have been, and continue to be, conveyed to the administration through this committee. The administration also conveys information of vital interest to the faculty via this committee.

Here is some of the information the committee reviewed this year.

Undergraduate Admissions

In the current application cycle for the Class of 2008, we have received more than 20,000 applications. The applications for ESIA are up—the school would like to see a cap of 500 freshmen this year. Targets for various schools this year are: CCAS- 1490; SBPM- 275; SEAS- 135; SPHHS- 25. We accepted 1150 early decision students in ED-I and ED-II; this is 200 more than last year. Our admit rate is about 38% and we are putting more students on waiting list. Last year we had 1200 students on waiting list; this year the number is somewhat larger.

Last year, GW received 18,600 applications for undergraduate admissions and we admitted 38.4% of the total. The yield rate was 32.4% and we brought in 2,300 freshmen. In addition, we brought in 230 transfers. The average SAT of the Class of 2007 is 1270, which is up 10 points from the previous year. The number of incoming students who are in the top 10% of their graduating class went up 65%. (Note: 130 applicants forfeited their deposits.) Gender breakdown of the freshmen class in Fall 2003 is: 59% women, 41% men. As of the census date for Fall 2003, we had enrolled 2261 students (which was about 140 below the target); we had also accepted 150 from the waiting list.

At one meeting of the committee, we discussed the issues of minority recruitment and whether we are doing anything different currently to recruit more minorities. We learned that the Hispanic numbers went up this year while African American numbers were flat. GW is taking a variety of initiatives to increase minority enrollments.

Tuition Rates and Financial Aid

GW has announced a fixed tuition program for the incoming freshmen class; the tuition rate of \$34,000 is approximately 16% above the current year's tuition. GW would guarantee certain level of financial aid to a student if he/she is eligible for institutional financial aid. Note: other schools have done fixed rate tuition in the past but have not guaranteed aid. Our 7 year BA/MD program tuition rate for Fall 2004 is set at \$41,563; these students get \$15,000 tuition discount and receive no other merit aid.

Of the 5,404 undergraduate financial aid awards in 2003-04, need based awards totaling \$59.3m went to 3,642 students and merit based awards totaling \$23.9m went to 1,762 students. This contrasts with the previous year's data: in 2002-03, need based awards totaling \$52.6m went to 3,375 students and merit based awards totaling \$24.7m went to 1,920 students. It is noted that families are very concerned with the high costs and about 60% of undergraduates are on some sort of financial aid. Grants generally constitute 70% of the financial aid and the rest is loans. Average merit based awards are in \$12-14k range while average need based awards are \$16k. There is more reliance on loans and the financial aid office dealt with loan amounts totaling \$100m last year; this year the total is expected to increase to \$110m. The university is holding down on merit money so more money can be given to need based students.

The undergraduate discount rate for the next year (2004-05) has been set at 36%-- currently it is 35.2%. A total of \$100 million is projected as financial aid for undergraduates for 2004-05; of this money, about \$75 million has been allocated to continuing students leaving \$25 million for the freshmen class. Total money administered by the financial aid office is \$220 million—this includes graduate loans. Most of the money is disbursed in the spring; we ran out of money in August 2003 though we try to keep \$1-2 million for special cases.

The Student Financial Assistance office had processed \$49 million in loans for graduate students by the end of November 2003; this number was up from \$45 million the previous year. A total of 2,800 graduate students have loans through this office. The loan packages consist of a combination of subsidized and unsubsidized loans: graduate students can borrow a maximum of \$8500 per year in subsidized loans; up to \$18,500 may be borrowed as Stafford loans where the interest can be deferred. Undergraduate (including parents) loans in November 2003 totaled \$54 million; which compares with \$47 million total in Nov 2002. GW acts as the lender for graduate students.

Graduate Enrollments and Financial Aid

The next year's graduate tuition has been set at \$876 per credit hour + \$1 per credit hour for student association fee. Financial aid is set with 23.7% discount rate for the next year. There might be some increases in graduate aid and the discount rate may go up to 24%. There is new discretionary money of \$900,000 and there will be extra money for all schools. The plan is to zero in on the academic excellence programs. On the graduate side, we would like to increase the Master's degree enrollment.

Merit aid administered by the Office of Graduate Student Assistantships and Fellowships had an operating budget of \$14.48 million last year. We rely on programs to bring in grants and outside

fellowships. As an example, the Scottish Rite Endowment has available \$700,000 for graduate students; Hyundai Corporation has a large endowment earmarked specifically for Korean students who must be on J-1 visas. GW charges no overhead on non-sponsored projects fellowships, funded from the outside. A lot of this money goes to biomedical programs. On sponsored projects, we attempt to match stipends to graduate students with tuition grants though it is not done in SEAS where permission of the dean is needed.

The overall graduate enrollment numbers are up this year; PhD numbers are up while Master's numbers are down. International numbers did not drop this year. Graduate certificate program numbers are down somewhat. The Business School is on a downward slide; down 5.6% below last year. This may not be so bad because, nationwide, there has been a 30% drop in MBA program enrollments. Executive MBA programs are also down: there are 30 schools that offer MBA programs in DC area, and 15 schools offer International Business graduate programs in DC area. All of this affects SBPM graduate enrollments.

Respectfully Submitted,

Murli M. Gupta, *Chair*

April 30, 2004

Committee Members:

Tarek El-Ghazawi, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science

John Geranios, Strategic Management and Public Policy

Nancy Greenawald, Program in Physical Therapy

Murli M. Gupta, Mathematics, *Chair*

Daniel Kane, Strategic Management and Public Policy

Dina Khoury, History

Geralyn Schulz, Speech and Hearing Science

Daniel Ullman, Mathematics

Ex officio:

Crystal Belk, Gelman Library

Michael Castleberry, Teacher Prep, Executive Committee Liaison

Robert Chernak, VPSASS

Eric Daleo, Student Liaison

Dennis Geyer, Registrar

Donald Lehman, EVPAA

Kathryn Napper, Office of Admissions

Geri Rypkema, Fellowships and Graduate Student Support

Daniel Small, Student Financial Assistance

Kristin Williams, Graduate Student Enrollment Management

ANNUAL REPORT

APPOINTMENT, SALARY, AND PROMOTION POLICY COMMITTEE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

2003 -2004 Academic Year

The ASPP Committee met 6 times during the academic year. The subjects discussed included:

- Tenure Clock extension
- Adjunct Faculty Status
- Contract Faculty Status (Request by Executive Committee)
- Alternative Academic Calendar
- Administrators' and Faculty Salary & Salary Equity
- Prescription Plan Vacation Overrides (Request by Executive Committee)

TENURE CLOCK EXTENSION

The issue of the extension of the tenure clock for new parents was discussed extensively by the committee. Members of the ASPP Committee interacted with members of the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee (PEAF) and the thoughts of our Committee were conveyed. At the January 16, 2004 Faculty Senate Meeting, the PEAF Committee presented "A RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ELECTION AS OF RIGHT BY TENURE TRACK FACULTY WHO BECOME NEW PARENTS DURING THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD." The Resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate. On February 4, 2004, the Executive Committee requested that the ASPP Committee consider the question of whether the extension of the tenure clock for any member of the faculty should be extended to those who are eligible for and take advantage of the Family Medical Leave Act. In particular, should it include faculty who take medical leave. The Committee noted that for special cases involving medical problems and the like, University policy allows that the tenure clock be extended, although not as a matter of right. However, since medical problems can vary in degree and frequency, each case must be evaluated independently. Hence, the Committee felt that the current policy is adequate and that there is no need to make it a matter of right to extend the tenure clock in cases of medical problems. This was conveyed to the Executive Committee.

ADJUNCT FACULTY STATUS

A Faculty member having an allegedly substandard salary requested that the ASPP Committee consider the issue of Adjunct Faculty Salaries. The Committee felt that adjunct faculty salaries were generally determined on a competitive basis and chose not to take up this issue. Vice President Lehman did provide a report on Part-Time faculty salaries as well as guidelines currently in effect.

CONTRACT FACULTY STATUS

The GSEHD informed the committee of a report that was being prepared on the status of contract faculty in that school. They expressed concern that the number of contract faculty in GSEHD far

exceeds the limitations stated in the Faculty Code: *“The proportion of regular, active status faculty serving in non-tenure accruing appointments shall not exceed 25 percent in any school, nor shall any department have fewer than 50 percent of its regular, active-status faculty appointments either tenured or tenure-accruing. The foregoing shall not apply to the Medical Center faculty who are stationed at affiliated institutions, nor to the faculties of the Law School or of the College of Professional Studies.”* This situation is a result of the fact that the contract faculty are generally funded by sponsored programs which can be cancelled. Thus, the University is reluctant to make long-term commitments to these faculty. Following the guidelines of the Faculty Code might result in eliminating many of these positions. Hence, this is a continuing issue. The expected GSEHD report was not provided to the committee and will probably be an issue next year.

In its February 4, 2004 memorandum, the Executive Committee requested the ASPP Committee consider the following two issues related to contract faculty:

- Extension of contracts for contract faculty who become new parents.
- Formulation of policies on reappointment and promotion of contract faculty in programs without departmental affiliations.

The committee felt that these two issues were very wide-ranging and important and required a joint effort between the ASPP and the PEAFF Committees. It was decided to propose a joint task force on all issues dealing with contract faculty. There was agreement on this between the PEAFF Committee and Vice President Lehman. The Joint Task Force on Contract Faculty was then established with membership provided by the ASPP Committee, the PEAFF Committee, and Academic Affairs.

ALTERNATIVE ACADEMIC CALENDAR

The Committee had extensive discussions on the impact that the proposed versions of the alternate academic calendar might have on faculty salaries and fringe benefits. This issue was widely studied by other committees. The Senate Educational Policy Committee presented a resolution at the October 31, 2003 Faculty Senate Meeting entitled: **“A RESOLUTION ON THE PROPOSALS FOR AN ALTERNATIVE ACADEMIC CALENDAR”** which expressed the disapproval of the Faculty with the administration proposals. The resolution was passed unanimously. This made the issue mute for the ASPP Committee, so further discussions were entertained.

ADMINISTRATORS’ AND FACULTY SALARY & SALARY EQUITY

At the December 12, 2003 Faculty Senate Meeting, Professor Gupta, on behalf of the ASPP Committee, distributed an Interim Report comparing administrative and faculty salaries at the University. Professor Gupta briefly summarized the information appended to the Report. Over a 5.5 year period, he said, senior University administrators received a cumulative 64.4% increase, compared to professorial compensation, which increased over that period only 21%. At present, faculty salaries are frozen, he added. There was concern that even though in corporate America, executive compensation far outpaces that of other workers, but the discrepancy between academic administrators and academicians is nothing short of astounding. The faculty expressed concern that an extraordinary disparity exists. Vice President Lehman said he thought it

inappropriate to comment on this matter, as the Board of Trustees' Compensation Committee works with the President to determine administrative salaries. Professor Robinson said she thought it might be appropriate for the Senate Executive Committee to direct an inquiry through the President to the Board's Compensation Committee, asking for an explanation of these administrative/faculty salary disparities. This is a potential issue for the ASPP Committee next year.

PRESCRIPTION PLAN VACATION OVERRIDE

The Executive Committee, in its memo of August 29, 2003, requested that the committee consider the issue of whether the new GW Prescription Plan (Advantage) provides for vacation overrides for prescription medications which enable participants to obtain additional medications beyond the regular supply for use while out of town and, especially, out of the country. Associate Vice President Susan Kaplan discussed the issue at length with the Committee and provided a detailed memorandum dated November 20, 2003 explaining the changes in the new drug program. She pointed out that while only a 30-day supply of drugs can be obtained at local pharmacies, through mail order, a 3-month supply can be obtained. For individuals who will be out of the country for more than 3-months, special arrangements can be made by the GW broker, Brown & Brown who can arrange for the individual to obtain sufficient medication while on travel. The Committee was satisfied that the new program, while altering the procedure, provides adequate benefits to the Faculty in this matter. This was conveyed to the Executive Committee.

ISSUES FOR THE ASPP COMMITTEE IN AY 2004-05

- Inconsistency between the number of contract faculty in some schools and the 25% limitation of the Faculty Code.
- Contract faculty and their involvement in new department-like programs where 100% of the faculty are contract such as the Writing Program which has no tenure track or tenured faculty.
- Salary equity between faculty and administration.
- Cost of living salary increases for faculty.

Charles A. Garris, Jr. , Chair
May 2004

2003-04 ANNUAL REPORT

FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS AND RECREATION

The Faculty Senate Committee on Athletics and Recreation met once during the Spring semester lacking the submission of agenda items from the Senate, faculty or athletics.

Jack Kvancz gave an update on GWU team and conference activities. UNC Charlotte and St. Louis University are joining the A-10 Conference making it a 14 school conference. GWU has 22 sport programs and meets gender equity guidelines. Academically, 365 of 425 student-athletes have B or better GPA's. Constraints to the program are financial and the lack of fields and other facilities.

Pat Sullivan reported that work of the ad/hoc committee on recreational sports and fitness has neared completion of its work collecting data.

An agenda item for next year is discussion of the 2003-04 Women's Softball problems leading to the cancellation of the season games and resignation of the coach.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald C. Paup, Chair

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE
Spring, 2004

TO: Dr. Lillian Robinson, Faculty Senate
FROM: Dr. Laura Youens, Interim Chair, Educational Policy Committee
DATE: April 29, 2004
SUBJECT: 2003-2004 Report to the Faculty Senate

During the fall semester, 2003, it was the first task of the Educational Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate to react to the University's plan to implement the following drastic changes: 1) a required summer session for rising juniors; 2) a required semester off, during which those students could not take courses at another university or live in their dormitories; and 3) a change from the current 5-courses-for-3-credits-each plan to 4-credits-each-for-4-courses. An implementation committee was scheduled to begin work at the beginning of November, so it was imperative that the Committee respond quickly.

The Committee met four times in September (9/9, 9/16, 9/23, and 9/26), with a joint meeting with the Faculty-Student Committee on 9/30. A special meeting was also called on 10/27. A forum for students sponsored by the Student Association featured a panel of representatives from the administration, the Educational Policy Committee, and the Faculty Senate. Departments and individual faculty members responded en masse to a call for comments with insightful memos, which were placed on a digital shelf for quick access, along with a lengthy report from the Committee authored by its chairman, Paul Duff. These compelling arguments resulted in a withdrawal of the proposed changes.

The Committee's chairman, Paul Duff, was then appointed Interim Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies, with the interim chairmanship of the Committee passing to Laura Youens. After those vigorous and successful arguments against required summer sessions and a 4x4 plan, the Educational Policy Committee headed into the spring semester with a charge to examine promotion and tenure policies, not only across departments but also across schools. The Committee had discussed this issue since 2000 and had gathered together a substantial number of school and departmental by-laws and promotion guidelines for study and comparison. Examination of those by-laws and guidelines in meetings of this committee from earlier years had already revealed striking disparities.

The Committee met on March 23 and April 13, 2004. At the first meeting, the committee determined that AAUP guidelines about promotion and tenure should be studied by the members; subsequently, copies of those guidelines were sent to the committee members. Its members agreed that each department of each college should define high-quality scholarly output and that such definitions should not be

so vague as to be useless to tenure-track faculty seeking written guidance. Departments should define as best they can scholarly output, teaching effectiveness, and service, although it is recognized that scholarly output will undoubtedly continue to be the primary consideration. Members of the committee determined that promotion and tenure considerations might ideally be distributed under the headings of *Departmental Criteria* and *Procedures* for the sake of clarity.

Mentoring should be taken seriously, and Committee member Lowell Abrams provided us with “Thoughts concerning the mentoring of new faculty.” These should be formalized, examined further, and incorporated into future P&T documents. There is little in departmental guidelines about mentoring, although the CCAS annual report form for fulltime faculty specifically includes mentoring as a category. Many departmental guidelines also fail to mention the now-obligatory 3rd-year review for tenure-track faculty.

Committee members also considered voting procedures and agreed that all of those voting must be part of the discussion, including those on any kind of leave, even if by conference. They also agreed that there should be a record of the vote, but only of the numbers for, against, and abstaining.

The committee learned that a resolution concerning promotion and tenure was being sent forward by the PEAFF Committee, chaired by Prof. Charles Garris. That Resolution was subsequently passed by the Faculty Senate on 4/9/04. Its stipulations about the role of a college’s dean relative to the tenure recommendations of the department are being reviewed, and the members of the Faculty Senate and of the Educational Policy will probably be hearing more about this section of the Resolution.

In addition, the Committee was apprised that CCAS has called for departments to provide copies of departmental bylaws and other operating documents (memo from Executive Associate Dean Edward Caress, dated April 12, 2004). Once these documents have been collected, they will be studied, and departments might receive recommendations to update them. Ultimately, it is envisioned that they would be posed on a digital shelf so as to be available to all those interested in examining them.

The members of the Educational Policy Committee should continue to be a vital part of all discussions of promotion and tenure guidelines. We anticipate hearing about any subsequent discussion of the PEAFF resolution, especially with regard to the role of the deans. Given the considerable amount of work the committee has already dedicated towards the goal of greater uniformity and clarity in tenure procedures, the Committee will undoubtedly want to participate in future considerations of departmental promotion guidelines.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Youens, Interim Chair
Members of the Educational Policy Committee

Faculty Senate
FISCAL PLANNING & BUDGETING COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-2004 TERM
May 7, 2004

The Fiscal Planning & Budgeting (FP&B) Committee met approximately once a month to receive and discuss with University officers, primarily Assoc. VP for Budget Don Boselovic and Exec. VPAA Don Lehman, a wide variety of financial and planning reports on the University. (Due to absence from this year's committee of a faculty member from the Medical Center we did not review or discuss that separate budget.) During this term the Committee was principally occupied with preparation of two reports.

The first was an *oral report* delivered on Oct. 31, 2003, as the FP&B Committee's contribution to the Faculty Senate's debate on the Administration's proposal for an "alternative calendar" and a shift to a so-called "4X4 course structure." The Committee reviewed the financial planning for the two proposals, and the three questions on which the Committee focused were the following:

- (1) Were the revenue gains from the alternative calendar reliably estimated? We concluded that additional revenues had been quite optimistically estimated.
- (2) Were the additional costs for the two proposals adequately projected, especially the most significant cost, the hiring of additional faculty? We concluded that they had been seriously underestimated.
- (3) Had the Administration adequately explained the purposes for which new revenues were so needed as to justify these wrenching changes? We noted that little specific information had been offered on this score, only vague generalities, and our review of the Administration's recent record of allocation of funds across the University did not evoke our confidence that if any additional funds were actually realized, such monies would be used in significant part to advance the academic side of the University, which is always the faculty's main concern.

The second report was our *Special Report on FY 2004 Operating Budget and Five Year Capital Budget*, presented to the Faculty Senate at its meeting of April 9, 2004. In that report we provided the Senate and faculty generally with an overview of current and proposed operating and capital budgets. We also presented data on the relationship between the recent rapid growth in undergraduate enrollments and recent increases in faculty appointments, noting a correlation between the enrollment growth and growth in the number of faculty appointed on non-tenure-accruing contracts. We also analyzed the proposed "fixed tuition plan", which we found raised a number of unanswered questions; examined the implications of the University's growing debt; and discussed such vexing problems as the continuing, well-recognized shortage of classroom space for the number of classes the faculty proposes to provide; the University's weak fund-raising record; and the rapid growth in legal expenses.

During this term, the FP&B Committee found itself struggling to deal with the several major issues before it, and was unable to give much attention to other issues on which it had originally planned to work. Due to the urgency of the problems involved in (a) the proposal for the alternative calendar, (b) assessing the rapidly shifting budget picture as the University

struggled to adjust to the lowering of endowment support to the operating budget and the rising cost of debt service, as well as (c) attempting to review the new fixed tuition plan made public (through The HATCHET) only late in the spring term, we were simply unable to focus on the following issues, which are hereby made "continuing business" for next year's Committee:

1. *Further Study of Changing Ratio of FT Tenure-track to FT Non-tenure-track appointments.* -- This was an item to which we drew attention in our last two reports on the Operating and Capital budgets, but as it is a matter of great concern we would like to develop a special report on this topic, if possible.

2. *Study of the Budget Model and Budget Decision-Making Process* -- Our Committee assumes that faculty would be interested in gaining a clearer understanding of the University's budgeting process, but we have been unable to satisfy ourselves that we can present an informative report based on what we now know. However this appears to be a project worth continuing to develop.

3. *Review of the Medical Center Budget* -- Because the budget of the Medical Center has now been disencumbered of many of its less-academic enterprises (e.g. the hospital, HMO and faculty practice plan), leaving mainly the budget for the School of Medicine and Health Sciences and the School of Public Health and Health Services, the Committee undertook last year for the first time to review this budget. We were unable to continue this review this year, but if we can obtain the cooperation of a Medical Center faculty member on the Committee we think this an effort worth pursuing.

4. *Review of Budgets for Athletics & Recreation* -- Consideration of this has been a joint project with the Senate Committee on Athletics. The data we have been seeking has now largely been provided us, and only requires updating. What is needed now is to find time to analyze the data and determine whether the results are significant enough to be reported to the Senate. We would propose to continue this joint subcommittee effort.

The Committee extends special thanks to Don Boselovic, Associate Vice President for Budget, and to Don Lehman, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, for their extensive cooperation with the Committee's efforts. The Chair thanks Lou Katz, Executive Vice President and Treasurer, for helpful conversations about the University's budgeting process, and Senior Vice President Chernak for his input as well.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Committee:

William B. Griffith, Chair (CCAS)

Voting Members:

Cherian, E. MGT, SBPM
Critchfield, A. ORG SCIENCES/COMM
Garris, C. MECH & AEROSP. ENGIN.
Gowan, M. MGT, SBPM
Lindhahl, F. ACCT, SPBM
Packer, R., BISC, CCAS
Shotel, J. TPSE. GSEHD
Watson, H. ECON, CCAS
Yezer, A. ECON, CCAS

Administrative Members:

Bass, G., Assoc VP for Health Econ, Med
Boselovic, D. Assoc. VP for Budget
Chernak, R., Sr. VP for Stud/Acad Sup Svcs
Harding, H., Dean, ESIA
Katz, L. Exec. VP and Treasurer
Lehman, Exec VP for Acad Affairs
Siggins, J., University Librarian
Whitaker, R., Assoc VP/Acad Dev &ContEd
Wirtz, P. Mgt Sci, Exec Cte Liaison

Report of the Honors and Academic Convocations Committee

May, 2004

Owing to its peculiar and checkered history, the purview of the **Honors and Academic Convocations Committee** of the GW Faculty Senate has evolved into one sole function—to recommend (or not recommend) candidates for honorary degrees who have been nominated by members of the GW community. This function has now been restored to this Committee after a hiatus, which in turn has led to a new commitment on the part of the University Administration to maintain this essential link in the approval process. In particular, the Committee has been charged with the goal of assuring that outstanding achievement in the academic disciplines plays a major role in the selection process, as is fitting for a University that has ambitions of greatness.

The University uses three criteria in selecting candidates for honorary degrees:

- 1) Achievement in the career field of the candidate;
- 2) Contributions outside this field, particularly public service;
- 3) GW affiliation or connection.

Sufficient qualifications are required for at least two of these criteria.

The Committee met four times during AY2003-04. In our first three meetings, in September and October 2003, we established twelve categories for honorary degree recipients:

- 1) Letters and History
- 2) Science
- 3) Social Science
- 4) Engineering
- 5) Fine Arts
- 6) Music
- 7) Theatre and Film
- 8) Medicine, Law, and Clergy
- 9) Business and Administration
- 10) Politics and Military
- 11) Journalism
- 12) Sports

and of those persons who had been nominated previously or up to October 6, 2003, we selected seven, plus five backups (second choice in the same category). Of these, one (Nobel Laureate in Physics Leon Lederman) was selected for the 2004 Commencement by the President, along with three others previously approved by the Trustees. In his acceptance message, Lederman wrote: “I hasten to accept the true honor of recognition from one of the most important and prestigious institutions in the nation.” This was nice to hear.

In March, 2004, we met again to consider the 17 new nominations that had been received during the intervening period. We recommended seven of these (for 2005 or beyond), rejected one, and asked for more information about the other nine (please note that nomination papers are often incomplete—they should be buttressed with sufficient information to address all of the above three criteria). As of this date, additional information has been received for five of these nine. Evaluating these nominations, along with any other nominations received over the summer, will constitute our first order of business in AY2004-05.

Respectfully submitted,

The Honors and Academic Convocations Committee

Barry Berman, Chair

David Anderson (University Archivist)

Michael Freedman (Vice President for Communications)

Theodore Glickman

Kathryn Guccione (Student Representative)

Jill Kasle (University Marshal)

Joan Regnell

Patricia Sullivan

Alan Wade

Bernard Wood

**Faculty Senate Committee on Libraries
Annual Report 2003/2004**

The Committee met on December 11th, February 19th, and March 25th.

One major issue was identified over the 2003/2004 academic year: the increasingly burdensome costs associated with serials acquisitions by the University's libraries. A subcommittee was formed, chaired by Professor John Heins, and Resolution 03/9 was written by the subcommittee, and then refined by the entire Committee. The Resolution was brought to the Faculty Senate at the April 9th meeting and was unanimously approved.

The Committee proposes that the 2004/2005 Library Committee review any potential follow-up actions required following the approval of the Resolution.

Respectfully submitted, May 7, 2004,
Sylvia A. Marotta
Chair, Senate Committee on Libraries

Members of the 2003/2004 Committee on Libraries:

Berkovich, Simon, Computer Science
Fon, Vincy, Economics
Harizanov, Valentina, Mathematics
Heins, John, German & Slavic Languages
Kwak, Young H., Management Science
Shambaugh, David, Political Science and International Affairs
Toftoy, Charles, Management Science

Ex officio:

Bader, Shelley A., Director, Medical Library
Klarén, Peter, F., History and International Affairs, Executive Committee Liaison
Lehman, Donald R., Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
Mankuta, Ross D., Student Liaison
Pagel, Scott, B., Librarian Law Library
Siggins, Jack A., University Librarian
Sterling, Christopher, Director, Telecommunications Program
Stewart, Andrea W., Assistant Librarian

**ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PHYSICAL FACILITIES COMMITTEE
ACADEMIC YEAR 2003-2004**

The Physical Facilities Committee met eight times during the fall and spring semesters and communicated electronically between meetings.

At the first meeting the committee heard a summary of building/renovation projects in progress or planned from Associate Vice President for Academic Planning and Special Projects, Craig Linebaugh. One major building project, a new business school, is underway. Floors 3, 4, 5, and 6 of Fungler are to be renovated beginning June-August, 2004. The Department of Statistics, a Fungler occupant, will move to a dedicated townhouse. The other Fungler occupants, political science, economics, and mathematics, will move into swingspace for two years in Old Main. The old business school is to be renovated and the "other" occupants of Fungler will move into the renovated space. A new residence hall is under consideration near Key Hall. Funding is being sought for three projects: renovation of the basement of Corcoran, renovation of Corcoran 405 for classroom and laboratory use, renovation of Gelman, 6th floor with relocation of academic units. In a subsequent meeting, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman reported that the engineering school was planning for renovation.

The bulk of the committee's work this academic year was to respond to a request from the Executive Committee of the University Senate.

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate requested (September 17, 2003) that the Physical Facilities Committee identify the most pressing academic need with respect to the construction of new facilities in light of the approaching availability of the old hospital site. It became apparent quickly that Annual Reports filed by previous Physical Facilities Committees from 1996 forward spoke to the need for new science facilities. (Perhaps even earlier reports, not reviewed by the present committee, speak to this need. Dean Caress spoke of the promise of a new science building when he was recruited to GW which indicates long-term recognition by some of the need). In this eight year period of time, we have seen the actual or planned construction of several academic buildings-Media and Public Affairs, ESIA, Law School addition, SBPM under construction, and a School of Engineering in the planning stages. Thus, the Physical Facilities Committee, convinced of the need for new science facilities, took on as its charge, with the approval of the Executive Committee, the development of a rationale in support of new science facilities. The Committee met with Columbian College Dean Frawley, Executive Vice President Lehman, Vice President for Advancement Bond, and Executive Vice President and Treasurer Katz. Based on information gained from these meetings, review of PKAL (Project Kaleidoscope) reports, review of the University's Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence, and research conducted by members of the Committee, the Physical Facilities Committee submitted the Faculty Senate a Resolution on the Construction of New Science Facilities as the Top Priority Among New Academic Structures.

The committee's charge did not include recommending a size or site for new science facilities. While the old hospital site could, indeed, be the location for new science facilities and/or be a source of new revenue to finance new facilities either on that or other property, the committee agreed that the future use of the old hospital site should be leveraged to best benefit the Institution. Implicit in the Committee's position is the view that revenue/space derived from the old hospital site should contribute toward construction of new science facilities.

The final work product of the Committee is the attached resolution, "A Resolution on Construction of New Science Facilities as the Top Priority Among New Academic Structures:", submitted to the Executive Committee on April 23, 2004 and to the University Senate on May 7, 2004.

Respectfully submitted

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Linda Gallo".

Linda L. Gallo, Chair

Members: Jerome Danoff
Hugo Junghenn
Donald Paup
Bradley Sabelli
George Stephens
Michael King
Robert Donaldson

Ex Officio: Anyah Dembling
(student)
Robert Harrington
Craig Linebaugh
Jean Pec
Louis Katz

**ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND
ACADEMIC FREEDOM COMMITTEE
2003-2004 ACADEMIC YEAR**

The PEAFC Committee met throughout the academic year and focused its efforts on three Senate Resolutions:

1. **“A Resolution to Recommend the Establishment of an Election as of Right by Tenure Track Faculty Who Become New Parents During the Probationary Period” (03/6) adopted, as amended, by the Senate on January 16, 2004. The PEAFC Committee thanks Miriam Galston and Phil Wirtz for their efforts in leading toward the successful adoption of this resolution. The PEAFC Committee’s role in this resolution was to review and make minor amendments to the document as prepared by the Joint Committee on the Tenure Clock.**
2. **“A Resolution on the Roles of Faculty Members, Advisory School-Wide Personnel Committees and Administration Officials in Tenure and Promotion Cases” (03/10), adopted by the Senate on April 9, 2004. The PEAFC Committee thanks our Executive Committee liaison, Arthur Wilmarth, for his tireless work on this resolution.**
3. **“A Resolution to Amend the Policy on Scientific Misconduct” (03/8), from the Committee on Research, adopted as an interim policy by the Senate on March 12, 2004 and referred to the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee to review and amend the policy with regards to issues of due process. The PEAFC Committee has drafted a revised resolution to be finalized over the summer and prepared for presentation to the Faculty Senate early in Fall 2004. The PEAFC Committee thanks William Briscoe, Chair of the Research Committee, and Carol Sigelman, GWU Associate Vice President for Research, for their assistance to the committee in its deliberations.**

The PEAFC Committee has begun to coordinate with other Senate committees to consider the myriad of issues regarding contract faculty at GWU. This will be a lead item on its agenda for 2004-2005.

I thank all PEAFC Committee members for their work this year and a special thanks to the work of Executive Committee liaison, Art Wilmarth, for his energy and direction.

**Ernie Englander
Chair, PEAFC Committee
May 2004**