CALL TO ORDER

The Assembly was called to order by Vice President Lehman at 3:10 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular Assembly of October 3, 2000, were approved as distributed.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW FACULTY

Vice President Lehman said it was his pleasure to have the opportunity to introduce new faculty who have joined The George Washington University this year. He called upon the deans for introduction of newly-appointed faculty in their respective schools. Following the introductions, Vice President Lehman welcomed the new faculty to the University.

PRESENTATION OF THE BENDER TEACHING AWARDS

Vice President Lehman noted that the Bender Teaching Awards were established thanks to the generosity of Morton A. Bender, a friend of GW and an advocate of quality teaching. Vice President Lehman then introduced Mr. Bender, who was in attendance, to the Assembly, and Mr. Bender received a round of applause.

The following faculty each received a Bender Teaching Award:

- Galina Shatalina - Department of German and Slavic Languages and Literatures (for teaching by a non-tenured, full-time faculty member)
- Jessica Matthews - Department of English (for use of innovative technologies in teaching)
- Dewey Wallace - Department of Religion (in recognition of general teaching)
- Al May - School of Media and Public Affairs (in recognition of general teaching)
- Steven Schwinn - The George Washington University Law School (for teaching by a part-time faculty member)
Philip Jacks - Department of Fine Arts and Art History (for use of innovative technologies in teaching)

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

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

**THE GW UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC PLANNING**

President Trachtenberg said that he was delighted to welcome new faculty. He then introduced Richard N. Sawaya, the University’s new Vice President for Government, International, and Corporate Affairs, who received his Ph.D. in Literature from Harvard University. The President then also introduced Vice Presidents Katz and Chernak. Noting that this year marked his fourteenth at the University, the President presented his report to the Assembly on a Strategic Planning initiative which he said would “develop a coordinated planning process to support (the University’s) efforts for significantly greater academic quality and distinction.” (Report by President Trachtenberg is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

**STRATEGIC PLANNING – ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE**

Donald R. Lehman, Vice President for Academic Affairs, reported on the newly-formed Committee on Academic Excellence. (Report by Vice President Lehman is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

**STRATEGIC PLANNING – SERVICE AND BUSINESS**

Louis Katz, Vice President and Treasurer, reported on the composition and mission of the Committee on Service and Business, which is the second component of GW’s Strategic Planning initiative. (Report by Vice President Katz is attached and made a part of these minutes.)
Robert Chernak, Vice President for Student and Academic Support Services, also reported about the task facing the Committee on Service and Business. (Report by Vice President Chernak is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

Following Vice President Chernak’s report, Vice President Lehman introduced John Wilson, Assistant Vice President in the Vice President and Treasurer’s Office, and advised that Mr. Wilson would be coordinating work between the Committee on Academic Excellence and the Committee on Service and Business.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Assembly, and upon motion made and seconded, Vice President Lehman adjourned the meeting at 4:35 p.m. He then invited everyone to the reception immediately following.

Dennis L. Geyer
Secretary
The George Washington University Strategic Planning

by

Stephen Joel Trachtenberg, President

As some of you know, I am now into my fourteenth year as President of The George Washington University. The prior thirteen years have been everything and more than I ever expected. If you will allow me to put aside modesty for a moment, I think we can all agree that GW as an institution has made major strides in several areas over this period. Moreover, I believe we can agree that it didn’t just happen. Sure, some things occurred because certain critical components fell into place, but the rest came about because of the hard work of many people -- our faculties, our staff, and others. We can be proud of the quality of our undergraduate students, the improvement in our facilities, the growth of the funding for our faculties’ research work, the additions to our physical plant, the recognition of the quality of our professional master’s degree programs, to name just a few items on what is a long list. We managed these accomplishments in what at times seems like a daunting environment of challenges thrust upon us by rapid external change in higher education and the finiteness of our own resources. Fortunately, we have not wavered in our drive to carry out the task before us.

Those of the faculty who were at GW on the order of twenty years will recall that in the early 1980’s, President Elliott appointed the so-called Commission on the Year 2000. In May 1985, the members of the Commission presented to President Elliott its final report. President Elliott presented the Report to the Board of Trustees who voted to receive the Report, commend the Report to the administration and faculty for working out the details of the recommendations and priorities, and requested that the Administration give regular progress reports. For those of you who were here during that time, you may recall that the Report contains 18 recommendations under two headings: Building a University of Quality and Distinctive Aspirations. Of the 12 recommendations under the heading of Building a University of Quality, I conclude that 9 of the recommendations have been fully accomplished, two are essentially accomplished, and one was not achieved. Among those realized are “The University should establish plans and policies that will enable it to develop into a research institution of the first rank” and “The University should continue to build faculty morale and take new steps to foster a sense of academic community.” However, we have not fully realized the recommendation that “The University should develop a coordinated planning process to support its efforts for significantly greater academic quality and distinction.” Nor have we met the recommendation to provide, “At the earliest possible time, ... modern laboratories for teaching in the natural sciences and engineering, and additional facilities to support research and teaching in these areas.” At the same time, all 6 recommendations under Distinctive Aspirations have been achieved. Two of note are “The University should develop the present School of Public and International Affairs to serve as the cornerstone for the University’s diverse programs in international affairs” and “The University should develop a Center for the Study of Public Policy to aid in developing new research programs, particularly those which emphasize multidisciplinary activities, and to facilitate and strengthen current faculty research.” The first you will recognize as the Elliott School of International Affairs and the second the newly established GW Institute
of Public Policy. I believe the GW community can be justifiably proud of these accomplishments and the other accomplishments, both large and small that have occurred over the last 16 years.

Obviously, we cannot sit on our accomplishments. We must continue to build from that which we have already established. Moreover, as I pointed out earlier, we did not realize fully the recommendation to develop a University coordinated planning process to underpin the efforts to achieve significantly greater academic quality and distinction. Until recently, I was not disturbed at that neglect, because I thought to move the University the way we have depended on an opportunistic approach with flexibility to take the most direct path to improvement. However, the world of higher education is getting more complex, there are external influences for which account must be given, and the finiteness of valuable resources appear to necessitate a more defined approach that will give us a framework for decision making and a clearer agenda for fund raising. Therefore, I unveiled to the GW Board of Trustees at their retreat in June a vision for GW that included strategic planning.

I presented my vision for GW through a set of a dozen items. I shall simply read them here, without providing you the amplification to each one that I had given earlier:

1. Develop national distinction for academic programs by application of the principle of selective, academic excellence;
2. Continue to evolve an environment that values innovation and creativity across all areas of the University: curriculum, pedagogy, services to students, general operations;
3. Create a high quality and intellectually stimulating and challenging learning environment for all students through a mixture of large lectures and small classes and seminars;
4. Continue to offer and evolve A+ undergraduate programs in parallel with distinctive, leading graduate and professional degree offerings;
5. Promote a culture that leads to an understanding among the undergraduate students of the importance of an education that is balanced among the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences, even when they are pursuing a professional degree;
6. Add potential value to each student’s educational experience by offering a breadth of academic, artistic, civic, leadership, cultural, athletic, fitness, and social opportunities;
7. Offer to all students a strong collegiate experience through a well developed, and defined, residential campus that is safe, well cared for, and well designed;
8. Use technology to improve instruction and to enhance our general operations;
9. Create an environment within the whole University that values and celebrates diversity in the fullest sense;
10. Build community both on- and off-campus;
11. Develop an approach that recognizes and rewards outstanding contributions to the attainment of the University’s goals;
12. Develop connectivity between the University strategic planning priorities and fund-raising/development efforts.

One who is familiar with the University’s six goals can see that my dozen “vision” items are directly linked to the goals. My vision is one where the concept of selective academic excellence is externally recognized as GW’s approach and such excellence is realized through a quality of undergraduate education that is top-tier, through master’s professional and graduate education that is state-of-the-field, through doctoral degree programs that are at least nationally recognized and underpinned by forefront research and scholarship by the involved faculty and students, through a planned approach to making available the resources needed to implement the agreed upon priorities, and through a careful emphasis on what it means to be an inclusive and responsive community.

How do we plan to get from here to there? Clearly, there needs to be a process. I see the process as having two purposes: One is to chart a future direction for GW through increased recognized academic excellence, while increasing student satisfaction and strengthening the business development that supports the academic enterprise. The other is to educate the University’s stakeholders about what we want the University to be and what it takes to actually get there. We want our stakeholders to gain a greater understanding of the University’s needs and have them committed to its future.

The GW Strategic Planning Process will involve two committees: Academic Excellence; Service & Business. Don Lehman will Chair the Academic Excellence Committee with a co-chair from the faculty. Bob Chernak and Lou Katz will co-chair the Service & Business Committee. After deliberations, and including testimony from various stakeholders and outside experts, I expect the initial products from the respective committees to be the formulation of defined criteria for the selection of priority academic programs or areas of emphasis in the service/business domain. In addition, I expect the committees to give measures to assess on-going performance in their areas. The Academic Excellence Committee will focus on selective academic excellence and consider issues associated with setting criteria that programs must meet to be designated priority areas for future investment. This Committee will have the added responsibility of reviewing proposed academic programs from the schools and recommending to the Academic Vice President and me those they think best satisfy the criteria to be selected as a priority area. The Service & Business Committee will address the undergraduate experience outside the classroom, in particular their extracurricular opportunities, services provided to students, and general issues that surface when students become alumni. In addition, the Committee will look at our service functions for faculty and students, sustainability of our revenue generating auxiliary initiatives, and our relationship with the District of Columbia. Criteria will be determined to measure overall performance in all cases. You will hear more detail about the two committees shortly.

I mentioned earlier that we want our stakeholders, in particular you, the faculty, to gain a greater understanding of GW and an evolving University of excellence. Obviously, it will take time for the committees to digest input not only from stakeholders, but also
from outside experts who can help us understand better the social, economic, technological, and political environment in which GW operates. It is essential that we understand what we control and what we do not control. We need to affirm our strengths and build from them, while we continue to analyze our opportunities. In the end, the planning process is not to produce a detailed plan of action. That task will be left to the appropriate senior staff and deans. However, they are expected to base their actions on the priorities that emerge from the Strategic Planning Process, and their decisions will follow the logic that is described by the process.

In closing, I want to emphasize that my vision for GW for the next five years or so is fully integrated with the University’s stated mission and six succinctly stated goals. The vision is based on selective academic excellence at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. To realize the vision to its fullest extent, we shall engage in planning. The outcome we expect is a new level of academic excellence for GW and recognition for The George Washington University.
Strategic Planning – Committee on Academic Excellence

Remarks by Donald R. Lehman, Vice President for Academic Affairs

Faculty Assembly, 9 October 2001

You just heard President Trachtenberg give a synoptic version of the vision that he presented to the Board of Trustees at their retreat this past June. As President Trachtenberg pointed out, his vision ties to the University’s six goals. His vision stresses selective academic excellence, professional and graduate education, nationally recognized doctoral programs, a planned approach to the use of available resources to implement agreed upon priorities, and development of an inclusive and responsive community. To achieve the University’s goals such that we can realize the President’s vision, he emphasized that there needs to be a process, a process that has as its central focus strategic planning.

The vision for GW in the immediate coming years is one that we wish to realize to the fullest possible extent. Its connectivity to the University’s mission and six goals gives the basic framework for the work of the Strategic Planning Committee on Academic Excellence. Moreover, it is consistent with the vision for Academic Affairs. “The vision for Academic Affairs is that GW becomes nationally and internationally recognized for its academic excellence in selected areas of emphasis that are primarily derived from existing programmatic strengths, across disciplines, in teaching, scholarship, and externally funded research. The vision (for Academic Affairs) derives from society’s need for continuing scientific discovery, applications of technology, and synthesis of information to create new understanding of, and solutions to, human and societal problems in order to promote growth and prosperity. Through fulfillment of the selective excellence vision, GW (as an institution) can make significant, acknowledged contributions.” The work of the Committee on Academic Excellence is aimed towards filling the Academic Affairs vision.

Who are the members of the Academic Affairs Committee? It is a committee composed of faculty, deans, Board of Trustees representation, and academic staff across the University. Let me read the list of members.

******************************************************************************

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE ON SELECTIVE ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

Committee on Academic Excellence (Composition)

Chair: Donald R. Lehman, VPAA, (lehman@gwu.edu)
Co-Chair: C. Dianne Martin, Professor, Computer Science (diannem@seas.gwu.edu)

Jean Folkerts: Interim Dean, CCAS (jfolk@gwu.edu)
Harry Harding: Dean, ESIA (hharding@gwu.edu)
What is the agenda of the Committee on Academic Excellence? The agenda of the Committee has five components:

- Develop a set of criteria against which programs can be evaluated for potential designation as areas for priority investment towards a higher level of academic excellence;
- Address the question as to how GW can assure a challenging academic experience for undergraduate students as well as graduate students?
- Address the question as to whether GW’s academic experience for students at the undergraduate level might be enhanced through a four-course, four-credits per course, semester? In addition, the Committee will address the question of whether an approach of four-credits per course at the graduate level has the potential of enhancing graduate offerings?
• Address the question of whether GW has more doctoral programs than it can support from the view of having doctoral programs that are recognized and potentially nationally ranked? Related to this question is the important issue as to whether the component of our current Academic Program Reviews associated with reviewing of doctoral programs is sufficiently rigorous to permit sound decisions as to whether programs meet minimal standards of excellence.

• From proposals received from the Schools that are constructed against the criteria formulated by the Committee, select approximately 10 programs or areas to recommend to the President and Vice President for Academic Affairs to be selected as programs or areas for growth and development over time, in order to bring them to a level of externally recognized academic excellence.

Let me expand on these by talking about how the committee is undertaking its work.

The Committee on Academic Excellence has been hard at work for about a month. The Committee meets every Friday for about 90 minutes. Sometimes the Committee meets as a whole and has roundtable-like discussions. Sometimes the Committee breaks up into subgroups for discussion and the subgroups report back to the Committee as a whole. In addition, the Committee plans to invite “expert” testimony from individuals from both inside and outside the University on each of the agenda items. So far, the Committee has had meetings that used all these approaches. And, on occasion, the committee members have “homework” to do in preparation for the following meeting.

The Committee has made significant progress on the first item on its agenda and expects to finalize that task this coming Friday. At this point, the Committee has identified three broad categories with related criteria under each category. For example, the first category is “Ability to Raise the Academic Excellence, Intellectual Distinction, and Academic Reputation of the University.” Sitting under this broad category are criteria like “Ability to achieve or extend academic excellence”, “Already intellectually distinguished”, and “Ability to integrate first-tier research and scholarship into top-level education”. This Friday will be a meeting where each of the criteria under each category will be fine-tuned prior to their being forwarded to the schools for use in preparing proposals to be considered by the Committee in February 2002.

Beginning the week of 22 October 2001, the Committee will move onto the second item on its agenda. Most all of us know the importance of this undertaking based on the input that we receive back from our students on exit surveys and satisfaction surveys. Certainly, for GW to be recognized as an institution of quality education, we cannot have our students conveying that they are not being academically challenged. The quality of GW undergraduate students has been on the rise. One question is whether we as faculty have shifted our approaches to teaching and learning towards the changing quality of the undergraduate population? This concern is not limited to undergraduate students. Graduate students have become and are becoming more astute learners and have high expectations when the costs of professional and graduate education are high. We as faculty must continually deliver a quality educational product that is conducive to learning at the highest level. I expect the Committee to spend approximately one month
on this topic and to glide smoothly into the third topic concerning the approach to the curriculum – three-credit courses versus four-credit courses.

The fourth topic on the Academic Excellence Committee’s agenda falls directly under the heading of “implementing selective academic excellence”. We carried out an initial review of our doctoral programs over the last few years. This led all of us to realize that adjustments could be made to our doctoral offerings to recognize that not all doctoral programs are viable, either because of the lack of student interest or the inability of GW to provide the required underpinning of faculty and other resources. As a result, a number of changes were made in our doctoral offerings in several schools. This was a positive first step. Now, it is time for us as faculties to go back and ask even harder questions about our doctoral offerings. Where does each really stand on a national level? What is the realistic potential for changing that standing? In order to answer such questions carefully and rationally requires that we have appropriate criteria in place for such evaluation and subsequent decision-making. The Committee on Academic Excellence is charged with looking at the current doctoral program evaluation approach to determine if it needs adjustment as we work towards higher excellence in the future.

I believe I have given you a fairly detailed overview of the composition, agenda, and approaches to the work of the Committee on Academic Excellence. It is clear this Committee has a significant task before it, but one that if achieved, will help us achieve the mission of Academic Affairs, that is, “…to provide students and faculty the optimal environment for the creation and acquisition of knowledge and the pursuit of creative endeavors…”, while, at the same time, helping make the vision of Academic Affairs a reality. Such achievement will contribute significantly to making real President Trachtenberg’s vision for the University.
Remarks by Louis Katz, Vice President and Treasurer, at the Faculty Assembly held on October 9, 2001

I'd like to begin by commenting on the composition of the Committee on Service and Business, and then tell you what we hope to accomplish in the next six months.

The Committee will be chaired by Vice President Bob Chernak and myself, and will have sixteen members, four of whom will be faculty. There will also be one Dean, one student, three members (or former members) of the University’s Board of Trustees, and seven administrators. Thus far, two slots are still unfilled (one faculty and one Board member), but the following people have agreed to serve on the Committee: Professors Steve Roberts (School of Media & Public Affairs) Barbara Miller (Anthropology – Columbian College), and Jim Millar (Economics in International Affairs – Elliott School). Dean Michael Young of the Law School has also agreed to serve, as has Mr. Roger Kapoor, President of the Student Association. Ms. Lydia Thomas, a Board member who is President and CEO of Mitritek Systems, and Vice Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board, will serve on the Committee, as will Mr. Oliver Carr, former Chair of the Board of Trustees. Among the administrators serving on the Committee will be Mr. David Swartz, the University’s Chief Information Officer, Mr. Richard Sawaya, Vice President for Government, International, and Corporate Affairs introduced earlier today, Ms. Beverly Bond, our new Vice President for Advancement (formerly Development) and Mr. Johnnie Osborne, Assistant Vice President and Chief Financial Officer in Student and Academic Support Services.

The focus of the Committee on Service and Business will be to make GW as excellent in its operations as it is, or intends to be, academically. The agenda for the Committee over the next six months will include developing a common understanding of GW’s current strengths and identity; examining GW’s institutional capital in the areas of financial management, physical, information, and external capital. The Committee will also assess the University’s current business and student support services and establish standards and tracking. As it begins its work, the Committee will describe our challenges and outline our plan.

The Committee will examine issues such as resource allocation, not only in terms of financial resources, but in terms of space and human capital, and examine possibilities if the University can get beyond its current position where the mode of operation is tuition driven. Technology will also be a focus. One
question before the Committee will be looking at how GW's uniqueness can be enhanced by further refining our service functions, advancing our revenue-generating capacity, and looking at mutually beneficial relationships with external entities including partnering, which could also include governmental units. A great deal of the work will be done in subcommittee, and the full Committee plans to meet once or twice a month, from now through February. Finally, in March and May, it will work with the Academic Excellence Committee to develop the larger plan.
Strategic Planning - Committee on Service and Business

Remarks by Robert Chernak, Vice President for Student and Academic Support Services at the Faculty Assembly held on October 9, 2001

I’m commencing my fourteenth year here at the University as Vice President for Student and Academic Support Services. I look forward very much to sharing the honor of leading this Strategic Planning process with Vice President Lehman and Vice President Katz. And, unfortunately, in light of the horrific events of September 11th, GW will face some significant challenges as an urban, private, selective institution that attracts a very large international population. Approximately 2,500 of our students come from 180 foreign countries. Many of our students now at the graduate level come from west of the Mississippi. The University has to recognize that economic factors, as well as possible fear of travel and concern for personal safety, will have influences on schools like GW, and certainly have an impact in the future.

Consequently, I applaud President Trachtenberg for putting into play an open process that will involve numerous stakeholders from the University so that we can take stock of some of the current market conditions that we are facing, overlap them with some of the business objectives that have been alluded to by Vice President Katz, and support the primary mission of the institution, which is the academic agenda as outlined by Vice President Lehman.

To give a little bit of history, originally the Strategic Planning process envisioned three working committees – one on Academic Excellence, and one on Business Services, and a third on Student Satisfaction. The decision was made to merge Business Services and Student Satisfaction because, when we looked at the respective committee agendas, we came to recognize that what we do both on the business side and on the student services side involves a good bit of overlap. Both sides use the same type of systems, for example, in terms of technology and information systems. We each have issues dealing with physical plant and space allocation. We each have a unique role in terms of trying to provide better customer service to our students, whether it be through student accounts or financial aid, and we certainly have a particular role in assisting the University in meeting its enrollment objectives with regard to how we handle our admissions strategies and student financial aid strategies.
We think that we have proper representation from all segments of the GW community, and I think we are going to be particularly scrupulous in our efforts to make sure that those resources that are not currently a part of the academic budget are used wisely, efficiently, and effectively, so that we can do all that we can to support the reason we are all here – and that is to provide one of the best undergraduate and graduate educations we can for our students.

I have one final point that is related to something that Professor Robinson mentioned. Among my responsibilities are all the areas under the Dean of Students, and one of these areas is the Office of Disabled Student Services. We have here at the University approximately 800 students who come to us with diagnosed learning disability problems, or other physical handicaps, who avail themselves of Disability Support Services, and I applaud the faculty of this University, because this is the fourth university at which I’ve served, and I don’t know of another place where the faculty have been so cooperative and so understanding of the particular needs of this population. I also hope that all of the new faculty who are coming on board will join in this effort to do all that we can to make sure that all of these students who have invested themselves in a GW education receive the kind of service that we all would prefer.
On behalf of your colleagues on the Faculty Senate, I would like to report on matters which have been and are currently before the Senate.

RESOLUTIONS

Eight resolutions were considered by the Faculty Senate since the October, 2000 Faculty Assembly. These resolutions are reflective of the work of the Faculty Senate as it addresses a broad variety of internally and externally initiated issues of importance to our diverse faculty. It should be stressed that the Senate is both responsive and proactive with respect to matters of concern across school lines. It is the primary vehicle of faculty communication with the officers of the administration and the Board of Trustees. The work of the standing committees, reports, and resolutions reflective of the priorities and concerns of the faculty, are transmitted, through a variety of mechanisms, to the administration and to the Board and Trustees and/or its committees.

Let me now turn to three of the resolutions.

1. Resolution 01/2 endorses the faculty statement, prepared by the Educational Policy Committee, on students with disabilities. It endorses the University's responsibility and the faculty's commitment to providing accommodation and equal opportunity for participation in University programs, activities and services. Simultaneously, it recognizes the students' responsibility for following appropriate procedures as established through the Office of Disability and Support Services.

2. Two Resolutions, 00/2 and 00/5, deal with amendments to the Faculty Code with respect to the faculty grievance procedures (Article X., Section E.), the review of which was originally undertaken in 1997 and revisions made by a Senate resolution in 1999. In response to a subsequent administration request, Resolution 00/2, passed in October 2000, recommends amending one provision of the procedures of the same section. The Board of Trustees approved these changes, but with additional modifications made on the advice of the Office of University Counsel. The second Resolution, 00/5, requests that, in accordance with established procedures of shared governance, the Faculty Senate be provided an opportunity by the Board of Trustees to consider and make recommendations with respect to the additional changes made without consultation with the faculty. The faculty has now been advised by the administration that it "...shared this Resolution with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees." And "...they (the Board of
Trustees) would be willing to consider further suggestions for enhancing the subject of the Resolution that the Faculty Senate wishes to provide."

Accordingly, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be forwarding the Board's response to the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee for its consideration and action.

4. The third Resolution (00/6) deals with a draft of the Sexual Harassment Policies and Procedures, as revised by University and external Counsel. These revisions were made to the policy on Sexual Harassment adopted by the Faculty Senate in May, 2000.

At a special meeting of April 2001, by unanimous vote with one abstention, the Senate approved, with revisions, Resolution 00/6. The Resolution requests that the President suspend acceptance of the draft, as revised by University and external counsel. Further, it requests, in consultation with the Faculty Senate, a redrafting of the document that would better protect procedural rights of defendants without discouragement of complainants.

GRIEVANCES

Four grievances were received by the Executive Committee: one in Columbian College and three in the Medical School; the Executive Committee appointed a Special Mediator in each of these cases. The grievance from Columbian College and one from the Medical School were successfully resolved. Of the two remaining cases in the latter, one is in the formal grievance stage, and in the other case, the Special Mediator has advised that efforts to achieve resolution through informal consultation have been exhausted.

NONCONCURRENCES

The Executive Committee was notified of administrative nonconcurrences in the Engineering School, Columbian College, and Medical School. The administration withdrew its nonconcurrence in the Engineering School; a settlement was reached in the Columbian College nonconcurrence, in the Medical School the nonconcurrence proceeded to the appeals stage and then the appeal was withdrawn.

REPORTS

The Senate received special reports providing information on the state of the University, its goals, and the attainment of its missions. These addressed expenditures for administrative and general purposes, the state of the University Library, changes in the Consortium's Bylaws, improvement of effectiveness and productivity of the Faculty Senate, recruitment and appointment of women and faculty of color, status of the College of Professional Studies, faculty salary equity, and the G.W. Health Plan.
MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION

To date, the standing committees of the Senate have identified and begun to address numerous and varied areas of interest and concern. They have also received items for consideration from the Executive Committee, the Administration, and individual faculty. Among the items under consideration are the following:

- Funding for graduate teaching assistantships
- Policies pertaining to non-tenure accruing faculty
- Annual report on faculty salaries
- Annual report on executive compensation
- The Senate's role with respect to part-time faculty
- Survey of Departments' criteria and procedures with respect to tenure and promotion
- Usage and adequacy of classroom space
- Annual report on recruitment and retention of minority and women faculty

This report lists only some of the activities and accomplishments of our colleagues, members of the Senate and volunteer members of its standing committees. They have expended much time and energy on behalf of the University. Many of the issues addressed have been difficult ones and have required careful and lengthy consideration and discussion within the faculty and with the Administration. With respect to the latter, especially in our work with Vice President Lehman and President Trachtenberg, we have experienced a high level of productivity, and positive interaction.

Essential to our success as a faculty participating in a shared governance structure is your involvement. The issues we have had to address and will need to continue to address affect, often critically, so many aspects of our professional lives. Our main vehicle of expression and action is through the Faculty Senate. It has achieved a long and remarkable record of success.

On behalf of our Faculty Senate colleagues, I extend sincere thanks for your past contributions and continued help.