

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D.C.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON  
FEBRUARY 11, 2005, IN THE MARVIN CENTER, ROOM 310

Present: Vice President Lehman, Registrar Amundson, and Parliamentarian Pagel;  
Dean Frawley; Professors Biles, Briscoe, Castleberry, Englander, Gallo,  
Garris, Granger, Griffith, Gupta, Helgert, Klaren, Marotta, Mueller, Robin,  
Robinson, Shambaugh, Shen, Vergara, Wilmarth, and Wirtz

Absent: President Trachtenberg; Deans Futrell, Harding, Katz, Phillips, Scott, Tong,  
Whitaker, and Trangsrud; Professors Cordes, Delaney, Friedenthal, Lee,  
Packer, Simon, and Watson

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Executive Vice President for  
Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Vice President Lehman called for approval of the minutes of the January 21, 2005  
meeting. Professor Gupta pointed out an error on page 6 of the minutes and asked the  
identity of the individual referred to as "Professor f." This could not be immediately  
determined as this error did not appear in the draft of the minutes sent to Senate members  
in the editing stage. The Senate was assured that "Professor fs" identity would be  
ascertained and entered into the record. That oversight aside, Professor Wilmarth said that  
he thought the Senate staff deserved a real vote of thanks for bringing coherence to the  
minutes of a very long and difficult meeting, and all present concurred. The minutes were  
approved subject to the indicated amendment.

RESOLUTIONS

I. RESOLUTION 04/8 "A RESOLUTION TO RESTATE THE NAMES OF THE  
STANDING COMMITTEES IN THE BYLAWS OF THE FACULTY SENATE  
APPENDED TO THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN"

Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr., Chair of the Executive Committee of the Faculty  
Senate, introduced Resolution 04/8. Professor Wilmarth advised the Senate this was a very  
simple pro forma Resolution, stemming from the Executive Committee's research into the  
history of Senate Standing Committees. The Executive Committee had found that several  
Senate resolutions since 1990 had changed the names of Standing Committees, and one  
Committee had been abolished. There were also several informal actions of the Executive  
Committee that altered the names of Standing Committees as their jurisdiction shifted, and  
these alterations had not been formally approved by the Senate. The Executive Committee  
thought it best to request Senate approval of a restatement of the names of Senate

Committees as set forth in Resolution 04/8. In addition, Professor Wilmarth pointed out that Resolution 04/8 provides for the deletion of the second paragraph in Section 10 of the Bylaws, as there are no standing Committees of the Senate other than the ones listed in the first paragraph of Section 10, and it would be confusing to suggest that there were. Professor Wilmarth added that he thought this provision was probably a transitional measure adopted when the Senate Bylaws were first established.

Professor Gupta asked if the Dispute Resolution Committee should be included in the listing, and Professor Wilmarth responded that, like the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, this Committee was not a Standing Committee of the Senate, although the Senate obviously contributes to its activities.

Professor Griffith called the question, a vote was taken, and Resolution 04/8 was adopted by unanimous vote. (Resolution 04/8 is attached.)

### INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced; however, Professor Shambaugh raised an issue of concern to the faculty members in the Elliott School of International Affairs (ESIA), which had held their faculty retreat that morning and discussed Resolution 04/6 adopted, as amended, at the January 21, 2005 meeting of the Senate. Unfortunately, the Elliott School faculty meeting did not take place before the January Senate meeting, but Professor Shambaugh said that, nevertheless, he had been asked to raise several concerns expressed at the School's retreat.

Professor Shambaugh said that, on behalf of the Dean and faculty members of the ESIA, he wanted to raise four points about the Conflicts of Interest and Commitment Policy and accompanying Disclosure Forms.

1. Whether the Policy and the Disclosure Forms adopted are in line with best practices nationally, and whether they are required by federal law.
2. ESIA faculty members expressed the view that information requested on the Disclosure Forms was quite intrusive, and concerns about privacy were raised. Their question was, how do the Policy and accompanying forms compare with financial disclosure forms in use at similar universities, market-basket, or otherwise, and further, are they legal.
3. The Policy and Disclosure Forms request, under one umbrella, information in connection with corporate competitors, family interests, and personal consulting issues; the Dean had expressed the view that it might be more useful to separate these issues for different purposes.
4. The question was raised as to when and if these Financial Disclosure Forms would be required of all University employees, as well as members of the Board of Trustees.

Professor Shambaugh said that he did not know if it was appropriate to revisit an issue following a Senate vote on the matter, but that the ESIA faculty was very troubled by these questions, and he thought that perhaps these issues might be referred to Committee, or to the Senate for reconsideration.

Discussion followed on the procedural aspects of Professor Shambaugh's request, and the conclusion was that the matter should be referred to the Senate Executive Committee as it could not properly be considered at the Senate meeting. Professor Gupta suggested that several ESIA faculty members be invited to present their views at the February 25<sup>th</sup> Executive Committee meeting, particularly because if the ESIA faculty were raising issues not previously considered, it was important to review this new information. Professor Wilmarth agreed, and there was no dissent on this point. There being no further discussion, the next item of business was considered.

### REPORT ON THE COLUMBIAN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Vice President Lehman noted that the Senate had thus far entertained reports from two Deans during the 2004-05 session. These reports had been presented to the members of the Board of Trustees last summer in connection with their efforts to examine development/advancement issues in the context of the priorities of the Schools. Following reports to the Senate by the Deans of the School of Medical and Health Sciences (Dean Scott), and the School of Business (Dean Phillips), Dean Frawley's presentation would be the third such report, with Dean Timothy Tong's report on the School of Engineering and Applied Science to follow at the March Senate meeting.

William J. Frawley, Dean of the Columbian College of Arts & Sciences, began his report by saying it had been updated during the six months since it was presented to the Board. His report was made in conjunction with a Powerpoint presentation which he noted would be made available in the future in the "Digital Shelf" portion of the Columbian College Website. He also distributed a packet of materials describing various programs in the College.

Dean Frawley reported that Columbian College will move in five directions for the future: enhancing both undergraduate and graduate excellence; stimulating faculty involvement in the research environment; developing and employing technology; and monitoring the way in which the College conducts business. All of these activities will be directed toward supporting GW's Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence, with emphasis this year and next on building the research environment, primarily in the sciences.

Dean Frawley then gave an overview of the College's demographics, noting that the proportion of female and male students, full and part-time, was similar to the rest of the University. Growth in both graduate and undergraduate enrollment, however, is significant. He also offered a comparison of the College's enrollment to other GW Schools and that of comparable educational institutions.

Dean Frawley asserted that focusing on investing, promoting, and advancing science programs is essential to the development of the College and its ability to achieve the goals of GW's Strategic Plan. While science will be a driving force in the College's future, this new

direction will not de-emphasize the humanities and social sciences, but will instead enhance their stature.

Turning to a discussion of the College's science programs, Dean Frawley said that they are focused on their and GW's mission. The departments are well aware of their strengths, and are recognized for them. The programs are well-defined and well-structured, and engage in a number of cross-cutting research collaborations with other Schools within the University as well as with organizations and institutions outside of the University.

In terms of what Dean Frawley called "the measures that matter," the College's science programs are poised to advance steadily. Colombian College's external fund generation for this year amounts to \$31.5 million in contracts, of which the sciences garner 77%. This is one of the measures of visibility and success for a Research I University, a status to which GW aspires. Another measure of success is the grant submission success rate, which has shown steady improvement.

Another measure that matters, according to Dean Frawley, is research space, which he said was hard to judge as the College's space is broadly distributed. Yet another important measure is the number of tenured or tenure-track faculty in the College. Of approximately 300 such faculty, 83 represent the sciences. Publication of scholarly material is another measure of importance. Once again, the College's science faculty is strong in this area.

Dean Frawley then expanded upon his theme, asserting that science matters to the measures that matter, and he reiterated that the University needs to invest in the sciences to achieve its goals. He then gave examples of major awards in external funding to science departments at the University, and discussed the College's efforts to recruit faculty who understand the connection between research and grants and how to secure the latter. Increased emphasis in the College on obtaining grant-based research has also borne fruit in non-science departments, one example being the receipt of a large award by the Museum Studies department.

Dean Frawley then reviewed what comparable institutions are doing to focus programs on science and research, and he briefly commented on traditional ranking systems and other, perhaps more important, non-traditional methods of evaluation. His major conclusion was that GW needs to compete better against its market basket schools. Given the resources presently available, the College has done remarkably well, he concluded.

Returning to his theme, "measures that matter," Dean Frawley outlined a number of initiatives necessary to better position science programs in the College. These include doubling external funds, increasing research space and annual funds for equipment, restructuring and renovating the research environment, and hiring additional research project managers, tenure-track faculty, and graduate teaching assistants. All of these initiatives are in line with those underway at comparable institutions.

Dean Frawley estimated that the College would need approximately \$100 million in funding in order to achieve its goals. That \$100 million would break down into

approximately \$60 million for a new multifunctional science complex, \$15 million for renovation of existing space, and \$25 million for the establishment of a dedicated science initiative fund. Noting that “life goes faster than fundraising,” Dean Frawley said that the total amount of money needed to achieve the College’s goals might well increase over time. In selecting programs in which investment might produce the greatest initial return, Dean Frawley identified such programs as the mathematical sciences and other disciplines which are not laboratory-intensive.

Challenges that must be faced by the College include the management of undergraduate enrollment and fine-tuning the College’s commitment to a signature undergraduate experience. At the graduate level, the College needs to consider seriously the results of the recently undertaken doctoral programs review. Science faculty will need to be recruited, an examination of the College’s indirect cost structure and return must be undertaken, and the College needs to obtain some very substantial grants.

In conclusion, Dean Frawley said that because GW is a tuition-dependent institution, it is important to focus advancement efforts on raising discretionary funds so as to provide the flexibility to advance institutional initiatives.

A short exchange between Professor Gupta and Dean Frawley followed which touched upon the importance of attracting funding and resources to science programs. Professor Gupta said he thought this will require a sustained commitment from the Trustees and the Administration and recognition that when possible, funding and resources will be given to the sciences.

Professor Wilmarth inquired about the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty in CCAS, as Vice President Lehman’s last report to the Senate on this subject indicated that the College had fallen slightly below the 75% requirement set forth in the Faculty Code. Vice President Lehman responded that the numbers in his last report concerned filled tenure lines, and did not include those that are vacant. Dean Frawley confirmed this, and added that he thought if the whole picture were examined, the College was in compliance with Code requirements.

## GENERAL BUSINESS

### I. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Wilmarth presented the Report of the Executive Committee, which is enclosed.

### BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Griffith observed that the University has just announced the appointment of a new Vice President for Advancement, and he asked if the Executive Committee would consider inviting her to a Senate meeting so that everyone could be introduced and exchange ideas on directions for Advancement at GW.

Professor Griffith also said that some CCAS faculty were told that morning that Dean Frawley had informed the Council of [department] Chairs that the Council of Deans has now set up a series of meetings, or a process, by which the Deans could discuss directions for development of the Square 54 site. Professor Griffith said that he had not heard of a mechanism for faculty or Faculty Senate involvement in discussions on this subject, and he asked if the Senate Physical Facilities Committee was involved in site planning.

Dean Frawley said that the Council of Deans has had continuing discussions concerning development alternatives for Square 54, and at the most recent meeting, this had been discussed as the last item of business on the meeting agenda. He added that there is no special group or process convened by the Deans for the purpose of making recommendations on the site's development.

Professor Griffith commented on developments to date in the effort to identify alternative for developing Square 54, including the alarming possibility that the site could be developed for commercial and residential uses only, rather than for badly-needed academic or mixed use. Vice President Lehman reminded the Senate that the process is at a very fluid stage, and that the prospective time-frame to begin any type of construction would not occur for four to six years. He agreed with Professor Griffith that faculty should be involved in discussions as it becomes clear what the best strategic direction for GW is with respect to Square 54.

Professor Gallo noted that both she and Professor Edward Cherian had been appointed to participate in discussions about Square 54 development, and she suggested that perhaps Vice President and Treasurer Louis Katz could be invited to give another report to the Senate on what has transpired since his last update. Professor Gallo also indicated she would be happy to share with the Senate the most recent information provided by Vice President Katz.

Professor Mueller agreed with Professor Griffith that a number of faculty members have opinions about development of Square 54, and he said he thought that another report was fine, but that faculty participation in the process is an absolute necessity.

Vice President Lehman said that he was confident there would be an opportunity for faculty input, but until the process moves further along with respect to the University's effort to increase allowable density on campus, it may be premature to inject more voices into the process before options are more firmly identified.

Further discussion followed between Professors Griffith, Wilmarth, Englander, and Vice President Lehman about possible directions development of Square 54 could take. Professor Griffith observed that if the site ultimately is devoted solely to commercial and/or residential uses, this would leave the University with a long wait before academic space can be developed.

Professor Griffith noted that Professor Wilmarth had asked for a sense of the Senate on when and whether Executive Vice President and Treasurer Katz should be invited to brief the Senate on Square 54 developments, and added that perhaps the best thing to do might be to leave in the hands of the Senate Executive Committee the determination of

when might be the most propitious time to invite Vice President Katz. Professor Wilmarth agreed with this view, and added that he hoped that Vice President Lehman would convey to President Trachtenberg the Senate's sense of urgency and also its desire to be kept abreast of the situation as it develops. Vice President Lehman said that he understood that President Trachtenberg and/or Vice President Katz might be invited to attend the first Friday meeting of Medical School Chairs in March, and it was possible that new information might be reported at that time.

Professor Wilmarth invited Vice President Lehman to comment on recent meetings of the Board of Trustees. Vice President Lehman said that he routinely attends three Board Committee meetings: Information Technology, Finance and Audit, and Academic Affairs.

In connection with Finance and Audit Committee meeting, Vice President Lehman reviewed the suspension on June 29 of one of the cooperative agreements at the Virginia campus associated with the National Crash Analysis Center. In the course of an investigation and internal audit, the University was required to address a number of issues within 90 days of the suspension, which it did. As of the date of this meeting, however, that suspension has not been lifted. The Committee seemed unified in the opinion that the University has been very slow in addressing issues in this area that require immediate attention. It is critical for the University to keep abreast of requirements for effort reporting in connection with grants. The need to take a proactive stance in this area is made even more evident as other institutions have been fined for non-compliance. In addition, recent developments at the National Institutes of Health, which has just adopted a policy of requiring conflict of interest disclosures (and divestment of questionable financial items) from every staff member, make it clear that GW is not the only institution which is struggling to keep up with shifting requirements. Of particular concern is how the University will manage to comply with these developing requirements and still move forward in ways which will meet the Trustees' expectations with respect to academic excellence and strategic plans. Vice President Lehman then said he thought GW faculty and the administration would have to work collaboratively within a very short time-frame to develop new policies as the Trustees seek to discharge their academic and fiduciary responsibilities.

Vice President Lehman then spoke briefly about the need to develop a Code of Ethics for the University. Mr. Raymond Oglethorpe, Chairman of the Board's Finance and Audit Committee, made it very clear at the Board meeting that the University needed to develop and adopt such a Code, applicable to both GW faculty and staff, preferably before the May, 2005 Board meeting.

Professor Wilmarth said that he thought that Vice President Lehman had captured very well the flavor of the meeting with Board members, particularly in the Academic Affairs Committee meeting which he had attended. Professor Wilmarth said that he had briefed members of this Committee on Senate activities since the last Trustees meeting. In focusing on the Research Misconduct and Conflicts of Interest and Commitment Policies (and accompanying Disclosure Forms) just forwarded for Board action, Professor Wilmarth said he had shared with Board members the development of these documents, and the faculty's attempt to balance, on the one hand, privacy interests of the faculty with the need of the University to have relevant (or required) information. However, the Trustees at this

point in time view compliance and disclosure as more important than concerns about privacy, particularly in light of recent events at the Northern Virginia campus.

With respect to the adoption of a Code of Ethics for the University, Professor Wilmarth said he was pleased to hear Mr. Charles Manatt, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, say he did not expect that such a Code could be developed by the end of the academic year. Some discussion has already taken place in the Senate Executive Committee on this issue, after Vice President Lehman shared with the Committee a one-page University of Southern California (USC) Code of Ethics, along with the observation that GW might well wish to adopt a similar document. Professor Wilmarth remarked that the USC Ethics Code contained a general statement of ethical principles that was quite similar to the principles of conduct already set forth in the brochure and poster for GW's Regulatory Compliance Help and Referral Line.

Professor Englander asked how Professor Wilmarth envisioned the development of a Code of Ethics. Professor Wilmarth responded that he thought that the General Counsel's Office might prepare a draft Code and that he would ask that Office to clarify whether the Code was to be a statement of aspirations, a mission statement, or a more comprehensive document that would include procedures for addressing violations of the Code. In the latter case, the document would need to include due process protections for faculty and these would have to be linked to provisions of the Faculty Code. Upon receipt of the draft, Professor Wilmarth said he would expect that the Senate Executive Committee would refer the draft to the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee (PEAF) for its review before full Senate consideration. Vice President Lehman said he did not know the exact nature of the Code which the Trustees seek, but he would endeavor to clarify this at the earliest possible opportunity for the Senate Executive Committee.

Professor Wilmarth reported that the Trustees also made clear that they expect that a final Sexual Harassment Policy and Procedures document will reach the Board before its meeting in May, 2005. While the Senate forwarded to Vice President Lehman the names of faculty willing to participate in this process some time ago, work has still not begun on this issue. Vice President Lehman interjected that he expected the Student Association President to forward to him the names of student representatives within the week [and thus the group could be constituted].

Professor Wirtz said that he fully understood the seriousness of the Board's position on these matters, and he had been pondering what to do about obstacles preventing the faculty from working collaboratively on issues which are of common concern to everyone in the University community. It is difficult, he said, to avoid the perception that the Board wishes to act unilaterally, or without real collaboration, in these matters. This possible misperception was reinforced, for example, when the Executive Committee recently wrote to the Chair of one of the Board Committees, and received no response to its offer of participation and engagement in discussions concerning the development of Square 54. Contrasting this state of affairs with what he described as a real culture of mutual engagement and collaboration on the Board's Information Technology Committee, Professor Wirtz said he wondered how this spirit of working together could be extended to remedy the present bottleneck, where most communication is one-way, with faculty communicating with the administration, and the administration communicating with the

Trustees. He added that he hoped that the Administration would take the initiative to bridge this gap.

Discussion followed between Vice President Lehman, and Professors Robinson, Wilmarth, and Griffith on ways in which communication between faculty members and Trustees might be initiated and enhanced. Professor Griffith observed that faculty members had been routinely invited to participate in the luncheons of Board Committees during President Elliott's administration, and this informal atmosphere had proved a convenient opportunity for Trustees and faculty to get acquainted. Professor Robinson agreed that this practice, discontinued many years ago, had been a valuable one. Professor Wilmarth noted that Chairman Manatt invited Senate members last year to a dinner for honorary degree recipients, and Professor Robinson noted that President Trachtenberg invited Senate members to his home for a social hour last year. Discussants agreed upon the value of promoting such informal interaction between the faculty, Administration, and Trustees, particularly in view of the need to work swiftly together in the coming months on matters of importance to the University community. Vice President Lehman concurred and said he thought that such activities should be encouraged.

Professor Englander reported that the PEAFF Committee had just submitted its Interim Report, to be included with the minutes of the February Senate meeting. Copies of the Report were made available to those in attendance at the meeting. (The Report is attached.)

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, and upon motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

*Elizabeth A. Amundson*  
Elizabeth A. Amundson  
Secretary

**A RESOLUTION TO RESTATE THE NAMES OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES IN THE BYLAWS OF THE FACULTY SENATE APPENDED TO THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN (04/8)**

**WHEREAS, Section 10 of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate provides for the establishment of a number of standing committees, in accordance with Article III, Section 5(a) of the Faculty Organization Plan; and**

**WHEREAS, since 1990, the Faculty Senate has amended Section 10 of the Bylaws on four occasions in order to eliminate one standing committee and to change the names of three standing committees; and**

**WHEREAS, on certain occasions since 1990, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee has informally changed the names of standing committees; and**

**WHEREAS, it now seems desirable to amend Section 10 of the Bylaws in order to restate the names of the standing committees of the Faculty Senate so that those names will conform to the current practice of the Faculty Senate; NOW, THEREFORE**

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

**That Section 10 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws be amended to read as follows:**

**There shall be standing committees for the following areas:  
Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies (including Fringe Benefits);  
Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management;  
Athletics and Recreation; Educational Policy; Faculty Development  
and Support; Fiscal Planning and Budgeting; Honors and Academic  
Convocations; Libraries; Physical Facilities; Professional Ethics  
and Academic Freedom; Research; and University and Urban Affairs.**

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**

**That the second paragraph of Section 10 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws, which provides that “Other standing committees created by the Senate shall continue in force.”, be deleted as unnecessary and obsolete, in view of the fact that all of the standing committees of the Faculty Senate will be listed in Section 10 of the Faculty Senate Bylaws as amended by the preceding resolution.**

**Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate  
January 28, 2005**

**Adopted, February 11, 2005**

Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom  
Committee  
2004-2005 Interim Report  
January 2005

The Committee considered two issues over the fall semester: the policies on Research Misconduct (originally referred to as Scientific Misconduct) and Conflict of Interest. The Committee met numerous times, usually as a subcommittee and usually in concert with members of the Research Committee. Senate President Art Wilmarth took the lead in crafting both of these policies after PEAFF meetings, extensive e-mail discussions, and the active participation of Associate Vice President for Research Carol Sigelman and representatives of the Office of General Counsel.

The PEAFF Committee also created a joint committee with the Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies to consider issues regarding non-tenure accruing faculty.

## REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr., Chair

February 11, 2005

### ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

#### Faculty Senate Resolutions

The Executive Committee has forwarded Faculty Senate Resolutions 04/5, 04/6, and 04/7, together with supporting exhibits, to President Trachtenberg for his consideration and response. Although we have not yet received a formal response from President Trachtenberg, we understand that the Research Misconduct Policy (attached to Resolution 04/5) and the changes to the Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment, including the revised Disclosure Forms (attached to Resolution 04/6), were approved by the Board of Trustees at their meeting held earlier today.

#### Appointments to the Trachtenberg Prize Committees

The Executive Committee has recommended the appointment of Professor Charles A. Garris to this year's Selection Committee for the Trachtenberg Prize for Faculty Scholarship. The Executive Committee previously recommended the appointment of Professors Peter F. Klaren and Philip W. Wirtz to the Selection Committees for the Trachtenberg Prizes for Teaching and University Service, respectively.

#### Joint Working Group to Prepare a Final Policy and Procedures on Sexual Harassment Complaints

At its meeting held earlier today, the Board of Trustees requested that the Administration and the Faculty Senate jointly prepare a Final Policy and Procedures on Sexual Harassment Complaints before the Board's next meeting on May 19-20, 2005. As previously reported, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee has designated Professors Mary M. Cheh, Charles B. Craver, Lilien F. Robinson, and Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr. to serve as the Faculty Senate's representatives on a joint working group to prepare such a policy. The Administration has not yet designated the other members of this joint working group.

### PERSONNEL MATTERS

I am pleased to report that no faculty grievances have been filed with the Dispute Resolution Committee since the date of my last report.

### MARCH MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on March 11, 2005, in Marvin Center 310, beginning at 2:10 p.m. In keeping with the Senate's practice of receiving periodic reports from the Deans of the University's Schools, Dean Tong has agreed to present a report on the School of Engineering and Applied Science at the Senate's meeting on March 11. The Executive Committee is most grateful to Dean Tong and also expresses

its appreciation to Deans Scott, Katz, Phillips, and Frawley for their recent reports to the Faculty Senate. At the March meeting the Faculty Senate will also receive a report on Information Technology Security from David G. Swartz, Chief Information Officer of the University.

On February 25, 2005, the Executive Committee will meet to establish the agenda for the Faculty Senate's meeting on March 11. If you wish to present resolutions, reports, or any other matters for consideration by the Senate on March 11, please submit them to Ms. Sue Campbell, Faculty Senate Coordinator, prior to February 25.

#### GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Forms requesting faculty members to volunteer for service on Faculty Senate Standing Committees and Administrative Standing Committees have been distributed to members of the University's regular, active-status faculty. I would again ask each member of the Faculty Senate to encourage your colleagues to serve on these Committees. I would also urge each of you to express your own interest in serving on a Committee. The activities of Standing Committees and Administrative Committees are vital to the success of the Faculty Senate and to the preservation of effective faculty participation in University governance. Because some of your colleagues may not be familiar with the specific activities and missions of Standing and Administrative Committees, I would ask each of you to provide faculty members in your Schools with helpful information concerning the work of the various Committees. Please contact Sue Campbell in the Faculty Senate office if you need any information regarding particular Committees.

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr.  
Professor of Law  
Chair, Faculty Senate Executive Committee

---