

Minutes as amended at the Senate meeting held on December 9, 2005

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, DC

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON  
NOVEMBER 11, 2005 IN THE ALUMNI HOUSE

Members Present: President Trachtenberg, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman, Registrar Amundson and Parliamentarian Johnson; Deans Futrell and Phillips; Professors Artz, Biles, Briscoe, Delaney, Friedenthal, Gallo, Griffith, Gupta, Helgert, Kim-Renaud, Marotta, Mueller, Robinson, Rycroft, Shen, Wilmarth, Wirtz, and Zea

Members Absent: Deans Brown, Frawley, Katz, Lawrence, Scott, Tong, and Whitaker; Professors Castleberry, Cordes, Englander, Garris, Miller, Pagel, Robin, Simon, and Vergara

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman at 2:25 p.m.

IN MEMORIAM

Professor Lilien F. Robinson read a Tribute in Memory of Philip Robbins, Professor Emeritus of Journalism. (The Tribute is attached.)

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of September 9, 2005 were approved as distributed

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

UPDATE ON CLASS SCHEDULING AND THE AVAILABILITY OF CLASSROOMS

Associate Vice President for Academic Planning and Development Craig W. Linebaugh began by describing the goals of the scheduling system, which are to place courses in classrooms of an appropriate size which will meet student demand and also accommodate the pedagogical needs and desires of faculty.

One of the major factors related to pedagogical issues is an increase in the faculty's use of instructional technology. The University is expected to have 88 classrooms with resident technology in them once renovations in Monroe Hall and the Hall of Government

are complete. There is also an extensive pool of portable technology available for classroom use.

Vice President Linebaugh observed that a scheduling system does not exist that will meet the desires and personal requirements of absolutely everyone, students or faculty, no matter how extensive scheduling software becomes, or how diligent the personnel implementing it are, unless there is an infinite supply of classrooms, and people and money to support them.

Relative to priorities for scheduling classes, at the top of the list is accessibility so that special requirements, including health-related issues, of faculty and students can be met. A second priority is related to the number of students who are affected by a classroom assignment. In a situation where the options are placing a 150 student class or a 25 student class in a particular room, scheduling would opt to assign the larger class to the space because the scheduling decision affects more students. The Scheduling Office also takes into account whether or not classes are senior level classes that students must take to meet degree requirements.

Vice President Linebaugh then outlined the three primary drivers within the scheduling system, which include enrollment cap and historical enrollment, pedagogical factors, and classroom location. He then reviewed recommendations contained in the Report of the University Task Force on Class Scheduling and the Availability of Classrooms, which was distributed with the agenda for the meeting.

At this point, of 3,351 courses in the spring '06 schedule (excluding the Law School and the Medical Center), it appears that only 28 courses do not yet have classroom assignments. Vice President Linebaugh said he thought that this gap is completely manageable, as compared to the situation in previous years where many more courses were unassigned. It has not, therefore, been necessary to request additional space from any of the Schools. Of the 28 unassigned courses, 15 of these are in Columbian College of Arts & Sciences (CCAS), and the rest are distributed fairly evenly among the other Schools. In terms of timeband utilization, 17 of the unassigned classes have start times at 12:45 p.m., and between 3 and 4 p.m. The other 6 are scheduled to begin at 5:10 p.m. So there are particular timebands that are problematic.

With respect to the recent implementation of centralized scheduling, the importance of the early phase of the scheduling process has become quite clear, as there have been huge improvements just in the past six months. It was not uncommon after the first scheduling run under the old system for over 300 courses to be unassigned to classroom space. That number has now been reduced in the early phase by 51%, and this represents a significant change in the number of adjustments that have to be made to the classroom schedule. With that said, the number of department-initiated changes to the schedule remains huge and there are a large number of changes coming in well after printed schedules are issued. As this has led to confusion, the University is trying to replace the printed schedule with a more accurate and more up-to-date web page schedule.

In line with recommendations of the Task Force to centralize scheduling, Deans of Schools other than the Law School, Medical School, and Public Health and Health Services,

agreed to contribute funds proportionally to the Registrar's Scheduling Office so that additional staff could be hired. There are now four such personnel where before there were two, one of whom worked on the current schedule, and another who worked on the schedule for the coming semester. A search is underway for a Scheduling Office director, but it has proven difficult to find someone with both Banner and Resource 25 (the scheduling software) experience.

Vice President Linebaugh said that the evaluation of timebands is an ongoing process, and adjustments in these are being made where indicated. This is particularly important since classrooms were added at 1776 G Street; the area in which classrooms are held now ranges all the way from 18<sup>th</sup> Street to 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, and from E Street to K Street and schedules must allow time for transit between classes.

In terms of improving compliance with classroom scheduling procedures, Vice President Linebaugh said that progress has been made but there is still a long way to go. The Task Force recommended that each Dean appoint someone at the Assistant or Associate Dean level to coordinate scheduling with the central Scheduling Office. In Schools where this person has devoted significant resources to the task, such as in Columbian College, this measure has been very effective in reducing problems. Still, scheduling difficulties persist when a School schedules, for example, 53 of 79 courses on Tuesday and Thursday, only 26 on other days, and with only 5 of 234 courses assigned during the 8 a.m. timeband. Other measures for improving compliance include simplifying the instructions for compliance, and preparing department chairs for their scheduling responsibilities.

Vice President Linebaugh said he thought that preserving dedicated departmental space was a very big issue to the Task Force, and he added that he thought this was important. However, the University needs to be able to use that space, especially in the evenings and during other high demand timebands for graduate classes.

Another very important, if sensitive, issue is creating a mechanism for adjusting room assignments to enrollments; Vice President Linebaugh said he thought it crucial that the central Scheduling Office have the authority to adjust room assignments to match actual course enrollment without having to seek permission from every faculty member, department chair, and Dean for each adjustment made. Very often when one change is made, the result is a domino effect which makes several other adjustments necessary. The Scheduling Office takes into account the accommodation of special needs requests and pedagogical and technical needs when making such adjustments, but it is impractical to consult numerous individuals for each change that is necessary.

Another means of improving classroom scheduling is the development of hybrid courses where a class that has historically met two to three times a week in a classroom would now do so once a week, with other sessions held online. Information on these sorts of courses is posted at the Center for Instructional Design and Development website, and faculty who have developed these types of courses will showcase their work on November 14<sup>th</sup>. The hybrid courses are presently developed under the Curriculum Development Grant Program operated through the University's Office of Academic Planning and Assessment.

In conclusion, Vice President Linebaugh described Resource 25, within which new scheduling software resides. Loading of all of the classroom attributes for general purpose classrooms has been done, and this enabled the University to better match classroom space with pedagogical and enrollment needs without relying on preassignment, as was done before. Also, for the first time ever, the scheduling software features not only a production instance but a test instance which allows for experimentation without risking destruction of a partially complete schedule. The system will be updated in the near future to include a database on virtually every possible teaching space on the campus, from Marvin Center rooms to other facilities not normally used for classrooms. This is important not only for regular scheduling purposes but for situations in which the University would need to hold classes in alternate space.

President Trachtenberg said he thought that this survey might be expanded to explore where classes might be held in the event it was necessary to operate off campus. Registrar Amundson said that her Office has already developed a Continuity Plan which addresses issues of emergency classroom and office space.

Professor Griffith asked Vice President Linebaugh if there had been any success in identifying new classroom space. Vice President Linebaugh said he thought that the present inventory was sufficient for all of the Spring 2006 courses. Discussion followed between Vice President Linebaugh and Professors Griffith and Wirtz on difficulties encountered in setting enrollment caps and controlling course registration. It is difficult to set different course enrollment caps in Banner and Resource 25 because the caps are transactionally linked between the two systems. This is done to reduce the possibility of inadvertently over-subscribing courses. If changing this is a programming problem, Professor Griffith said it seemed to him that Scheduling has not had any real priority in terms of getting programming help in a timely fashion, which it would need to resolve this issue. Vice President Lehman said he thought that the issue was important, but very technical, and he suggested that this discussion be continued offline. There being no further questions of Vice President Linebaugh, the next agenda item was considered.

#### UPDATE ON THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Dean Mary H. Futrell of the Graduate School of Education and Human Development (GSEHD), presented a report on the School, which featured descriptive information and highlights of its operations. She described the vision and mission of the School and profiled the School's academic departments and degree programs, along with program locations and distance education offerings. She also gave a breakdown of the faculty ranks in the School along with a listing of Research Centers and Projects.

The GSEHD is ranked 24<sup>th</sup> among graduate schools of education nationwide by U.S. News & World Report, and first (for the second consecutive year) by the Academy of Human Resource Management in its Human Resource Development Program. In terms of internal recognition, the School received the highest score among all schools in several key areas on GW's 2005 Graduate Student Graduation Survey. Dean Futrell described the School's accreditation, external funding, and profiled faculty publication over the last 10

years. She also presented information on enrollment trends, the School's doctoral programs, and partnerships. Information on the School's leadership in its field and its impact on the teaching profession was outlined, and Dean Futrell noted the strong market for graduates of the School's programs, as well as the very low job attrition rate of GSEHD trained educators -- 11% after five years, which is 35% below the national average.

Dean Futrell concluded her report by describing trends in the Education and Human Services Fields, challenges faced by the School, and long-term priorities which include the establishment of two endowed professorships and additional fundraising, creating a model professional development partnership with the DC Public School System (expanding on its partnership with the School Without Walls), achieving a rank in the top 20 of its peers, and acquisition of additional facilities to further the mission of the School. (Dean Futrell's report is attached.)

Professor Wilmarth remarked that in the last few years he had reviewed the applications of several prospective law students who had been former teachers. Every one of them explained that the reason they left teaching was because the atmosphere in the classroom was so chaotic that they could not remain in the profession. He said he thought this was a nationwide crisis because many good people have decided to leave the teaching profession.

Dean Futrell said she thought this was a very good point, and that is why the GSEHD puts so much emphasis on classroom management, discipline in the schools, and the involvement of parents in the educational process. GSEHD students are put into school environments very early in their programs so they get as much classroom experience as possible. The Hamilton Fish Institute for Schools and Communities also works with the GSEHD and local school districts to deal with classroom and discipline issues.

Professor Helgert inquired about faculty and facilities at the School's programs in Singapore and Hong Kong, and Dean Futrell described the GSEHD's use of shared space in those locations. Faculty go for several weeks to teach onsite, and remaining coursework is conducted via distance learning. Students then come to GW's Ashburn campus during the summer to complete their studies. Another program similar to this is being developed in Shanghai.

Professor Gupta inquired about faculty ranks and salaries. Dean Futrell said that while salaries have moved up to some degree, overall it looks as if they are, on average, at about the 60<sup>th</sup> AAUP percentile, or a bit lower, so there is still work to be done in this area. In terms of the numbers of contract versus tenured and tenure-track faculty, the School is out of compliance with the Faculty Code, but the School is working to rectify this.

Professor Griffith asked Dean Futrell to describe how the School came to be out of compliance with the Code. Dean Futrell said it has been that way for quite some time and that was true when she became Dean, although there has been some improvement. Vice President Lehman agreed with Dean Futrell about improvement in this area, noting that several years ago, non-tenure-accruing faculty comprised approximately 50% of the GSEHD faculty, as compared to approximately 43% now. All of this ultimately depends on the budgetary structure of the School. At the current time, the School's revenue generation and

its expense budget are basically in balance, and so there is no margin contribution to the University as a whole. So in effect, examining the overhead structure of the School, they are not actually covering their overhead costs. In addition, many of the Schools programs depend on external funding through training grants, which could be terminated, changing the fiscal picture dramatically. In order to deal with this possibility, the prudent course is to retain the current structure vis a vis tenure lines.

Professor Mueller said he did not wish to disagree with Dean Futrell, and had not seen recent salary data, but for the record, he did not believe that GSEHD is close to the 60<sup>th</sup> AAUP percentile. He further observed that the GSEHD has a large number of contract faculty who have been on contract for many years. These people are almost a permanent part of the faculty, and the University already has the expense of funding these positions. These lines might as well be converted into tenure-accruing lines, and new lines created to address the increase in demand for higher enrollments. As a footnote to Professor Mueller's comment, Dean Futrell said the School has been able to recruit some incredibly talented faculty members in recent years, but it is beginning to lose them now, not because they dislike working at GW, but because they can not afford to stay.

Professor Wirtz said he did not remember any provision in the Faculty Code which makes an exception to the required proportions of tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty for each School, particularly an exception based on a School's reliance on training grants. Either an exception for the GSEHD needs to be made, or the School needs to be brought into compliance. He added that he was not as concerned about lack of compliance in this area by the School of Public Health and Health Services, as this was a new entity when the issue arose, and he understood there is a plan to bring that School into compliance. What is not acceptable is an ongoing violation of Faculty Code provisions.

President Trachtenberg explained to the Senate that there are universities whose large endowments stand behind and guarantee every tenure line. There are also universities like GW where tenure is functionally a commitment of the full faith and credit of the institution. The preservation of tenure at such institutions rests on its ability to honor the commitments it makes. To the extent that tenured professorships are endowed, there is a high level of comfort that the University will be able to sustain those tenured positions no matter what happens. To the extent an institution like GW has a School that derives a significant portion of its budget from a contingent revenue stream, such as training grants, prudence would incline those who are concerned about the maintenance of tenure and the ability of an institution to honor commitments it has made in this area to be cautious.

The President said that he shared Professor Wirtz's notion, and that if in fact the language in the Code is not appropriate to contemporary circumstance, it ought to be amended so that the institution could conform to the Code, as it should.

Dean Futrell observed that the projects in question have been in existence for some fifteen years, so these are not programs that are unstable or have a lot of turnover. Vice President Lehman reiterated his concerns about the financial structure of the School, and added that if the enrollment and revenue picture changes while the School maintains its current expense structure, that would change the entire situation.

Professor Griffith asked approximately what proportion of the expense budget was provided by contingent funding, and Dean Futrell responded that it was approximately 22-25% overall for the School. Vice President Lehman said he thought this was accurate. Professor Mueller said he thought an important fact had been left out of the discussion, in that the department which depends most heavily on the training grants in question is in conformity with the Faculty Code. It is the School at large which is out of conformity, he added.

Discussion followed between Professors Mueller and Wirtz, Dean Futrell, Vice President Lehman, and President Trachtenberg. Professor Griffith gave some of the history of Faculty Code provisions concerning the number of tenured faculty in each school by saying he had been one of the people involved in negotiations with the University administration when it first started appointing non-tenure-track faculty in the 1970's. He said that President Elliott approached the Faculty Senate and expressed the view that the University was becoming over-tenured, and he felt a need to appoint non-tenure-accruing faculty. The Senate agreed with that proposal on the basis of the stipulation that the non-tenure-track group would not constitute more than 25% of the faculty of any School, and no more than 50% of the faculty of any department. Professor Griffith then said that if the administration feels the Code is not adequate in the current situation, language to make it adequate should be drafted and forwarded for the Senate's review, but the Faculty Code should not just be ignored.

Both President Trachtenberg and Vice President Lehman agreed upon the need to take another look at pertinent provisions of the Faculty Code in light of the Senate's discussion. Professor Robinson then thanked Dean Futrell for her Report and commended progress that has been made at the GSEHD.

#### REPORT ON FY 05-06 OPERATING AND CAPITAL BUDGETS

On behalf of the Fiscal Planning & Budgeting Committee (FP&B), Professor William B. Griffith, Chair, reported on the University's Operating and Capital Budgets for 2005-06 (excluding the Medical Center), a copy of which was made available to Senate members by the Budget Office prior to the meeting. Professor Griffith indicated that the second portion of his report on Operating Assumptions behind the FY '07 budget would be given separately and that report would be distributed just prior to his presentation on the subject as the information was not received in time to distribute it with the agenda for the Senate meeting.

Professor Griffith explained that the budget before the Senate had been updated from the version presented to the Board of Trustees in May, 2005, and information in the budget pertaining to additional monies for faculty raises, achieved by the reallocation of funds, was now included. Professor Griffith noted that the budget outlines funding initiatives in the capital budget which will enable the University to use Foggy Bottom space -- administrative, student, and academic -- more efficiently. While some of the initiatives are laudable, such as the idea of providing some faculty housing, Professor Griffith said he would like to point out that his impression of the overall budget is that the University is really very far extended now, in terms of the amount of space it has and in the number of

faculty who actually teach, both of which have occurred in an environment where tuition is fixed and enrollments cannot grow further.

Professor Griffith commented briefly on the amount of the capital budget funded by debt; approximately 74% of the debt service is funded by specific revenue sources. In terms of enrollment, the projected growth is very small, and the University is really at its limit. While a 2.9% growth in enrollment is projected at the graduate level over the next three years, overall the growth will amount to only 1.9%. Professor Griffith asked Vice President Lehman about the total number of beds the University would be expected to provide in student housing next year; Vice President Lehman said the figure depends on enrollment, but he thought it would be close to 6,200, leaving the University about 180 beds short of the required number.

Professor Griffith then turned to the section of the budget detailing endowment budget support, and noted that not only has the value of the endowment fallen (although it is recovering somewhat), the payout from endowment funds authorized by the Board of Trustees has been cut to something like 4.8%. He then asked Associate Vice President for Budget Don Boselovic about the line item concerning endowment payout reinvested in the endowment, which the FP&B had overlooked in their review of the figures. Mr. Boselovic said this was done because the University could not expend funds from endowments which do not have a minimum balance, so these funds are reinvested.

Professor Griffith then directed the Senate's attention to the Debt Management Summary on page 34 of the Report, which gives a figure of approximately \$45 million in debt service for FY 05. Subtracting the proportion of the debt funded by specific revenue sources from this amount leaves the University with approximately \$11 million of the operating budget which will have to be devoted to debt service rather than other purposes.

Professor Griffith then invited questions. Professor Wilmarth again expressed his concerns about (1) the fact that the University's total debt was almost equal to its endowment, (2) the University's relatively low level of fundraising for an institution of its size, with only about \$12 million of gifts being generated each year, and (3) the large amount of variable rate debt that the University is carrying in an environment where interest rates are rising rapidly. Professor Griffith said he understood the Treasurer's Office is in the process of exchanging some of this variable rate debt for fixed rate debt, and he deferred to Mr. Boselovic for further information on the subject. Mr. Boselovic noted that a large portion of the increase in the University's debt was housing debt, and that another portion of the growth was attributable to the University leveraging a larger piece of the endowment. At the same time, the University anticipates that interest rate savings achieved by the use of conservative interest rate assumptions for variable rate debt (about \$11 million last fiscal year) will decrease this year.

Professor Biles asked if he understood correctly that there would be a shortfall at the end of the FY 06 budget. Professor Griffith said he understood there would be, and that discussions are in a preliminary stage on how to best deal with this development. Vice President Lehman added that the shortfall that has directly to do with enrollment amounts

to approximately \$2.6 million. (The Report on the University's Operating and Capital Budgets for 2005-06 [excluding the Medical Center] is attached.)

### REPORT ON FY 07 BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS

Professor Griffith distributed a memorandum dated October 18, 2005, from Associate Vice President Boselovic to Deans and Vice Presidents concerning Preliminary FY '07 Budget Assumptions (the Memorandum is attached.)

Professor Griffith noted the projected \$6 million shortfall for FY 07, which does not include any increases in funding for Strategic Plan Initiatives. Strategies under consideration for closing this funding gap include budget reallocations, where each 1% reduction to the operating budget (excluding fixed costs for debt service, utilities, leased space, insurance, etc.) would yield \$3 million. A tuition increase in excess of 4% (an alternative which Professor Griffith said he thought was unlikely) could also help close the gap. [The memorandum also mentions review of contributions from off-campus and summer programs and residence halls, and an increase to the endowment payout rate to help fund an increase for the Advancement Office.]

The primary expense drivers for FY 07 outlined in the memorandum are increases in expenses for merit funding for salary increases; debt service; operating costs for Duques Hall; Utilities, Insurance and Other Occupancy Costs; and Advancement. It is possible that the Board of Trustees would consider increasing the current endowment payout rate of by 1/10<sup>th</sup> of a percentage point, which would cover the \$1 million increase in projected Advancement expenses.

Professor Griffith concluded by saying that he thought this was the earliest information the faculty has had on budget planning, and he offered the suggestion that a general meeting of the Vice Presidents, Deans, and representatives of the Faculty Senate be held to consider alternative ways of addressing the budget shortfall for FY '07. He added that this was not proposed by the FP&B Committee, but rather came out of a discussion he had with Professors Packer and Cordes [members of FP&B] who assisted him in preparing the budget information to be presented at the meeting.

Professor Biles said that he understood that FP&B would be giving a budget update at the January Senate meeting after enrollment projections are updated, along with revenue and expense projections. Discussion followed between Professors Griffith and Wilmarth about aspects of the budget situation.

### GENERAL BUSINESS

#### I. NOMINEES FOR ELECTION TO SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Professor Robinson moved the nominations of the following faculty members to Senate Standing Committees: Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies: Eugene Abravanel; Educational Policy: Barbara von Barghahn. The nominations were approved.

II. NOMINATION FOR APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT TO ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES

Professor Robinson moved the nomination of Professor Harry E. Yeide to the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students. The nomination was approved.

III. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

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

During the portion of her report concerning the work of the 4 x 4 Joint Task Force, Professor Robinson asked Vice President Lehman if local universities utilize a 4 x 4 curriculum. Vice President Lehman said that a Task Force subcommittee would be talking to Georgetown University. Several years ago Georgetown considered such a curriculum, but it is not clear what the outcome of these deliberations was. Professor Robinson asked if American University had considered a 4 x 4 curriculum at some point, and Vice President Lehman said they had actually converted, whereupon Professor Robinson asked if American had now reverted back to their previous system. Vice President Lehman said that they did not totally revert, but they have a very fixed system, and his understanding was that, because the faculty did not stay in compliance with what was expected, they now have a mix of the old and new systems.

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Murli M. Gupta, Chair of the Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies, gave an Interim Report on the Committee's work. (The Report is attached.)

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

*Elizabeth A. Amundson*  
Elizabeth A. Amundson  
Secretary

## A TRIBUTE IN MEMORY OF PHILIP ROBBINS

Philip Robbins, Professor Emeritus of Journalism, died of pancreatic cancer on Thursday, October 13, at his home in Elkton, Maryland. Phil dedicated his life to the practice of journalism and the principles of a free press and freedom of information. As a professor of journalism at GW for 25 years, he trained a generation of print, radio, and television journalists to report the news with accuracy, openness, and precision. Following his retirement from GW, he focused his efforts on the international stage. From 1995 through 1998, he was the ombudsman for the *Stars and Stripes*, the venerable newspaper read by the United States Armed Forces. He was also awarded a Knight International Press Fellowship with the International Center for Foreign Journalists (ICFJ). As a Knight Fellow, Phil traveled to emerging democracies to improve the standards of a free and open media. In this capacity, he traveled to Columbia and Nigeria, and trained dozens of visiting journalists from countries as varied as the former Soviet Bloc countries, China, Nepal, Peru and Ecuador.

Professor Robbins received his master's degree in journalism from Columbia University in 1955 and began his career that year as a reporter for the *Baltimore Evening Sun*. From 1962 to 1971, Robbins was the assistant city editor and then metro news editor at the *Washington Evening Star* in Washington, D.C.

In 1971, he accepted a position as Professor of Journalism at The George Washington University. He chaired the Journalism Department from 1973 through 1991, implementing a significant expansion in journalism studies, establishing and directing the degree program in Political Communication, and serving on the Dean's Council. He served on the Faculty Senate from 1987 to 1991, and as Faculty Co-Chair of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students for four years. From 1991 to 1995, he was Director of Journalism Program of what was then the National Center for Communication Studies, and what is today the School of Media and Public Affairs.

In 1989, Robbins received the Distinguished Service Award from the Society of Professional Journalists. In 1992, he was nominated for the Trachtenberg Prize for Excellence in Teaching, and in 1993, he was awarded GW's highest service award, the George Washington Award. After his retirement in 1995, he was awarded the designation of Professor Emeritus.

In the last year, with the understanding that the disease would take his life, he and Pat, his wife of 49-years, traveled to Africa with a granddaughter. Having taken his other grandchildren on previous trips to Africa, he and Pat didn't want this last grandchild to feel left out. He did this in the midst of a grueling regimen of chemotherapy, an experience so severe most who endure it find it difficult to get out of bed, much less travel to Africa. When the growth of the cancer slowed for a short time this past summer, Phil and Pat celebrated by touring the temples of northern India. This is the sort of man he was. He never stopped exploring and learning. We will miss him.

Steven Livingston  
Interim Director of the School of Media and Public Affairs  
Associate Professor of Media & Public Affairs  
and International Affairs

Read into the record of The George Washington University Faculty Senate meeting held on November 11, 2005

## **REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Lilien F. Robinson, Chair

November 11, 2005

### **ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

#### ***Board of Trustees Meeting***

At the October 20, 2005 meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees I presented a report on behalf of the Faculty Senate. That report will be distributed with the Minutes of today's meeting.

#### ***Consultations with Chairs of the Committees of the Faculty Senate***

The Executive Committee has been in discussion with the Chairs of various Senate Committees with respect to matters in process, potential matters for consideration, and resolutions in preparation. The Committees include: Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies Committee, Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee, Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, Honors and Academic Convocations Committee, Educational Policy Committee, and Physical Facilities Committee.

#### ***4 x 4 Joint Task Force***

The Executive Committee has been receiving updates from Senate-appointed members of the Joint Task Force investigating the 4 X 4 curriculum. Our understanding is that members of the Task Force are in the process of visiting a number of institutions that have either adopted a 4 X 4 curriculum or have considered doing so.

### **PERSONNEL MATTERS**

#### ***Grievances***

There are two pending grievances, one in Columbian College and the other in the School of Business. The first is in mediation, while the second has been assigned a mediator. Professor Mary Cheh of the Law School has agreed to serve in that capacity.

### **OTHER MATTERS**

- Two resolutions from the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee are being planned for presentation at the December meeting of the Faculty Senate. They will address the Statement of Ethical Principles and the Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form

- The biennial Salary Equity Report will be presented by Professor Michael King and members of the Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies Committee at the December meeting.
- The biennial Report on Recruitment and Retention of Women Faculty and Faculty of Color is being scheduled for the March meeting.

### **NEXT MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Please note that because of the Thanksgiving Holiday, the next meeting of the Executive Committee has been scheduled a week earlier. It will be held on Friday, November 18. Resolutions, reports, and any other matters should be submitted in advance of that date.

# **FACULTY SENATE REPORT TO THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

October 7, 2005

Since the May 19, 2005 meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee, the Faculty Senate has met once, on September 9, 2005.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

On June 9, 2005, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, the Executive Committee sent a letter to Chairman Manatt and President Trachtenberg, reiterating some of the Senate's concerns and recommendations, contained in its resolution on faculty and staff compensation increases and compensation policy, which was passed by unanimous vote on May 13, 2005.

The letter endorses the Board of Trustees decision to bring assistant professors to the AAUP 80<sup>th</sup> percentile as well as President Trachtenberg's stated goal of returning to the 12-month pay cycle. It reiterates the need for a parallel commitment to bring all schools up to at least the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile of the AAUP national average. It further requests the establishment of a systematic working relationship between the administration and the Faculty Senate's Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee.

The Resolution, Executive Committee letter, and the August 26, 2005 response of Chairman Manatt and President Trachtenberg are attached to this report.

## **PERSONNEL MATTERS**

### Grievances

One grievance in Columbian College is in mediation.

### Nonconcurrences

One administration nonconcurrency with the faculty's negative recommendation on tenure was forwarded to the Academic Affairs Committee. The latter sustained the nonconcurrency, thus approving tenure despite the recommendation of the faculty.

## **REPORTS TO THE FACULTY SENATE**

The Faculty Senate received an update from Vice President Lehman on the funding of classroom renovations in the past and future and a report by Vice President Katz on campus construction and renovation.

## **OTHER MATTERS**

### Sexual Harassment Policy

The University General Counsel's office, in consultation with the Faculty Senate, is completing its review of the Sexual Harassment Policy, which was approved by the Senate at its May meeting.

Biennial Salary Equity Review

The biennial salary equity review has been completed. The report will be presented to the Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies and then to the Faculty Senate.

**MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION BY FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEES**

On-line Course Evaluations

-Review by the Educational Policies Committee of an on-line course evaluation pilot program. The program was established in accordance with a resolution presented by the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students and passed by the Faculty Senate

Recruitment of Minority and Women Faculty

- Preparation of report on recruitment of minority and women faculty by the Faculty Development and Support Committee

Budget Reports

-Preparation by Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee of reports on FY'05 operating and five-year capital budgets, budget model, and budget decision-making process

Gelman Library

-Review and comparison of the Gelman Library budget and cost structure with those of comparable university research libraries by the Committee on Libraries

Code of Academic Integrity

-Review and revision of the Code of Academic Integrity by the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilien F. Robinson  
Chair, Executive Committee  
Faculty Senate

**The George Washington University**  
**Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies**  
**Interim Report to Faculty Senate**  
November 11, 2005

**ASPP committee has met three times this semester. Here are some of the issues we have considered so far:**

1. We considered the widely reported recent action taken by Princeton University to make tenure clock extension automatic when a tenure track faculty member becomes a new parent. We decided that there is already a process in place for extending the tenure clock (by request) and the current policy seems to work pretty well at GW. (The difference is that at Princeton it is an entitlement; while at GW, it's not. At GW, faculty member has to initiate the request.)
2. We have formed a new joint subcommittee of ASPP and PEAFC Committees to review the status, role, and treatment of non tenure-accruing, regular active-status faculty. Consensus was earlier reached in our committee that the language of appointment letters for such faculty should be very specific about the faculty member's responsibilities, and this is currently being done. Consensus was also reached that the criteria determining promotion from associate to full professor should be the same for all full-time faculty, whether tenure-accruing or not. The joint subcommittee has met once already and will attempt to draft a resolution that can be brought to the Senate later this year.
3. Faculty Salary Equity report: A biennial report analyzing the salaries of full-time, regular active-status faculty was recently completed and presented to ASPP Committee. This report has been forwarded to the Executive Committee for placement on the Agenda for December meeting of Senate.
4. We recently learned that Ohio State University allows part-time tenure (at the level of  $\geq 50\%$ ). This issue was brought to light by President Trachtenberg at the Faculty Assembly. We have formed a subcommittee to research this issue and come up with possible options for GW. This subcommittee has already had its first meeting.

Murli Gupta  
Chair, ASPP