

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D.C.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON  
NOVEMBER 14, 2008 IN THE STATE ROOM

Present: Executive Vice President Lehman, Registrar Amundson, Parliamentarian Charnovitz; Dean Phillips and Interim Dean Reum; Professors Benton-Short, Biles, Castleberry, Cordes, Corry, Costanza, Galston, Garris, Griffith, Harrington, Helgert, Johnson, Lipscomb, Marotta, Pagel, Parsons, Plack, Rycroft, Simon, Wilmarth and Windsor

Absent: President Knapp; Deans Barratt, Brown, Burke, Dolling, Futrell, Lawrence and Scott; Professors Artz, Becker, Englander, Hotez, Miller, Robinson and Wirtz

The meeting was called to order by Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman at 2:20 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of September 12, 2008 were approved as distributed.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

PROGRESS REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING COMPLEX

Professor Helgert, Chair of the Faculty Senate Special Committee for the Science and Engineering Complex, distributed a copy of his powerpoint report. (The report is attached.)

Professor Helgert reviewed key points of the report, beginning with a description of the project teams, committees and consultants involved thus far in planning for the possible construction of a Science and Engineering Complex (SEC). The Senate Special Committee was created by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee early in the summer of 2008 as a means of providing input into the planning process, as well as to keep the Faculty Senate, and through it, the GW faculty, apprised of planning activities for the SEC, which, if implemented, would be one of the most significant undertakings in GW's history. On several occasions during the summer the Special Committee held meetings, including one meeting at which President Knapp, Executive Vice President Lehman, and Executive Vice President and Treasurer Louis Katz were present. During that meeting the Committee was provided with projected timelines for the project, and other issues were discussed, including questions about funding and parking. During the fall semester members of the Special

Committee also attended meetings of the other groups involved in the process, as detailed in the report.

The first section of the Special Committee's report provides information about the membership of each of several groups involved in the Planning Process. These groups include the Physical Facilities Project Team, comprised of four members of the Physical Facilities department, and the Project Planning Committee, comprised of two members of the Project Team, Associate Vice President Lenn, one faculty representative from the School of Engineering and Applied Science (SEAS) and another from Columbian College of Arts and Sciences (CCAS). Two Faculty Senate representatives from the Special Committee also serve on this Committee: Professor Cordes, Chair of the Senate Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee (FP&B), and Professor Helgert, Chair of the Senate Physical Facilities Committee.

The GW Board of Trustees has also formed a Committee on the SEC. Trustee Nelson Carbonell Chairs that Committee, on which three other Trustees serve. The administration is represented by Vice Presidents Lehman, Katz, Price Jones, Chief of Staff Porter and Associate Vice President for Principal Gifts Kudless. The Deans of CCAS and SEAS were also appointed to this Committee, along with Senate representatives Cordes and Helgert. One faculty member from SEAS, another from CCAS, and a third from the School of Medicine and Health Sciences (SMHS) were appointed as faculty representatives to the Committee. Four other members of the Committee were drawn from the SEAS National Advisory Council and the CCAS National Advisory Council, as detailed in the report.

The Faculty Senate Special Committee for the SEC is chaired by Professor Helgert, with Professor Biles from the School of Public Health and Health Services serving as Executive Committee liaison to the group. Nine other faculty members serve on the Special Committee: five from CCAS, two from the Elliott School of International Affairs [including Professor Cordes of the Senate FP&B Committee], and one each from the SMHS and the SEAS. As set forth in the report, the charge of the Special Committee is to analyze and report to the Senate on the projected size and scope of the SEC, as well as the projected cost -- including costs for furnishings and equipment. The Special Committee is also expected to report on the anticipated sources of funding to meet building costs, as well as the projected impact of the SEC on the University's operating and capital budgets over the next several years.

Several meetings, workshops and conference have taken place during the fall semester 2008. The first substantive meeting held this fall was a Visioning Meeting on October 11 facilitated by Francis Cameron. Three members of the Physical Facilities department were in attendance, along with Trustee Mark Hughes, Executive Vice President Lehman, and Associate Vice President Lenn. Five SEAS representative also participated, including the Dean. CCAS was represented by six faculty members. [Seven are listed in the report as one of the faculty members could only attend half of the meeting, and a substitute was found for the remainder.] As detailed in the report, the agenda for the meeting was to develop a vision statement for the building as well as to identify occupants, assess space requirements, and develop a strategy for building use. Also on the agenda were exploring possible collaborations and synergies between departments and faculty and the sharing of resources such as equipment and special facilities.

Because the final report on Visioning Meeting outcomes was not available before the Senate meeting on November 14<sup>th</sup>, Professor Helgert shared the unapproved working draft which includes the vision agreed upon as well as guiding principles for the building. After reviewing each of the guiding principles in the draft, Professor Helgert added that the Visioning Meeting report would be made available to the Senate once it was final.

Professor Helgert next reported on the meeting of the Board of Trustees' SEC Committee held October 21. The purpose of this meeting was to report on the Visioning Meeting held on October 11<sup>th</sup>, review timelines and milestones, fundraising strategies, and anticipated enhancements to teaching, learning and research both upon completion of the building, and five years after. Among the conclusions of this meeting were that areas of activity in the building for institutes, centers and laboratories should be identified early in the planning process and that fundraising strategies should be developed by identifying areas of interest among potential donors. Building needs and objectives and fundraising strategies need to be specified for presentation at the Board of Trustees meeting in February, 2009. A subcommittee of the Board's SEC Committee consisting of Dean Dolling (SEAS), Dean Barratt (CCAS) and Professor Werling (SMHS) were asked to carry out the forecasting of prospective enhancements to research and teaching (the fourth item on the Committee's agenda) and submit their report the week of November 10, 2008.

On October 27 and 28, 2008, Dean Dolling and two faculty members from SEAS, along with another from CCAS and two members of the Physical Facilities department attended a Tradeline Conference in San Diego, California on college and university science facilities. At this conference presentations were made by faculty and administrators and planners and architects about planned and completed science and engineering building projects at a number of U.S. institutions. The report sets forth the common motivations which prompt construction of these types of new buildings, as well as common building objectives. Professor Helgert reported that the space allocation in these types of facilities was a hotly debated issue, but the consensus was that there should be no ownership of laboratories or equipment by researchers or departments. Further, the allocation of these resources should be based, as set forth in the report, upon the scope and relevance of research, level of funding, and institute priorities. Periodic evaluation of space utilization is also to be based on productivity and an important component of this evaluation is to be based on financial measures.

On October 31, 2008, a workshop on Planning New Spaces for Science was held at Phillips Hall. The workshop was facilitated by two members of the Physical Facilities Office and Jeanne Narum of Project Kaleidoscope. Participants included chairs and key faculty from the nine departments from SEAS and CCAS [Electrical and Computer Engineering, Computer Science, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Engineering Management and Systems Engineering, Chemistry, Biology, Physics, and Physical Anthropology] involved in the project, as well as Professors Cordes and Helgert from the Special Senate Committee. According to the status report, the objective of the workshop was to formulate a set of questions leading to a report to the GW Board of Trustees in February 2009 on the scope and impact of the SEC. Key strategies to achieve this objective included determining GW's current strengths in science and engineering, and determining the relationship of the SEC to other current

developments and future plans. The workshop received presentations concerning the experiences of Georgia Tech and Boston College as part of a third strategy to consider lessons learned by other institutions undertaking projects similar to the SEC. Key conclusions reached at the workshop were that the SEC should be developed as an international crossroads for science and engineering. There is a need for large spaces in the building, both to host national and international conferences and workshops and provide large classrooms with modern audiovisual equipment. Building-wide opportunities need to be provided, and new pedagogical models, such as project based learning, need to be developed.

It is anticipated that at the Board of Trustees meeting in February 2009, the Board will review the SEC building project, and approval will be sought for a planning budget for preliminary work in programming and architectural design. The Board is expected to consider the needs and objectives that the project will address, as well as a financial model and fundraising requirements. After the Board approves going forward with the next stage of the SEC project, a programming firm to develop the program for the building will be retained, and an architectural firm will be hired to design the building at a 15% level of effort. The zoning process for the SEC could begin as early as May, 2009 or early 2010. Professor Helgert said it has been stressed that the SEC is well within the present Campus Plan framework, so difficulty in getting approval by the Zoning Board for the project is not anticipated.

The next segment of the Special Committee's report outlines building parameters and occupancy and utilization data. The SEC will be a single building occupying Square 55, the site of the current Parking Garage, and Building K, both of which will be demolished. On a total site area of 56,000 square feet, the SEC will occupy 90% of that lot, rising eight floors above ground to a height of 110 feet along I Street and a step-down height of 90' along H Street. It is estimated that the maximum square footage above ground that can be achieved is 400,000 square feet, with 60% of that assignable space and the rest devoted to hallways, elevator lobbies and hallways, restrooms, and so forth. It is also estimated that a gross 50,000 square feet will be available below ground. At this stage of the planning process, it is expected that classrooms will be on the first floor. There is a possibility that an auditorium will also be built on the first level. Laboratories are to occupy floors 2 through 7 and below grade space. Faculty and administrative offices will be on the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> floors. There is a tentative plan for 300-500 parking spaces below grade, and for some 5,000 square feet of retail space along Eye Street. A stated objective for the SEC is to encourage collaborative research between science, engineering and medicine, however, as the plan stands, no departmental space would be made available to SMHS departments. Collaborative research with the Medical School would come about as a result of shared research space and equipment. Actual space allocations have not yet been designated, but these will be made on a competitive basis. In terms of a possible construction timeline, soil tests under the parking garage have been conducted and an initial site survey has been completed. Acoustic and vibration measurements in the vicinity of the project have been taken to ensure that the site is suitable. It is possible that the building could be started in 2011 and completed in 2014.

Turning to the issue of parking, Professor Helgert acknowledged the importance of this issue to many. The University Parking Garage on Square 55 currently holds 1250

spaces, mostly used by faculty. The University's Campus Plan requires that GW maintain the current number of parking spaces available. Professor Helgert said it was his understanding that some 362 parking spaces would be available for University use under Square 54, with Boston Properties, the lessee, retaining the rest. Under the Square 80 building on G Street, it is expected that 178 spaces would be available. Professor Helgert added that the balance of required spaces will have to be worked out, but it is clear that without a solution to the parking problem the SEC building is not going to happen, period.

In conclusion, Professor Helgert said he would defer to Professor Cordes to provide financial information about the SEC project. He said it was his understanding that nothing is really firm at this point, and the projected cost of the building and the funding strategy for it are under development. Thus far, planning funds allocated to Facilities Project Management amount to \$1,500,000 -- \$700,000 in Fiscal Year 2008, and \$800,000 for Fiscal Year 2009. Additional planning and programming funds depend upon further development and a decision by the Board of Trustees to go forward with the next phase of the project.

Professor Galston said she had not heard the term "green" [sustainability] mentioned in the presentation, and she inquired if the SEC project would be "green." Professor Helgert responded that sustainability was a topic widely discussed at the San Diego Conference, and it is a very strong consideration among people who are planning ventures similar to the SEC. He added that he could not imagine that GW would not place great emphasis on this aspect of the project.

Professor Wilmarth noted that a major stated rationale for the SEC was that it would replace GW's existing science and engineering facilities for teaching and research, which are outdated. Substandard classroom and laboratory facilities for science and engineering have been cited as an obstacle to the recruitment of highly qualified undergraduate and graduate students. Professor Wilmarth said that it was not clear from Professor Helgert's report whether these laboratory and teaching needs -- both undergraduate and/or graduate -- would be satisfied by building the SEC. Professor Helgert said that at the moment, there is no concrete plan as yet to determine how new space in the SEC will be allocated between teaching, classrooms, and research. He said that his sense was that classrooms and teaching facilities in the SEC would be coupled very tightly to the laboratories. What was learned as a result of the San Diego conference was that it is not wise to dedicate this sort of new space to standard classrooms, but rather to pair classrooms to specialized teaching labs that involve students, particularly undergraduates, in research almost from day one.

Professor Simon observed that the University is contractually obligated to provide roughly 320 parking spaces to the GW Hospital. Therefore, if the University Parking Garage is torn down, 320 of the available 362 parking spaces under Square 54 (the Boston Properties project) are already taken, and only 42 net spaces will be available. This leaves over 900 parking spaces to be replaced. Professor Simon also asked about the amount of indirect cost recovery monies available if departments to be involved in the SEC project were to move today. Professor Helgert said he did not have the information to answer this question directly but that the issue had been discussed at the San Diego conference, and the prevailing view is that increased indirect cost recovery might well be able to cover the operating costs of the new building.

Professor Plack said she understood that the nine CCAS and SEAS departments would have office space in the SEC, but would not be guaranteed lab space. Professor Helgert responded that lab space would be awarded on a competitive basis. Professor Plack asked if SMHS faculty who were not housed in the building could compete for the lab space available. Vice President Lehman said that it has always been the vision for the building that lab space would be available on a competitive basis with the idea that scientists from the Medical Center would be able to conduct research in the building along with engineers and other science faculty on a collaborative basis. Vice President Lehman added in response to Professor Wilmarth's question that the teaching of science, particularly in a student's first or second year, is really very rapidly changing. These activities in the SEC building will take place on the first floor and be visible to the campus community, and this will assist in recruiting students who can observe the teaching and learning interface directly.

Professor Wilmarth observed that a significant number of public and private universities have recently constructed or are currently constructing new science facilities in an effort to attract sponsored research. He asked whether there is a potential problem that the University may be entering what is already a saturated market, in terms of attracting sponsored research, if many other universities are seeking to do the same thing. Professor Helgert said he thought the point well taken, and that the selection of which research projects should be pursued could be a critical one.

Discussion followed. Professor Marotta noted that \$1.5 million will have been expended by the end of FY 09 on SEC project planning and inquired about the source of this funding. Vice President Lehman said the funds were taken from the capital budget. Professor Simon expressed concern about sources of research funding going forward, noting that funding from the National Institutes of Health is not expected to increase. Vice President Lehman said that the SEC concept was not based solely on a biomedical research model, but upon one that is a combination of all of the sciences.

Professor Windsor said that he thought that GW might be about to produce a paradigm shift, from its present focus on basic and health sciences. He added that, despite the discussion about the SEC's physical facility and so forth, he had not heard anything about the investment that will need to be made to hire additional faculty to achieve the building's mission. Attention must be paid to this issue for the SEC to succeed. Vice President Lehman agreed that this will be a very expensive proposition, but it has not been ignored. Professor Parsons said he understood that the Boston College project had been deemed successful and seemed to be viewed as a very fine model for the SEC. Professor Helgert said that a very detailed report, which he offered to make available to the Senate, had been presented at the San Diego conference about this. Their new science facility has proven quite successful in recruiting students, but not as successful as they had hoped in attracting top researchers with large research grants.

Professor Lipscomb said she understood that across the country, science facilities are being built and faculty are competing for research space in them. What is not clear is how teaching and research will proceed if faculty are housed in the SEC but their labs and support facilities are elsewhere because they are not awarded lab space in the SEC. Professor Lipscomb said she thought it was unclear what GW is really trying to do with this

building; it's not clear that what has been done at Boston College is really comparable to what GW is trying to do. Professor Helgert responded that most of the presentations at the San Diego conference concerned new or contemplated science [particularly biomedical science] buildings rather than the science and engineering model intended for the SEC.

### **REPORT ON THE UNIVERSITY'S OPERATING AND CAPITAL BUDGETS, AND THE IMPACT OF THE SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING COMPLEX ON THOSE BUDGETS**

Professor Cordes, Chair of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee distributed a copy of his powerpoint report, which is attached. The first portion of the report provides information about the Capital Budget for New Construction and Major Renovations approved by the GW Board of Trustees for Fiscal Year (FY) 09. The information provided excludes the Medical Center. Professor Cordes observed that the total amount approved through FY 12 for capital projects is approximately \$170,000,000; essentially the SEC would cost at least this much, and probably more, so it would be a major project. The report also provides a Debt Management Summary which describes the total amount funded by specific revenue sources and general revenue, as well as the total debt outstanding and annual debt service for FY 05, and the estimated totals for FY 08 and FY 11. Approximately 75 % of the Capital Budget for FY 09 is funded by debt compared by 86% for FY 08. While contributions and endowment payout funded 1% of the Capital Budget in FY 08, in FY 09 14% of the Capital Budget will come from these sources.

The report outlines the link between the Capital and Operating Budgets, as projects funded by the Capital Budget impact future Operating Budgets in several ways, from the cost of debt service to the operating, staff and equipment costs of new buildings. The SEC would be a major new project and as there is little or no room in the current Operating Budget to fund it. Therefore, significant additional sources of revenue will be required if the SEC is to become a reality. [Information on the Operating Budget for FY 09 is provided on page 8 in the report.]

While a precise estimate of building costs is not yet available and will not be until more extensive planning is complete, Professor Cordes provided an illustration for a funding model for the SEC. If the construction cost is \$400 to \$600 per square foot for 450,000 square feet, the cost of the SEC, excluding research equipment, would range from \$180 to \$270 million at present day rates. These numbers could change. Professor Cordes said that President Knapp has clearly stated several times that, unlike prior projects where funding was derived from tuition, that will not be the case for the SEC. Sources of funding for the complex can be thought of as a three-legged stool, consisting of revenue from Square 54 (the old GW hospital site), increased indirect cost recoveries from sponsored research, and increased charitable giving. In the scenario set forth in the report, assuming a building construction cost of \$250 million (slightly above the midpoint of the high and low figures for cost of construction per square foot), and assuming further that this cost would be 100% financed with debt having an amortization period of 30 years and a fixed interest rate of 6%, then approximately \$18 million in annual debt service costs would be added to the University's budget. Assuming that operations and maintenance costs for the SEC would be \$14 per square foot, as is predicted for the new School of Public Health and Health Services building, that would add another \$6.3 million per year to the University's annual

expenses. Taken together, an annual budget gap of \$24.3 million -- nearly the amount of the current operating surplus -- would be created. This illustration does not take into account equipment costs, some or all of which may be covered by sponsored research grants.

To meet these debt service and maintenance costs, Professor Cordes' illustration assumes revenues of \$7 million per year from the University's endowment, based on a 4.4% annual payout on the capitalized value (\$162 million) of the Square 54 lease, along with a possible \$5 million per year of additional indirect cost recoveries (if a 50% increase above current indirect cost recoveries is achieved). After taking account of these additional revenues, an annual budget gap of between \$10 and \$12 million would remain. Under the funding parameters described by President Knapp, this remaining gap would have to be closed by increased fundraising. For example, the funding gap for a \$250 million building could be closed if the University raised \$100 million of gifts and contributions for the building. In that event, the amount financed by debt would be reduced to \$150 million, instead of \$250 million. Another funding issue arises because the Board of Trustees will be asked to approve \$10 million in planning and programming funds for the building. If this outlay is approved, initially these funds would be drawn from cash reserves, but this sum would become a deferred expense included in the cost of the building itself.

Professor Cordes emphasized that information provided in the report is meant to provide a perspective on the magnitude of the budgetary impact the SEC would have, and the figures given are not actual projections. A full assessment of the budgetary impact of the SEC would need to include the estimated cost of research equipment and hiring staff as well as estimates of construction and operating costs. As part of the financial plan to be developed before the February, 2009 Board meeting, consideration needs to be given to the need for the expansion of the pool of full-time science and engineering faculty who will require additional office space. It is clear from the illustration given that financing needs will be significant for the building, and a major increase in gifts will be required.

Professor Wilmarth asked if the figures for the University's operating budget presented in the report reflect the most current information available. Given the current financial crisis, there are growing concerns among the faculty that the University will suffer a substantial deterioration in its projected tuition revenues or that the University will need to provide a significantly higher amount of financial aid to students. Professor Cordes responded that budget numbers are provided quarterly, and thus far it appears, from the first quarter of FY 09 (which ended on September 30, 2008), that the University's current budget projections are on target. It remains to be seen if future numbers will come in as planned, in which case a small surplus for FY 09 may be anticipated. Professor Wilmarth noted that the Board of Trustees has approved initial planning for a new building for the School of Public Health and Health Services, and there has also been discussion of either renovating or replacing Ross Hall. It appears that those projects may cost between \$100 and \$150 million. Professor Wilmarth asked whether there has been any discussion in the Budget Working Group about how expenditures for those projects might affect the University's capital budget. Professor Cordes responded that no such discussion had taken place, and it was his impression that the University's capital budget does not include the Medical Center. He added that perhaps the Senate needs to take a look at the Medical Center's budget as well, but that information is not reflected in the report.

Discussion followed, with Professor Simon saying he understood that the information in the report was illustrative rather than a final statement of budget options for the SEC; however he said thought that actual construction costs for the SEC might actually be significantly more than those in the report. Professor Cordes responded that at this stage, the actual numbers can only be crudely estimated. Professor Simon asked how some \$2 million annually had become unavailable, as the estimate of revenue for Square 54 was reported at \$9 million per year rather than \$7 million. Professor Cordes responded that the lease for Square 54 has been capitalized at \$162 million and this figure was added to the endowment. Thus the annual payout from the revised endowment total would account for the difference. From an accounting perspective, this is a perfectly appropriate way in which to capitalize the value of the lease in question. Professor Simon said he wondered what the University intends to do with the additional \$2 million in cash flow that the University will receive each year from Square 54 over and above the endowment payout value.

Professor Griffith said he would be reluctant to criticize the decision to capitalize the lease for Square 54 and add the monies to the endowment, but the understanding has been that between \$9 and \$10 million annually would be available, and that number would increase over the life of the lease. He noted that this seems to be a way of constraining how the money from Square 54 would be made available for use. He added that, while he understood there are still ongoing discussions about whether there should be some sort of special payout from the segment of the endowment represented by the Square 54 lease, at present there are fewer funds available than anticipated. Professor Griffith also said that the SEC project struck him as one in which the University is once again reaching very far from the relatively stable equilibrium it enjoys now. He asked if Vice President Lehman had a sense that the Board of Trustees is firmly behind the SEC project, and would use their contacts to assist in the fundraising necessary for the project to succeed. Without serious support from the Board, it is likely that the Development Office will be hard-pressed to raise the funds necessary.

Vice President Lehman responded that Trustee Carbonell had presented a report at the June Board retreat, and that those Trustees present were supportive of pursuing the SEC proposal. In addition, Board members toured the existing lab facilities in science and engineering on the Foggy Bottom campus, so they are aware of the condition of existing facilities, which they take seriously. Board members understand that the SEC project is just a proposal, and they expect that all of the analysis that is underway will be completed, after which they will make a decision. Professor Griffith asked if the Board would be asked to consider whether the building should be built fully, or should be completed in phases, as has been discussed. Vice President Lehman responded that the Board would, as Professor Cordes had indicated, examine different scenarios, including phased-in construction, as they analyze cost factors associated with the SEC. Professor Cordes observed that models or scenarios put together would change over time; at this point the question is whether or not resources should be spent to take the next step in planning for the SEC, which in part will determine the amount of funding required and what the likelihood is of raising this funding from the different sources available. Vice President Lehman added that the five and ten year projections of enhancements to teaching and research had been received from Dean Barratt, Dean Dolling, and Professor Werling. These materials will be used to begin

the effort to build the case statements that staff in the Development Office will use in exploring possible sources of financial support for the SEC.

Professor Wilmarth thanked Professor Cordes and Professor Helgert for all of the efforts they had made in preparing and presenting their reports to the Senate. He asked those present if they agreed that Executive Vice President and Treasurer Katz should be invited to attend the Senate meeting on December 12, 2008, for the purpose of providing additional information relevant to the issues discussed in the reports presented by Professors Cordes and Helgert. The Senate agreed that it would be useful to hear from Executive Vice President Katz on those issues. Professor Parsons commented that it would be useful to learn about all of the costs that might be involved in the SEC project, as it matters a great deal what the total cost is likely to be, not just the cost of constructing the building.

### GENERAL BUSINESS

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

Professor Wilmarth moved the election of the following faculty members to Senate Committees: Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies: Carol Hayes; Libraries: Daniele Podini. The nominations were approved.

#### II. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

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

#### III. CHAIR'S REMARKS

No remarks were made by the Chair.

### BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

There were no brief statements or questions.

### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, and upon motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

*Elizabeth A. Amundson*  
Elizabeth A. Amundson  
Secretary

Science and Engineering Complex  
Status Report  
to the Faculty Senate

Presented by the  
Faculty Senate Special Committee for the  
Science and Engineering Complex

November 14, 2008

# Project Teams, Committees and Consultants

# Physical Facilities Project Team

- Juan Ibanez, Executive Director, Facilities
- Arthur Bean, Director, Facilities Project Management
- David Wellman, Executive Project Manager
- Michael Burns, Project Management

# Project Planning Committee

- Facilities:
  - David Wellman, Chair
  - Michael Burns
- Administration:
  - Jeffrey Lenn

## Project Planning Committee (Cont.)

- School Representatives
  - Can Korman (SEAS)
  - Randy Packer (CCAS)
- Senate Representatives
  - Joseph Cordes (Chair, Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee)
  - Hermann Helgert (Chair, Physical Facilities Committee)

# BoT Committee on the Science and Engineering Complex

- Board of Trustees
  - Nelson Carbonell (Chair)
  - Mark Hughes
  - Lydia Thomas
  - Gerald Lazarus

# BoT Committee on the Science and Engineering Complex (Cont.)

- Administration
  - Donald Lehman, EVPAA
  - Louis Katz, EVP and Treasurer
  - Laurel Price Jones, VP, Development and Alumni Relations
  - Barbara Porter, Chief of Staff, Office of the President
  - John Kudless, AVP, Principal Gifts

# BoT Committee on the Science and Engineering Complex (Cont.)

- Deans
  - Peg Barratt (CCAS)
  - David Dolling (SEAS)
- Faculty Senate
  - Joseph Cordes, ESIA
  - Hermann Helgert, SEAS
- Faculty
  - Can Korman, ECE
  - David Ramaker, Chemistry
  - Linda Werling, SMHS

# BoT Committee on the Science and Engineering Complex (Cont.)

- SEAS National Advisory Council
  - Allyn Kilsheimer (CEO, KCE Structural Engineers)
  - Nicholas Paleogolos (President, Miller and Long)
- CCAS National Advisory Council
  - Martin Pera (Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California)
  - Ellen Zane (President and CEO, Tufts Medical Center)

# Faculty Senate Special Committee for the Science and Engineering Complex

- Hermann Helgert - SEAS (Chair)
- Brian Biles – SPHHS (Executive Committee Liaison)
- Joseph Cordes – ESIA
- Linda Gallo - CCAS
- Michael King - CCAS
- Murray Loew - SEAS
- Donald Parsons - CCAS
- Gary Simon - SMHS
- Anthony Yezer – ESIA
- Diana Johnson - CCAS
- Alison Brooks - CCAS

## Faculty Senate Special Committee for the Science and Engineering Complex (Cont.)

- Tasked to analyze and report to the Senate on:
  - The projected size and scope of the SEC
  - The projected cost of building the SEC with the requisite equipment and furnishings
  - The anticipated sources of funding to meet the costs
  - The projected impact of the SEC on the University's operational and capital budgets during the next several years

# Meetings, Workshops and Conferences

# Visioning Meeting October 11 ,2008

- Facilitator: Francis Cameron
- Physical Facilities: Juan Ibanez, Art Bean, David Wellman
- BoT: Mark Hughes
- Administration: EVPAA Donald Lehman, AVP Jeffrey Lenn

# Visioning Meeting October 11 ,2008 (Cont.)

- SEAS Representatives
  - David Dolling, Can Korman, Kim Roddis, Michael Plesniak, Abdou Youssef
- CCAS Department Representatives
  - Randy Packer, Diana Lipscomb, Michael King, Barry Berman (Mark Reeves), Brian Richmond, Roy Guenther

# Visioning Meeting Agenda

- Develop a vision statement for the building
- Identify occupants
- Carry out a space requirement assessment
- Develop a building use strategy
- Explore possible synergies and collaborations among departments and faculty
- Sharing of resources such as equipment and special facilities

# Visioning Meeting Outcomes (Working Draft – Not Approved)

- The Vision
  - Create an intellectual center in the nation's capital for world class, collaborative research and learning in science and engineering

# Visioning Meeting Outcomes (Cont.) (Working Draft-Not Approved)

- The Guiding Principles
  - Develop an environment for internal and external collaboration
  - Create structural flexibility
  - Use visibility to promote internal and external interests in science and engineering
  - Balance a distinctive architecture with excellent design (and precedence over cost)
  - Develop core facilities with associated structure of the building to permit ease of access

# BoT SEC Committee Meeting October 21, 2008

- Agenda
  - Report on Visioning Meeting 10/11/2008
  - Review of timelines and milestones
  - Fundraising strategies
  - Anticipated enhancements to teaching, learning and research
    - At completion of building
    - Five years after completion of building

# BoT SEC Committee Meeting October 21, 2008 (Cont.)

- Conclusions
  - Areas of activity in the building should be identified early in the planning process – institutes, centers, laboratories
  - Develop fund raising strategies by identifying areas of interest among potential donors
  - Specify building needs and objectives, and fund raising strategies for February 2009 BoT meeting

## BoT SEC Committee Meeting October 21, 2008 (Cont.)

- Develop forecasts for new research and teaching programs
  - at completion of building
  - five years after completion of building
- Linda Werling for SMHS
- David Dolling for SEAS
- Peg Barratt for CCAS
- Report due week of November 10, 2008

# Tradeline Conference

## San Diego, CA

### October 27-28, 2008

- Conference on College and University Science Facilities
- GWU Attendees: David Dolling, Can Korman, Hermann Helgert, Randall Packer, David Wellman, Michael Burns
- Presentations by faculty, administrators, planners and architects of completed and planned science and engineering building projects at many institutions across the US

# Tradeline Conference

## San Diego, CA

### October 27-28, 2008 (Cont.)

- Common motivations for new buildings
  - Stimulation of major new research initiatives
  - Enabling new pedagogical models of project-oriented learning
  - Synergy effects on science and engineering
  - Catalyst for campus-wide innovation
  - Recruiting and retention tool for high quality students and leading research faculty
  - Potential for increased level of research funding at enhanced indirect cost rates

# Tradeline Conference

## San Diego, CA

### October 27-28, 2008 (cont.)

- Common building objectives
  - Promote collaboration among the science and engineering disciplines
  - Provide open access to specialized facilities
  - Plan laboratories for maximum flexibility and easy adaptation to changing needs
  - Facilitate teamwork and interaction through transparent design of space
  - Replace traditional classrooms with interactive teaching laboratories

# Tradeline Conference

## San Diego, CA

### October 27-28, 2008 (cont.)

- Space allocation concepts
  - No ownership of laboratories or equipment
  - Allocation based on scope and relevance of research, level of funding, and institute priorities
  - Periodic evaluation of space utilization based on productivity (publications, patents, licensing agreements, books, awards)

# Workshop on Planning New Spaces for Science

October 31, 2008

## ■ Objectives

- Formulate a set of questions leading to a report to the BoT meeting in February 2009 on the scope and impact of the SEC

## ■ Strategies

- Consider lessons learned from similar projects at other institutions
- Determine GWU's current strengths in science and engineering
- Determine the relationship of the SEC with other current developments and future plans

# Workshop on Planning New Spaces for Science

October 31, 2008 (Cont.)

## ■ Facilitators

- Jeanne Narum - Project Kaleidoscope
- Michael Burns – GWU Facilities Office
- David Wellman – GWU Facilities Office

## ■ Participants

- Chairs and key faculty from 9 SEAS and CCAS departments
- Chairs of Senate Committees on Physical Facilities and Fiscal Planning and Budgeting

# Workshop on Planning New Spaces for Science

October 31, 2008 (Cont.)

- Presentations
  - Wendy Newstetter – The Georgia Tech Story
  - Kevin Bedell – The Boston College Story

# Workshop on Planning New Spaces for Science

October 31, 2008 (Cont.)

- Key Conclusions
  - Develop the SEC as an international crossroad for science and engineering
  - The need for large spaces to host national and international conferences and workshops
  - Create building-wide learning opportunities
  - Include large classrooms with modern AV equipment
  - Develop new pedagogical models – project based learning

## BoT Meeting in February 2009

- Review building project
- Seek approval of planning budget for
  - Programming
  - Architectural design (15% level of effort)
- Consideration of
  - Needs and objectives
  - Financial model
  - Fundraising requirements

# Project Planning Activities

## Planning and Design

- EVPAA Donald Lehman as Spokesperson within and outside of Academic Affairs
- Hire a programming firm after approval by BoT in February 2009
- Develop the program for the building
- Engage architectural firm for 15% level of effort design
- Begin zoning process in late 2009-early 2010

## Building Parameters

- Single building on Square 55 - site of current parking garage and Physical Sciences building
- Bounded by 22<sup>nd</sup> , I Street, 23<sup>rd</sup> , and H Street
- Total site area of 56,000 square feet
- 90% lot coverage of building
- Eight floors above ground
- 110' height along I Street, 90' height along H Street to depth of 40 feet
- 400,000 square feet gross above ground (Max.)
- 50,000 square feet gross below ground (Est.)

## Building Parameters (Cont.)

- 60% assignable space
- Classrooms on Floor 1
- Laboratories on Floors 2 to 7 and below grade
- Faculty and department administrative offices on Floors 7 and 8
- Possible auditorium on Floor 1
- Below grade parking
  - Tentative plan for 300 – 500 spaces
- Retail space along I Street – 5000 sq. ft.

## Building Parameters (Cont.)

- Spatial and design differentiation of Science and Engineering
- Flexible assignment of space through modular design
- Shared laboratory space and equipment
- Mobile and shared support functions

# Occupancy and Utilization

## ■ CCAS

- Chemistry
- Biology
- Physics
- Physical Anthropology

## ■ SEAS

- Electrical and Computer Engineering
- Computer Science
- Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
- Civil and Environmental Engineering
- Engineering Management and Systems Engineering

## Occupancy and Utilization (Cont.)

- Encourage collaborative research between science, engineering and medicine
- Space allocation between departments, faculty, research centers and institutes on a competitive basis

## Construction Timeline

- Currently conducting soil tests under parking garage
- Completed initial site survey
- Perform acoustic and vibration measurements in vicinity of site
- Target construction schedule: 2011-2014

## Interim Parking

- Replacement of 1250 spaces currently available in the parking garage
  - 362 spaces under Square 54 building
  - 178 spaces under Square 80 building, additional spaces in planning
  - Parking Facilities is currently in confidential and sensitive negotiations on potential acquisitions and shuttle service
  - Encourage faculty and staff to rely more on public transportation

# Financial

- Projected cost under development
- Funding strategy under development
- Currently allocated planning funds to Facilities Project Management
  - \$700,00 for fiscal year 2008
  - \$800,00 for fiscal year 2009
- Additional planning and programming funds pending further development and BoT approval

# **The Proposed Science and Engineering Complex and the University Operating and Capital Budgets**

Faculty Senate Fiscal Planning and  
Budgeting Committee

Nov. 14, 2008

# Outline

- FY 2009 Capital Budget
- Link between capital and operating budgets
- Simple framework for gauging budgetary impacts
- Applying the framework
- Caveats

## FY 09 Capital Budget

### New Construction & Major Renovations (1)

(Dollars in Thousands)

Building	Description	FY08	FY10	FY11	FY12	Total FY08 to FY12	Total Completion
<b>Academic Facilities</b>							
Science Building	New Construction (Programming)	600	800			1,400	1,500
Ames	Renovations	-		400	650	1,050	1,050
Funger Hall - 1st and 2nd Floors	Sprinkler System	400	400			800	800
Funger Hall - 1st and 2nd Floors	Lobby / CR Modernization	760	1,250			2,000	2,000
<b>Total Academic Facilities</b>		1,760	2,450	400	650	5,260	5,350
<b>Student Housing and Student Life</b>							
School Without Walls	New Building - On Campus Housing	52,500	6,700			59,200	75,000
Pelham Hall (Housing / Student Life)	New Building - MVC Campus Housing	20,000	30,700	5,000		55,700	60,000
Aston Hall	M&E Upgrades	4,800				4,800	8,188
Thurston Hall	Exterior Façade and Window Replacement	2,656				2,656	13,800
<b>Total Student Housing and Student Life</b>		79,956	37,400	5,000	-	122,356	167,888
<b>Other Projects</b>							
Virginia Campus	Migration of Administrative Functions	500				500	1,000
Sq 108 Law Learning Center and Garage	New Construction (Planning)	600				600	600
Smith Center	Renovations	8,000	18,000	15,000		41,000	43,000
<b>Total Other Projects</b>		9,100	18,000	15,000	-	42,100	44,600
<b>Total New Construction and Major Renovations</b>		90,716	58,850	20,400	650	170,616	207,838

- (1) Excluding Medical Center and capitalized interest. Projects in bold italics represent new projects or increases to previously approved projects.

## Debt Management Summary

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 05	Est. FY 08	Increase <sup>(6)</sup>	Est. FY 11	Increase <sup>(6)</sup>
<b>Debt Outstanding at Year End:</b>					
<b>Funded by Specific Revenue Sources:</b>					
Housing	166,735	182,774	16,039	245,914	63,140
Parking	19,462	18,900	(561)	17,810	(1,090)
Recreational / Student Life <sup>(1)</sup>	48,118	38,935	(9,183)	49,002	10,067
Investment Properties <sup>(2)</sup>	193,659	250,700	57,041	250,700	0
Medical Center	38,706	38,946	241	38,946	0
Other <sup>(3)</sup>	25,158	19,671	(5,488)	19,524	(147)
<b>Total Funded by Specific Revenue Sources <sup>(4)</sup></b>	<b>491,838</b>	<b>549,926</b>	<b>58,089</b>	<b>621,897</b>	<b>71,970</b>
<b>Funded by General Revenue</b>	<b>245,010</b>	<b>233,619</b>	<b>(11,391)</b>	<b>241,997</b>	<b>8,378</b>
<b>Total Debt Outstanding</b>	<b>736,848</b>	<b>783,545</b>	<b>46,698</b>	<b>863,893</b>	<b>80,347</b>
<b>Annual Debt Service</b>	<b>43,112</b>	<b>51,365</b>	<b>8,254</b>	<b>57,038</b>	<b>5,673</b>

- (1) Primarily the Lerner Family Health & Wellness Center, Cloyd H. Marvin Center, Mount Vernon Athletic facilities and Smith Center.
- (2) Assets of the endowment fund.
- (3) Primarily the National Traffic Safety Board facility at the Virginia Campus.
- (4) Equates to approximately 70% percent of total at FY 08 and 71% percent at FY 11.
- (5) Increases from FY05 to FY08 excludes \$65 million in internal advances.
- (6) Increase from FY08 to FY11 primarily due to Pelham Hall, School Without Walls and the Smith Center.

# Funding the FY 2009 Capital Budget

- About 75 percent of the spending will be funded by debt.
- This is lower than the 86 percent reflected in last year's capital budget as a result of the additional emphasis on fundraising.
- Contributions and endowment payout will fund 14 percent of spending, up from 1 percent last year.

# Link Between the Capital and Operating Budget

- Projects in the capital budget affect future operating budgets in multiple ways:
  - Costs of debt service
  - Operating costs of new buildings
  - Costs of equipment
  - Costs of staffing new buildings

# Science and Engineering Complex and the Operating Budget

- Science and engineering complex would be a major new capital project with significant effects.
- Little or no slack to finance costs in the current operating budget (see next page).
- Additional revenue sources are required.

University Operating Budget	FY 2009
Revenue	Budgeted
Student Tuition & Fees	\$583,228
Less University Funded Scholarships	-\$148,334
Non-Tuition Revenue	\$140,229
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$575,123</b>
<b>Expenses</b>	
Salaries & Wages	\$290,912
Fringe Benefits	\$69,167
Compensation	\$360,079
Purchased Services	\$77,686
Supplies	\$7,987
Equipment	\$15,374
Bad Debt	\$3,000
Occupancy	\$45,264
Scholarships & Fellowships	\$8,963
Communications	\$4,679
Travel and Training	\$11,068
Other	\$13,761
NonCompensation Expense	\$187,782
<b>Total Expense</b>	<b>\$547,861</b>
Operating Surplus	\$27,262
<b>OTHER (DECREASES) INCREASES IN NET ASSETS</b>	
Debt Service & Mandatory Purposes	-\$53,087
Endowment Support	\$34,528
Capital Expenditures	-\$10,991
Support/Investment	\$2,288
Endowment Suppt+Capital Exp.+Suppt/Investment	\$25,825
Total Other (Decreases) Increases in Net Assets	-\$27,262
Operating Expense + Changes in Net Assets	
<b>Net Operating Results</b>	<b>\$0</b>

# An Illustration

- Estimate of building cost
  - A precise cost estimate is not yet available.
  - A current “best guess” is that cost per square foot would equal approximately \$400 to \$600 per square foot
    - Includes items such as built-ins, instructional space
    - Does not include specialized scientific equipment associated with research activities
  - If building is 450,000 square feet, this translates into a building cost of \$180 to \$270 million.
- Sources of financing
  - For the complex
    - Revenue from Square 54
    - Increased Cost Recovery
    - Increased Giving
  - For research equipment
    - Sponsored research

# A Simple Budget Scenario

- Assumptions
  - Construction starts in 2011
  - Construction costs = \$250 million
  - Construction costs are debt-financed
    - Assumed amortization period: 30 years
    - Assumed interest rate: 6 percent
- Budgetary impact of construction :
  - Add to the cost of debt service in the University budget by approximately \$18 million per year.
- Budgetary impact of operations and maintenance
  - One guess: \$14 per square foot = \$6.3 million per year
- Total impact of construction and operations:
  - \$24.3 million per year budget gap that would need to be financed.

# Financing the Gap: I

- Square 54 addition to the endowment equals \$162 million
  - Assuming a 4.4 percent payout, this would yield \$7.1 million;
- Revenue from increased cost recovery
  - If the Science and Engineering complex led to a 50% increase in revenue from cost recovery above current levels reported in the University budget, that would yield an additional \$5 million;
- Under these assumptions there would be an annual gap remaining to be covered on the order of \$10 to 12 million per year.

# Financing the Gap: II

- Increased fundraising can reduce or eliminate the projected gap by reducing the amount of funds that would need to be borrowed for construction costs.
- In the previous illustration, the \$10 to \$12 million annual gap would be eliminated if the amount required to be debt-financed was \$150 million instead of \$250 million.
- This would require increased gifts and contributions raised directly for the building of \$100 million.

# Other Funding Issues

- In February, GWU Board of Trustees will be asked to approve spending of \$10 million for planning of the building.
- Amount would initially come from GWU cash reserves and not be reflected in operating budget.
- If approved, the amount would be a deferred expense to be included in the cost of the building itself.

# Caveats

- Calculations above are illustrative and are not actual projections.
- Calculations focus on construction and operating costs.
  - Do not include estimated cost of research equipment
  - Do not include estimated costs of hiring additional science and engineering faculty
- Thus, budget illustration is best seen as providing orders of magnitude of budgetary impact associated with construction and physical costs of operating the building.
- Assessing the full budgetary impact of the proposed Science and Engineering complex will require that multiple factors be taken into account.
- But, simple example illustrates that relative to the current university operating budget, financing needs will be significant, and major increase in gifts will be needed.

# Conclusion

- Building a science and engineering complex poses budgetary challenges
  - Part of next phase of planning should be more detailed analysis of the “moving parts”
    - Costs of building
    - Costs of operating
    - Costs of research equipment
    - Costs of staffing
  - Analysis of options for phasing in construction to match availability of financial resources
- But, budgetary challenges should also be placed in the context of a broader plan for the University
  - 20 year campus plan
  - Proposal to Board of trustees for significant expansion of full-time faculty requiring additional office space.

## REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

November 14, 2008

Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr., Chair

On behalf of the Executive Committee I offer the following report:

### I. ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

#### *Resolutions*

Resolution 08/3, "A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Organization Plan with Regard to the Composition of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee," was adopted by the Faculty Assembly on October 3, 2008. This Resolution was also approved by the Board of Trustees at its meeting on October 17, 2008.

#### *SPHHS Compliance with the Faculty Code*

On May 6, 2008, the Executive Committee sent a memorandum to Dean Ruth J. Katz of the School of Public Health and Health Services (SPHHS). The Executive Committee's memorandum requested that Dean Katz provide, not later than September 19, 2008, a detailed, comprehensive plan that will bring SPHHS into compliance with Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code within a reasonable period of time not to exceed five years. Article I.B.1. requires that at least 75% of the regular, active-status faculty within a School must hold tenured or tenure-accruing positions, and that at least 50% of the regular, active-status faculty within each department must hold tenured or tenure-accruing positions. The Faculty Senate has been seeking SPHHS' compliance with Article I.B.1. since April 12, 2002, when the Senate adopted Resolution 01/11 (which called upon SPHHS to develop a plan to achieve compliance by the end of 2007).

On September 24, 2008, Interim Dean Josef J. Reum of SPHHS submitted a plan to bring SPHHS into compliance with Article I.B.1. within the requested five-year period. The Executive Committee has referred this compliance plan to a Special Joint Committee on Compliance by SPHHS with the Faculty Code (which was originally established in December 2006). The Executive Committee has asked the Joint Subcommittee to review and evaluate the compliance plan, and to advise the Executive Committee whether the plan is feasible and is reasonably designed to enable SPHHS to achieve compliance with the Faculty Code by 2013. The Executive Committee has also asked the Special Joint Subcommittee to advise whether the procedures that SPHHS intends to follow for future searches for faculty members and academic administrative officers will comply with Parts B and C of the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code. The Executive Committee expects to receive a report from the Special Joint Subcommittee in the near future.

In addition, the Executive Committee has discussed with Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald Lehman the upcoming search for a new Dean of SPHHS. The Executive Committee has emphasized the importance of conducting the Dean's search in full compliance with Part C.2. of the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code. The Executive Committee has expressed its great concern about this matter, because

previous searches for the Dean of SPHHS did not comply with the procedures mandated by the Faculty Code.

*Reports by the Chair of the Executive Committee*

The Report of the Chair of the Executive Committee to the Board of Trustees' Academic Affairs Committee, dated September 30, 2008, is attached to this report.

II. PERSONNEL MATTERS

Two faculty grievances, both from Columbian College, are currently in the hearing stage.

III. OTHER MATTERS

*Undergraduate Advising*

The Faculty Senate Educational Policy Committee has agreed to investigate the issue of undergraduate advising and to make recommendations to the Executive Committee.

*Class Attendance Policy*

Executive Vice President Lehman has advised the Executive Committee that the Class Attendance Policy, as amended after consultation with the Educational Policy Committee, will be published and implemented.

*Faculty Salary Equity Survey*

Executive Vice President Lehman has informed the Executive Committee that the next faculty salary equity survey will not be published until the spring of 2010, due to other projects that are currently being addressed by Institutional Research. The Executive Committee has requested that the faculty salary equity survey be completed not later than May 1, 2010. Within the next few months, Vice President Lehman plans to present to the ASPP Committee a gender-based breakout of the faculty salary data that GW has reported to the AAUP.

*Reaccreditation of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences*

The Executive Committee discussed the issue of reaccreditation of SMHS with President Knapp and Executive Vice President Lehman at the Executive Committee's meeting on October 24, 2008. President Knapp and Executive Vice President Lehman reported on the University's efforts to resolve the probationary status of SMHS and to achieve reaccreditation within the next 24 months.

*Faculty Assembly*

I have conveyed to President Knapp and Executive Vice President Lehman the Executive Committee's recommendations that, whenever possible, (i) the Faculty Assembly should be scheduled for 2 p.m. on the first Friday in October each year, and (ii) President Knapp should provide a "State of the University" address as a centerpiece of the Assembly's proceedings.

*Interim Reports by Committee Chairs*

Chairs of Standing Committees of the Faculty Senate should submit their interim reports not later than the Faculty Senate's meeting on December 12, 2008.

**IV. NEXT MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Because of the Thanksgiving holiday, the next meeting of the Executive Committee will be held on Friday, November 21, 2008, at noon. Resolutions, reports, or other matters for consideration at the Faculty Senate's meeting on December 12th should be submitted to the Executive Committee before November 21st.

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr.  
Chair, Faculty Senate Executive Committee

**FACULTY SENATE REPORT TO THE  
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS OF THE  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
September 30, 2008**

Since its last report to the Committee on Academic Affairs, the Faculty Senate has met twice, on May 9 and September 12, 2008.

**ACTION ITEMS**

**FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS**

At the first two meetings of the 2008-2009 Session, the Faculty Senate considered three resolutions. Two resolutions were adopted without amendments, and the third resolution was tabled. Following are summaries of the two adopted resolutions:

***“A Resolution to Amend the Time Limitation on Reporting of Final Grades by Faculty Members”***

This resolution was adopted by the Faculty Senate on May 9, 2008. It provides for an extension of the previous 72-hour requirement for the reporting of final grades. The resolution proposes that final grades should be reported within five working days after the final examination has been given. The Administration has accepted this resolution, and the new time limitation will be observed beginning this academic year.

***“A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Organization Plan with regard to the Composition of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee”***

This resolution proposes an amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan to correct a technical error that currently appears in the document with respect to the composition of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The Faculty Senate adopted this resolution on September 12, 2008. As required by the Faculty Organization Plan, the proposed amendment will be submitted to the Faculty Assembly for its approval on October 3, 2008, and, if approved, will be forwarded to the President for presentation to the Board of Trustees.

**REPORTS TO THE FACULTY SENATE**

During the first two meetings of the 2008-2009 session, the Executive Committee arranged for the Faculty Senate to receive (i) a report from Professor Joe Cordes, Chair of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, concerning the University’s current and projected operating budgets, and (ii) a report from Associate Vice President Adrienne Rulnick concerning the Administration’s efforts to enhance the quality of its alumni programs.

## **STATUS OF FACULTY PERSONNEL MATTERS**

### **Nonconcurrences**

The Executive Committee did not receive any administrative nonconcurrences with faculty personnel recommendations during the 2007-2008 academic year.

### **Grievances**

During the 2007-2008 academic year, one grievance originating in the School of Engineering and Applied Science was heard by a Hearing Committee of the Faculty Senate's Dispute Resolution Committee. The Hearing Committee dismissed the grievance, and that dismissal was upheld on appeal by the Dispute Resolution Committee. As of the date of this report, two grievances originating in Columbian College of Arts and Sciences are in the hearing stage.

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

### **SPHHS Compliance with the Faculty Code**

On May 6, 2008, the Executive Committee sent a memorandum to Dean Ruth J. Katz of the School of Public Health and Health Services (SPHHS). The Executive Committee's memorandum requested that Dean Katz provide, not later than September 19, 2008, a detailed, comprehensive plan that will bring SPHHS into compliance with Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code within a reasonable period of time not to exceed five years. Article I.B.1. requires that at least 75% of the regular, active-status faculty within a School must hold tenured or tenure-accruing positions, and that at least 50% of the regular, active-status faculty within each department must hold tenured or tenure-accruing positions. The Faculty Senate has been seeking SPHHS' compliance with Article I.B.1. since April 12, 2002, when the Senate adopted Resolution 01/11 (which called upon SPHHS to develop a plan to achieve compliance by the end of 2007).

On September 24, 2008, Interim Dean Josef J. Reum of SPHHS submitted a plan to bring SPHHS into compliance with Article I.B.1. within the requested five-year period. The Executive Committee has referred this compliance plan to a Special Joint Committee on Compliance by SPHHS with the Faculty Code (which was originally established in December 2006). The Executive Committee has asked the Joint Subcommittee to review and evaluate the compliance plan, and to advise the Executive Committee whether the plan is feasible and is reasonably designed to enable SPHHS to achieve compliance with the Faculty Code by 2013. The Executive Committee has also asked the Special Joint Subcommittee to advise whether the procedures that SPHHS intends to follow for future searches for faculty members and academic administrative officers will comply with Parts B and C of the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code.

### **Assignments to Standing Committees**

In accordance with its customary practice, the Executive Committee has forwarded to the Chair of each Standing Committee of the Faculty Senate a list of assignments for the 2008-2009

session. Those assignments include the following requests:

**Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management**

Consult with the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee regarding the impact of the University's admissions and financial aid policies on the University's operating budget.

**Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies**

Continue discussion of the appropriate weighting of faculty scholarship, teaching and service for purposes of tenure and promotion decisions and salary increases.

**Athletics and Recreation**

Consider re-establishment of a University-wide Steering Committee to review matters related to intercollegiate athletics.

**Educational Policy**

Consult on matters related to undergraduate education with the University Steering Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum (Dean Peg Barratt and Professor Gary Simon, Co-Chairs) and the Senate Special Committee on Educational Quality (Professor Donald Parsons, Chair). In addition, consider possible reforms to undergraduate academic advising.

**Faculty Development, including Academic and Administrative Support**

Consider the institutional involvement of emeriti faculty with GW. In addition, review the type and quality of administrative and technical support currently provided to faculty members at the school level.

**Fiscal Planning and Budgeting**

Prepare reports on the University's five-year operating and capital budgets. In addition, (i) review the impact on the University's budgets of current building projects, including Square 54 and the Science and Engineering Complex, and (ii) participate in the Budget Working Group, which is jointly chaired by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Executive Vice President and Treasurer.

**Honors and Academic Convocations**

Advise the President on nominations for honorary degrees, and consider procedures for faculty involvement in the approval process for awards given by departments, schools, or other units of the University to individuals other than students or faculty.

**Libraries Committee**

Consider draft resolution with respect to copyright clearances. In addition, consider (jointly with the Research Committee) the issue of whether the University should adopt a policy, as Harvard University has done, to require faculty members to make their scholarly articles available for free online access through a web portal established by the University.

**Physical Facilities**

Review the faculty's involvement in the University's decision-making procedures for construction of new buildings and implementation of the Campus Plan, including the Science and Engineering Complex. In addition, review the University's arrangements for

cleaning and maintaining facilities and dealing with safety issues and fire and environmental hazards.

### **Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom**

Consider possible resolution to amend the Faculty Code with regard to procedures for selecting academic administrative officers within Schools.

### **Research**

Discuss research funding issues with members of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee. In addition, consider (jointly with the Libraries Committee) whether the University should adopt a policy requiring free online access to scholarly articles produced by faculty members.

### **University and Urban Affairs**

Plan and support programs to bring together University faculty members and administrators with D.C. governmental leaders, citizen groups and members of the Foggy Bottom community. In addition, continue to work on expanding opportunities for the involvement of students and faculty members in community outreach and service projects.

### **Joint Committee of Faculty and Students**

Review problems resulting from the scheduling of final examinations outside the authorized dates established by the Registrar's Office, and consider preparation and distribution of a survey to faculty members on final examination practices.

## **Appointment of Special Committees**

In addition, the Executive Committee has recently established two special committees and has given those committees the following assignments:

### **Special Ad Hoc Committee on Financial and Operational Planning for the Science and Engineering Complex**

In May 2008, the Executive Committee established a Special Ad Hoc Committee on Financial and Operational Planning for the Science and Engineering Complex (SEC). The Executive Committee asked the Special Committee to report back to the Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate after analyzing the following issues:

- (i) the projected size and scope of the SEC;
- (ii) the projected costs of building the SEC and providing the SEC with the requisite equipment and furnishings;
- (iii) the anticipated sources of funding to meet those costs; and
- (iv) the projected impact of the SEC on the University's operational and capital budgets during the next several years.

President Knapp, Executive Vice President Lehman and Executive Vice President Katz met with the Special Committee on June 18, 2008. President Knapp also agreed to appoint two members of the Special Committee – Professor Joe Cordes and Professor Hermann Helgert – to serve on a special committee established by the Board of Trustees to develop plans for the SEC.

The Executive Committee received a progress report from the Special Committee in July. The Executive Committee has asked the Special Committee to present a second progress report to the Faculty Senate at its meeting on November 14, 2008, in conjunction with a report on the University's operating and capital budgets, which will be presented by the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee.

### **Special Joint Subcommittee on Educational Quality**

Also in May 2008, the Executive Committee established a Special Joint Subcommittee on Educational Quality. As requested by the Executive Committee, the Subcommittee is examining a variety of issues involving the recruitment and retention of highly qualified undergraduate students, including issues related to admissions policies, financial aid, faculty resources and other academic resources that are needed to enhance the quality of the University's undergraduate academic programs. The Subcommittee will report its findings to the following Committees of the Faculty Senate: the Committee on Admissions Policy, Enrollment Management, and Student Financial Aid, the Committee on Educational Policy, and the Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr.  
Chair, Faculty Senate Executive Committee