

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
DECEMBER 14, 2007 IN THE STATE ROOM

Present: Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman, Registrar Amundson, and Parliamentarian Johnson; Dean Barratt; Professors Becker, Biles, Castleberry, Cordes, Corry, Costanza, Delaney, Englander, Gallo, Galston, Garris, Griffith, Harrington, Helgert, Johnson, Pagel, Parsons, Robinson, Rycroft, Simon, Wade, Wilmarth, Wirtz, and Yezer

Absent: President Knapp; Deans Brown, Futrell, Katz, Lawrence, Phillips, Scott, Tong, and Whitaker; Professors Artz, Marotta, and Pelzman

The meeting was called to order by Vice President Lehman at 3:15 p.m. He announced that he was substituting at the meeting for President Knapp, who regretted that he could not attend due to a temporary illness. Vice President Lehman also requested that Senate members sit in the tiered seats facing the head table, and that speakers use microphones in the room.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on November 9, 2007 were approved as distributed.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION 07/4, "A RESOLUTION CONCERNING SECONDARY APPOINTMENTS FOR REGULAR, ACTIVE-STATUS FACULTY MEMBERS"

On behalf of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF), Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr. introduced Resolution 07/4. Professor Wilmarth said it had come to the Committee's attention during the fall semester that an increasing number of schools are granting secondary (sometimes called "courtesy") appointments to faculty members from other schools. This is also occurring between departments in the same school.

Presently, there is no reference to secondary appointments in the Faculty Code, nor is there any discussion of the procedure to be followed for such appointments. As the University is likely to undertake even more interdisciplinary research in the future, the PEAF Committee thought it was important to include in the Code a provision that would recognize the legitimacy of and outline the appropriate procedures for such appointments.

Professor Wilmarth reviewed key points of Resolution 07/4. Secondary appointments would be available only to regular, active-status faculty. As is the case with other faculty appointments, secondary appointments must be recommended by the

appropriate faculty and administration officers, and these recommendations must be transmitted to the Executive President for Academic Affairs. Professor Wilmarth added that the Executive Vice President might choose to issue certain additional rules and procedures relating to these secondary appointments.

Professor Wilmarth explained that, under Resolution 07/4, secondary appointments would not confer tenure, would have a limited renewable term, and would automatically expire at the end of the faculty member's regular, active-status appointment. In addition, the PEAFF Committee felt it very important to specify that a secondary appointment does not itself confer any of the governance rights granted under the Faculty Code or the Faculty Organization Plan in the department or school that provides the secondary appointment. The Resolution does not speak to what such a department or school may do; it simply notes that the Code itself does not provide these rights.

Professor Wilmarth turned the floor over to Professor Garris, Chair of the PEAFF Committee. He said he thought Professor Wilmarth had done a wonderful job describing the deliberations of the Committee, and he expressed appreciation to him for drafting the Resolution. Professor Garris said there had been wide input into discussions on the resolution from within and outside the Committee, including the University General Counsel's office. Professor Garris added that the Committee believes the resolution as framed would promote interdisciplinary research and teaching.

Professor Wirtz asked about the status of existing secondary appointments which were not created with limited terms. Professor Wilmarth said he thought those departments or schools that had granted such appointments would probably be encouraged to clarify the term of existing appointments. Professor Wirtz asked if existing secondary appointments would be grandfathered in the absence of such clarification. Professor Wilmarth said he thought that would be the view of the PEAFF Committee, as Faculty Code amendments are not generally viewed as applying retroactively.

Discussion followed between Professor Cordes, Vice President Lehman, and Professor Wilmarth. Professor Cordes pointed out that there are a large group of faculty with appointments in the Elliott School of International Affairs and Columbian College of Arts and Sciences who presently have voting rights in both schools, and he asked if these faculty members would be considered to have secondary appointments referenced in the Resolution. Professor Wilmarth said he understood that there are a limited number of such joint appointments at the University and he understood that normally these were regular, active status faculty appointments with budgetary contributions from both schools. Vice President Lehman said he had just become aware that there were appointments in existence that did not fit this model. In fact, there are only three individuals with true joint appointments across schools, where part of their total salary is paid by each school.

Professor Simon said he was not comfortable with the idea of a limited term for secondary appointments even if they could be renewed, and that departments should decide this issue in addition to whether faculty members should have voting rights or serve on committees. Professor Wilmarth responded that although the Resolution proposes Faculty Code language specifying that secondary appointments are not regular, active-status appointments which convey governance rights, governance privileges can be granted by

departments or schools. Professor Griffith spoke in favor of having the Resolution amended to make it clearer that such governance rights could be granted by departments or schools. Further discussion followed, with Professor Garris speaking in favor of limited terms for secondary appointments.

Professor Simon moved that the phrase in the Resolving Clause “for a limited renewable term.” be removed, and the motion was seconded. Professor Parsons spoke in opposition to the amendment, favoring a limited term, as did Professor Robinson. Professor Helgert spoke in opposition to the amendment, but added that he thought the limited term should be quantified. Professor Wilmarth said that this issue had been discussed by the PEAFC Committee, and that departments would need to decide issues of term limits as well as how many times an appointment could be renewed.

Professor Englander spoke in favor of changing the phrase “limited term” to “specified term” rather than removing the phrase entirely. Professor Galston agreed with Professor Englander, and Professor Simon accepted this language as a friendly amendment to his motion. Professor Galston also proposed that the last sentence of the Resolving Clause be amended to read “A secondary appointment lasts for the term specified by the department or school making the appointment, but terminates automatically upon expiration of its specified term ...” Discussion followed. Professor Wilmarth suggested that the language of the last sentence of the Resolving Clause should remain as written, except that the word “stated” should be replaced by the word “specified.” This was also accepted as a friendly amendment by Professor Simon. The question was called, a vote was taken, and the Simon amendment to Resolution 07/4 passed.

Further discussion on the Resolution followed. In the phrase, “A secondary appointment does not confer any of the rights ...” Professor Griffith moved that the word “automatically” be inserted before “confer,” and the motion was seconded. Following remarks by Professor Englander, Professor Wilmarth proposed a friendly amendment (accepted by Professor Griffith) concerning the ability of departments or schools to confer governance rights not conveyed by the Faculty Code, with the final language of this amendment to read as follows; “A secondary appointment does not automatically confer any of the rights provided by the Faculty Code and the Faculty Organization Plan to participate in faculty governance in the department or school that granted the secondary appointment, but the granting unit may confer governance rights with the approval of that unit’s voting faculty.” [Underlines indicate final amendments.]

The question was called on the motion, a vote was taken, and the second amendment to Resolution 07/4 passed.

Further discussion of Resolution 07/4 ensued. Professor Cordes again spoke in favor of very clearly defining secondary appointments. At present, quite a number of arrangements are in place for faculty appointments in more than one department or school, apparently without term limitations, with and without governance rights, some of which are budgeted to one school, and others to both departments or schools. It is not clear whether or not these existing appointments would be considered secondary or not. Professor Wirtz also spoke in favor of clarity in defining exactly what a secondary appointment is and

resolving ambiguities in the Resolution. He moved to remand the Resolution, and the motion was seconded. Professor Becker spoke in favor of a remand, as did Professor Englander. Professor Garris said it seemed to him that the issue of joint appointments had been discussed by the PEAFF Committee and it seemed a very complex issue; any reconsideration of Resolution 07/4 should include that issue.

Professor Wilmarth said he thought that if a remand were to be successful, the PEAFF Committee would have to receive considerable direction from Academic Affairs and the school deans, because it is not clear that there is a common understanding of what constitutes a joint or even secondary faculty appointment. Vice President Lehman said he thought there is a category of faculty appointments that do not yet have a designation; while the definition of a joint appointment is related to budgetary issues, there are others, particularly in the Elliott School, that have been considered secondary appointments, again, in relation to budgetary ties. He added that his office was available to assist the inquiry in any way possible.

Professor Cordes spoke in favor of the remand, and Professor Griffith spoke in favor of a logical examination of faculty appointments now in force between departments and schools, whether they are considered joint or secondary, as part of the remand.

The question was called, a vote was taken, and the motion to remand Resolution 07/4 [as amended] to Committee passed. (Resolution 07/4 is attached.)

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

UNIVERSITY BUDGET OVERVIEW

Professor Joseph J. Cordes, Chair of the Senate Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee distributed the Committee's Report, which is attached. [Professor Cordes noted at the outset that, as information in the Report was drawn from several sources, page numbering in the report following page 16 is not sequential.] The Report provides an overview of the University Budget for Fiscal Years 2007 through 2010, along with a description of the annual budgeting framework. A description of measures used to close the budget "gap" in FY 2007 is included in the Report, along with a table setting forth budgeted versus actual revenue, expense, and operating results for FY 2007. Also included is information on other changes in actual and budgeted net assets, along with a chart of actual and budgeted net asset changes.

The Report contains projected figures for FY 2008 along with budgeted versus projected revenue, budgeted versus actual expense, and budgeted versus actual net changes in net assets. It also contains planning assumptions for FY 08 – FY 10 in the areas of enrollment, pricing (tuition), financial aid assumptions, faculty and staff compensation, and projected budget gaps. The Report concludes with a summary of longer term budget issues facing the University.

Professor Cordes began his presentation by saying that information contained in the report does not include the Medical Center. The focus of the report is on the operating rather than the capital budget, which is separately reported. Information contained in the Report was obtained from documents presented to the Board of Trustees, or posted on the Budget Office website at: <http://www.gwu.edu/~univbud/>.

Professor Cordes reported that University Budgets must balance before receiving approval by the Board of Trustees. In FY 2007, there was a projected gap of \$8.2 million, which was addressed as described in the Report, by savings from non-academic units of \$3.2 million, 2.4 million in reduced funding from the operating budget for capital projects, and \$2.6 million in reductions in interest rate and investment property reserves. A \$2 million reserve was also set aside from academic budgets, with \$1 million to be used for one-time strategic initiatives if FY '07 budget targets were met, and \$1 million for unanticipated budget shortfalls.

Summarizing actual results versus budget projections, Professor Cordes reported that net tuition and fees for FY '07 amounted to \$16 million above budget; indirect cost recoveries (from research) were better than expected, as were revenues from auxiliary enterprises, and academic programs, such as the Speech and Hearing Clinic. Contributions also increased, particularly restricted gifts. On the expense side, compensation came in below budget, as did bad debt collection and other expenses. However, purchased services exceeded budget projections by \$14 million. At the end of FY '07, the final amount of actual (versus budgeted) net asset changes totaled \$19.6 million.

Professor Cordes then reviewed information provided for FY 2008, when the budget gap is expected to total \$3.9 million. It is expected that approximately one-half this amount will come from administrative budgets, and the other half from academic budgets. Looking ahead to FY 2009 and 2010, assuming that budget projections and planning assumptions set forth in the Report hold true, projected budget gaps should amount to \$2.1 million in FY '09, and \$4.2 million in FY 2010. The Report concludes with a summary of longer term budget issues which include needs/aspirations, and possible sources of financing.

UPDATE ON SQUARE 54 AND THE SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING COMPLEX, AS RELATED TO THE 2008-09 BUDGET

Executive Vice President and Treasurer Louis H. Katz confirmed what he said he thought everyone already knew – the District of Columbia has approved the University's plans both on development of Square 54 and the Campus Plan. While the Foggy Bottom Association has appealed these decisions, the basis for these appeals is not clear yet because District procedure does not require the basis for an appeal to be stated when it is filed. Vice President Katz expressed optimism that, if all goes favorably, the University hopes to break ground on Square 54 this calendar year following closing with the development firm, which has already filed some of the permit applications for the site.

The planning process for the Science and Engineering Complex is underway. Because this building will occupy the space where the Parking Garage presently stands, some 1250 parking spaces will need to be replaced. 178 will be constructed below grade at the new residence hall/School Without Walls site on F Street, and an additional 362 spaces

for exclusive University use will be made available at the Square 54 site. Another 450 spaces will probably be constructed under the Science and Engineering Complex. A formal transition plan will have to be filed with the District to provide for parking. Vice President Katz said it is likely that daytime parkers will have to use the Kennedy Center parking garage and shuttle service to campus during construction. While final formal proposals for the Complex will have to be submitted to the Board of Trustees for its approval, there is agreement on the concept, and President Knapp has indicated this is a very high priority project. The formal proposal will have to include a detailed plan for the building, programs to be housed there, and the plan funding the project. A major fundraising effort will have to be launched for the Complex to become a reality. Vice President Katz said he thought it very important to mobilize everyone to focus on program and fundraising targets for the new building, because this will determine how quickly the building is completed and the programs to be housed there can be launched.

Professor Helgert asked how soon the University might break ground on this project. Vice President Katz said the University would like to do this within three years, but acknowledged this is a very aggressive target. Construction time for the building will likely take at least two years. Everything considered, Vice President Katz said he thought it would be some six to eight years before the building is ready for occupancy.

Professor Griffith inquired about the expected size of the income stream from the Square 54 developer once the closing takes place. Vice President Katz indicated he could not answer this question at present, but he presumed the amount would become public following the closing. Professor Englander asked about use of these funds, and Vice President Katz responded that, since Square 54 will be an endowment investment for 60 years before the property reverts to GW, the money will be placed in the University's endowment until the Board of Trustees designates exactly how the money will be spent. Professor Biles said that at various points, indications were that the full amount of the income stream from Square 54 would be devoted completely to construction of the Science and Engineering Complex, but now he understood that this money would instead go into the endowment. He asked what the current ballpark amount is that needs to be raised to build the Complex at the size currently projected. Vice President Katz responded that it was premature to project the amount before the cost of construction and start-up for the program side was worked out. Just because the income stream from Square 54 will initially be placed in the endowment does not mean that ultimately it will not be used for the Complex. The Board of Trustees has been very supportive overall of this initiative, but they cannot in good conscience be expected to approve something before they know exactly what it is. Professor Biles asked if it was fair to say the anticipated amount required for the Complex could exceed \$100 million. Vice President Katz said he thought that was possible. Professor Cordes said he understood that a combination of revenue from Square 54 and fundraising could be used to fund development of the Complex, but he thought it was really important for either the Budget Working Group or the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee to be informed about and understand the choices and tradeoffs under consideration as the process moves forward.

Discussion followed. Vice President Katz pointed out that the University could anticipate an increase in research once the Complex was complete and an increase in indirect cost recoveries could probably be expected from that. Professor Englander

inquired about the involvement of faculty members from the various schools which will use the Complex. Vice President Lehman responded that the macroscopic legwork on this planning has been underway for over a year, involving a group of science and engineering faculty along with the appropriate deans; this group has already produced a concept report.

Discussion followed between Professor Yezer and Vice President Katz about the University's cost of construction [particularly for residence halls], which Professor Yezer insisted was high in contrast with comparable institutions so that new dormitories at GWU cost 40% more than new dormitories at Georgetown University, raising the question of why students would pay so much more to attend GWU. Vice President Katz responded that he thought that construction cost index figures do not really reflect the type of construction undertaken in detail; the University does take into account costs at comparable institutions before going forward with these projects.

Professor Englander noted that Harvard University has now announced that it will reduce tuition, and other schools have begun to announce their responses. As a tuition-driven institution, Professor Englander asked how GW would respond to this initiative. Vice President Katz noted that educational institutions with larger endowments than GW tend to have more flexibility in this regard, but that GW would be looking at how it will continue to provide a quality education and improve program access for students. There will be continued pressure to deal with the loan program which will be difficult because at present GW does not have great depth in financial aid dollars. In addition to examining financial aid options, ultimately there will probably need to be specific fundraising for scholarships, as students leave the University with a lot of debt.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. NOMINATION FOR ELECTION TO SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Professor Robinson moved the nomination for election of Professor Ellen M. Dawson to the Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies. The nomination was approved.

II. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Robinson presented the Report of the Executive Committee, which is enclosed. As this was Professor Gallo's last Senate meeting, Professor Robinson said that although a formal tribute would be forthcoming [as is customary for retiring faculty members who have served on the Senate] she wanted to take the opportunity to thank Professor Gallo for her outstanding service. She commended Professor Gallo for her wisdom, calm when it was most needed, and incredible hard work. She added that the Senate really sincerely appreciated Professor Gallo's enormous contributions and that she will be terribly missed. Professor Robinson's remarks were followed by a round of applause, after which Professor Gallo said that she was humbled by these remarks, and that her years at GW had been a very good ride, particularly because it provided the opportunity to work with dedicated faculty such as those who serve on the Faculty Senate.

III. INTERIM REPORTS OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Interim reports from the Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies Committee and the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students were distributed at the meeting. (The Reports are attached.)

Professor Helgert, Chair of the Physical Facilities Committee, said that the Committee had been asked to investigate the issue of the availability of classrooms for special purposes following Professor Yezer's recent report that he had not been able to reserve a classroom space for a special class review session. Professor Helgert was referred by Associate Vice President for Academic Planning Craig Linebaugh to Registrar Amundson, who researched the issue and provided a comprehensive report to the Committee. Professor Helgert asked Registrar Amundson to summarize her report.

Registrar Amundson said she thought it was unfortunate when a dedicated faculty member who wishes to conduct a weekend review session cannot reserve suitable classroom space. She then commented on two sets of circumstances encountered by Professor Yezer. First, on the Saturday in question, there were quite a number of events scheduled on campus, as is common on most weekends. On this particular weekend, two student organizations had reserved large spaces for their activities. All four of the large general purpose classrooms which would have met Professor Yezer's requirements had been properly reserved by the Parliamentary Debate Society and the International Affairs Society, both registered student groups. Outside participants were invited to attend these functions, and a sizeable fee was paid for the use of the rooms.

Secondly, policies for the use of classroom space overseen by the Registrar's Office are administered with a view toward advancing the enhancement of student engagement and learning through academic challenge and providing a rigorous intellectual environment that permeates every aspect of student life. This is goal one of the University's Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence. Similarly, goal four calls upon the University to encourage the development of a strong sense of community. Registrar Amundson said she thought that as a policy matter, accommodating the space requests of both of the student organizations for the scheduled activities was appropriate. Beyond that, no reservations are confirmed for any activities in classrooms until after the beginning of the semester, because it is understood that classes come first and there are changes in room assignments and added courses up to the second week of the semester. Once classroom scheduling is complete, classroom space is made available for reservation by registered student groups, departments, or individual faculty members. It is also the Registrar's policy that confirmed reservations cannot be cancelled in order to accommodate a later request.

Discussion followed. Registrar Amundson explained that the University rents space to non-profit organizations only, due to the University's tax status. Professor Robinson said she understood the policy as explained, but she had encountered the same problem in trying to schedule a class review session. She asked if there were any way that a number of classrooms could be set aside for classroom use on weekends. Registrar Amundson responded that this is not impossible, but it is really a matter of deciding on priorities. On most weekends, the large classrooms are usually scheduled for part or all of the day. A

decision could be made not to do this, and the tradeoff could be that the rooms would remain empty, even if faculty, departments, or student organizations needed space. Potentially, revenue associated with the rental of these spaces would be foregone, and access to activities of interest to the University community would be curtailed. Discussion followed by Professors Cordes, Galston, Griffith, and Gallo, who suggested that rather than altering current policy, it might be helpful if faculty members could schedule their review sessions at the beginning of the semester rather than later on.

Professor Cordes reported that a joint subcommittee of the Committee on Libraries and the FP&B Committee would be formulating specific proposals concerning library collections, and these should be ready to report to the Senate in the spring semester.

IV. CHAIR'S REMARKS

Vice President Lehman conveyed President Knapp's good wishes to everyone for a very pleasant holiday break, a sentiment in which he joined.

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

There were no brief statements or questions.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

**A RESOLUTION CONCERNING SECONDARY APPOINTMENTS FOR
REGULAR, ACTIVE-STATUS FACULTY MEMBERS (07/4)**

WHEREAS, certain schools within the University have granted secondary appointments (sometimes called courtesy appointments) to regular, active-status faculty members who hold their primary appointments in other schools: and

WHEREAS, certain departments within a single school have granted secondary appointments to regular, active-status faculty members who hold their primary appointments in other departments within the same school;

WHEREAS, secondary appointments can encourage and facilitate interdisciplinary collaboration among faculty members from different schools or departments; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Code does not refer to secondary appointments; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that it would be desirable to amend the Faculty Code to provide explicit authorization for secondary appointments; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that a secondary appointment should not confer any of the rights to participate in faculty governance that are provided under the Faculty Code and the Faculty Organization Plan;
NOW, THEREFORE

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

That the Faculty Code be amended by adding the following new subsection at the end of Article I.B.:

- 6. Secondary Appointments:** A faculty member holding a regular, active-status appointment in one department or school may be granted a secondary appointment (sometimes called a courtesy appointment) in another department or school for a ~~limited~~ specified renewable term. A secondary appointment shall require the recommendation of the appropriate faculty and officers of administration of the unit granting the appointment and shall comply with rules and procedures for secondary appointments established by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. A secondary appointment does not automatically confer any of the rights provided by the Faculty Code and the Faculty Organization

Plan to participate in faculty governance in the department or school that granted the secondary appointment, but the granting unit may confer governance rights with the approval of that unit's voting faculty. A secondary appointment terminates automatically upon expiration of its ~~stated~~-specified term or upon termination of the faculty member's regular, active-status appointment.

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
December 5, 2007

Remanded to Committee with amendments December 14, 2007

University Budget Overview
Past: FY 2007
Present: FY 2008
Future: 2009, 2010, & Beyond

Joseph Cordes
Chair, Faculty Senate Committee on
Fiscal Planning and Budgeting
Dec. 14, 2007

Outline

- Fiscal year 2007
 - Closing the projected budget gap
 - Fiscal year 2007: Budgeted & Actual
- Fiscal year 2008
 - Budget projections
 - Actual performance through 1st Quarter
- Fiscal years 2009 and 2010
- Broader budget issues

Comments and Caveats

- Data on operating budgets, expenses, and “gaps” refer to “university budget” which does not include the medical center.
- Focus on operating budget, not capital budget
- Information is taken from documents either presented to Trustees, or posted on budget office website:

<http://www.gwu.edu/~univbud/>

Annual Budgeting Framework

- Submission to Board of Trustees of budget that must be balanced
- Budget balance: budgeted (projected)
Operating Results (next slide) must equal \$0
- When budget projections indicate that Operating Results < \$0 there is a budget gap
- Budget gap needs to be addressed in order for budget to be approved.

The Budgeting Framework II

(Approved FY 2007 Example)

	Budgeted		
Operating Revenue	\$509.4		
Operating Expense	\$469.9		
(Operating Revenue - Operating Expense)	\$39.4		
Other Decreases (Increases) in Net Assets	-\$39.4		
Operating Results	\$0.0		

Fiscal Year 2007: Closing the Gap

- Projected gap for FY 2007 of 8.2 million
- Actions taken to address the gap
 - Budget savings from non-academic units (\$3.2m)
 - Reduced funding from operating budget for capital projects (\$2.4 m)
 - Reduction in interest rate and investment property reserves (\$2.6 m)
 - Creation of \$2 million reserve for future budget contingencies from funds set aside from academic budgets
 - \$1 million to be used for one-time strategic initiatives if FY 2007 budget targets were met
 - \$1 million held in reserve for unanticipated budget shortfalls.

FY 2007: Budgeted vs. Actual

	Budgeted	Actual	Difference
Operating Revenue	\$509.4	\$544.3	\$34.9
Operating Expense	\$469.9	\$473.9	\$4.0
(Operating Revenue - Operating Expense)	\$39.4	\$70.5	\$31.1
Other Decreases (Increases) in Net Assets	-\$39.4	-\$59.0	-\$19.6
Operating Results	\$0.0	\$11.5	\$11.5

Differences FY 2007: Actual and Budgeted Revenue

- Net tuition and fees: + **\$16.1million**
 - \$4.7m undergraduate enrollment
 - \$4.0m Law School enrollment
 - \$6.5m graduate (largely off-campus) programs
- Indirect cost recoveries: +\$1.4 million
- Auxiliary Enterprises: + **\$3.1 million**
- Contributions: + **\$7.4 million (net)**
 - + \$8.7 million (restricted)
 - - \$1.3 million (unrestricted)
- Other revenue: + **\$6.9 million**
 - \$1.5m academic programs
 - \$1.5m athletics and recreation
 - \$0.7m concerts & special events
 - \$3.2m refunds + one-time adjustments

Differences FY 2007: Actual and Budgeted Expenses

- Compensation: -\$5.8 million below budget
- Purchased Services: +\$14.0 million above budget
 - \$4.0 million one-time spending for projects funded by additional revenue or carryover prior year budget authority
 - \$3.2 million reallocations from compensation savings for contract personnel
 - \$3.1 million for compliance & legal
 - \$1.5 million for Study Abroad program Expenses
- Bad Debt: - \$3.2 million below budget
- Other expenses: -\$1 million below budget

Other Changes in Net Assets: Budgeted and Actual

	Budgeted	Actual	Difference
Debt Service & Mandatory Purposes	-\$51.4	-\$46.9	\$4.5
Endowment Support	\$30.7	\$31.6	\$0.9
Capital Expenditures	-\$11.2	-\$13.2	-\$2.0
Support/Investment	-\$7.6	-\$30.4	-\$22.9
Total	-\$39.4	-\$59.0	-\$19.6

Differences FY 2007: Actual and Budgeted Net Asset Changes

- Net Changes in Assets: - **\$19.6 million**
 - Lower interest expense: + **\$4.45 million**
 - Added set aside in academic reserves: - **\$11.9 million**
 - \$5.5m for law school capital projects
 - \$3.5m in revenue sharing among academic units
 - \$2.1 million carryover in Strategic plan funding
 - Net increase in capital reserves: -**\$4.9 million**
 - Carryover of FY 07 budget authority: -**\$4.4 million**
 - Establish reserve for housing occupancy: -**\$1 million**
 - Added funding fixed price tuition reserve: -**\$0.7 million**

Fiscal Year 2008

- Projected gap of \$3.9 million
- Actions taken to close the gap
 - \$2 million from administrative budgets
 - \$0.75m from student housing
 - \$0.5m from amount budgeted for bad debt
 - \$0.5m from amounts budgeted for capital reserve
 - \$0.25m reduction in administrative unit budgets
 - \$1.9 million from academic budgets
 - \$1.4 m from increased enrollment estimates
 - \$0.5 m from sequestered funds

FY 2008: Budgeted vs. Actual

	Budgeted	Actual	Difference
Operating Revenue	\$538.8	\$549.3	\$10.5
Operating Expense	\$500.1	\$510.1	\$10.0
(Operating Revenue - Operating Expense)	\$38.7	\$39.2	\$0.5
Other Decreases (Increases) in Net Assets	-\$38.7	-\$34.2	\$4.5
Operating Results	\$0.0	\$5.0	\$5.0

FY 2008: Budgeted vs. Projected Revenue

- Net tuition & fees: +\$9.1 million above budget
 - \$1.4 m undergraduate
 - \$2.1 m graduate
 - \$3.5 law school
 - \$2.1 m other
- Contribution: +\$ 1.4 million above budget
 - +\$5.0 m restricted gifts above budget
 - - \$3.6 m shortfall relative to budget in unrestricted
- Auxiliary enterprises: -\$0.3 below budget

FY 2008: Budgeted vs. Actual Expense

- Compensation: +\$1.6 million above budget
- Purchased services: +7.5 million above budget
- Bad Debt: -\$0.8 below budget

FY 2008: Budgeted vs. Actual Net Change in Assets

- Debt Service & Mandatory: -\$3.7 million below budget
- Support Investment: -\$0.3 below budget

Going Forward: Fiscal Years 2009 and 2010

- Enrollment (Budget Office slide)
- Tuition (Budget Office slides)
- Compensation (Budget Office slide)
- Projected Budget Gaps

Planning Assumptions FY 08 – FY 10

Enrollment

	FY 07 Budget	FY 10 Estimated	Change
On Campus:			
Academic Year⁽¹⁾			
Undergraduate	9,472	9,505	0.3%
Graduate	5,571	5,374	-3.5%
Law	1,823	1,805	-1.0%
Non-Degree	754	678	-10.1%
Total Academic Year	17,620	17,362	-1.5%
Summer⁽²⁾	21,990	21,835	-0.7%
Off Campus⁽³⁾	55,873	54,220	-3.0%

- (1) Reflects headcount as of the Fall census for the Foggy Bottom and Mount Vernon campuses. Excludes the School of Medicine and Health Sciences and the School of Public Health and Health Services. Excludes Continuous Enrollment and Continuing Research.
- (2) Reflects total credit hours. For budget purposes FY 07 = Summer 2006 and FY 10 = Summer 2009.
- (3) Reflects total credit hours for the Summer, Fall and Spring terms.

Planning Assumptions FY 08 – FY 10

Pricing

The approved tuition increases for next year and the increases assumed for FY 09 and FY 10 are lower than past increases and are more in line with inflation.

	Approved FY 08	Assumed FY 09/FY 10
Undergraduate (New Students) ⁽¹⁾	3.8%	3.5%
Graduate (On Campus)	4.3%	4.0%
Off Campus (Average)	4.6%	4.0%
Law School	5.2%	5.0%

(1) In FY 08, virtually all full-time undergraduates will be covered by the Fixed Price Tuition Plan.

Planning Assumptions FY 08 – FY 10

Pricing

Modest changes are projected in the tuition discount rates used to determine the financial aid budget:

- ❖ The undergraduate discount rate will drop .6 points by FY 10. A greater share of the aid will be need-based.
- ❖ To remain competitive with peer institutions, the graduate discount rate will increase .9 points.

	FY 07 Budget	Assumed FY 10
Undergraduate ⁽¹⁾	35.8%	35.2%
Graduate ⁽¹⁾	23.7%	24.6%

(1) The figures represent the percentage of gross tuition revenue that will be allocated to student aid.

Financial Aid Assumptions

FY 07 – FY 10

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 07 Budget	FY 07 Final/Estimate	FY 08 Budget	FY 09 Estimate	FY 10 Estimate	Change FY 07 Budget vs. FY 10 Estimate
Undergraduate:						
Discount Rate ⁽¹⁾	35.8%	36.7%	35.8%	35.5%	35.2%	-0.6%
Total Spending ⁽²⁾	\$110,922	\$116,713	\$116,064	\$119,138	\$122,425	10.4%
Graduate:						
Discount Rate ⁽¹⁾	23.7%	23.7%	24.2%	24.6%	24.6%	0.9%
Total Spending ⁽²⁾	\$17,557	\$17,557	\$18,633	\$19,704	\$20,614	17.4%

(1) Represents the percentage of gross tuition revenue allocated to student aid.

(2) Does not reflect aid awarded to students enrolled in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences and the School of Public Health and Health Services.

Planning Assumptions FY 08 – FY 10

Compensation

The budget estimates assume 4 percent annual merit increases for faculty and staff. The increases will be effective:

- ❖ January 1, 2008
- ❖ January 1, 2009
- ❖ January 1, 2010

The budgeted fringe benefit rate for full-time faculty and staff will increase 1 point (to 25 percent) next year. The estimated impact of the increase is \$2.4 million.

Projected Budget Gaps

- Fiscal Year 2009
 - Projected operating results: **-\$2.1m**
- Fiscal Year 2010
 - Projected net operating results: **-\$4.2m**

Longer Term Budget Issues

Needs/Aspirations

- Collective bargaining
- Restraining tuition growth
- Enhancing GWU stature
- Raising Faculty salaries
- Expand library collections
- Increasing full-time faculty
- Science and engineering complex

Financing

- Net Tuition and fees
- Contributions
- External research support
- Endowment payout
- Square 54
- Debt

**The George Washington University
Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies Committee
TIAA-CREF Options**

There has been concern raised that those GWU faculty participating in TIAA-CREF are limited in their choices of investment opportunities. While it is true that the information packet lists the TIAA-CREF Variable Annuity Accounts, it is not true that GWU faculty are limited in their choice of TIAA-CREF investment choices, with certain restrictions. All GWU participants in TIAA-CREF have access to all of the Variable Annuity and Retirement Class Mutual Funds listed in the TIAA-CREF quarterly performance guide through their on-line account access. However there are restrictions on what you can move. Funds contributed to any TIAA fund cannot be moved at the discretion of the participant. Thus, contributions to the TIAA Traditional Annuity and TIAA Real Estate funds cannot be moved. However, all contributions to CREF can be divided among any of the other retirement class funds. Thus, if participants are interested in other funds, one possibility is to make initial contributions to CREF Money Market Fund and then transfer them to other funds.

It should be noted that investment strategies are the choice and responsibility of the participants and that GWU and TIAA-CREF cannot be held accountable for individual participant's decisions. Further, TIAA-CREF is more than willing to discuss investment options with participants.

Created by the ASPP Subcommittee on TIAA-CREF Investment Options

Approved by ASPP Committee
November 30, 2007

**Joint Committee of Faculty and Students
Interim Report
December 14, 2007**

The committee has met five times during the fall, 2007, semester.

The senate's executive committee asked the JCFS to review the Code of Academic Integrity with special reference to the issue of plagiarism and to do so following recommendations made by the Educational Policy Committee presented in its final report of the 2006-07 academic year. To this end the committee heard presentations by Tim Terpstra, Director of the Office of Academic Integrity, Carol Sigelman, Associate Vice-President for Graduate Studies and Academic Affairs, and Robin Zeff, Assistant Professor of Writing.

Technology intended to aid in fostering the responsible conduct of research has been, and will be, made accessible to faculty and students. Faculty and students currently have access through Blackboard to a tutorial that speaks to plagiarism. In the spring semester, 2008, a tool called "Safe-Assign" will be tested in BlackBoard. Safe-Assign will offer students a tool for drafting papers and faculty a tool for determining if a student's paper contains unattributed source material (to the extent of Safe-Assign's database). Vice-President Sigelman intends an educational campaign to faculty and students when this and other software has come online.

The committee determined additional, unprioritized agenda items including a review of academic advising structures, a review of The Code of Non-Discrimination, access online to course syllabi prior to registration, and the maintenance of test "banks" in the Marvin Center.

Respectfully Submitted,

Alan Wade, Professor of Theatre
JCFS Faculty Co-Chair

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Lilien F. Robinson, Chair

December 14, 2007

On behalf of the Executive Committee I have the following to report:

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Steering Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum Review:

The charge to the University Steering Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum Review, co-chaired by Dean Barratt and Professor Gary Simon, has been prepared and forwarded to the Co-Chairs and the Committee members representing the five schools with responsibility for undergraduate education.

The charge contains the expectation that the Steering Committee will be providing periodic reports on its work.

Budget Overview:

At the invitation of the Executive Committee, Professor Joseph Cordes, Chair of the Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting, provided an overview on the FY 2008 operating and capital budgets, including a summary of budget projections.

Decanal Requests for Additional Outside Reviews in Tenure and Promotion Considerations:

The Executive Committee has continued its discussions in response to the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Committee's request that the Senate review tenure and promotion review policies and procedures with a focus on the rigor of such reviews. These discussions have also been ongoing in the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom.

One focus has been on the issue of the final decision with respect to unresolved administration nonconcurrences with faculty recommendations. In the current system the nonconcurrence is forwarded either to the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs or the President. The alternative discussed has been that the final disposition be determined by an elected Committee of faculty.

The most recent discussion has been on the matter of possible decanal requests for additional outside reviews of scholarship in general and specifically their desirability, potential function and timing.

Dispute Resolution Committee:

The Executive Committee has appointed Professor Leo Moersen, School of Business as an alternate temporary member on the Dispute Resolution Committee.

PERSONNEL MATTERS

Grievances:

Meditation efforts with respect to the grievance in the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences have been unsuccessful. Accordingly, this case will now proceed to hearing.

The Chair of the Dispute Resolution Committee has reported receipt of a grievance in Columbian College.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Committee on Faculty Development, including Academic and Administrative Support:

The Executive Committee has requested that the Committee on Faculty Development, including Academic and Administrative Support, consider the current level of engagement with the University by emeriti faculty and the potential for mutually beneficial expanded involvement.

The Committee will also be receiving a request that it examine the type and level of administrative and technical support provided to faculty members by their schools.

Committee on Physical Facilities:

The Physical Facilities Committee has been asked to examine existing policies and practices with respect to faculty members scheduling classroom space for special needs such as examination reviews, make-up examinations, and additional class meetings.

UPCOMING MATTERS

The Executive Committee is in the process of scheduling the following:

- annual report on the composition of the faculty**
- biennial report on women and faculty of color**
- emergency preparedness**

NEXT MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is scheduled for December 21. Resolutions, reports, and any other matters should be submitted before that date.

On behalf of the Executive Committee, I extend warmest wishes for the holidays and the new year!