

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
FEBRUARY 16, 2007 IN THE ALUMNI HOUSE

Present: Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman, Registrar Amundson, Parliamentarian Johnson; Dean Phillips; Professors Artz, Biles, Castleberry, Cordes, Englander, Galston, Griffith, Harrington, Helgert, Marotta, Mueller, Pagel, Robinson, Rycroft, Simon, Wade, Wahlbeck, Wilmarth, Wirtz, Yezer, and Zea

Absent: President Trachtenberg, Deans Brown, Futrell, Katz, Lawrence Lipscomb, Scott, Tong, and Whitaker; Professors Briscoe, Delaney, Gallo, Garris, Gupta, and Pelzman

The meeting was called to order by Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman at 2:15 p.m.

IN MEMORIAM

Professor Ernest J. Englander read "A Tribute in Memory of Roy Brandon Eastin," Professor Emeritus of Business Administration, who passed away June 14, 2006. (The tribute, prepared by Professor Englander, is attached to and made a part of these minutes.)

Professor Michael S. Castleberry read "A Tribute in Memory of Loretta May Stallings," Professor Emeritus of Human Kinetics and Leisure Studies, who passed away November 17, 2006. (The tribute, prepared by Professor Castleberry with the assistance of Professor Patricia A. Sullivan, is attached to and made a part of these minutes.)

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on January 19, 2007, were approved as distributed.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Professor Robinson moved that the order of the agenda be changed to permit Executive Vice President and Treasurer Katz to make his report as the next item of business. The motion was seconded and approved.

UPDATE ON THE CAMPUS PLAN PROCESS

Executive Vice President and Treasurer Louis H. Katz began his update by reporting that the School Without Walls project received unanimous approval by the D.C. Zoning Commission on December 11, 2006. The written order issued in connection with this final approval was received in record time and the University is moving forward to commence construction on GW's portion of the site for a residence hall which is expected to provide

474 beds and 178 parking spaces, with an occupancy date of Fall, 2009. In connection with this project, GW will provide approximately \$12 million to the District of Columbia School System for renovation and expansion of the School Without Walls, and programmatic efforts between the University and the School will continue.

With respect to the Campus Plan, Vice President Katz reported that six public hearings were held on the Plan between September 14 and November 30. The Zoning Commission considered the Planned Unit Development portion of the Campus Plan at its meetings on January 17 and February 4. The Commission unanimously voted to approve not only the overall density requested by the University, but also the heights and locations for proposed facilities to accommodate the University's forecasted academic and undergraduate student housing space needs. The next step in the Campus Plan approval process will be consideration of the Plan by the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC), after which the Zoning Commission will review and act upon the NCPC's recommendations, if any. Vice President Katz said the hope is that the Plan will receive final approval by the Zoning Commission sometime around March 1st.

The process for approval of the Square 54 development proposal follows a route similar to that of the Campus Plan, with approval first by the Zoning Commission, review by the NCPC, further review and approval by Zoning, followed by issuance of a written order. Two public hearings on this project were held in November and January, and the Zoning Commission has scheduled a decision meeting for February 28, with NCPC review to follow. Vice President Katz said that the University is hopeful that a favorable ruling will be issued and the hearing process will be complete by early March 2007.

Finally, Vice President Katz reported that planning for redevelopment of the Pelham Hall site at the Mount Vernon campus is ongoing, and negotiations with the community continue. Every effort is being made to secure community support so that the project can go forward unopposed. The University plans to tear down the existing residence hall, and replace the 78-bed facility with one containing approximately 288 beds and 50,000 square feet of student support space which would include a new dining facility. It is anticipated that applications for the project will be filed later this spring.

Professor Yezer asked about plans for the use of the Hall on Virginia Avenue. Vice President Katz responded that the Hall no longer houses undergraduates, but is instead used for graduate student housing. The University is looking at the possibility of providing subsidized housing for junior faculty on this site in the future. Also, next fall the Aston will no longer be used to house undergraduates, but will be offered to first-year law students. Undergraduate housing in Columbia Plaza will also be discontinued, as well that in City Hall, formerly known as the St. James Hotel.

Professor Griffith asked if both the Campus Plan and Square 54 hearings would be concluded by early March. Vice President Katz responded affirmatively. Professor Griffith also asked how long it would take before the University realized an income stream from the developer of Square 54. Vice President Katz responded that the University would have to obtain a written order from the Zoning Commission before proceeding, and this could take at least six months. Any written order issued would be subject to appeal. The agreement between the developer of Square 54 and the University specifies that GW will receive income from the site within a certain period of time after the entitlement is received from the City,

assuming the entitlement is accepted by the University. The entitlement is not issued until the written order process is complete. If all goes well, the University might begin to receive payments under the agreement by the end of the calendar year 2007.

Professor Simon inquired about the plan to include a mere 360 parking spaces in the new building on Square 54, and he asked how many parking places are currently utilized by medical center staff and patients at the University Garage. Vice President Katz confirmed that 362 spaces will be reserved solely for University purposes in the parking facility underneath the Square 54 building. He also noted that there are presently 1250 parking spaces in the University garage at 22nd and I Streets, not all of which are used, so there is excess capacity there. Professor Griffith asked if there would be adequate parking during construction of the building on Square 54 and the future Science Center. Vice President Katz said that University staff believes adequate parking can be provided, and this will be done with as little disruption as possible; on a temporary basis this may mean some parking will be located at satellite sites, such as the Kennedy Center.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

Professor Robert J. Harrington, Chair of the Special Committee on the 4x4 Curriculum Report, requested unanimous consent of the Senate to consider Resolution 06/5. Professor Griffith objected, and pointed out that, in the absence of unanimous consent, a two-thirds vote of the Senate would be required to consider a resolution not previously distributed with the meeting agenda. A motion was made and seconded to introduce the resolution, and discussion of the motion followed.

Professor Griffith said that he would like to hear why the Senate should entertain Resolution 06/5, because he thought there were two major reasons why the timing of the Resolution was inappropriate. He said that in a previous Resolution, the Senate had instructed the faculties of the schools that Senate action concerning the 4x4 curriculum proposal would be taken up at the April 2007 meeting, and that the faculties had been invited to report to the Senate their views on the 4x4 proposal before that meeting. Professor Griffith noted that his own School, Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, (CCAS) tentatively planned to vote on the issue at some time toward the end of March. In a meeting of CCAS department chairs that morning, Professor Griffith said that there was great surprise that a resolution not on the Senate agenda, which would presumably be dispositive of the 4x4 issue, would be presented at the February Senate meeting.

Secondly, Professor Griffith said that he thought Resolution 06/5 raised concerns because of a fairly subtle constitutional problem about the role of the Faculty Senate with regard to curricula in the schools. Although the Faculty Code is not terribly specific on this subject, Professor Griffith said that this is largely understood to be under the control of the faculties of the schools. The Senate, therefore, is in an advisory position except when it establishes educational policy for the whole university. Resolution 06/5 is not a Resolution that purports to advise the faculties, but rather asserts that the 4x4 scenario be rejected, thereby advising the Administration of the Senate's own view. Professor Griffith said it seemed to him that this presents an awkward question, i.e. what the Senate would do if some colleges decide to accept the 4x4 proposal, and others did not. Professor Griffith said he would welcome the Special Committee's view on the necessity of immediately considering Resolution 06/5.

The Chair called upon Professor Robinson, who said she thought Professor Griffith had mischaracterized the original resolution [Resolution 06/3, adopted November 10, 2006, which set forth a timetable for consideration of the 4x4 curriculum proposal]. This Resolution indicated that the schools and the Senate should concurrently consider the 4x4 proposal, and conclude their deliberations, at the very latest, before the April, 2007 Senate meeting. She added that the Resolution did not specify that the Senate should wait for the schools to conclude their deliberations before reaching its own conclusions about the proposal.

Professor Robinson said that several years ago, the Senate passed an alternative calendar resolution very similar to Resolution 06/5, which rejected both a proposal for a summer session and a 4x4 curriculum. The Senate does not instruct the schools, she added, but it does make recommendations in matters of policy that affect more than one school.

Professor Griffith responded to Professor Robinson's comments by acknowledging that Resolution 06/5 did not explicitly instruct the college faculties to consider the 4x4 proposal and report back to the Senate. However, at the point where the alternative calendar resolution was discussed and adopted, the Senate was in the very welcome position of having a vote from each of the faculties involved, and each had rejected the alternative calendar prior to the Senate's action. Professor Griffith said he would yield to Professor Robinson's point that Resolution 06/3 did not specify that the schools should act before the Senate, but he said that he thought it was generally understood that concurrent consideration by the Schools and the Senate meant that each group would consider the 4x4 proposal, and in April, some sort of conclusion would be reached.

Professor Harrington said he agreed with Professor Robinson that Resolution 06/3 simply said that the schools should make their recommendations no later than a week before the April 2007 Senate meeting. In addition, the Special Committee was commissioned by the Senate to examine and make its recommendations on the 4x4 Task Force's Final Report within that same time frame. As the Special Committee had concluded its work, Professor Harrington said he thought it important that the Resolution be considered by the Senate without delay and that the schools have the benefit of the Committee's and the Senate's conclusions with respect to the 4x4 Final Report.

Professor Castleberry called the question, but no motion to close debate was made, and discussion followed. Professor Cordes said he was more comfortable with the Substitute Resolution before the Senate than the one circulated before the meeting. He spoke in opposition to consideration of Resolution 06/5, saying he thought this would be premature without the Senate having the benefit of a clear expression of opinion from its constituency.

Discussion followed. Professor Yezer said that he thought that this was an across-the-schools issue because one school could not switch course structure without disrupting other schools. Professor Griffith agreed with Professor Cordes that the language in the Substitute Resolution was an improvement over the original, but he noted that the first Resolving Clause in the Substitute Resolution still recommended that the 4x4 curriculum model scenario should not be adopted by the schools. He also observed that, normally, when the Senate crafts resolutions, it makes recommendations to the University

administration. If the Senate's intention was to make a recommendation to the faculties of the schools, then Professor Griffith said he thought the Resolution ought to be quite explicit about that. Professor Griffith then argued again in favor of postponing consideration of Resolution 06/5 until the individual schools had each taken a position on adoption of the 4x4 scenario.

Professor Wilmarth spoke in favor of the motion to consider Resolution 06/5, and urged the Senate to express its opinion on what he viewed as a premature adoption of the 4x4 scenario. Professor Wilmarth said it was troubling that the University administration was pushing so hard for the schools to vote on adoption of the 4x4 scenario without having adequate data to make an informed judgment on the merits of that scenario.. The schools are being asked to vote on the 4x4 scenario as the vehicle for curricular reform before they have even begun to examine their curricula to determine the most academically sound structure for their respective programs. Moreover, the schools are being asked to vote before the faculty of the University has had an opportunity to consult with our incoming President on the issue. In addition, Professor Wilmarth found it disturbing that the 4x4 scenario contemplated a likely reduction in classroom hours from 15 per week to 12 per week. He asked whether it was academically sound or justifiable to be cutting classroom hours at a time when the University was reportedly charging the highest tuition in the nation. Finally, Professor Wilmarth said he was disappointed that the outgoing University President had been quoted in The Hatchet as saying that he would choose a dean for the CCAS "who thought the 4x4 was a good idea." Professor Wilmarth believed it was not desirable for the outgoing President to be dictating what an incoming dean should do on such a fundamental curricular matter. In sum, Professor Wilmarth thought that Resolution 06/5 was entirely appropriate, as was the motion to consider it, because the Resolution represented the Senate's advice to the faculties of the Schools on how they should respond to the pressure being applied by the administration for a premature adoption of the 4x4 scenario..

Further discussion followed. Professor Robinson said she thought that Resolution 06/5 reflects the Senate's leadership role in making recommendations on matters that affect more than one school. The faculties are not bound by such recommendations, but it is appropriate for the Senate to express its opinion. Professor Simon also spoke in favor of the motion.

Professor Wirtz said he thought it would be helpful if Vice President Lehman could shed some light on the administration's expectations with respect to the expected sequence of events. Vice President Lehman responded that he thought the central point under discussion was the 4x4 scenario which was recommended by the Joint Task Force in its Report. The scenario had been written by Committee, he added, and it seemed to him that the troubling part of it was the first paragraph. The scenario recommends a study of the curriculum and clearly states the expectation that this would take from 24 to 36 months; it spells out that no adoption of the 4x4 should take place before the curricular examinations are complete. Adoption of the scenario, he added, is not a vote to make a change to the 4x4 curricular model; it is a vote to undertake all of the hard work that needs to be done to reform the curriculum in the schools relative to the 4x4, and then a decision will be made on implementation of the 4x4 curricular structure itself.

Professor Wirtz clarified that he had been asking about the administration's expectations with respect to the sequence of events that consideration of the 4x4 scenario would follow, both in the schools and in the Senate. Vice President Lehman responded that the administration had agreed to the timetable proposed in Resolution 06/3, which said that by early April all of the schools would have taken a vote on the 4x4 scenario. The expectation was then that the faculties would inform their senators and that the Senate itself would vote on the scenario. Professor Wirtz said it seemed to him that the question presently under consideration was whether or not the Senate as a body which commissioned a study by its Special Committee was in a position to operate in the other direction, and inform the faculty of its conclusions.

Professor Englander said that as he read the scenario, it seemed like a roadmap to the 4x4, as the Final Report says "a 4x4 curricular model will be implemented," so it seemed to him that a vote for the scenario was in fact a vote to adopt the 4x4. Vice President Lehman said that if he had written the scenario in question, it would not have read as it does, but it had been written by Committee, and was actually an amalgamation of several scenarios under consideration by the Joint Task Force. He added that he thought the offending sentence was the one in the first paragraph referred to by Professor Englander. He advised the Senate that he thought there was always the possibility that a school could fine-tune the scenario by agreeing with part, but perhaps not all, of it.

Professor Wilmarth said he agreed with Professor Englander's comments, and he noted that the first and last paragraphs of the scenario both contemplate only the 4x4 structure as a curricular model. He could not see how those paragraphs could be read as anything but a presumptive adoption of a 4x4 curriculum.

At the conclusion of the discussion a motion was made and seconded to curtail discussion, and a vote was taken to introduce Resolution 06/5 for Senate action. The motion was adopted with fifteen senators in favor, four opposed, and two abstaining.

RESOLUTION 06/5, "SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION REGARDING RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE REPORT OF THE JOINT ADMINISTRATION/FACULTY TASK FORCE ON A POSSIBLE FOUR-COURSE, FOUR-CREDIT UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULAR STRUCTURE"

Professor Harrington, Chair of the Special Committee on the 4x4 Curriculum Report, advised that, following its work during the fall semester, the Special Committee had held three meetings in January and February 2007. As previously reported to the Senate in its Interim Report, three subcommittees were formed to study different aspects of the 4x4 Task Force Report. These subcommittees presented their findings to the Special Committee. Professor Harrington read the report of the Special Committee, which included conclusions of the subcommittees on Academic Motivation for Change to a 4x4 Curriculum, Specific Issues Related to 4x4 Implementation, and Financial Motivation for Change to a 4x4 Curriculum. He also read the text of Resolution 06/5.

Professor Griffith moved that the first Resolving Clause of Resolution 06/5 be amended to add the phrase, "to the faculties of the Schools" after the word, "recommends." The motion was seconded and no discussion ensued. A vote was taken, and the motion to amend the Resolution passed.

Professor Englander said he would favor inserting a Whereas Clause that would append the Special Committee's Report to Resolution 06/5. Professor Wilmarth moved that the following language be inserted as the third Whereas Clause: "Whereas, the Report of the Special Committee is attached hereto as Appendix A., and". The motion was seconded, a vote was taken, and Resolution 06/5 was amended a second time.

Further discussion followed. Professor Cordes asked if the adoption of Resolution 06/5 would preclude the implementation of a 4x4 curricular structure at some point in the future. Professor Robinson said she thought this might well be the end result of curricular deliberations. Professor Wilmarth agreed that Resolution 06/5 does not preclude the faculties of the Schools from adopting in the future any type of curricular structure that they might determine to be best suited for the accomplishment of their academic objectives.

Professor Wirtz said that he wanted to comment on a point made earlier by Professor Wilmarth. He said that he was not sure that President Trachtenberg's remarks about selection of a possible dean for CCAS had been reported accurately by The Hatchet, but if the account was correct, he thought this remark very unbecoming, as the way in which the 4x4 issue will be resolved is through scholarly discourse, rather than through arm-twisting. Professor Wirtz said that he thought that the employment of such a litmus test for decanal candidates was one of the most un-academic things he had heard in a long time. He added that he was sorry the President was not present to respond to these observations, and hoped he would take up the challenge to do this at the next Senate meeting.

Professor Wirtz spoke in support of Resolution 06/5, as he thought it was appropriate for the Senate to consider major issues that confront it. He said he was not sure that the 4x4 is necessarily a bad idea, but the problem the faculty he represents has is not the 4x4 itself but the absence of the answers to important questions. He added that he thought the Business School faculty would be very reluctant to endorse a 4x4 until these questions were answered. These questions include very specifically whether the administration can point to measurable, specific outcomes that others have experienced that derive from a transition to a 4x4, and whether or not the incoming administration is committed to implementing a 4x4 in a form that is compatible with the faculty and the faculty's view of how to move forward to the next step. Also at issue is whether or not a four credit course system will involve an increase in actual seat time, as well as whether or not there will be something that the administration can point to that demonstrates a 4x4 will be better, and produce a higher quality education. Finally, if implementation of a 4x4 results in any cost savings, it is not clear that under the new administration those cost savings would be directed, as the faculty feels important, toward the academic side of the University.

Professor Wirtz concluded by saying he thought the change in tone conveyed by the Substitute Resolution was an improvement over the original version of Resolution 06/5. He said that colleagues in the Business School with whom he had talked are actively in favor of improving the curriculum and the School's educational program, and would favor anything that will move the School in that direction, including the 4x4, if that helps to achieve the desired objectives. There is not at this point enough flesh on the bones of the 4x4 proposal for the faculty to make a decision one way or the other. Professor Wirtz then said that if he had any improvement to offer in the terms of the current resolution, he would "put more

teeth” into the last Whereas Clause. He said he thought that it would be difficult to move forward on curricular reform given the lethargic sort of predisposition among current faculty, which is not limited to faculty in the Business School; an acknowledgment on the part of faculty that they understand the spirit of the 4x4 and are committed to curricular reform would be a welcome change.

Professor Yezer, a member of the Special Committee, said that in case the language of the Special Committee’s report was not perfectly clear, he wanted to point out that the basic business model for the 4x4 scenario in the Joint Task Force Report is seriously flawed. Professor Yezer said that as an economist, he evaluates business models, and several years ago, he had asked how the GW Solutions venture could succeed, and had been told that the University had a business model. The business model employed then resulted in a loss of \$8 to 10 million dollars before the enterprise was abandoned. Professor Yezer said he thought the business model presented for the 4x4 was in a league with the one put together for GW Solutions.

Professor Galston observed that one of the triggers for consideration of the 4x4 scenario seemed to be an observation about students’ dissatisfaction with the quality of their education, and she said she would like to know more about how this observation was reached. Vice President Lehman asked for and received the privilege of the floor for Dr. Cheryl Beil, Executive Director of Academic Planning and Assessment.

Dr. Beil reported that her Office surveys graduating seniors, and it is possible to obtain survey responses from most of this group. The Office at one time was able to conduct exit surveys with students who decided to leave GW before they graduated, but the response rate for this has fallen off in recent years. In surveys of graduating seniors, these students were asked about their level of academic challenge and engagement, and how much time they spent on academic work in and outside of the classroom. A comparison of the responses with data from some of GW’s market basket schools indicated that GW students are not putting in as much time in connection with classroom work as students at other institutions, and GW students are also engaged in quite a number of off-campus pursuits, including work and internships.

Dr. Beil added that until recently, aside from students’ grades, the only data available on student learning was self-reported information collected on student surveys and course evaluations. To obtain direct evidence of student learning, her Office and Columbian College decided to participate in a longitudinal study using the College Learning Assessment (CLA), an assessment instrument that measures quantitative reasoning, analytic thinking, and writing. GW is one of 44 colleges and universities participating in this study that is funded by the Lumina Foundation. In her opinion, the CLA is the only assessment tool worthy of use. Modeled after the Scholastic Aptitude Test and the Law School Admission Test, all of its measures are open-ended, and it purports to measure the value-added benefit of students’ undergraduate education at a particular institution.

The CLA was first given to 300 randomly selected CCAS freshmen entering in 2005. This cohort will take the CLA at the end of their sophomore and senior years. To establish a baseline measure for the value added component of a GW education, the CLA was administered to 100 CCAS seniors in spring 2006. Their actual scores were compared to what their scores were expected to be based on their SAT scores. The findings showed that

based on their SAT scores, these seniors underperformed in quantitative reasoning and analytic thinking; their scores on the writing component were what they were expected to be. Particularly troubling to Dr. Beil was that an examination of students' transcripts indicated that over 50% of them had graduated from GW with Latin Honors, thus raising questions about the quality of GW's undergraduate education.

Further discussion followed. Professor Wilmarth expressed support for the idea of curricular reform, but reiterated his concern about whether or not a 4x4 structure would actually mean four hours of classroom "seat time" per week per course. Vice President Lehman confirmed that the 4x4 scenario does not mandate that all learning take place in the classroom; thus a four credit course might have fewer than four hours of seat time. Professor Englander also spoke in support of curricular reform. Professor Simon observed that in the process of evolution, structure follows function, so it makes no sense to define the structure (the 4x4 scenario) and then try to push the function into that structure. Professor Robinson agreed with Professor Simon's remarks.

The question was called and a vote was taken on Resolution 06/5 as twice amended. The Resolution was adopted by unanimous vote.

Professor Cordes said that a lot of comments had been made at the meeting which would be reflected in the meeting minutes, and this forms part of the record on what people are thinking about the 4x4 issue. He urged everyone to take special care in reviewing the record so that it could inform future deliberations on this subject. (Resolutions 06/5 and 06/3 are attached.)

ANNUAL REPORT ON THE COMPOSITION OF THE FACULTY

Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman distributed a copy of his report on Faculty Counts as of fall semester, 2006. As has been done for the past several years, the report provides updated information for the previous five years on the number of regular, active-status faculty in non-tenure-track (NTT) and tenure-track (TT) occupied lines at the University. As of November 1, 2006, the number of regular, active-status faculty in both categories totaled 722, excluding faculty in the College of Professional Studies (CPS), the GW Law School, (GWLS), the School of Medicine and Health Sciences (SMHS), and the School of Public Health and Health Services (SPHHS). A breakdown of these 722 faculty by school is given in the report, along with the percentage of regular NTT faculty in the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences (CCAS), the Elliott School of International Affairs (ESIA), the School of Business (SB), the School of Engineering and Applied Science (SEAS), and the Graduate School of Education and Human Development (GSEHD). Overall, for these schools, there are a total of 159 non-tenure-track faculty, and 563 either tenured or on the tenure-track.

The report also details the number of regular, active-status faculty in the CPS, GWLS, SMHS, and the SPHHS. Of 223 faculty in this category, 77 are classified as non-tenure-track, and 146 are tenured or on the tenure-track. The number of limited service faculty, excluding research and visiting faculty, is also set forth in the report for all of the degree granting schools. The two schools with the largest number of limited service faculty are CCAS and the SMHS, with 556 and 1,578 faculty respectively. For the first time, the report on Faculty Counts contains a tabulation of the number of research faculty for the nine

schools; these numbers show that over the last four years, these ranks have declined by approximately 20%. Professor Simon then questioned why limited service faculty are included in the report, as their sole contribution to the teaching mission is allowing a student observer in their office.

Professor Wirtz said he thought the information in the report was very important with regard to compliance with Faculty Code requirements concerning faculty ranks. He asked if it would be possible to obtain information on faculty counts in the departments in addition to that provided on a school-wide basis. Vice President Lehman said that this could be done, but that he would only provide data for 2006 due to the large amount of information requested.

Professor Englander asked if there was any way to account for the number of doctoral students and the number of classes taught by them. He added that this would be important information to have as the schools undertake curricular reviews. Vice President Lehman agreed to provide this information. (The Report is attached to these minutes.)

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Robinson presented the Report of the Executive Committee. She also distributed a copy of her Report to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, which she had presented at the Committee's meeting on February 8, 2007. (Both Reports are enclosed.)

As the Senate's representative to the Trustees' Committee on Advancement, Professor Griffith said he would support the formation of a Senate Committee on Advancement, which Professor Robinson's Report indicated is under consideration by the Senate Executive Committee. He said he thought it was pretty clear that the University could improve its relations with alumni and increase alumni gifts to GW, and he thought that faculty and Senate members would increasingly be called upon to help in these areas in the near future. Professor Robinson agreed with the observation that alumni giving at GW is at the very bottom when compared to that of the University's market basket schools.

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Wirtz noted with some chagrin an article that had first appeared in the Washington Post, which was later picked up by the popular press, concerning apparently special admissions treatment offered by President Trachtenberg to the daughter of the late Jack Kent Cooke. The impression that was left was that GW seems to be an institution that favors certain kinds of people, such as those who will inherit large sums of money, over others who do not. Gerald Kauvar, Special Assistant to the President, responded to these comments by noting that the article in the Washington Post was accurate, but the one in Inside Higher Education was not. He said that President Trachtenberg had contacted the attorney for Ms. Cooke after he read an account in the paper about her predicament and

learned that she would not be allowed to re-register at Southern Methodist University because she owed the institution \$23,000. The President's offer provided that if she was admissible to GW under current admission standards, the University would consider offering her financial aid on the condition that she agree to pay it back with interest when she came into the entirety of her trust fund.

Professor Wirtz asked if the statement in one of the articles that if Ms. Cooke could not repay the tuition, that would be all right was correct, and Mr. Kauvar responded that it was not. Professor Wirtz asked if any correction had been requested, or made, and the response was negative. Professor Robinson asked if this represented a new policy for the University to make such offers.

Mr. Kauvar said he did not think this was a policy, rather, it was the President's response to an individual situation that had come to his attention. This is not an unusual offer, he said, as the President holds student office hours every month. Some of the students who come to see him have financial problems staying at GW, and it is the President's habit, when he feels that students are deserving, to use his discretionary funds to pay their tuition so that they can stay at GW.

Professor Wirtz asked if Mr. Kauvar understood the concern that prompted his question, and Mr. Kauvar responded that he had explained the President's procedure. Professor Wirtz said he thought there is an appearance of impropriety in the offer made to Ms. Cooke, just as there was years ago when the President offered special admissions treatment to Ritchie Parker. There is also an appearance of favoritism, and it is ironic that the University should dwell on a person who is of such incredible means as Ms. Cooke when there are a lot of people in the District of Columbia who would love to have this sort of special attention. Professor Wirtz concluded by saying that he hoped that the President would show more sensitivity to these sorts of things and situations in the future than he has in the past, because in the long run, it tarnishes the image of the institution.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, and upon motion made, seconded, and approved, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

A Tribute in Memory of Roy Brandon Eastin

It is both with sorrow and fond memories that The George Washington University notes the death of Roy Brandon Eastin on June 14, 2006. Professor Eastin was born in Henderson, Kentucky in 1917 and came to Washington to work at the U.S. Government Printing Office in the 1930s. He left GPO in 1960 to join The George Washington University faculty.

Dr. Eastin attended university while working at the GPO and received his B.A. degree in 1943 and M.A. degree in Psychology in 1945, both from GWU. He earned his Ph.D. in Public Administration from American University in 1953.

Dr. Eastin taught personnel management in the School of Government and Business Administration from 1960 until his retirement in 1987. He helped to organize the Department of Business Administration and served as Personnel Management Program Director for many years.

Roy Eastin served on the Faculty Senate from 1963 to 1966. He chaired the Committee on Admissions and Advanced Standing from 1964-65 and served on the Committee on Scholarship in 1964 and the Public Ceremonies Committee for 17 years covering the period from 1967 to 1987.

Professor Eastin is remembered by his colleagues for his reasoned passion for students and his joy of learning. He also took great pride in mentoring junior and not-so-junior faculty in both the skills of being a professor and the daily organizational life of being a part of the University. He was a fierce advocate for faculty governance and liked to remind his colleagues that “the dean proposes, the faculty disposes.”

Be it resolved that these remarks be incorporated into the minutes of the Faculty Senate and a copy sent to his family.

Ernest J. Englander
Member of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
School of Business
February 16, 2007

A Tribute in Memory of Loretta May Stallings

Loretta May Stallings, Emeritus Professor of Human Kinetics and Leisure Studies, served The George Washington University from 1954-1987. She was an innovator of programs in the area of perceptual motor development and a dedicated teacher. Her textbook on motor learning impacted instruction in colleges and universities all over the country. She was highly respected among her colleagues for her expertise in the fields of neuroanatomy and motor learning. She was given the distinguished status of Emeritus Professor of Human Kinetics and Leisure Studies upon her retirement in 1987.

Dr. Stallings received her B.A. in Physical Education from Stanford University in 1947. She received the M.A. degree in Health Education in June, 1950 from the University of the Pacific and her Ed.D. in Education and Anatomy from the University of Texas in 1965. Prior to her affiliation with the University she served as Chair of the Department of Health and Physical Education at St. Mary's College in Maryland from 1952 to 1954.

She came to the University in 1954, serving as an Instructor in Physical Education. After completing her doctoral studies, she became Professor of Physical Education and continued to teach until her retirement. During her career at the University she served as Director of Women's Athletics, from 1960 to 1969 as well as Chair of the Department of Physical Education for Women from 1960 to 1970. She was a highly respected teacher in coursework integrating human anatomy, health education, and motor learning.

Dr. Stallings was active in the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation throughout her career, 1947-1987, a Fellow of the American College of Sports Medicine from 1964 to 1987, a member of the American School Health Association from 1960 to 1987, and the National and Eastern Associations of Physical Education for College Women from 1954 to 1987. She was active on School and University committees throughout her career at the University, serving on the Faculty Senate from 1982 to 1987, as well as on the Public Ceremonies (now Honors and Academic Convocations) Committee and the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee.

Michael S. Castleberry
Member of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
Graduate School of Education and Human Development
February 16, 2007

**SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION REGARDING RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE
REPORT OF THE JOINT ADMINISTRATION/FACULTY TASK FORCE ON A
POSSIBLE FOUR-COURSE, FOUR-CREDIT UNDERGRADUATE
CURRICULAR STRUCTURE (06/5)**

WHEREAS, The George Washington University established a joint administration/faculty Task Force (the Task Force) under the leadership of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs in April 2005 to examine once again the desirability and feasibility of introducing a four-course, four-credit undergraduate curricular structure, and

WHEREAS, The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, in accordance with the Faculty Code, established a Special Committee of the Faculty Senate to receive and evaluate the report of the Task Force and to make comments and recommendations to the Faculty Senate, and

WHEREAS, the report of the Special Committee is attached hereto as Appendix A, and

WHEREAS, The faculty is committed to a comprehensive review and improvement of curriculum, and

WHEREAS, Resolution (03/4) adopted by the Faculty Senate concluded that a 4X4 curriculum would greatly diminish the opportunities for breadth and number of required and elective courses students could take, and

WHEREAS, The Task Force claimed that the proposed 4X4 curricular structure would facilitate academic excellence but did not provide persuasive evidence to support that claim, and

WHEREAS, Transition to a 4x4 curriculum would significantly disrupt the operation of the University's educational activities and would require the expenditure of enormous faculty resources for the next several years, and

WHEREAS, The Special Committee believes that a major curricular review should be undertaken, beginning in the fall of 2007, as a collaborative effort between the faculty and the incoming administration of President-elect Steven Knapp, and

WHEREAS, Exit surveys of graduating seniors have been cited as primary evidence of poor intellectual challenge and intellectual engagement, but such surveys are generally regarded as producing results of limited validity and recent surveys have actually revealed a modest improving trend under the University's existing curriculum, and

WHEREAS, Recent tabulations of undergraduate student course evaluations indicate students find that current courses are difficult and do provide a “great deal of significant high quality learning,” and

WHEREAS, The Task Force report assumes that students who are not currently challenged will have their learning increased with decreased “seat time” and that substantial cost savings will result from the implementation of a 4X4 curriculum, and

WHEREAS, The academic literature shows that increased learning and favorable educational outcomes increase with higher amounts of “seat time,” and accordingly, educational outcomes could not reasonably be expected to improve under a 4X4 curriculum that reduces the number of required classroom hours per semester, and

WHEREAS, The Faculty Senate therefore believes that the Task Force’s proposed 4X4 “scenario,” which could lead to a potential reduction of up to 20% in the amount of required classroom hours per semester, is not consistent with the University’s stated aspirations for academic excellence, and

WHEREAS, Models presented in the Task Force report used to predict cost savings are simplistic and rely on unrealistic expectations, while reasonable alternative assumptions lead to predictions that costs could actually increase under a 4X4 curriculum, unless a 4X4 curriculum is simply used to inflate academic credit hours by reducing required classroom hours and faculty positions; NOW, THEREFORE,

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

That the Faculty Senate recommends to the faculties of the Schools that the 4X4 curriculum model “scenario” as described in the report of the Task Force should not be adopted at this time, because that “scenario” has not been adequately justified and would prematurely commit the University to a curricular model with major potential flaws, before the faculties of the several Schools have been given a reasonable opportunity to undertake a comprehensive review of their respective curricula and to determine the desirability of fundamental changes to those curricula, and

That the Faculty Senate urges the faculties of the several Schools, beginning in the Fall of 2007, to undertake a comprehensive curriculum review in their Schools in collaboration with the incoming administration of President-elect Steven Knapp, and to establish metrics informed by

scholarly literature on the learning process that are reasonably designed to achieve the University's stated aspirations for academic excellence.

**Special Committee on the 4X4 Curriculum Report
February 16, 2007**

Adopted, as amended, February 16, 2007

APPENDIX A

**The George Washington University
Faculty Senate
Special Committee on the Joint Administration/Faculty Task Force on 4x4
Curriculum Structure Report**

Report to the Faculty Senate

February 16, 2007

The Special Committee has had three meetings this semester as follows: January 30, February 6 and February 13.

The subcommittees as previously reported in the interim report of the Committee presented their findings at the first of these two meetings. A resolution from the Committee for the Faculty Senate was prepared at the third. In brief, the presentations of the subcommittees follows:

Subcommittee I: Academic Motivation for Change to a 4*4 Curriculum.

The premise that a change in curriculum to the 4x 4 will increase the student perception of their level of academic challenge/engagement remains unproven. In 2003 the conclusion of a Study Group appointed by the President to study the risks and opportunities of moving from a 5 course to a 4 course semester are as valid in 2007 as in 2003 when the Academic Issues Subcommittee of the Study Group stated there is “little if any empirical research on the connection between a 4x4 or 3x5 and academic engagement, and it is therefore unclear whether a 4x4 system would be a solution to the problems it is meant to solve”. (The report of the Educational Policy Committee and the resolution 03/4 of the Faculty Senate are in line with this). The only significant additional piece of data collected by the GW Task Force in the recent study is a comparison of opinions from faculty and others from schools with a 4x4 or some permutation thereof and the original premise is not borne out.

The Report of the Academic Excellence Strategic Committee in 2002 expressed concern over lack of academic challenge and over the low proportion of student time spent studying. This Committee made many suggestions for change that might reverse their concerns. Among these were changes that spanned recruiting/admissions, orientation, changes that could be made in the freshman, middle, and senior years as well as changes in faculty and campus culture and changes in the existing curriculum that fall short of converting to a 4x4. All of these suggestions have merit and would probably be easier and less costly to implement than a total curricular change. This Committee recommended the establishment of an Academic Excellence Oversight Committee to Oversee and assess the changes recommended by the Committee. This does not appear to have been carried out.

Exit surveys of graduating seniors have been cited as a primary evidence of poor intellectual challenge and intellectual engagement. In 2002 the question about academic challenge was added to the survey and in 2005 the question about intellectual engagement was added (a short track record). These scores are revealing a modest improvement in trend (no statistical evaluation given) over this time. In 2003, 2004, and 2006, respectively, 57%, 62%, and 66% of the sample responded that intellectual challenge was high/somewhat high in the major and in 2004 and 2006, 30% and 33% of the sample responded that intellectual challenge was high/somewhat high in the introductory courses. Similarly, in 2006, 77% of the sample responded that the level of engagement in the major was somewhat/very high and 46% responded that the level of engagement was somewhat/very high in the introductory courses. While these values are lower than desirable, it is interesting to note that over this same time period, 85-86% of the sample is satisfied with the quality of their education, 82-89% is satisfied with GW, and 80-88% of the sample is satisfied with the courses in their major while 69-74% of the sample is satisfied with the introductory courses. To the extent that the survey data is relied upon to stimulate curricular change, one might conclude that the larger problem lies with the introductory courses and that these should be given some attention.

If there was indisputable evidence that a change to a 4x4 curriculum would lead to a significant financial saving that would go into academics without the curricular change detracting in the least from the academic experience, this would be a valid reason, in our opinion, to undertake the curricular change. Such evidence does not seem to exist. It would seem that a study within the Schools of their existing curriculum and how it might be improved is very much in order.

Subcommittee II: Specific Issues Related to 4x4 Implementation.

The Joint Administration Task Force (4x4 Task Force) identified several issues that the Committee investigated: accreditation, transfer students, double majors, 5 year undergraduate programs, study abroad programs, impact on graduate programs and seat time.

The accreditation issue does not appear to present difficulties to all programs. For example, it has been reported that it does in the GW Law School but it does not for GSEHD. A member of the Board of Examiners for NCATE did mention that it was unusual in graduate programs; he had not seen a 4x4 in any visits he had made on behalf of NCATE.

Transfer students all must have their transcripts reviewed and the admissions personnel in each college must then translate all courses into credits to fit the proposed new curricular structure. This is more complicated when translated by semester into a different format. It is time consuming as it cannot be uniformly done, but must be reviewed by personnel individually. This would be labor intensive.

Students with double majors present a significant concern for the proposed new curricular structure. Course requirements would need review and revision. It would present a new set of challenges and would require greater clarity about the impact beyond what the Committee could find. However, study abroad programs do not appear to have as many implications other than the obvious one - semesters are easier to arrange students programs and travel within the traditional structure. Additional data is needed to respond to this issue. This would include the needs of international students as well. No adequate study of the implication of the 4X4 on international students with regard to their needs, their attendance patterns and expectations has been carried out.

Contact hours, referred to as “seat time” is also a major concern. Current scheduling practices are already creating “seat time” challenges. The new time bands used by GW to alleviate the classroom space issues have already reduced the class contact hours. However, the principal concerns expressed by faculty were marketing and recruitment, particularly for graduate programs. The compressed time frame would significantly impact the recruitment process.

Report of Subcommittee III: Financial Motivation for Change to a 4x4 Curriculum

The Joint Administration Task Force (4x4 Task Force) Report claims that switching from the current 5x3 to a 4x4 curriculum structure would reduce instructional costs significantly. Scenarios evaluated in Appendix D of the 4x4 Task Force Report forecast cost savings ranging from 5 to 15 million dollars per year. These forecasts are produced by the assumption that 350 fewer courses/sections would be offered saving both labor and classroom rental costs. We note that among the “market basket schools” that GW is usually compared with, only 4 of the 15 schools have “some kind” of a 4x4 curriculum structure. Some of the others have already considered and rejected adopting a 4x4 curriculum.

Understanding the Basis for Forecasting of Cost Savings

The forecast of cost savings is based on a forecast of a 20% reduction in classroom teaching time per student, from 12.5 hours per week to 10 hours per week with no change in class size. This would necessitate a 20% reduction in the requirements for graduation from the current 40 courses to 32 courses. With no change in the number of courses taught by each faculty member, cost savings would arise due to a smaller wage bill for faculty and some reduction in classroom rental costs. (The 4x4 Task Force Report claims, without proof, that this reduction in classroom time would have a positive effect on student learning. This contention stands in contrast with literature on educational outcomes where there is evidence of a significant positive product of classroom time.¹ Furthermore, the 4x4 Task Force Report forecasts ignore the fact that, at some universities the 4x4 provides the same or even more than the 12.5 hours of classroom time as is currently provided in the 5x3) It appears that the 4x4 Task Force failed to produce a forecast of cost savings that would accompany a shift from 5x3 to the type of 4x4 in which classroom teaching time would not be reduced. Our expectation is that there would be no cost savings in this case.

Accordingly, our brief examination of the economics indicates that switching to a 4x4 with no reduction in classroom time (call this a 4x4-12.5 classroom hours) would result in a significant cost increase. The arguments supporting this position will be apparent upon reading the remainder of this report. Therefore, the only question remaining is the forecasts of cost savings for changing from a 5x3-12.5 to a 4x4-10.0 – i.e. for the case in which classroom time is decreased by 20%. (No attempt will be made to compensate for the fall in educational output associated with a 20% decline in classroom time.)

¹ See for example, Robert A. Fitzgerald, “College Quality and the Earnings of Recent College Graduates,” National Center for Educational Statistics, Research and Development Report, August, 2000. Also note that American Bar Association standards for accreditation include requirements for seat time per credit hour. See also the summary of effects on school performance generally in Erid Hanushek, “Assessing the Effects of School Resources on Student Performance: An Update,” *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, Summer 1997.

Important Factors Not Considered in the Forecast of Cost Savings

The forecast of cost savings offered by the 4x4 Task Force Report omits a number of factors that could alter the conclusions substantially. A number of the most obvious of these omissions are enumerated below. Given the short time provided for the Committee's work, this list should not be regarded as complete.

1. The most significant cost savings to be realized for a 4x4 implementation is in the reduction of full-time active status faculty needs. Indeed, if a 20% reduction in full-time faculty is made to correspond to the 20% reduction in course offerings, a substantial savings will be realized. On the other hand if the 20% reduction in faculty needs comes from a reduction in the vast number of part-time faculty the University employs – described as a desirable objective - there will be a cost increase because of the larger percentage of full-time faculty needed to staff the surviving courses. This decision is critical to understanding and estimating the financial impact of a 4x4 implementation.

2. The 4x4 Task Force Report notes that implementation costs associated with transforming a 5x3 into a 4x4 would be significant. Given that these costs would be experienced “up front” they could be more consequential than any future cost savings. Indeed, the “bottom line” effect of the switch should be based on discounting the early transition costs and any future cost savings to a present value.

3. The 4x4 Task Force Report forecast is based on the assumption that, under a 5x3 each student takes 5 courses per semester and under a 4x4 each student takes 4 courses per semester. However, students are far more likely and able to depart from the standard of 4 courses under a 4x4 than under a 5x3 curriculum. Indeed, if anything, the 5x3 invites students to take fewer courses per semester while the 4x4 encourages students to take more than 4 courses per semester. If students responded to the 4x4 by taking an extra course, it would become a 5x4 and the number of total courses taken by students will not be reduced much. Under these circumstances the forecasted cost savings would fall substantially.

4. If students adjust course loads as noted above, and the requirement for graduation is 32 courses, and additional course credit can result from advanced placement or summer sessions, many students may routinely graduate in 6 or 7 semesters rather than 8 as is now the norm. In addition to obvious effects on the “class tradition” associated with the 8 semester norm, this will impose significant additional costs due to the cost of recruiting new students to fill enrollment.

5. The 4x4 Task Force Report focuses on engagement of students and expenditure per student as problems – the former to be increased and the latter decreased. Based on an informal analysis of higher education, we suspect that educational engagement of students and expenditure per pupil are positively related! The 4x4 Task Force Report never considers the possibility that the low level of instructional expenditure per student at GW is the impediment to greater student learning and satisfaction! We believe that a comparative analysis of instructional expenditures per pupil at GW and market basket schools would confirm the hypothesis that GW expenditures are currently too low rather than too high. Accordingly, we

recommend that, going forward, a comparative cost analysis of GW and market basket schools be performed on cost data which separates expenditure by instructional expense (i.e. faculty salaries by full time-part time), educational support, libraries, academic plant, general and administrative, categories so that future planning can focus on cost savings in areas where current expenditures per pupil are inconsistent with the competition.

Conclusions

Based on the above considerations, we conclude that switching from a 5x3 to a 4x4 with reduced classroom time could result in either net cost savings, no significant change in net costs, or net cost increases for the institution depending on implementation decisions and the relative effects of the items noted above and not considered in the 4x4 Task Force Report. Given that the effect on learning from a reduction in classroom time is considered to be negative by most faculty (note that this proposal is not suggested for the School of Law because accreditation there is based on the assumption that learning is positively related to classroom time), it is curious that there is any support for such a change.

Respectfully submitted, Robert J. Harrington

Members of the Committee: Professors Abravanel, Biles, Cherian, Gallo, Kahn, Tickin, West, Yezer & Harrington (Chair)

**A RESOLUTION ON THE TIMETABLE FOR ACTION ON THE
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JOINT ADMINISTRATION/FACULTY TASK
FORCE ON A POSSIBLE FOUR-COURSE, FOUR-CREDIT
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULAR STRUCTURE (06/3)**

WHEREAS, The George Washington University Administration established a joint Administration/Faculty Task Force (the Task Force) under the leadership of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs in April 2005 to examine the feasibility of introducing a four-course, four-credit undergraduate curricular structure and,

WHEREAS, the Task Force, after eighteen months of deliberations, produced and circulated a report on October 24, 2006 together with appendices covering minutes of Task Force meetings, visits to other universities/colleges - trip reports, summary of trip reports, models for the possible reduction of general education requirements, preliminary models of expense-reduction scenarios in converting from a 5x3 to a 4x4 curricular structure, goals and scenarios and,

WHEREAS, the Faculty Code of The George Washington University specifically grants the regular, active-status faculty an active role in the development, revision, or elimination of curricular offerings of each department and school and,

WHEREAS, the Administration accepted Resolution (05/5) adopted by the Faculty Senate, at its meeting on January 20, 2006 that the final report from the Task Force be submitted concurrently to the School Faculties and the Faculty Senate for full review, debate, and subsequent recommendations and,

WHEREAS, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate established a Special Committee of the Faculty Senate to receive and evaluate the report of the Task Force and to make comments and recommendations to the Faculty Senate and,

WHEREAS, on receipt of the Report on October 24, 2006, the Special Committee was convened on October 30, 2006 and arrived at an estimate of its responsibilities to assess the Task Force report together with relevant materials and documents available to it and not included in the Task Force Report and,

WHEREAS, implementation of a 4x4 curriculum would significantly change the organization and operation of the University's educational activities and would require the expenditure of enormous faculty resources for the next several years, and

WHEREAS, the Special Committee, in the light of previous status reports from the faculty representatives (as reported at the Faculty Senate meeting of April 14, 2006 and summarized in the minutes thereof), determined that the recommendations of the Task Force report would require additional inquiry and thorough deliberation by the Faculty Senate and by the Faculty members throughout the University through their School's Faculty meetings and committees, and

WHEREAS, such inquiry and deliberation could not be accomplished within a two-month timetable, and

WHEREAS, the Schools and the Faculty Senate must have sufficient time to comment on the Task Force Report and to make their recommendations in line with their responsibilities regarding any changes to the curriculum, **NOW, THEREFORE,**

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

That the Senate Special Committee and aforementioned School Faculties make their recommendations no later than one week before the Faculty Senate meeting of April 13, 2007.

Special Committee on the Proposed 4x4 Curriculum Report
November 7, 2006

Adopted November 10, 2006



THE GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON DC

Academic Affairs

Faculty Counts – Fall 2006

**Non-tenure-track and tenure-track faculty
members**

Data as of 1 November, 2006

Faculty Senate Presentation

by

Executive VP for Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman

16 February 2007



Regular Active Status Faculty Numbers (NTT and TT – Occupied Lines)

Academic Affairs

School	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999
CCAS	410	409	420	411	399	392	374	371
ESIA	44	44	44	42	41	37	39	37
SB	121	122	122	118	131	130	123	120
SEAS	81	81	85	87	85	82	76	71
GSEHD	66	73	70	70	71	67	68	65
Totals	722	729	741	728	727	708	680	664



Regular Active Status Faculty Numbers (NTT/TT – Occupied Lines)

Academic Affairs

School	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000
CCAS	102/308 24.9%	101/308 24.7%	108/312	107/304	102/297	98/294	75/299
ESIA	6/38 13.6%	6/38 13.6%	7/37	6/36	6/35	5/32	6/33
SB	21/100 17.4%	22/100 18.0%	22/100	27/91	29/102	29/101	22/101
SEAS	5/76 6.2%	5/76 6.2%	7/78	8/79	9/76	11/71	11/65
GSEHD	25/41 37.9%	30/43 41.1%	29/41	30/40	29/42	26/41	26/42
Totals	159/563 22.0%	164/565 22.5%	173/568	178/550	175/552	169/539	140/540



Regular Active Status Faculty Numbers (NTT and TT – Occupied Lines)

Academic Affairs

School	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000
CPS	8	3	3	2	2	0	0
Law	79	76	76	71	75	74	72
SMHS	88	89	83	84	85	87	93
SPHHS	48	50	50	38	38	34	29
Totals	223	218	212	195	200	195	194



Regular Active Status Faculty Numbers (NTT/TT – Occupied Lines)

Academic Affairs

School	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000
CPS	7/1 87.5%	3/0 100%	3/0	2/0	2/0	0/0	0/0
Law	11/68 13.9%	11/65 14.5%	11/65	11/60	13/62	12/62	14/58
SMHS	31/57 35.2%	32/57 36.0%	31/52	32/52	30/55	31/56	41/52
SPHHS	28/20 58.3%	31/19 62.0%	30/20	21/17	25/13	22/12	15/14
Totals	77/146 34.5%	77/141 35.3%	75/137	66/129	70/130	65/130	70/124



Limited Service Faculty Numbers (Excluding Research and Visiting)

Academic Affairs

School	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
CCAS	556	568	572	571	534	585
ESIA	68	58	61	49	42	51
SB	63	71	83	72	80	74
SEAS	71	72	86	87	110	89
GSEHD	82	76	81	69	74	71
Totals	840	845	883	848	840	870



THE GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON DC

Limited Service Faculty Numbers

(Excluding Research, Visiting, and Affiliated)

Academic Affairs

School	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
CPS	6	4	4	0	0	0
Law	170	161	138	136	106	139
SMHS	1,578	1,556	1,652	1,644	1,718	1,675
SPHHS	245	231	208	190	198	180
Totals	1,999	1,953	2,002	1,970	2,022	1,994



Research Faculty

Academic Affairs

School	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
CCAS	26	27	29	31	34
ESIA	2	2	1	1	2
SB	4	2	1	3	3
SEAS	15	12	13	15	15
GSEHD	8	8	7	7	7
CPS	2	0	0	0	0
LAW	1	3	2	1	1
SMHS	43	47	55	57	58
SPHHS	30	34	33	41	38

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Lilien F. Robinson, Chair
February 16, 2007

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Institutional Fundraising and the Faculty Senate

At the January meeting of the Executive Committee, Vice President for Advancement Laurel Price Jones, shared with the Committee ways in which the Faculty Senate might play a role in institutional fundraising. She proposed that the Executive Committee consider the merits of creating an Advancement Committee of the Faculty Senate.

The Executive Committee plans further discussion of this matter and subsequent reporting and recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

PERSONNEL MATTERS

Grievances

The two grievances, one in Columbian College and the other in the School of Business continue in process. The appeal has been heard in the first and the decision is pending. In the School of Business the case is still in hearing.

UPCOMING RESOLUTION

Committee on Libraries Resolution

The Executive Committee has received and will be placing on the agenda for the March meeting of the Senate a Resolution from the Committee on Libraries.

This is a follow up on the Committee on Libraries Resolution 05/7 which was passed by the Faculty Senate during the 2005-2006 session. The new Resolution is response to the administration's request for additional consideration of the matter.

UPCOMING REPORTS

Service Learning Report

The Committee on University and Urban Affairs has prepared a comprehensive report on service learning. The Executive Committee looks forward to receiving the report and having it transmitted to the Faculty Senate.

School Reports

As part of our program of updates on the schools, Dean Brown will be presenting his report on the Elliott School at the March meeting.

Report to the Board of Trustees Committee on Academic Affairs

On behalf of the Faculty Senate, the Chair of the Executive Committee presented the Faculty Senate's report on its activities since the October meeting of the Board of Trustees. Copies of the report have been distributed to the Senate today and will be attached to the Minutes of this meeting.

NEXT MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is scheduled for February 23. Resolutions, reports and any other matters should be submitted in advance of that meeting.

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

January 25, 2007

Since the last report to the Committee on Academic Affairs, the Faculty Senate has met three times, on November 10, December 8, and January 19.

ACTION ITEMS

Resolutions

“A Resolution to Amend the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate”

Presented by the Executive Committee and passed by the Faculty Senate, the purpose of this resolution is to extend the mandate and mission of the Senate’s Faculty Development and Support Committee.

It assigns to the Committee the responsibility for addressing an increased number of administrative and support issues being forwarded to the Faculty Senate. To reflect this expansion of mandate, the resolution also designates a change in name to the *Committee on Faculty Development, Including Academic and Administrative Support*. (Enclosure)

“A Resolution on the Timetable for Action on the Recommendations of the Joint Administration/Faculty Task Force on a Possible Four-Course, Four-Credit Undergraduate Curricular Structure”

This resolution was introduced by the Faculty Senate’s Special Committee on the Proposed 4x4 Curriculum Report.

It provides for an extension of the administration’s two-month timetable for faculty response to the report of the Task Force on the 4x4. The resolution points out that in view of the potentially profound and wide-sweeping consequences of adopting the recommendations, the report requires serious inquiry and deliberation. Further, the resolution stresses that this could not be accomplished in two months with respect to a report produced after eighteen months of deliberation.

The resolution establishes a deadline for the Schools’ and Faculty Senate response of one week prior to the April 13, 2007 Faculty Senate meeting. The resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate. (Enclosure)

“A Resolution on Construction of New Academic Facilities”

The resolution was presented by the Committee on Physical Facilities. Pursuant to the Committee's extensive study of the programmatic needs as presented by the Deans of the Schools, it addresses and makes recommendations with respect to future construction of academic facilities.

The resolution endorses investment in new facilities for the School of Engineering and Applied Science identifying it as a priority second to the construction of a Science Center. On the University side, it identifies the Graduate School of Education and Human Development and on the Medical Center side, the School of Public Health and Health Services as the next priorities.

The Faculty Senate passed this resolution. (Enclosure)

PERSONNEL MATTERS

Tenure Revocation

As required by the *Faculty Code*, the Dispute Resolution Committee heard the appeal in the School of Engineering and Applied Science tenure revocation case. The Committee upheld the decision of the Hearing Committee which supported the revocation of tenure.

Grievances

The two grievances, one in the Columbian College and the other in the School of Business continue in process. The appeal has been heard in the first, and a decision is pending. In the School of Business the case is still in hearing.

REPORTS

Report on the School of Public Health and Health Services

As part of the ongoing updates by the Deans of each School, Dean Ruth J. Katz presented a report on the School of Public Health and Health Services.

She briefed the Senate on the progress made by the School since its founding in 1997 as well as the challenges faced with respect to endowment, physical facilities, and the number of tenured and tenure-accruing faculty appointments. The latter is of particular concern with respect to attracting highly qualified faculty. It also places the School out of compliance with the tenure/ non-tenure faculty ratio requirement of the *Faculty Code*.

Report of the Law School

Dean Frederick M. Lawrence provided an update on the Law School, focusing on the internationalization of the School's curriculum, faculty productivity, and the School's advancement programs and resultant accomplishments.

Report on Emergency Preparedness

Vice President for Public Safety and Emergency Management, John N. Petrie provided a review of the University's emergency preparedness efforts. The report included information on the structure and lines of responsibility, ongoing major projects, system of campus advisories, outreach education for students, faculty and staff, and the University's points of contact with Consortium members and the city.

Report on Campus Security

University Police Chief, Dolores A. Stafford, presented an overview of the programs, measures, and mechanisms in place for on campus safety and security of the University community at Foggy Bottom and at Mount Vernon.

Ms. Stafford reported that the University Police is now an accredited law enforcement agency, noting that less than 1% of the nation's university police departments are accredited..

Interim Reports of Committees of the Faculty Senate

As customary, at the December and January meetings, Chairs of Standing Committees presented written and/or oral reports on matters that have been resolved, considered or under consideration by their committees.

OTHER MATTERS

Meeting with Dr. Steven Knapp

Over the semester break, at the invitation of the Executive Committee, incoming President Dr. Steven Knapp joined the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate for luncheon and discussion. The Executive Committee extended good wishes and offered assistance on behalf of the faculty.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilien F. Robinson, Chair
Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Enclosures