THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D.C.  

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON  
FEBRUARY 19, 2010 IN THE STATE ROOM

Present: Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman, Registrar Amundson, and Parliamentarian Charnovitz; Deans Barratt, Burke, and Reum; Professors Barnhill, Benton-Short, Biles, Cordes, Corry, Dickson, Galston, Garcia, Garris, Griffith, Harrington, Helgert, Hotez, Johnson, Klaren, Pagel, Parsons, Rehman, Robinson, Simon, Wilmarth, Windsor, and Wirtz

Absent: President Knapp; Deans Brown, Dolling, Futrell, Lawrence, Phillips, and Scott; Professors Boyce, Costanza, Green, Lipscomb, and Plack

The meeting was called to order by Executive Vice President Lehman at 2:15 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting held on January 15, 2010 were approved as distributed.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Professor Robinson requested and received unanimous consent so that the following presentation could be heard as the next item of business.

UPDATE ON THE BENCHMARKING AND PROGRAMMING PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE PROPOSED SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING COMPLEX

Senior Associate Vice President for Operations Alicia O’Neil distributed copies of a Powerpoint report (the report is attached) and introduced members of the Ballinger Architectural team Bill Gustafson and Craig Spangler. This team has been leading the process of benchmarking and programming for the proposed Science and Engineering Complex (SEC). This benchmarking and programming represents the first stage of the planning process.

Senior Associate Vice President O’Neil summarized the overall process for planning and construction of the proposed SEC (page 2 of the report). As a result of the Ballinger team's interactions with the University leadership, deans, faculty, and students, a number of high-level goals and objectives have come to light. The first is that the SEC should have a campus wide impact. While the SEC is intended to bring together and showcase science, engineering and research it should also enhance GW’s reputation, urban sustainability, and serve as a hub of activity to link disciplines housed in the building. The SEC is intended to be a collaborative and interdisciplinary building showcasing an engaged learning paradigm which integrates research with teaching and fosters interaction between faculty and students. The nature of activity in the building will be clear to everyone who visits the facility because science will be “in sight.” Research will be integrated with teaching
through the creation of research/teaching neighborhoods and learning common spaces. The SEC will also engage the public through outreach programs and serve as a magnet for forums on science and engineering in the District of Columbia.

Other project goals and design criteria are set forth on page 3 of the report. These include measurable outcomes based upon metrics of success, including cost and delivery. The SEC is intended for use over the next 50 to 100 years, and thus, it must be designed and built so that spaces within it can be flexible and adaptable as the programs in it grow and change over the years.

Senior Associate Vice President O’Neil gave a quick overview of the Ballinger team’s interaction with members of the campus community, including the Deans of the Engineering School and Columbian College, chairs of nine departments, and faculty and administrators in the Medical School. Input has also been received from the steering committee established by the Board of Trustees as well as the GW leadership committee comprised of administrators and students. An operating committee composed of faculty and staff has also met every two weeks to provide input. Details on the membership of these groups and an outline of stakeholder engagement activities undertaken since early November, 2009 are provided on pages 4 and 5 of the report.

Mr. Gustafson said he thought for a project of this magnitude, it is very important to build a participatory process from the very beginning. The purpose of the numerous and sometimes lengthy meetings described in the report is to engage different groups and individuals to build an understanding of programming to be accommodated in the SEC. Some of the questions explored included looking at the nature of research and teaching in the future, and the relationship between the two in this kind of building. Out of these workshops it became clear that interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary activity would be a logical outcome as disciplines merged together and interacted with one another. From that idea came the notion of a research teaching neighborhood, where students would interact with faculty not only in a teaching environment, but in a research environment as well.

Mr. Spangler agreed with Mr. Gustafson's observation that the trend in science and engineering is toward inter-and cross-disciplinary activity. At GW's Foggy Bottom campus, the departments which would potentially be located in the SEC are housed in twelve separate buildings, on separate floors, with departments split up. Page 10 of the report provides an illustration of space currently occupied by Engineering and Columbian College departments. The total square footage of existing space is estimated in the illustration at 155,000 net (usable) square feet.

Mr. Gustafson reviewed some of the key building principles (the information below is taken from pages 15 through 17 of the report). These include expectations that the building will be constructed to maximize the site potential; that research/teaching and departmental office space will be included (as well as the Dean's Office for the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences [SEAS]). Faculty offices for Departments with Affiliated Research include Columbian College Programs in Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Hominid Paleobiology, and SEAS departments in the following areas: Civil/Environmental, Computer Science, Electrical/Computer; Mechanical /Aerospace. Current programming, as noted, does not call for the inclusion of Engineering Management /Systems Engineering in the building.
Over the next ten years, it is projected that 41 additional faculty members will be added in Engineering and Columbian College programs, and most of this growth will involve faculty members with either funded or fundable research. An increase in the number of graduate students and post-doctoral students is also expected. Faculty in the Medical Center and other University collaborators will participate in the building through Centers, Institutes and Thematic Research.

Other key building principles include the expectation that teaching will include both non-major and upper level teaching labs and that research and upper-level teaching space will be flexible to transition between these two uses over time. Research space will be shared and allocated based on external funding, and incubation space will be available to faculty in the building. Finally, departmental shared support will be implemented to assist in space efficiency.

Mr. Spangler briefly reviewed the site analysis portion of the report (pages 12 – 14). Site limitations include the size of the building’s floorplate and a height limitation of 110 feet. Therefore the building has a capacity that is defined by those constraints. As outlined on page 18 of the report, at this stage of planning, it appears that the SEC will have a total capacity of 480,000 square feet with 8 floors above ground, and 6 below. This would provide a net square footage of 290,000 square feet. Parking for 300 to 400 cars will be provided on four levels below ground. Ceiling heights for the floors above the parking levels for the most part will be fourteen feet (see diagram on page 18). The 7th and 8th floors of the SEC will be constructed as shell space which will be unfinished/unoccupied initially. The SEC building will be able to provide the utilities for the three residence halls on the block, and opportunities are being sought to develop synergies with Ross Hall and further improve the sustainability of the facility.

Mr. Gustafson reviewed information presented on page 19 of the report, which illustrates projected uses of the 290,000 net square feet of space that will be available in the building for all of the functions contemplated.

Mr. Spangler and Mr. Gustafson then presented concepts featured on pages 20-23 of the report, basing their comments on models which they had brought to the meeting. These concepts included plans for Centralized Collaborative Interaction Zones on the Upper Levels of the SEC. Activities on floors 2-4 of the SEC will be devoted to teaching, research, and departmental operations. Floors 5 and 6 will be devoted to teaching and research. Three models illustrating planning concepts for the ground and lower levels of the building were presented, the first featuring an externalized commons, the next an externalized commons with a courtyard entry, and a third with an internalized commons plan. A critical challenge in a building with a large floorplate and many levels like this one is to find ways of bringing natural light into as many areas as possible, and the team is working very hard to build this into plans for the SEC.

In conclusion, Mr. Gustafson briefly commented on the benchmarking phase of the planning process which will allow the team to look at facilities and programs at other colleges and universities to gain ideas which will inform planning for the SEC. The information presented lists other NSF research-ranked educational institutions in the U.S. (page 25 of the report). The team plans to conduct site visits to gain knowledge about
science and engineering facilities and activities on these campuses during February and March, 2010. Campuses to be visited are listed on page 26 of the report.

Discussion followed. Professor Johnson asked how many faculty members from the Engineering School and Columbian College would occupy the building. Vice President Lehman responded that he could not give an exact figure, but said he thought the total would be around 80 individuals. He offered to supply exact figures at a future meeting. Professor Johnson also asked about approximate room dimensions for faculty offices and meeting room in the SEC. Mr. Gustafson responded that the typical office size is 120 square feet for faculty members. Two post-doctoral students could be accommodated in an office of the same size. In terms of teaching spaces, two kinds of class-labs will be accommodated, one for upper level courses for up to 24 students, and the other for foundation or core-level courses for up to 36 students. In addition, an auditorium in the SEC will be able to accommodate 160 people. In the teaching/research neighborhoods, forecasting is for seminar rooms on each of those floors that will accommodate up to 20 people per room.

Professor Wilmarth asked about the approximate percentage of teaching space – primarily undergraduate teaching space – that will be accommodated in the SEC, and how much will remain in existing buildings. Senior Associate Vice President O’Neil responded that the building has been designed in terms of capacity for courses that have related labs. Given current plans, all of the undergraduate teaching could be accommodated in the SEC.

Professor Hotez said he thought the plans look very exciting. Given the SEC’s proximity to Ross Hall, he said he thought this would be a great opportunity to create a bridge or tunnel connecting the two buildings to foster interactions with the Medical School. Senior Associate Vice President O’Neil responded that no one in the District of Columbia has been successful with requests like this, particularly for a tunnel in such close proximity to a Metro Station. The only entities that currently have a bridge are the District, the federal government and the D.C. Convention Center. Professor Hotez urged that the University seek a waiver to build a bridge over 23rd Street, as construction of the SEC will stimulate biotechnology in the District, leading to job creation and additional revenue.

Professor Barnhill said he viewed the project more or less as a venture capital investment with large potential returns, (and risks) and that frankly, at this point, an overall business plan or model is lacking. This would include not only spatial descriptions, but also the identification, articulation, and quantification of resources required to build the space and make the University competitive in its research efforts with other institutions. The plan also needs to include the identification of the types of human resources necessary for the project to be successful. Vice President Lehman responded that the programming and benchmarking process underway is a step that must be completed by the Ballinger firm before such a plan can be formulated by the University.

Professor Barnhill said he thought the business plan would include a fairly careful evaluation of competition in the research arena, including what kinds of resources have been required in order for other institutions to be successful at a high level. Vice President Lehman agreed with this observation, as this sort of analysis is part of the benchmarking process underway.
Professor Wirtz noted that the area around H Street is now something of a dumping ground. Cars exit onto H Street on both sides, from the University Garage, Duques, Tompkins, and Funger Halls, The shuttle bus is also stationed on H Street. At 6 o’clock at night, this part of H Street is as busy as any area downtown. New construction involving lane and pedestrian restrictions will only complicate an already difficult situation, and Professor Wirtz said he hoped that something would be built into the plan that would take this into account. Senior Associate Vice President O’Neil noted that the volume of traffic, some 1,200 cars, from the Parking Garage would be eliminated once that facility is demolished. 300 to 400 cars would park in the SEC once it is constructed. In addition, a traffic and pedestrian study is required by the District of Columbia for construction projects such as the SEC. Professor Wirtz said he hoped that plans for the SEC would address traffic concerns better than those made for Duques Hall and the recently constructed residence hall on F Street.

Professor Parsons said he was very concerned that the cost of the SEC project is unknown. Approximately 8 months from now, Trustee approval will be sought for this project. This is a rather rapid timeline from a planning point of view, and he asked if Ballinger was to arrive at financial estimates as part of its planning process. Senior Associate Vice President O’Neil responded that the planning process begins with a determination of what the building and the program it houses it are to be. The University is at the very beginning of that process with the SEC, and cost estimates and financial models will be developed following the programming and benchmarking.

Professor Parsons asked when the University would arrive at a firm cost estimate. Senior Associate Vice President O’Neil said that by the time of its October meeting, the Board of Trustees would have to be provided with an overview of the SEC project as well as the pricing and funding plan for the building. Professor Parsons followed up by asking if the Senate would know anything about the financial aspect of the project before the Board approves it. Vice President Lehman responded that the University has not deviated from its working timetable for this project, and he confirmed that financial projections would be made once the programming and benchmarking phase of the project is finished. The University is doing its utmost to stay on schedule so that the Faculty Senate and other faculty who have a deep interest in this building will have plenty of time to weigh in on what is and is not feasible in connection with this project. Vice President Lehman urged that everyone have patience with the process, and that questions be focused on the phase of the process that is now underway.

Professor Garris inquired about security for the SEC. Mr. Spangler said this was very much a part of the planning process, as there will be a tremendous through-put of people coming into the building on all levels. Ballinger is working on a concept where what he termed thresholds of security are built in, to allow visual engagement with building activity, while at the same time restricting access to spaces where through-put must be managed.

Professor Garris also asked if the SEC would incorporate state-of-the-art energy technology and make it visible so that users and visitors can appreciate it. He cited the construction of a relatively new building that does this at the Sidwell Friends School in Washington. Mr. Spangler responded that a subcommittee is already actively working on sustainability issues in connection with the project. Sustainability will also be a prominent consideration once the design phase begins.
Professor Griffith inquired about the total capacity of the building. Mr. Gustafson responded that if the building is fully occupied, it could accommodate approximately 180 faculty. Planning also takes into account approximately 4 graduate students or research assistants for each of these faculty members. These estimates are based on national experience. On the lower levels of the building, there is a capacity for up to 3,000 students using the facility over the course of a week. He added that he thought this was adequate capacity to deal with the combination of undergraduate non-majors and majors, and the projected growth in research and teaching faculty over the next ten years.

Professor Corry said that he did not recall seeing an artist’s rendering of the building in the presentation, and he wondered how much thought had been given to ensuring that the building would be outstanding architecturally. Senior Associate Vice President O’Neil confirmed that the schematic design phase in which this is done will immediately follow the planning process now underway. Discussion followed. Professor Korman was recognized and reported that he had traveled with the planning group to Temple University in Philadelphia where they viewed a building combining research and teaching functions similar to those contemplated for the SEC. He said he talked with the Dean, who had been able to raise approximately 40% of the cost of the building. Two factors were key in the effort to raise funds for the project: academic and research programs to be housed in the facility, and the distinctive design of the facility itself. Senior Associate Vice President O’Neil said she thought it would be important to strike the right balance between the building’s compatibility with existing campus architecture and the iconic quality desirable for a landmark type of building on campus, an observation with which Mr. Spangler agreed.

Further discussion followed about the building's potential to showcase research and teaching in science and engineering at the University. At the conclusion of the discussion, Professor Robinson thanked the architects from the Ballinger group for their presentation, saying she thought the building was beautifully designed and that space flow in the facility was particularly effective.

RESOLUTION 09/3, “A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE WITH RESPECT TO THE PARTICIPATION OF RESEARCH FACULTY IN THE GOVERNANCE OF THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND HEALTH SERVICES”

Before introduction of the Resolution, Professor Biles indicated that he would be requesting the privilege of the floor for Interim Dean Josef Reum of the School of Public Health and Health Services. He also said that at the conclusion of the discussion on the Resolution, he intended to offer a motion to defer the Senate’s vote on the Resolution until September, 2010. This delay would allow the School time to complete the recruitment of a new Dean, and allow him or her to participate in discussion of this important change in the role of research faculty on decisions within the School.

Professor Garris, Chair of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, noted that Resolution 09/3 and the accompanying report was distributed with the agenda for the meeting. There have been discussions concerning the Resolution with Professor Edward Cherian, Chair of the Joint Senate Subcommittee of the Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom and the Fiscal Planning & Budgeting Committees, which is
monitoring non-compliance with the *Faculty Code* by the School of Public Health & Health Services. In addition, the night before, Professor Garris said he met with Professors Brian Biles, Joseph Cordes, Sara Rosenbaum, and Arthur Wilmarth. As a result of that meeting several amendments were made to Resolution 09/3. These amendments have not been reviewed or approved by members of the PEAF Committee. Professor Garris moved that the amended Resolution 09/3 be considered in place of the Resolution distributed with the meeting agenda, and the motion was seconded.

After ensuring that the amended (or substitute) Resolution was distributed to everyone, Vice President Lehman called for discussion on the motion. Professor Dickson asked what substantive changes had been made to the original Resolution. Professor Garris responded that there was a concern expressed that the tone of the Resolution made it seem as if the PEAF Committee and the Senate were attacking the School of Public Health and Health Services, rather than expressing a spirit of collaboration. As the role of the Faculty Senate since the inception of the School has been one of trying to help it achieve its aspirations for academic excellence, build a national and international reputation as a pre-eminent School of Public Health, and meet the requirements of the *Faculty Code*, a preamble was added in the amended Resolution to make this clear.

Another concern that was raised is that research faculty members in the School are highly qualified, with excellent credentials. As noted by Interim Dean Reum in a letter to the Faculty Senate, they have made enormous contributions to the evolution of the School. There is a concern that the effect of the adoption and implementation of Resolution 09/3 would result in shutting out research faculty in the School from the governance process. In order to clarify that the Senate is not trying to exclude the SPHHS research faculty from general governance matters that the School deems appropriate, the language of the Resolution was amended by adding the term “code-specified” when reference is made to governance matters. Thus, research faculty would, in accordance with the *Faculty Code*, only be restricted from participation in the development of curricula, appointment, tenure, and promotion matters, and from the selection process for deans and other high-ranking academic officers in the School.

Lastly, Professor Garris noted that Professor Cherian’s Subcommittee had distributed a fifth status report on the School (see the enclosure to these minutes as referenced in the Report of the Executive Committee). The report was not received in time to include its findings in the Resolution circulated with the agenda, and so, amendments were made to Resolution 09/3 to reflect information submitted in this report dated February 4, 2010.

Professor Pagel raised a point of order, saying that he thought that an amended Resolution 09/3 which had not been approved by the PEAF Committee could not be substituted for the Resolution circulated with the meeting agenda. Rather, the original Resolution 09/3, which was approved by the PEAF Committee, reviewed by the Senate Executive Committee, and circulated with the meeting agenda, should be introduced, after which revisions and amendments could be considered. After consultation with Parliamentarian Charnotivz, Vice President Lehman confirmed that Professor Pagel was correct.
Professor Garris rescinded the motion to consider substitute Resolution 09/3; thus Resolution 09/3, circulated with the meeting agenda, was before the Senate. Professor Wilmarth moved that Resolution 09/3 be amended to contain all of the changes included in substitute Resolution 09/3 so that these changes could be discussed and acted upon before final approval of Resolution 09/3. The motion was seconded.

Professor Wirtz said that he was uncomfortable considering and potentially adopting Resolution 09/3 with all of the amendments and deletions proposed. He added that he would prefer to have the Resolution presented at a future meeting when an opportunity had been provided to review the Resolution in its final form. Professor Griffith agreed with Professor Wirtz on the need to postpone action on the Resolution, saying that the original motion was a nightmare of numerous Whereas Clauses and a relatively small number of Resolving Clauses. While Resolution 09/3 is accompanied by a Report, he said he thought that most of the material in the Whereas Clauses really should be included in the Report rather than in the Resolution itself.

There being no further discussion, a vote was taken on Professor Wilmarth’s motion, and the motion failed. Professor Simon moved to recommit Resolution 09/3 to Committee, and the motion was seconded. A vote was taken, and the motion passed.

Professor Griffith confirmed the Senate’s understanding that the motion to recommit did not specify when the Resolution is to be reported back and it is up to the Committee to introduce either the original Resolution 09/3 or an amended Resolution.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. NOMINATIONS FOR ELECTION OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Professor Robinson moved the nominations of the following faculty members to Senate Standing Committees: Faculty Development, Including Academic and Administrative Support: Theodore M. Barnhill as Chair through April 30, 2010 (replacing Professor Costanza, who is on sabbatical); Physical Facilities: Maida R. Withers. The nominations were approved.

II. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Robinson presented the Report of the Executive Committee, which is enclosed. Also enclosed are the Faculty Senate Report presented to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees at its meeting in February, 2010, and the Fifth Status Report (dated February 4, 2010) on Non-compliance with the Faculty Code by the School of Public Health & Health Services submitted by Professor Edward Cherian, Chair of the Joint Senate Subcommittee of the Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom and the Fiscal Planning & Budgeting Committees.
III.  CHAIR'S REMARKS

Vice President Lehman confirmed that he would be presenting the annual report on the composition of the faculty at the next Senate meeting on March 12.

He also distributed a Press Release issued February 19 announcing improvements to academic advising. The Press Release can be viewed by selecting this link:

http://www.gwu.edu/explore/mediaroom/newsreleases/thegeorgewashingtonuniversityannouncesimprovementstoacademicadvising

Vice President Lehman noted that there has been a lot of discussion on the part of undergraduate students concerning the inadequacy of academic advising, primarily in the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences. After consulting the deans of schools enrolling undergraduates asking for feedback and advice on improving the advising process, Vice President Lehman said he was able to tap initial savings identified by the Innovation Task Force so that the number of Columbian College advisers can be doubled, from nine to 18 over the next year. At the suggestion of Dean Phillips in the Business School, a university-wide advising committee will be established under the leadership of Professor of Psychology Carol Sigelman. The committee will be composed of one faculty member and one undergraduate student from each of the five schools enrolling undergraduates and meet monthly to examine best practices in advising in the schools, identify key issues, and recommend improvements.

A related development is accelerated completion of an electronic degree audit system, which will improve student advising because it will track a student’s progress toward completion of graduation requirements. An effort to accomplish this eight years ago was not successful because software available at that time could not be programmed to deal with the very complicated curriculum requirements in Columbian College. As everyone knows, there is also work underway in Columbian College to reduce the number of general curriculum requirements. This will have to be accomplished in the next year before a degree audit system can be fully implemented.

With respect to personnel searches underway, Vice President Lehman said that airport interviews have been scheduled with candidates for the decanal position in the School of Public Health and Health Services. In the decanal searches in the Graduate School of Education and Human Development and the School of Business, search firms have been retained, advertisements have been published, and applications are coming in to be reviewed by a Committee in each School.

Vice President Lehman also commented that recruitment is underway for senior people for the energy effort already in place at the Virginia campus, and two senior professors have been hired. They will be joined by junior faculty and several post-doctoral students. A search for a senior person in Physics is also underway.

A search is also in progress for a University Professor of International Affairs, who will replace Harry Harding, the former Dean of the Elliott School of International Affairs. He has gone to the University of Virginia to lead the newly-endowed Frank Batten School of Leadership and Public Policy. A search committee composed of current University
Professors has been convened to identify candidates who will interview for the open position.

Lastly, Vice President Lehman noted that a new Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations has been hired. President Knapp also recently established a new position -- that of Associate Provost for Diversity and Inclusion.

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Griffith noted that Dean Dolling of the School of Engineering and Applied Science reported at the last Senate meeting that 18 additional faculty would be added to the School's faculty. Professor Griffith added that he attended meetings of the Budget Committee faithfully, and, as he had never heard any discussion of funding to add these faculty members, he asked if money for this would come from an additional drawdown on the University’s endowment or funding from outside gifts. Vice President Lehman said that he was not present at the last Senate meeting, but after reading the minutes of that meeting, he thought the key point is that not all faculty positions in the Engineering School are filled at this time, and that a number of these 18 positions represent replacements of faculty who will leave GW, such as the six faculty members who have indicated their willingness to accept the voluntary separation package offered by the School. Additional positions may be added in these areas through fundraising and, possibly, through the work of the Innovation Task Force.

Professor Griffith noted that, in addition to funding for new hires, voluntary separation agreements would have to be funded. This will require a significant amount of money. Vice President Lehman responded that funds for this purpose have been set aside. As he could not provide complete details about this from memory, he offered to provide further information at the next Senate meeting.

Professor Cordes inquired about the progress of the Provost search. Vice President Lehman and Professor Robinson responded that President Knapp has received the recommendation of the Search Committee and the final decision is now up to him.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, and upon motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary
Faculty Senate: Agenda

1. Process Overview
   • Building Planning Process
   • Outreach & Engagement

2. Existing Conditions & Site Overview

3. Program
   • Principles & Assumptions
   • Program Concept

4. Benchmarking Overview
Overall Process

- Programming & Benchmarking
- Schematic Design
- Design Development
- **GW Board Approval to Proceed**
- PUD Approval
- Construction Documents
- Construction
- Commissioning / Move In
## Project Goals & Design Criteria

### GOALS

#### CAMPUS WIDE IMPACT

**Catalytic Effect**
- Site Location: HUB
- Urban Sustainability
- Enhance Overall Reputation of GW

#### COLLABORATIVE / INTERDISCIPLINARY

**Faculty & Students**
- Interaction
- No Barriers
- Open Character / “On Display”

#### ENGAGED LEARNING PARADIGM

**New Direction**
- Integrate Research w/Teaching
- Learning Commons
- Public Outreach

#### MEASURABLE OUTCOMES

**Metrics Of Success**
- Enhance GW Reputation
- Research Revenue
- Building Performance
- Cost / Delivery

#### 50 / 100 YEAR BUILDING

**Space & Systems**
- Flexible to Adapt
- Catalyst for Continued Growth of Science / Engineering / Research
Team Structure: Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGINEERING &amp; APPLIED SCIENCE (SEAS)</th>
<th>COLUMBIA COLLEGE OF ARTS &amp; SCIENCES (CCAS)</th>
<th>SCHOOL OF MEDICINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil/Environ Engineering</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Other Collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Other Collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical/Comp. Eng.</td>
<td>Hominid Paleobiology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng. Mgmt Systems</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical/Aerospace</td>
<td>Other Collaborators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATING COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demona Smith Strautmanis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can Korman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall Packer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Lenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermann Helgert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia O’Neil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Chiappinelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Werling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boston Prop.</th>
<th>SEAS</th>
<th>CCAS</th>
<th>Academic Ops</th>
<th>Faculty Senate</th>
<th>Ops/Budget</th>
<th>SOM</th>
<th>SOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**DEANS**
- DAVID DOLLING: Engineering
- PEG BARRATT: Columbian College

**GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LEADERSHIP COMMITTEE**
- **STEWEN KNAPP**: President
- **DONALD LEHMAN**: EVP Academic
- **LOUIS KATZ**: EVP Treasurer
- **LEO CHALUPA**: VP Research

**STUDENTS**

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES STEERING COMMITTEE**
### Stakeholder Engagement: Programming & Benchmarking Roadmap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORKSHOP</th>
<th>WORKSHOP FOCUS: KEY ISSUES / DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. November 3/4/5 | • Initial Department Chair, Deans & Leadership Interviews  
• Confirmation of Project Vision  
• Setting Processes & Formats                                                                                             |
| 2. November 17/18 | • Second Round of Program Interviews  
• Visits to On-Campus Facilities  
• **Collaborative Session with Chairs: Department Focused (11/20: 10:00-12:00)**                                                                                      |
| 3. Nov 30 / Dec. 4 (Tradeline: Dec. 2/3) | • Discuss Potential Site Visits  
• Initial Benchmarking Feedback  
• **Faculty Forum (Proposed 12/4: 10:00-12:00)**                                                                                       |
| 4. December 15/16 | • Initial Program Draft  
• Impact of Systems & Sustainability on Program  
• **Collaborative Session with Chairs: Research/Teaching Neighborhoods (12/18: 10:00-12:00)**                                                                                   |
| 5. January 5/6   | • Review Benchmarking Study: Metrics  
• Discuss Additional Site Visits  
• Critique / Modify Program  
• Critique Blocking / Stacking Options  
• **Faculty Forum (Proposed: January 10-12)**                                                                                                        |
| 6. January 19/20 | • **Collaborative Session with Chairs: Options Discussion (January 29: 10:00-12:00)**  
• Evaluate Block & Stack Alternatives                                                                                     |

**Notes:**
1. Additional Interactions for the Month of February Will be Added at a Later Date and Will be Based on Project Progress and Key Issues at That Time
2. The Process Will Also Include Student Interactions, Which Have not yet Been Scheduled, but Will Occur During the Spring Semester.
3. Additional Meetings on Sustainability and Building Systems are Also in Process.
Deans | Chairs Forum: Research Affinity Exercise

Information Commons / Interdisciplinary Clusters

Science & Engineering Clusters / Separate Teaching

Core Centric / Micro to Macro / Computational Intensity
Faculty Forum: Defining The Teaching-Research “Neighborhood”

Separate & Adjacent Teaching / Research / Commons: Shared Spaces as Links

Embedded Teaching / Theoretical & Experimental Mix Isolated Secure Experimental

Department & Research Affinity Groups Collaborative Space as Link: Research & Teaching

Radial Strategy: Non – Secure Core to Secure Perimeter Research Teaching Neighborhoods
Deans | Chairs Forum: Defining The Teaching-Research “Neighborhood”

Research Neighborhoods - Shared Cores & Teaching as Connector

Clusters - Theoretical, Experimental, Departmental

Hub (Resource Center) & Spokes (Intermittent Research/Teaching)
Deans | Chairs Forum: Ground Floor Affinity Exercise

- Entrances
  - Main Entry @ 22nd
  - Faculty / Quiet Entry @ 23rd
  - Quiet Spaces
  - Entry to LL
  - Corner Entry @ I
  - Sitting Area Entry @ H
  - Site Lines Through Floor Plate
  - Opening to LL
  - Filter Through Glass Teaching Labs
  - Segregated Teaching Support OK
  - Seating All Around
  - Lecture Hall @ Lower Level
  - Classrooms In Other Buildings
  - Research Space Above
  - Seminar Space: Res. Seminars
  - Planted Courtyards Between Bldgs.

- Entrances
  - 22nd & 23rd
  - Corner Entry @ I
  - Central @ H
  - Teaching Core @ 22nd & H
    - Adjacent to Campus Ctr.
    - Adjacent Teaching Support
  - Opening to LL
  - Lecture Hall @ LL Adj. to Commons
  - Classrooms In Other Buildings
  - Research Space Above
  - Seminar Space Important
  - Coffee @ Center of Activity
  - Study / Breakout Adj. to Munson Court
  - Planting @ H Street: South Face

- Entrances
  - 22nd & 23rd
  - Corner of H & 22nd
  - Pass Through Teaching
  - No Entrance @ I
  - Science Display
  - Central Opening:
    - Lower & Upper Levels
    - Mezzanine Overlook
  - Demonstration Research
  - Open Commons Adjacent to:
    - 3 Story Opening
    - Research
    - Munson Court
    - Hotel Offices
    - Coffee
  - Lecture Hall @ LL or 2nd Level

- Entrances
  - 22nd & 23rd
  - Middle of H
  - Corner of I & 22nd
  - Central Opening
  - Seating Around Opening
  - Demonstration Res. @ Main Level
  - Teaching Labs @ Main Level:
    - Re-Configurable
    - Adjacent Support
    - Commons In Between
  - Tutoring Center @ Main Level
  - Lecture Hall @ Lower Level
  - Seminar Rooms @ 2nd Level
  - Enclosed Study Adj. To Munson Court
Engineering / Science: Current Space for CCAS / SEAS Departments

TOTAL: 155,000+/- NASF
Site Images

Existing Site

Square 54
Site Capacity Studies: Lot Definition

Site Area: 56,415 sf

Maximum Lot Coverage: 90%

90% of 56,415 sf = 50,774 sf

50,774 SF @ 90% Coverage
Site Capacity Studies: Estimated Building Area

**Building Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated GSF Range</th>
<th>480,000 sf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Building Efficiency:</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated NASF:** 290,000 SF

Plus Parking (Number of Spaces TBD)
(Estimated 300 -400 Spaces on 4 Levels )
Key Building Principles

• Building Constructed to Maximize Site Potential

• Building To Include Research/Teaching/Departmental Office Space

• Faculty Offices for Departments with Affiliated Research Included
  • CCAS programs (Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Hominid Paleobiology)
  • SEAS programs (Civil/Environmental; Computer Science; Electrical/Computer; Mechanical/Aerospace; current program does not include Engineering Management/Systems Engineering)

• Includes Space for SEAS Dean’s Office
Key Building Principles

• Program Will Accommodate 10-Year Growth Projections for Faculty in CCAS/SEAS programs (+20 by 2014; +41 by 2019)

• Growth in Faculty will be Faculty w/ either Funded or Fundable Research

• Space Requirements Assume Integration of Increased Number of Doctoral/Post-Doctoral and Graduate Students into Research Projects

• Faculty in Medical Center & Other University Collaborators Participate in Building Through Centers/Institutes/Thematic Research
Key Building Principles

- Teaching Will Include Both Non-Major & Upper Level Teaching Labs

- Research and Upper-Level Teaching Space will be Flexible to Transition Between These Two Uses Over Time

- Research Space Will Be Shared and Allocated Based on External Funding

- Incubation Space Will Be Available to Faculty in the Building

- Departmental Shared Support Will Be Implemented to Assist in Space Efficiency
Building Section Concept

- **18'-6" MEP**
- **14' Shell**
- **14' Future Centers/Institutes/Teaching**
- **Institutes / Centers / Teaching**
- **Depts.**
- **Teaching / Research**
- **Dean**
- **Neighborhoods**
- **Non – Major Teaching**
- **Retail**
- **Non – Major Teaching & Forum**
- **Building Support**
- **High Bay / Cores**
- **14'-16'**
- **14'**
- **14'**
- **14'**
- **14'**
- **23rd St Setback**
- **110' Maximum**
- **10'**
- **9'**
- **9'**
- **9'**
- **9'**
- **9'**
- **10'**
- **18'**
- **18'-6" PH**
- **Above Grade**
- **Below Grade**

- **300-400 Cars**
- **Parking On 4 Levels**
- **3rd 14'**
- **4th 14'**
- **5th 14'**
- **6th 14'**
- **7th 14'**
- **8th 14'**
- **9th 14'**
- **10th 14'**
- **14' 1st**

- **Building Section Concept**
- **GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY: SCIENCE & ENGINEERING COMPLEX | BENCHMARKING & PROGRAMMING**
- **Ballinger**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>94 PIs @ 1185 SF (64 @ Floors 2-6 / 30 @ Floors 7 &amp; 8 Shell)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.L. Teaching Labs / Research / Centers</td>
<td><strong>143,470</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Labs / Support</td>
<td>52,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI Offices / Post Docs &amp; RA's</td>
<td>23,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Facilities &amp; High Bay</td>
<td>20,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Rooms / Interaction Spaces</td>
<td>11,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Assistants / Hotel Offices</td>
<td>3,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Level Teaching Labs / Support</td>
<td>18,480 (14 Labs @ 1,320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Teaching Lab Support</td>
<td>6,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Rooms</td>
<td>6,600 (10 @ 660)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Major Teaching Labs / Lecture</td>
<td><strong>43,120</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Teaching Labs</td>
<td>15,360 (8 Labs @ 1,920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Teaching Lab Support</td>
<td>3,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Hall / Meeting Rooms / Commons</td>
<td>10,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac. Hotel Off. / Resource Ctr / Breakout</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Offices</td>
<td><strong>30,520</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Administration Offices</td>
<td>9,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Research Faculty Offices</td>
<td>11,040 (92 @ 120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAS Dean’ Suite</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Support &amp; Retail</td>
<td><strong>13,800</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell (Centers / Institutes / Teaching)</td>
<td><strong>59,090</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>290,000 NSF</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upper Level Floor Concept: Floors 2-4

Teaching | Research Department Centric

Centralized Collaborative Interaction Zone
Upper Level Floor Concept: Floors 5&6

Teaching | Research Centric

Centralized Collaborative Interaction Zone
Ground & Lower Level Concepts

A  Externalized Commons

B  Externalized Commons Courtyard Entry

C  Internalized Commons
Building Section: Parking

- **1st Floor**: 14'-16' retail
- **2nd Floor**: 14'
- **3rd Floor**: 14'
- **4th Floor**: 14'
- **5th Floor**: 14'
- **6th Floor**: 14'
- **7th Floor**: 14'
- **8th Floor**: 14'

** MEP/CUP**
- **LL1**: 14'
- **LL2**: 18'
- **P1**: 10'
- **P2**: 9'
- **P3**: 9'
- **P4**: 9'

**Program Space**

**18'-6'' MEP**

**23rd St Setback**

**110' Maximum Setback**

**300-400 Cars Parking On 4 Levels**

**Above Grade**

**Below Grade**
## BENCHMARKING: GWU @ 85th / $119M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>NSF RANK</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>RESEARCH $</th>
<th>ENGINEERING</th>
<th>SCIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>$1,425</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Duke U.</td>
<td>$451M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Washington U.</td>
<td>$393M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Vanderbilt U.</td>
<td>$331M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Emory U.</td>
<td>$291M</td>
<td>3/2 Program</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Northwestern U.</td>
<td>$264M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>U. of Maryland</td>
<td>$236M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Boston U.</td>
<td>$235M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>U. of Virginia</td>
<td>$219M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>$199M</td>
<td>New Acquisition</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Wake Forest U.</td>
<td>$146M</td>
<td>3/2 Program</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>Lehigh U.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>Arizona State</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Blue Highlight Indicates Initial Acceptance of GW Benchmarking Request.
## Potential Site Visits: February – March 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONS</th>
<th>PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC (1 Day Trip)</td>
<td>NIH Building 10</td>
<td>Benchmark Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>Multiple Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>Multiple Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Multiple Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia (1 Day Trip)</td>
<td>CHOP</td>
<td>Research Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>Teaching / Research Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston (2 Day Trip)</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Multiple Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>Multiple Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>Broad Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago/Madison (2 Day Trip)</td>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>Multiple Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>Multiple Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>Multiple Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others:</td>
<td>Duke / Lehigh / Illinois</td>
<td>Multiple Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wake / Vanderbilt / Emory</td>
<td>Disparate Locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank You!
February 4, 2010

To: Lilien F. Robinson, Chair
   Faculty Senate Executive Committee

CC: Charles A. Garris, Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom Committee
   Joseph J. Cordes, Fiscal Planning & Budgeting Committee
   Josef Reum, Interim Dean, SPHHS

Re: Fifth Status Report on Non-compliance with Faculty Code by School of Public Health & Health Services

Joint Subcommittee members continue to review the efforts of the School of Public Health & Health Services with respect to Code Compliance. Projections for growth in Tenure and Tenure-Track Positions were received on January 8, 2010 (copy enclosed). The Subcommittee Chair, Edward Cherian, met with Interim Dean Reum and two Department Chairs in January 2010 and the Subcommittee recently met twice to review the latest documents available from SPHHS.

Our overall judgment is that the SPHHS continues to make good progress toward Code compliance and it is possible that in 2011 or 2012 the goal of the required number of tenured/tenure-track faculty will be met. Interim Dean Reum is again to be acknowledged for his continuing efforts and positive attitude toward making this effort successful.

The Joint Subcommittee continues to have concerns about the lack of specific APT criteria and process employed by SPHHS. At the department level there is even less available. In some cases no department APT documentation was provided when requested and we assume none exists. Currently there is an SPHHS “Advisory Group” responsible for gathering and analyzing APT criteria from other schools of Public Health and George Washington University schools. We have been informed that this Advisory Group will provide recommendations to the SPHHS APT Committee with regards to criteria and process for three specific classes of faculty: tenured/tenure-accruing, non-tenured, and research. We will continue to monitor this situation and seek to obtain draft copies of the school and department criteria and process when developed in order to assure that the school is making appropriate progress.

Edward J. Cherian, Chair
Subcommittee members:
Brian Biles, ex officio    Morgan Delaney
Michael Castleberry      Donald Parsons
Kurt Darr                Ryan Watkins (sabbatical)

Attachments
From: Josef Reum [josefr@gwu.edu]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2010 12:58 PM
To: Donald R Lehman, PhD, EVP; Edward Cherian, PhD
Subject: accurate SPHHS faculty data

Attachments: Tenure Projections 10_13_09 for Josef corrected.xls; ATT00004.htm
This is an update from the Oct 13th report previously provided, because three T/TT appointments were subsequently approved retro to 10/1. We have jumped from 41% to 62% from June 30, 2007 to Oct 13, 2009, and from 19 to 36 tenured/tenure-accruing faculty members. As of 10/13, we had 55 research faculty. I believe 46 were FT and 9 were PT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGULAR FACULTY</th>
<th>HISTORICAL DATA</th>
<th>7/1 to 10/13 2009</th>
<th>REMAINDER FY 2010</th>
<th>PROJECTIONS (STEADY STATE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># in place June 30 of previous FY</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Join during FY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Leave during FY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># in place on June 30 (end) of current FY</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENURED / TENURE-TRACK FACULTY ONLY</th>
<th>T / TT</th>
<th>T + TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># in place June 30 of previous FY</td>
<td>15 / 5</td>
<td>16 / 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Join during Year</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>3 / 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Leave during Year</td>
<td>0 / 2</td>
<td>2 / 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># in place on June 30 (end) of current FY</td>
<td>15 / 3</td>
<td>14 / 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TENURED / TENURE-TRACK FACULTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># as percent of all Regular Faculty on June 30 (end) of current FY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EOY** Tenure/Tenure-Accruing  
EOY Tenure/Accruing  
EOY Non Tenure-Accruing  
EOY Non Tenure-Accruing

* One tenure-track faculty member was awarded tenure.  
** This report includes one faculty member (non-tenure accruing) who was on leave as of 10/13/09.
The Faculty Senate has met three times since the October 16, 2009 meeting of the Committee on Academic Affairs.

On behalf of the Faculty Senate, I offer the following report.

REPORTS:

Update on Campus Construction

At the November meeting the Faculty Senate received an update from Executive Vice President and Treasurer Katz on projects under way on the Foggy Bottom, Mount Vernon, and Virginia campuses. He addressed the implementation of the 2007 Foggy Bottom campus plan, redevelopment of the Hospital site, and project milestones pertaining to the proposed Science and Engineering complex. His report also detailed the University’s continuing public/private partnership with the School without Walls. That partnership resulted in the renovation/modernization of the School’s facilities and the construction of the new University residence hall on F Street.

With respect to the Science and Engineering Complex, Vice President Katz reported that he anticipated that the benchmarking and programming phase of the project would be completed in late January or early February. One of the issues raised by the Faculty Senate related to the accommodation of undergraduate and graduate students in the new facilities. This was the major rationale behind the Faculty Senate’s resolution that urged the construction of a science facility. The concern that was expressed in the discussion following Vice President Katz’s report was that the Science and Engineering Complex should not become primarily a sponsored research facility that does not address and solve problems of the existing science facilities.

Report on the College of Professional Studies

Dean Kathleen Burke provided a report at the December meeting on the College of Professional Studies. It included an overview of the history of the College (chartered in 2001), the current organizational structure, and searches currently underway. She outlined the governing structure of the College and provided data on the demographics of the student body, enrollments, and revenues for fiscal year 2009.

Dean Burke emphasized the College’s development of curricular partnerships such as the U.S. Security and Safety Leadership Graduate Program with the U.S. Marshals, and the partnership with the Hildebrant Institute for the Law Firm Management Program. She also addressed the strategic priorities for the College including launching pilot international offerings, designing faculty development programs, improving student services, and defining a research agenda.
**Report on the School of Engineering and Applied Science**

At the January meeting Dean David S. Dolling presented data on the growth over the last five years of graduate and undergraduate enrollment, undergraduate majors, graduate programs, and student/faculty ratios. He discussed the Engineering School’s support of thirteen research centers and institutes and numerous research facilities and laboratories. He also reported on research funding in fiscal year 2009, which includes grants from the National Science Foundation, U.S. government agencies, and private sector and non-profit organizations.

Dean Dolling also addressed the Engineering School’s research and internship partnerships with national laboratories, government agencies, and corporations as well as the joint research partnerships formed by the School’s faculty with faculty from other universities. He noted that the Engineering School has established more than twenty academic exchange partnerships with universities and institutions in nineteen countries.

**Report on University Research**

Vice President for Research Leo Chalupa provided an update at the January meeting of the Faculty Senate on the activities of the Office of Research. He outlined in some detail the substantial reorganization of the Office of the Vice President for Research that has taken place since his appointment.

He reported that the campus and Medical School research operations were now combined and new campus-wide initiatives had been launched and that the University is increasing research initiatives for principal investigators, Chairs, and Deans. Vice President Chalupa also reported that the University is establishing undergraduate research awards and launching collaborations on car safety and energy with Virginia Tech.

With respect to campus-wide research, he enumerated specific initiatives that are being undertaken. They are Autism, Computational Biology, Sustainability, Science Policy, Neglected Diseases, and Renewable Energy.

**Budget and Finance Update**

At the November meeting, Professor Joseph Cordes, Chair of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, presented a University Budget overview covering operating results and the balance sheet for Fiscal Year 2009. According to the information provided the Senate Committee, total revenues exceeded expenses by $20.3 million; however, when combined with a decrease in net assets of $20.1 million only a small operating surplus remained.
PERSONNEL MATTERS

Grievances

With respect to the two grievances previously reported, one in Columbian College of Arts and Sciences was settled through mediation. The second case, (a grievance in the Elliott School of International Affairs) Professor Carol Izumi of the Law School has agreed to serve as mediator. The faculty is especially grateful to Professor Izumi who has undertaken challenging and time-consuming mediation assignments over a period of many years.

OTHER MATTERS

Faculty Senate Committee Assignments

Assignments undertaken by the Standing Committees of the Faculty Senate for the 2009-2010 term include the following.-Review of TIAA/CREF stock and mutual fund options and investigation of additional investment options offered at other market-basket academic institutions.
(Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion)
-Review/Assessment of undergraduate academic advising
(Committee on Educational Policy)
-Review of proposed patent policy which would replace the existing Policy on Patents and Scholarly Works
(Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom)
-Preparation of resolution on scholarly publications (Open Access to Scholarly Research)
The resolution has been forwarded to the University’s Office of Legal Counsel for review.
(Committee on Professional Ethics and Committee on Libraries)
-Planning of programs to bring together University faculty and administrators with D.C. government leaders, citizen groups and the Foggy Bottom community
This is an ongoing annual activity of the Committee
(Committee on University and Urban Affairs)
-Consideration of the appropriate weighting of faculty scholarship, teaching and service for purposes of tenure and promotion decisions and salary increases
(Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion)
-Review of undergraduate and graduate admissions, financial aid, and graduate student support packages
(Committee on Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid and Enrollment Management)

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilien F. Robinson
Chair, Executive Committee
Faculty Senate
On behalf of the Executive Committee I have the following report.

**ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Proposed School of Nursing**

The Executive Committee has established a Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing. The Committee will examine the proposal and the supporting evidence and then present their findings and recommendations to the Faculty Senate. The latter will form the basis of a Senate resolution to be transmitted to the administration and the Board of Trustees. Professors Brian Biles, Edward Cherian, Gary Simon, and Arthur Wilmarth have agreed to serve on the Special Committee.

Senior Associate Dean for Health Sciences Jean Johnson has been invited to meet with the Senate Executive Committee and members of the Special Committee to begin discussions of the proposal on February 26th.

**Science and Engineering Complex**

On February 5th. The Executive Committee received a presentation on the benchmarking and programming for the proposed Science and Engineering Complex from William Gustafson and Craig Spangler of the Ballinger Architectural Firm.

**University Provost Search**

At the invitation of the Provost Search Committee, the members of the Executive Committee met with the four candidates invited for on campus visits.

**REPORTS**

**School of Public Health and Health Services**

The Executive Committee has received a fifth status report concerning non-compliance with the *Faculty Code* by the School of Public Health and Health Services from the Joint Senate Subcommittee of the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom and the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committees. This report, provided by Professor Edward Cherian, will be circulated with the minutes of today’s meeting.
Faculty Senate Report to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees

The Faculty Senate Report presented to the Academic Affairs Committee on February 11 is available for distribution today and will be appended to the minutes of today’s meeting.

OTHER MATTERS

Re-establishment of the Human Resources Benefits Review Committee

Professor Miriam Galston, Chair of the Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies Committee, has invited Chief Human Resources Officer Louis Lemieux to meet with the Committee and invited guests to discuss the re-establishment of a Benefits Review Committee that would address the needs of both faculty and staff.

Upcoming Reports to the Faculty Senate

Executive Vice President Lehman will present his annual Report on the Composition of the Faculty at the March 12th Senate meeting. The biennial Report on the Recruitment and Retention of Women Faculty and Minority Faculty will be presented at the Senate meeting on April 9th.

March 12th Faculty Senate Meeting

Please note that the Faculty Senate meeting on March 12 will be held in Marvin Center 403 rather than the State Room.

May 14th Faculty Senate Meeting

Because of scheduling issues surrounding Commencement activities, the Faculty Senate meeting on May 14 will begin at 1 p.m. rather than the customary time of 2:10.

Faculty Senate Committee Service Forms

Faculty Senate Committee forms are being distributed to faculty throughout the University. Please urge your colleagues to join in the work of the Senate by indicating their willingness to participate in committee service.

Executive Committee Meeting

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is scheduled for February 26. Please submit resolutions, reports and any other matters for consideration prior to that date.