

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

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

- Present: President Knapp, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman, Registrar Amundson, and Parliamentarian Johnson; Deans Barratt, Futrell, and Phillips; Professors Becker, Castleberry, Cordes, Corry, Englander, Galston, Garris, Griffith, Helgert, Johnson, Marotta, Pagel, Parsons, Robinson, Rycroft, Simon, Wilmarth, Windsor, Wirtz, and Yezer
- Absent: Deans Brown, Katz, Lawrence, Scott, Tong, and Whitaker; Professors Artz, Biles, Costanza, Delaney, Harrington, Pelzman, and Wade

The meeting was called to order by President Knapp at 2:20 p.m.

IN MEMORIAM

Professor Wilmarth read a Tribute in Memory of David Earl Seidelson, Lyle T. Alverson Professor Emeritus of Law. (The Tribute is attached).

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman distributed copies of amendments he wished to make to the minutes of the meeting held on February 8, 2008. Those are as follows in strikethrough/underline format:

On page 7, third paragraph:

Vice President Lehman reported that, at this point in time, GSEHD has made the most progress toward the goal. It is presently operating at about 18 – 19% margin which is a significant improvement as just over a few years ago, when the School actually had a negative margin. ~~Unfortunately, Engineering School results have gone up and down—there was a period when the School seemed to be making good progress upwards, but most recently the School has gone backwards; it does not now have a negative margin, but it has not shown significantly positive gains as GSEHD has done.~~ Engineering School results have most recently gone down and up (FY 05 – 16.5%, FY 06 – 15.4% and FY 07 – 22.6% for the unadjusted margins) after a period when the School seemed to be making continuing progress upwards. So, to a limited extent, Professor Wirtz’s observation about tenure slots, teaching capacity, and research capacity is accurate.

On Page 9, second paragraph:

Professor Garris asked about the 40% margin as a benchmark for the GSEHD and SEAS. It seems that benchmarks are imposed that exclude the contribution of research that the schools and faculty make. Vice President Lehman responded that this is only because research is not included in the unified budget model; research itself, i.e., direct expenditures, are regarded as a zero contribution. He added that he thought whether or not research should be included or excluded in the unified budget model was something that could be discussed and that certainly the research component that comes from indirect costs could be added to the model as revenue if the expenses to support the research infrastructure (Office of Research Services, etc.) are allocated to each of the schools according to their use of such.

Also, the full name for the acronym IPEDS on Page 8, third paragraph should read: (~~International~~ Integrated Post-Secondary Educational Data System).

Upon motion made and seconded to accept these corrections, a vote was taken. The minutes were approved as amended.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Professor Robinson requested and received unanimous consent to change the order of the agenda so that President Knapp, who had to leave the meeting at 3:15, could present his remarks as the next item of business.

CHAIR'S REMARKS

President Knapp related that he had just returned to campus from a function held at the architecturally distinctive Scottish Rite Temple on 16th Street N.W., where George Washington's role in the Freemasons is prominently displayed. In part because of the historic connection between the University and the Masons going back to the University's eponymous founder, the Scottish Rite organization has, since the 1920's, provided scholarships and graduate fellowships for students enrolled at The George Washington University. Scottish Rite scholarships presently support 61 of GW's students and in fact, the contributions that the Masons have made to the University's endowment over the years now constitute the largest single component of the endowment dedicated to student aid at both the undergraduate and graduate level. In addition, four years ago, the Masons launched an internship program which is unusual in that it pays a salary to student interns who participate.

President Knapp reported that the University's Board of Trustees recently endorsed a plan to quadruple GW's fundraising efforts in the area of student support, again, at the undergraduate and graduate levels, over the next five years. As an institution, GW is currently raising approximately \$10 million per year in support for scholarships; that includes gifts to the endowment and for current use. President Knapp said it was his sense, given the ambitions the University currently has to significantly increase the resources it is bringing in from private philanthropy, that a more robust effort will be fruitful. To this end, the administration has engaged each of the deans in a conversation about establishing goals

in each school to increase the support the University enjoys from private sources for the support of its students.

President Knapp said he had also traveled to Seoul, Korea at the invitation of a University alumnus, who was a visiting scholar here for two years in the 1990's, and who was inaugurated as the new President of the Republic of Korea. The inauguration was well attended and enthusiasm among the University's alumni there was high. Quite a large number of talented students come from the Republic of Korea to study at GW, and traditionally this country has been one of the largest sources of international students on campus. While in Korea, President Knapp visited a Korean University and met with the head of a Korean foundation that already supports Korean Studies at GW. In fact, GW has just filled the second of two chaired professorships in the Elliott School of International Affairs funded by this Korean foundation.

President Knapp's travel schedule also took him to Taipei, where he had an opportunity to visit Chengchi National University, which is one of the strongest universities in Taiwan. GW has a partnership with this institution in intellectual property law, and the possibility of a broader collaboration in areas of common interest was a topic of discussion. He also received, on behalf of the University, the second of two \$1 million checks from the parent of two students who attended the University. President Knapp also visited GW alumni in Los Angeles and San Francisco on the return portion of his trip from Korea.

President Knapp explained that one purpose of his extensive travel was to visit locations with major concentrations of GW alumni. He said that in each place he has visited, there have been very significant expressions of interest in supporting the University in a variety of ways, by helping to recruit students, getting the word out about the strength of the University's programs, providing monetary support, and organizing stronger networks of alumni across the world. The University counts some 220,000 alumni worldwide, and it has not had a strong tradition of engaging them to the extent that it might. As many know, GW has appointed Adrienne Rulnick to the post of Associate Vice President for GW Alumni Relations and Development. President Knapp said he was gratified to speak recently with the Student Association President, Nicole Capp, who told him how pleased she and her fellow students have been with the way in which the development and alumni relations staffs are reaching out to GW's current students, who are beginning to think of themselves as alumni and become part of that network going forward.

While it is valuable to engage with alumni and parents of either current or prospective students and foster the development of these networks, President Knapp said that his travel schedule also provides the opportunity to visit with various university partners, to cultivate and explore a wide range of different partnerships. One example would be GW's collaboration with Sciences Po in Paris, where President Knapp said he had met with his counterpart at the institution. In England, President Knapp had an opportunity to meet with the heads of three institutions: the London School of Economics, at which a very large number of GW's exchange students study, the Imperial College London, with which GW shares a collaboration on the prevention of infectious and parasitic diseases that affect large numbers of people in the developing world, and also King's

College, which is associated with GW's humanities program. At the conclusion of his remarks, President Knapp entertained questions from Senate members.

Professor Englander asked the President to comment on the search for the newly created Vice President for Research position. President Knapp confirmed that the University is undertaking a national search to fill this position, and the Senate Executive Committee has been consulted concerning selection of members of the Search Committee. President Knapp added that additional resources for the area of research infrastructure have been provided, as the demand for this was a very strong message that he heard from faculty at the Town Meeting and in many other forums in which he had had an opportunity to hear from faculty. Establishment of this new position will provide a single Chief Research Officer for the University and the Medical Center, rather than the two now in place. Another objective is to establish a cabinet-level position focused on research across the disciplines, not just federally sponsored research in the physical and health sciences, which currently forms the bulk of the University's federal sponsorship. The University will also seek sponsorship by foundations and private sources for research which does not enjoy a great deal of federal support.

Professor Englander asked if it was possible that more than \$5.4 million in additional resources for research could be made available. President Knapp said that the University settled upon the amount of the initial infusion of funds in advance of the arrival of the new Vice President, one of whose roles will be to take a very close look across the entire institution at what the needs are. He said he also expected that he or she might have views both on the manner in which the University is investing its resources in the research effort, but also on what might be some additional sources of revenue which could be tapped. In the long run, President Knapp said he hoped the University would be able to draw support from more private and public sources than are now available to it. The \$5.4 million investment is designed to help with some of the most pressing infrastructure issues, and also to provide some seed money for the new person to invest once he or she is on campus.

Professor Wirtz said he had noticed that the announcement describing the new position said that the Vice President would report directly to the President through a Committee of three, and he asked how it was possible for someone to report directly to the President, but do this through a Committee. Professor Wirtz said he had requested an organization chart from the President's Office, but as yet had not received one, and added that he was curious about where the Committee stands in the overall administrative structure. President Knapp responded that the Committee of three is the existing Executive Committee on Research, which consists of three Vice Presidents with current budgetary responsibility in areas that affect Research: Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman, Executive Vice President and Treasurer Louis H. Katz, and Provost and Vice President for Health Affairs John F. (Skip) Williams. The new Vice President will on an operational basis be working with this Committee, but there is no question that he or she will have access to the President on a regular basis.

Professor Wirtz said it seemed to him that the University will now have a three-person Committee which is acting as if it is the Provost, because the new Vice President will report to this group. President Knapp said that because of the current separation between the academic divisions (the University and the Medical Center, which includes the School of

Public Health and Health Services) and the need for monitoring reporting, compliance, and budgetary issues, it was decided that using the existing structure as a reporting framework would enable the University to move fairly quickly in establishing this new position. There are, of course, many ways in which reporting structures may be organized, and this could be examined over time. Professor Wirtz asked if the Senate would be involved in the event such arrangements are revisited. The President responded that the Senate has certainly been involved in all of the discussions thus far. Professor Wirtz said from his perspective, and as a personal view, this arrangement did not make sense to him. He said he understood the concept of a Provost and having people report to the Provost, but he said that he thought it would be a disincentive for persons applying for the new position to have to report to the President through a committee. President Knapp responded that in his experience, this was not an unusual arrangement.

RESOLUTIONS

I. RESOLUTION 07/6, "A RESOLUTION CONCERNING SECONDARY AND COURTESY APPOINTMENTS FOR REGULAR, ACTIVE-STATUS FACULTY MEMBERS"

Professor Wilmarth deferred to Professor Garris, Chair of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF), so that he could comment first on Resolution 07/6. [The issue of amending the Faculty Code to authorize secondary appointments was first considered by the Faculty Senate at its meeting on December 14, 2007, when it considered Resolution 07/4, entitled "A Resolution Concerning Secondary Appointments for Regular, Active-Status Faculty Members." Resolution 07/4 as amended at the meeting was remanded to Committee for further consideration.]

Professor Garris said that the goal of the PEAFF Committee in bringing forward a resolution on secondary appointments at the December Senate meeting was to provide authorization in the Faculty Code for such appointments so that these appointments would be consistent across the University. The Committee felt strongly that providing for such appointments would facilitate interdisciplinary collaboration and collaboration between the various schools at GW. At the December Senate meeting, several concerns about the Resolution were raised, and it was remanded to Committee. The PEAFF Committee again consulted numerous faculty and Professor Garris and Professor Wilmarth attended a meeting of the Council of Deans where a productive discussion took place about these appointments. The PEAFF Committee considered the new information gathered, and Resolution 07/6 is the result of the Committee's conclusions. Professor Garris added that he supported Resolution 07/6 and believes that the language now addresses concerns raised at the December meeting.

Professor Wilmarth introduced Resolution 07/6 and said that, after further discussion on the issue of these appointments with both faculty members and deans, and with Vice President Lehman, the PEAFF Committee came to the conclusion that it would be necessary to differentiate between three categories of what might broadly be termed joint appointments. First, there are a small number of "true" joint appointments at the University, where a faculty member actually has the equivalent of a regular, active-status

appointment in two or more departments or two or more schools and that faculty member's salary is separately budgeted in each of the different departments or schools. Under the present language in the Faculty Code, that faculty member would automatically have full governance rights as a regular, active-status member in each department or school. Presently there are only four or five such joint appointments at the University.

The PEAFF Committee also discovered there are many other types of joint appointments at GW, and these tend to fall into two categories. The first would be considered a secondary appointment, where a faculty member holds a regular, active-status appointment in one school or department, is given faculty privileges in another school or department, and the regular, active-status faculty in the appointing department or school decide to give that particular faculty member governance rights, such as allowing them to vote on curricular matters, appointment issues, or possibly even serve on key committees. The second type of appointment has been termed a courtesy appointment, which is an appointment that gives faculty privileges in terms of attending faculty functions and teaching, but does not confer governance privileges. For example, Professor Wilmarth said that last fall the Law School had for the first time authorized courtesy appointments, but those appointments do not convey any governance privileges at the School.

In bringing forward a Resolution concerning these appointments, the PEAFF Committee took notice that these types of faculty appointments are not presently authorized in the Faculty Code, and have not been sufficiently distinguished in the past. Resolution 07/6 provides that neither secondary nor courtesy appointments automatically convey governance rights. This addresses a concern raised at the December meeting that faculty in departments or schools granting such appointments might have their existing voting rights diluted or changed without their consent. Resolution 07/6 also provides that the regular, active-status faculty of the department or school granting a secondary appointment can choose, with the approval of the regular, active-status faculty of that unit, to confer governance privileges on the person receiving the secondary appointment. The Resolution further provides that courtesy appointments would not confer governance privileges, and thus, departments or schools granting appointments which would confer any governance privileges would have to designate these as a secondary, rather than a courtesy, appointment. Resolution 07/6 does not specify the types of governance privileges authorized for holders of secondary appointments, because such privileges are to be determined by the faculty of the units granting the appointments.

Resolution 07/6 also provides that secondary or courtesy appointments shall be granted for a specified term. This language was carefully chosen to encourage departments and schools granting these appointments to consider how long the department or school should continue them. This could be a term of stated years, but it could also be for as long as the faculty member holds a regular, active-status faculty position at the University. Lastly, concern was expressed at the December Senate meeting about the issue of grandfathering existing arrangements and whether or not amending the Faculty Code to define secondary and courtesy appointments would essentially automatically revoke these. Vice President Lehman advised the Committee that the administration's general view is that when a faculty member holds certain rights and privileges and the Faculty Code is changed, existing rights and privileges are retained. The Committee included in Resolution 07/6 its understanding that the current terms and conditions of existing courtesy and secondary

appointments would not be changed by the proposed new language of the Faculty Code, and that the administration shares this understanding.

Discussion followed. Professor Galston asked how this new language might affect a faculty member's professorial title. Professor Wilmarth said that this issue was not considered, but he thought it would depend upon the appointment letter the faculty member receives. Vice President Lehman said that traditionally, faculty members have been allowed to add secondary titles in the University bulletin listings.

President Knapp asked if there is a tradition at GW for designating a faculty member as a professor by courtesy. Professor Wilmarth responded that there is no firm tradition at this point, but this is something that might be regularized by the administration. Vice President Lehman said that he thought that up to this point in time the University has not distinguished in any rigorous way the difference between secondary and courtesy appointments, and that both of these types of joint appointments have been referred to in appointment letters as secondary appointments. If new language is added to the Faculty Code, this will change.

Further discussion ensued between Professors Cordes, Wirtz, Wilmarth, and Garris and Vice President Lehman. Professors Garris and Cordes observed that departmental and school bylaws provided some flexibility for these units in drawing a distinction between secondary and courtesy appointments. Professor Yezer agreed with Professor Cordes, praising the revised resolution as perhaps the best resolution of the year.

Professor Englander suggested an amendment to the Resolution to simplify the language and allow the word, "courtesy" to be removed from most of the Whereas Clauses. Discussion followed by Professors Wirtz and Wilmarth on other possible amendments to the Resolution and these amendments were moved and seconded. Further discussion of other possible amendments followed but the Faculty Senate did not vote on any motion to adopt any of the proffered amendments. Professor Griffith moved to table the Resolution, saying he thought the Senate should not try and mark up a resolution on the floor that changes the Faculty Code to this extent. He added that the intended effect of the motion to table was to return the resolution, with its pending amendments, to the Committee, to allow them to consider and perfect the language of the amendments "off-line". The Committee could then take the Resolution from the table at the next Senate meeting. The motion was seconded. As a motion to table, once it is seconded, requires a vote without debate, a vote was taken, and the motion to table Resolution 07/6 carried. (Resolution 07/6 was distributed with the agenda for the meeting, and is attached.)

BIENNIAL REPORT ON WOMEN FACULTY AND FACULTY OF COLOR

Vice President Lehman distributed copies of the Biennial Report, which is attached. He thanked staff members who assisted him in preparing the Report including Annie Wooldridge Assistant Vice President for Faculty Recruitment and Personnel, as well as Cheryl Beil, Associate Vice President for Academic Planning & Institutional Research and Joe Knop, Director of the Office of Institutional Research, who are new members of the team as a result of the reorganization of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning.

The report has been reformatted this year so that key points are provided at the beginning, with supporting information, Tables, and Appendices following.

Turning to page 7 of the Report which contains data on new full-time faculty for the two-year period from November 1, 2005 to October 31, 2007 Vice President Lehman observed that of the 120 new faculty members hired, 69 were men and 51 were women. In the minority category there was an equal number of men and women.

In terms of changes to the entire group of full-time faculty, of a total of 1,122 faculty, 713 are men and 409 are women. There are 216 faculty members in the minority category, consisting of 118 men and 98 women. A breakdown of faculty members in each minority category reported is also given.

The Report also provides information in Table 3 over a ten-year period which shows significant changes in the minority faculty population at the University. More than 38 male minority faculty members were hired, increasing their numbers by 47.5%, and 45 minority women faculty members were added, for an increase of 89.4%.

Table 4 of the Report reports on tenure and promotion trends at the University over the 15-year period since 1992-93. 319 faculty members, 71 of whom were minority faculty members, were awarded tenure. Information concerning faculty members (tenure-accruing and non-tenure-track) terminating their service at the University is also provided in Table 5, and this shows that 131 such faculty left the University during the 15 year time-frame, with approximately two male faculty members leaving for every female who chose not to remain.

The next chart, Table 6A, provides a similar picture for the two-year period data for tenured and tenure-accruing positions and that separates out anyone who is not in a non-tenure-accruing position. That chart can be compared with the earlier chart. Table 6B includes data on non-tenure-accruing faculty. Vice President Lehman observed that the gender mix in the non-tenure-accruing faculty is more evenly balanced than it is in either the tenured or tenure-accruing faculty and part of that comes about because there is more turnover in the contract faculty.

Table 7A of the Report is of particular interest, because it shows distinct gender differences in the number of faculty in junior and senior ranks. For purposes of interpreting the Report, senior faculty are those in the ranks of Professor or Associate Professor with five or more years of service at that rank. Junior faculty are Assistant Professors or Instructors, and Associate Professors with fewer than five years of service at that rank. In the senior ranks, the minority population consists of 49 men and 32 women. In the junior ranks there is almost an even mix of men and women (276 versus 261), and the number of minority faculty in this group is significantly higher, roughly 2 to 1, compared to the senior ranks. This data shows clearly that there is an evolution with regard to the balance of the faculty in gender and also race. A cumulative summary of the data concerning the total faculty population is laid out in Table 8 of the Report.

Information provided in the Appendices to the Report is graphed to provide data on trends. Appendix I shows the percentage of regular, active-status Women faculty percentage-wise relative to the total. There is steady growth overall. This graph reflects

trends in all ranks, both junior and senior. Appendix A2 contains information on the total minority population which, for the past three years, has not increased percentage-wise. The same holds true for Asian faculty over the past five years. In terms of Black faculty, there has been a decrease; the Hispanic population, which did not increase for more than ten years, has finally started to increase at the University. Appendices B and C give a breakdown of data by school.

Appendices E1 and E2 contain benchmarking data comparing the University to local D.C. area institutions and GW's fourteen market basket institutions. Overall, relative to area institutions, GW has fewer women faculty, ranking fifth in this group. With respect to minority faculty, GW has moved from the 4th to 3rd position among local institutions. Compared to GW's market basket institutions the University ranks roughly fifth in its percentage of minority faculty; in terms of women faculty, GW ranks in the top 6.

Appendices G1 and G2 of the Report provide information about visiting faculty. Data concerning part-time faculty reporting on gender and ethnicity by School is provided in Appendix H and is benchmarked in Appendix I against GW's local area institutions. The University compares favorably with area institutions, ranking third, and the percentage of women is higher in the part-time than the full-time faculty ranks. Appendix J contains a comparison of the regular, full-time faculty population with GW's student body. Not surprisingly, the faculty population does not mirror the student population.

Professor Wirtz said he thought the information in the Report was very informative, if somewhat overwhelming. He added that there are two issues of interest to him, the first being the issue of how well the University is dealing with new faculty hires as a group. The other issue is the question of departures, particularly minority faculty departures, which are dealt with somewhat in Table 5. A preliminary look at the data provided appears to show that nearly 10% of the University's losses in minority faculty members are Asian, compared to losses in the Black and Hispanic population of 3 and 5%, respectively. Vice President Lehman agreed that it would be worthwhile to examine this data in greater detail, particularly over the past two years. Professor Wirtz said he thought one important objective of the biennial report was met by making comprehensive information about hiring available on a regular basis. It is also important to examine GW's environment and see if there is something about it that is sending certain people away from the University. Vice President Lehman agreed this was a valid question and said he would look at exit interviews conducted with terminating faculty to see if any information could be obtained from them on this issue.

Discussion followed. Professor Galston asked if instructors were considered regular, active-status faculty. Vice President Lehman confirmed that they are, but there are only a handful at the University, as these are normally newly hired faculty who are close to completing their terminal degrees, at which point they are promoted to assistant professor.

Vice President Lehman pointed out that Special Appendices to the Report, which he did not cover in his remarks, contain data about the non-medical faculty and the medical faculty (this data includes information on members of the Medical Faculty Associates). Information is also provided concerning the non-medical faculty (excluding the law faculty) and the law faculty.

Vice President Lehman concluded his Report by thanking the Senate for its attention and encouraging Senate members to contact him with any other questions they might have about the information provided.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. NOMINATION FOR ELECTION OF NOMINATING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Professor Robinson moved the nomination of the following faculty members for election to the Nominating Committee to select nominees to the Senate Executive Committee for the 2008-09 Session:

Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Convener; Professors Kurt J. Darr (SPHHS), Ernest J. Englander (SB), Charles A. Garris, Jr. (SEAS), Scott B. Pagel (GWLS), Robert W. Rycroft (ESIA), Gary L. Simon (SMHS), and Lynda L. West (GSEHD).

The entire slate was approved.

II. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

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

III. TRIBUTES TO RETIRING FACULTY WHO HAVE SERVED ON THE FACULTY SENATE

Professor Allan L. Goldstein read a Tribute to Linda L. Gallo, Professor of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Emeritus. Professor Englander read a Tribute to Salvatore F. Divita, Professor of Marketing, Emeritus, and a Tribute to J. Minor Sachlis, Professor Emeritus of Finance. (The Tributes are attached.)

IV. CHAIR'S REMARKS

Vice President Lehman reported that the Middle States Accreditation Visiting Team will be on campus from Sunday March 30th, through Wednesday morning, April 2nd. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee has been invited to a breakfast meeting with the Team. It is entirely possible that other faculty members will be asked to meet with the Committee during the visit as these accreditation teams usually follow a very flexible schedule. Faculty members may be asked to participate in a meeting either relative to their school or possibly for some other reason, such as their service on a University committee.

The Team's visit centers on GW's self-study which is focused on the University's Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence. There are 14 accreditation standards with which the University must comply. Ten of those standards have already been addressed through a preliminary visit with generalists and a preliminary report indicates that the University has met those standards. The four remaining standards are addressed through the work of the

self-study. Two of them are very critical because they are focused on the assessment of learning in the classroom and on institutional assessment measures. Vice President Lehman said he thinks the University is well prepared for this visit which is of great importance as it concerns the accreditation of the entire University.

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

On behalf of the PEAFF Committee, Professor Garris reported on a matter shortly to come before the Senate. The Committee will be seeking guidance from the full Senate because it has received several complaints about deans appointing associate and assistant deans without following the Faculty Code, giving the impression that there are quite widespread violations of the Code in terms of the appointment of these administrative officers. Members of the PEAFF Committee have discussed this quite a bit amongst themselves and with various administrators in the schools, with the result that the Committee is not entirely sure what to do about it. On one hand, as recently reported in the newspaper, in Germany, the title “doktor” is very carefully reserved, and if somebody improperly even if inadvertently uses the title, they can actually be arrested. Obviously in Germany, they worry about titles, but people in academia do too. The title of dean is a title that has been revered for centuries, and has a certain unique connotation to it. Presently the Faculty Code provides for significant faculty involvement in the process by which an individual can be appointed as an assistant or associate Dean.

Professor Garris said that the question is whether to preserve the title when various administration and staff people are being granted that title without due faculty review. Perhaps that makes sense: in other words, perhaps in modern administrations, deans should be allowed to select their own people without faculty involvement. Professor Garris said the Committee understands that this is a very controversial issue, but at present the Faculty Code treats the search process for assistant and associate deans exactly the same way as a dean search process. Professor Garris urged Senate members to consult with colleagues, administrators and deans in their schools so that they could be prepared to have an enlightened discussion of this issue when it comes before the Senate.

Following up on Professor Garris’s remarks, Professor Wilmarth invited Senate members to look at Part C.2. of the *Procedures for Implementation of the Faculty Code* on pages 20 and 21 of the Code because Part C.2. Specifies the procedures that deal with the appointment of assistant, associate, and full deans, and calls for faculty involvement in that process.

Professor Garris also spoke as a faculty member of the School of Engineering and Applied Science (SEAS), thanking Vice President Lehman for the retraction of comments that he made concerning the margin of the School in the minutes of the February 8th Senate meeting. As the Senate would recall, Vice President Lehman had made the statement that SEAS has gone backward when in fact its margin has continuously increased during Dean Tong’s tenure. Professor Garris said he was very grateful to the Vice President for the clarifying information provided.

Professor Garris said he was still a bit concerned that the minutes of the February Senate meeting contain a statement by Vice President Lehman that there has been a four

year trend in SEAS where the level of research expenditures has gone downward. This may be true in the short term, but the long-range trend in research expenditures for the School over the last ten to fifteen years has been steadily upward. The School showed great results in 2002-03 and 2003-04. Unfortunately, events at the Virginia Campus right after 2004 resulted in reduced revenue to the School, but over the long term the School has shown steady improvement in the research area, particularly at the Foggy Bottom campus.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, and upon motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Elizabeth A. Amundson

Elizabeth A. Amundson

Secretary

A TRIBUTE IN MEMORY OF DAVID EARL SEIDELSON (1929-2008)
Lyle T. Alverson Professor Emeritus of Law

It is with deep sorrow that The George Washington University Faculty Senate acknowledges the recent death of David E. Seidelson, Lyle T. Alverson Professor Emeritus of Law. Born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Professor Seidelson received his A.B. degree from the University of Pittsburgh in 1951. He served in the United States Army during 1951-53.

After completing his military service, Professor Seidelson entered the University of Pittsburgh Law School and graduated with great distinction in 1956. He then practiced law for four years with the Pittsburgh firm of Rothman, Gordon & Foreman. He was counsel of record in approximately 200 civil and criminal trials and lost only five cases.

Professor Seidelson joined GW's law faculty as an Assistant Professor in 1960. He was a member of the law faculty for 38 years until his retirement in 1998. He was promoted to Associate Professor in 1963 and Professor in 1966, and was named Lyle T. Alverson Professor of Law in 1987.

During his tenure at the Law School, Professor Seidelson taught several different courses, including Torts, Evidence and Conflict of Laws. He was admired and beloved by generations of law students as a rigorous and stimulating classroom teacher. He was also a prolific scholar, with more than seventy articles published in leading law journals. His articles were cited in numerous decisions of federal and state courts as well as legal treatises and casebooks. He served the Law School and University on a wide variety of important committees, and he also served for many years as faculty advisor to the George Washington Law Review and the Moot Court Board.

Professor Seidelson served for three years as a Faculty Senator, including one year as a member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Professor Seidelson also chaired, in successive years, the Senate Committee on Athletics and the Senate Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty.

During his 38 years as a faculty member, Professor Seidelson earned the universal respect and affection of the faculty, staff and students of the Law School. He also earned the highest esteem of many other colleagues throughout the University, who recognized the great value of the contributions he made to the University through his teaching, scholarship and service.

I ask that this tribute be incorporated in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be forwarded to Professor Seidelson's family with the Senate's heartfelt appreciation and condolences.

Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr.
Professor of Law
March 14, 2008

Read into the record of the Faculty Senate meeting held on March 14, 2008

**A RESOLUTION CONCERNING SECONDARY AND COURTESY
APPOINTMENTS FOR REGULAR, ACTIVE-STATUS FACULTY MEMBERS
(07/6)**

WHEREAS, a small number of faculty members in the University hold joint appointments, and each joint appointment (i) provides the faculty member with a regular, active-status appointment in two or more schools or departments, and (ii) is separately budgeted in each school or department granting that appointment; and

WHEREAS, Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code contemplates joint appointments, because the holder of a joint appointment receives a separate regular, active-status appointment from each participating school or department;

WHEREAS, certain schools and departments have also granted appointments that are not regular, active-status appointments to faculty members who hold regular, active-status appointments in other schools or departments within the University;

WHEREAS, such appointments are generally of two types – (i) appointments that confer specified governance privileges in the school or department granting the appointments (hereinafter referred to as “secondary appointments”), and (ii) appointments that do not confer any governance privileges in the school or department granting the appointments (hereinafter referred to as “courtesy appointments”);

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

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

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

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that a secondary or courtesy appointment should not automatically confer any of the rights to participate in faculty governance that are provided under the Faculty Code or the Faculty Organization Plan, but a secondary appointment may properly confer specified governance privileges if such privileges are approved by the regular, active-status faculty of the school or department granting that appointment; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate understands that the current terms and conditions of existing secondary and courtesy appointments would not be changed by the proposed amendment to the Faculty Code, and the Faculty Senate has been advised that the Administration shares that understanding; **NOW, THEREFORE**

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

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

- 6. Secondary and Courtesy Appointments:** A faculty member holding a regular, active-status appointment in one department or school may be granted a secondary or courtesy appointment in another department or school for a specified term. A secondary or courtesy appointment shall require the recommendation of the appropriate faculty and officers of administration of the unit granting that appointment and shall comply with rules and procedures for such appointments established by the unit granting that appointment and by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. A secondary appointment or a courtesy appointment shall not automatically confer any of the rights provided by the Faculty Code and the Faculty Organization Plan to participate in faculty governance in the unit granting that appointment. However, a department or school granting a secondary appointment may allow the faculty member holding that appointment to exercise specified governance privileges in that unit if those privileges have been approved by the unit's regular, active-status faculty. A secondary or courtesy appointment terminates automatically upon the expiration of its specified term or upon termination of the faculty member's regular, active-status appointment.

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
February 29, 2008

Tabled, March 14, 2008

A Tribute to Linda L. Gallo
Professor of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Emeritus

Professor Linda L. Gallo received a B.S. degree from West Virginia University and her M.S. degree in Biochemistry from The George Washington University in 1963, as well as her Ph.D. degree in Biochemistry from GWU in 1969.

Dr. Gallo has spent most of her 40-year academic career here, at The George Washington University, as a member of the Biochemistry faculty. During that time, Linda has achieved prominence both nationally and internationally as a researcher and as an educator, and is recognized for her outstanding scientific contributions to the areas of cholesterol metabolism and lipids. Many of her almost 50 peer-reviewed publications are considered classics in the area of lipid metabolism and steroidogenesis. During her tenure at GW, Linda helped organize and/or chaired a number of important scientific conferences, including two major international scientific meetings in Washington in the field of lipids and cardiovascular diseases, and served as the editor of important books in these areas.

As an educator, Linda also achieved prominence by virtue of her mentoring of numerous Ph.D and post-doctoral students, and by serving as reader on the examinations of multiple Ph.D candidates over the years. Her skills as a research investigator are only matched by her excellent communication skills and accomplishments as a teacher. On numerous occasions, she received the Department's "Excellence in Teaching Award," as well as multiple nominations by the first year medical students for the "Golden Apple Award." In 1997, she was selected by the SMHS faculty and medical students to the "Distinguished Teacher Society."

In the area of service to the University, Linda was the 2001 recipient of the "Trachtenberg Prize for University Service." From 1986 to 2003, Linda served as the Chair of GW's IACUC. Linda has served with distinction on the University Senate for nine years, beginning in 1998, and she was elected to the Senate Executive Committee for three terms. She also was selected to serve for four years on the nominating committee which recommends faculty members for election by the Senate to the Executive Committee. Her service on Senate Standing Committees was extensive: she was a member of the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee for seven years, and the Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies Committee for two. She also served for a year as Chair of the Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty, and from 2003 through 2008 she chaired the Physical Facilities Committee. Linda also served as a Senate representative on numerous committees and task forces at the University: she co-chaired the *ad hoc* committee for review of the sexual harassment policy, and also was a member of committees reviewing street safety issues on the campus, the 4x4 curriculum proposal, and the task force examining prospective uses of Square 54 (the old GW Hospital site).

Her administrative work and volunteer activities at GW are numerous, as are her other teaching and research activities.

In the 30 years that I have known her in my capacity as Chair of the Department, and as a colleague and friend, Linda has been an extraordinarily dedicated faculty member. She has always gone the extra mile to help her colleagues and her students.

In sum, Dr. Gallo has served GW with dignity, grace, dedication, and honor. In addition to her contributions as an educator and scientist, Linda has been the conscience of the Department, and I would add, on many occasions, the conscience of the Medical Center. I am delighted that The George Washington University is honoring her at the celebration of her retirement for a lifetime of scholarship, achievements, and good deeds by granting her Emeritus status as Professor of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology.

Respectfully submitted,
Allan L. Goldstein, Ph.D
Catharine B. & William McCormick Chair

Read into the record of the Senate Meeting held on March 14, 2008

A Tribute to Salvatore F. Divita
Professor of Marketing, Emeritus

Professor Salvatore F. Divita will retire at the end of the 2007-2008 academic year as Professor of Marketing, following 43 years of faithful service to the University.

Professor Divita received his Bachelors Degree in Industrial Engineering from the New York University in 1953; his Masters in Business Administration from Ohio State University in 1956; and his D.B.A from Harvard Business School in 1968.

Professor Divita came to The George Washington University in 1965 as a Professorial Lecturer. In 1970, he was appointed as Associate Professor and in 1974 he was granted tenure. He was appointed Professor in 1978. Over the years, Professor Divita has published articles, collaborated on text books, presented at conferences, served on the editorial board of the American Marketing Association Journal of Marketing and mentored students and junior faculty members.

Professor Divita served as the Chair of the Business Administration Department, as Director of the Marketing Program and as Chair of the Department of Marketing. In addition, he served as the Chair of the APT Committee, as a member and Chair of the Committee on Advising, and as a member of the Curriculum and Programs Committee and Senior Faculty Advisory Council.

Professor Divita has served the School of Government and Business Administration, the School of Business and Public Management, and now the School of Business as a member of the Commencement Committee, as a member of the Career Services Joint Committee, and as the School Marshal.

Professor Divita has served the Faculty Senate in several capacities: he represented the School on the Senate for ten years between 1980 and 2003 and the Executive Committee from 1990-1993 and again in 2000-2001; he chaired the Committee on Physical Facilities, served as Acting Chair of the University Development and Resources Committee, and was a member of the Alumni Affairs Committee, the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, and the Committee on Student Financial Aid.

Professor Divita has served the University in additional ways, including his service as a member and Chair of the University Club Advisory Committee, as a member of the GWU Honors Committee, as a member of the University Committee on Community Services and the University Commencement Committee, as a member of the Committee on the Role of Chairs and the Special Committee of the Senate on Northern Virginia. He also served as a member of the Search Committee for the Assistant Vice-President for Business Affairs, as a member of the Career Center Review Committee, as a member of the Northern Virginia Campus Marketing Committee, and as a member of the Committee on Research on Humans.

Professor Divita has served the Metro D.C. community as a member of several organizations including the Chamber of Commerce, and has been on the Board of Directors of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Greater Washington.

The Faculty Senate congratulates Professor Divita on his being accorded emeritus status, thanks him, in particular, for his long service to the work of the Senate, and wishes him a very happy and rewarding retirement.

**Prepared by his colleagues in the Marketing Department
George Washington University Faculty Senate
Read into the record of the Senate Meeting held on March 14, 2008**

**A Tribute to Dr. J. Minor Sachlis
Professor Emeritus of Finance**

Dr. J. Minor Sachlis was appointed an assistant professor of finance in 1975; he has provided valuable service to the University for 32 years. He was awarded tenure and promoted to associate professor of finance in 1980 and elected to retire in 2008. Professor Sachlis served on the Faculty Senate from 1981 to 1983, and on the Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty during the 1981-82 session.

Although Dr. Sachlis has made many positive contributions to the University, none have been more conspicuous, pervasive or important as teaching. A senior officer in the University's Development and Advancement program indicated, "Dr. Sachlis is the most frequently identified faculty member within the School of Business by alumni; former students remember his care, concern with learning and enthusiasm very fondly." Students routinely indicate that Dr. Sachlis was absolutely the best teacher or their favorite teacher. A faculty member notes why Dr. Sachlis has been so successful: "He developed an approach to teaching that sought real understanding behind the formulas and numbers that can be a model for all of us." Clearly, Dr. Sachlis has left a legacy that will last for generations.

Minor was a linchpin of the finance program when it was housed in the Department of Business Administration and the Masters of Science in Finance (MSF) in the early days. He was an outstanding program director prior to the days of course relief and stipends. A former department chair indicated, "For at least 20 years there was no harder working faculty member than Minor Sachlis, and his contribution to launching the MSF were particularly valuable."

Dr. Sachlis contributed to the field of finance. He authored or co-authored over ten academic articles and presented a similar number of papers at respected academic conferences. He is best known for his pioneering work that resulted in the initial publication of *ElFinBk* in 1995, which is an interactive graduate-level business finance textbook. A professor of finance indicated, "Whenever I had a vexing finance problem I would seek counsel from Minor; he might have an answer in ten seconds or ten days but his intellectual insight was always pertinent and useful."

Clearly, Dr. Sachlis qualified for *emeritus* status based on his long tenure with the University and many positive contributions to the School of Business and the Department of Finance. He is also a gentleman in the best usage of the term.

Written by Professor William Handorf

Read into the record of the Senate Meeting held on March 14, 2008

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 14, 2008

Lilien F. Robinson, Chair

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Faculty Assessment Report Proposal

At its meeting in February, the Executive Committee met with Professor David Constanza who gave an overview of the main issues concerning faculty performance assessment in University settings, along with an overview of findings, obstacles and recommendations. As review of institutional assessment procedures is a timely topic, the Executive Committee agreed to refer the matter for review and discussion jointly to the Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies Committee and the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom.

Proposed Modifications to the Faculty Annual Report Form

At the request of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Executive Committee provided responses and suggestions concerning proposed modifications to the Faculty Annual Report form.

PERSONNEL MATTERS

Grievances

The status of three grievances in process remains the same; the grievance in the School of Engineering and Applied Science is in hearing. One case in the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences remains in mediation and a mediator has been appointed for the second case.

OTHER MATTERS

The election of the Chair and Members of the Senate Executive Committee for the 2008-2009 session will take place at the April 11 meeting. A list of nominees for membership on the Dispute Resolution Committee and Administrative Committees will also be considered at the April meeting.

Also, please note that the call for Annual Reports of Senate Standing Committees will be placed on the agenda of the April 11 meeting, the last meeting of the 2007-2008 session. As is customary, the annual photograph of Senate members will be taken at the April meeting.

I am pleased to report that we have had a gratifying response to the annual call for faculty volunteers to serve on Administrative and Senate Standing Committees. While the deadline for response was set for today, please let your colleagues know that they still have time to submit their preferences as committee membership will be determined at the joint meeting of the old and new Executive Committees in April.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is on March 28, 2008. Please forward resolutions, reports, and any other matters to the Faculty Senate Office prior to that date.