

DRAFT/SUBJECT TO APPROVAL ON SEPTEMBER 10, 2004

**THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.**

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
MAY 7, 2004 IN THE MARVIN CENTER, ROOM 310**

Present: President Trachtenberg, Vice President Lehman, Registrar Geyer, and Parliamentarian Pagel; Deans Frawley and Tong; Professors Briscoe, Castleberry, Cordes, Delaney, Friedenthal, Gallo, Garris, Griffith, Gupta, Harrington, Klarén, Marotta, Mueller, Packer, Paup, Robin, Robinson, Shambaugh, Swiercz, Wilmarth, and Wirtz

Absent: Deans Futrell, Harding, Katz, Phillips, Scott, Whitaker and Young; Professors Englander, Helgert, Lee, Simon, Vergara, and Watson

The meeting was called to order by Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Vice President Lehman asked for corrections or additions to the minutes. Professor Gupta noted that he was absent at the April Senate meeting, rather than both present and absent.

Professor Wirtz noted that the minutes referred to his long-standing status as a consultant to the Faculty Salary Equity Group, and pointed out that this is his first year in that capacity. He then asked what his previous capacity had been, and Vice President Lehman explained that Professor Wirtz had previously been designated as a member of the group, a discrepancy he did not notice in submitting corrections to his segment of the minutes.

There being no further corrections or additions to the minutes, the minutes were approved as amended.

RESOLUTIONS

I. RESOLUTION 04/1, "A RESOLUTION ON CONSTRUCTION OF NEW SCIENCE FACILITIES AS THE TOP PRIORITY AMONG NEW ACADEMIC STRUCTURES"

On behalf of the Physical Facilities Committee (PFC), Professor Linda Gallo, Chair, introduced Resolution 04/1. Although she thought the Resolution was fairly self-explanatory, she said she wanted to inform the Senate about the reason the Committee undertook this task, and she also wanted to provide some data in support of each of the Whereas Clauses.

At the outset, the Senate Executive Committee asked that the PFC identify the most pressing academic need with respect to construction of new facilities, in light of the

approaching availability of the old GW Hospital site. Once the PFC reviewed annual reports by previous PFCs, it became apparent rather quickly that the annual reports all pointed to the need for new science facilities.

Moreover, she continued, and perhaps more importantly, in 1985, members of the Commission on the Year 2000 made eighteen recommendations in their report to then-President Elliott on strategic planning. And in June, 2002, in an address to the Board of Trustees, President Trachtenberg noted that only one of the Commission's recommendations had not been met. That was to provide, in its words, "At the earliest possible time, modern laboratories for teaching in the natural sciences and engineering, and additional facilities to support research and teaching in these areas." As this was the one goal that had not been fulfilled, the PFC was convinced of the need for new science facilities, and took as its charge the development of a rationale in support of them.

Professor Gallo also noted that the PFC's charge did not include recommending a size or site for new science facilities, as this would be beyond its capability. While the old Hospital site could indeed be the location for the new facilities and/or be a source of new revenue to finance them on that or some other property, the PFC agreed that future use of the old Hospital site should be leveraged to best benefit the University. Implicit in the Committee's position is the view that revenue or space derived from the old Hospital site should contribute towards construction of a science facility, she noted.

Professor Gallo then briefly reviewed the Whereas Clauses in Resolution 04/1. The first Clause is self-evident, she said, and the second lists findings of Project Kaleidoscope (Pkal) which were reached by a Committee of Visitors after site visits to a cross section of colleges and universities which have made major investments in facilities and programs. The question behind the visits was to determine what difference new and improved facilities make, and the Pkal Report (excerpts of which were distributed with the Senate agenda) supports each of the bulleted items listed in the Second Whereas Clause. While the Pkal Report addressed only undergraduate education, Professor Gallo said the Committee thought it reasonable to extrapolate Pkal's conclusions and apply them to graduate education as well.

In the third Whereas Clause, the PFC related conclusions reached by the Pkal Report to the goals and objectives of GW's Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence. There was significant congruence between the two, she added.

Fourthly, the Resolution notes that, given the draw of science and the revolution that is occurring within it, a large number of other educational institutions, particularly GW's competitors, are very much invested in the construction of new science facilities.

In the fifth Whereas Clause, and on page three of the materials appended to Resolution 04/1, the PFC sets forth in some detail the impact of a new science facility, and its many beneficiaries.

The sixth Whereas Clause reflects the PFC's conclusion that funding is justified for a new science facility, including the costs of construction and programming. Professor Gallo noted that Executive Vice President and Treasurer Louis Katz had stated to the PFC that funding for construction usually comes from a reallocation of funds, fund-raising, or indirect cost recovery. However, at this time, Vice President Katz said the University has the unique

possibility of using financial value from the sale of the Old Hospital site to pay for new science facilities.

In conclusion, Professor Gallo reviewed the seventh Whereas Clause, which points to the inadequacy of both the quality and quantity of existing science facilities at GW and the negative impact of this lack on the University's ability to achieve the goals stated in the Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence.

Professor Griffith asked Professor Gallo if he had correctly understood her to say that one outcome of the long development process underway for use of the old Hospital site was its possible sale. Professor Gallo confirmed that this was a potential outcome. President Trachtenberg said this was a possibility that could not be ruled out at this stage, but an unlikely one.

Professor Cordes asked about the Committee's reference to facilities for mathematical sciences, and asked what those might be. Professor Gallo responded that there are faculty in the mathematical sciences that have interactions with the natural and life sciences faculty, and it would be conceivable that they could be located in such a building.

Professor Packer asked about the number of square feet currently dedicated to physical facilities for the life sciences. Professor Gallo said that currently 90,000 square feet are so used. Professor Packer then asked about the size of the proposed science facility. Professor Gallo said it would depend upon whether the facility were school-wide or University-wide, but that Executive Vice President and Treasurer Katz told the PFC that if the facility were to be University-wide, it would involve some 400,000 square feet, or roughly the size of the new GW Hospital. Vice President Lehman pointed out that this figure did not include space of some 70,000 square feet now basically dedicated to science activity at the Virginia campus.

Professor Harrington congratulated the Committee on its excellent report and asked for the privilege of the floor, which was granted, for Dean Timothy Tong of the School of Engineering and Applied Science (SEAS).

Dean Tong said he has been impressed by the ability of the University's faculty to work across school boundaries, and gave as an example SEAS faculty working in the biomedical engineering area. He added that he could not help but wonder whether in the Resolution there could be a more explicit expression of such possible cooperation in the future.

Professor Gallo said that she was prepared to amend the Resolving Clause of the Resolution in order to satisfy the concerns of the Dean and the Engineering faculty. She moved that the first Resolving Clause be amended so that it would read as follows: "That the Faculty Senate endorses the investment in new science facilities that accommodate the physical, life and mathematical sciences, science programming, and science-related engineering programs as the top priority among future academic projects." The motion was seconded.

The question was called on the amendment to the Resolution, a vote was taken, and the amendment was approved unanimously, without abstention.

A short discussion followed between Professors Griffith and Gallo and Vice President Lehman concerning the meaning of the term “science programming.”

Vice President Lehman asked if anyone objected to the privilege of the floor being granted to Dean William Frawley of the Columbian College Arts and Sciences (CCAS). There being no objection Dean Frawley said he would like to go on record speaking in strong support of Resolution 04/1. A University can be transformed in many ways, he said, and given how quickly the University is moving forward, particularly in Columbian College, this new facility is a central part of new development given advances in biological and biomedical sciences, computation, modeling, and other areas of science. The construction of such a facility will also enhance the University’s ability to attract talented faculty and staff, as it demonstrates GW’s commitment to high-end intellectual activity. Dean Frawley added that the Resolution has the full support of the CCAS faculty, and its Advancement Office.

President Trachtenberg said that he agreed substantially with the Resolution, but that it might not be possible for the administration to follow literally the Senate’s recommendation. This could happen, for example, in the event that an earmarked amount of money is donated for the construction of a specific non-science facility.

Professor Gallo said that, in listening to President Trachtenberg’s remarks at a noon meeting, that perhaps the Resolution was not necessary, as the President appears convinced and supportive of the need for new science facilities. Still, the Resolution is another layer of faculty support for such a building. President Trachtenberg said that he thought the Resolution is helpful in that its adoption expresses unanimous University-wide faculty support for a science facility as the top priority, and this support was given by Senate representatives of schools which would not be immediate, apparent beneficiaries of such a facility.

The question was then called on the Resolution, a vote was taken, and Resolution 04/1 was adopted, as amended, unanimously, without abstention. (The Resolution is attached.)

II. RESOLUTION 04/2, “A RESOLUTION ON RESEARCH PRIORITIES AT THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY”

On behalf of the Senate Research Committee, Professor William Briscoe, Chair, introduced Resolution 04/2. As background to the Resolution, Professor Briscoe said that a subcommittee of the Senate Research Committee, co-chaired by Professors Charis Kubrin (who was present at the meeting), and Samantha Friedman, was charged with the task of investigating how far the University has come in fulfilling the goals and timetable set out in the GW Strategic Plan for Research. The subcommittee’s conclusion was that, while there has been some progress, it can be simply stated that GW is certainly behind in its timetable in fulfilling the goals of the Strategic Plan.

Professor Briscoe continued, saying that the Research Committee recognized that pointing a finger to a list of unfulfilled goals was not a useful task, especially since some important initiatives have recently been funded and are in the process of being implemented – such as the increase of infrastructure support for research within the Office of Research Services (ORS), the schools, and the departments. The Committee thought it better to assist the administration by focusing on the highest priority issues which are, in its mind, the full

funding of the Research Enhancement Incentive Awards (REIA), increasing Research Enhancement Funding (REF) support, and support for equipment cost sharing and support of startup costs. Certainly, he said, any priority list has to have a starting point, and given the shortfall in funds this year, the top issue for research-active faculty was certainly the inability of the University to fund fully the REIA incentive.

Professor Briscoe said that Resolution 04/2 seeks to bring this issue to the top of the list of priorities for the support of faculty research. The Committee believes that fully funding the REIA also assists Deans and Chairs to provide some level of equipment cost-sharing and startup costs, and, in a manner, does also help along these lines. While the Committee does not specify a formula, it does point to the fact that any initiative such as this needs to track indirect costs and tuition returns from research grants in its budgeting. With respect to the manner in which the level of return is distributed, there was a difference of opinion within the Committee. Those with established programs seemed to favor the Principal Investigator (PI) getting the bulk of the return, while those with smaller or building programs would like to see more going to the Deans. Professor Briscoe then pointed out that unless the budget line item is there and funded, this is a moot question. Professor Briscoe also said that in surveying highly research-active universities, more of this type of return goes to schools, or to departments through the schools, rather than directly to the individual PI's. Professor Briscoe then urged the adoption of Resolution 04/2 so that the University can get the REIA back on track with an adequate budget as soon as possible.

Professor Gupta said he was puzzled by the fate of the REIA, as the memorandum authorizing it provided an incentive to PI's which has now been withdrawn and given to the deans or the departments. Vice President Lehman confirmed that the return previously distributed was 5% of the net tuition brought in, 5% of the net direct costs brought in, and 1% of the indirect cost recovery, with a factor that penalizes PI's for failure to secure a full indirect cost recovery. He added that this year is the first year that the REIA has not been fully funded, and the distribution of the prorated amount of the \$655,000 available has been discussed extensively both in the Advisory Council on Research and the Senate Research Committee. The Council of Deans also discussed the matter, and from a strategic point of view, their conclusion was that the available funds would be better used if they were distributed to the deans, who would then use them to advance research priorities in their schools. In the end, Vice President Lehman said he agreed with this conclusion, and that is how the money was distributed this year. This was a change, he added, from previous years, in which funds were distributed equally among the deans, the department chairs, and the faculty member. Regardless, he said, the subject of the Resolution appears to be securing full funding for the REIA.

Professor Griffith asked about the current budget for the REIA, and Vice President Lehman said that the budgeted amount of \$655,000 has been level since the inception of the program approximately ten years ago. Professor Griffith, Associate Vice President Carol Sigelman and Vice President Lehman then briefly discussed the growth in payouts over the last several years, which ranged from \$879,000 to \$1 million, with the additional funds coming from one-time reallocations.

Professor Swiercz said that he thought this growth in payout signals that the REIA is working, and the decision to abandon it means the University has made a strategic and somewhat illogical decision to drop a program that is successful.

In followup to Professor Swiercz's point, Professor Wirtz said it seemed to him that there are two issues. One is budgetary constraints, which the University always faces, but which are now a little more serious than in the past. He asked if the source of some of the funds was the endowment, and Vice President Lehman responded that it was not.

Professor Wirtz then turned from the issue of budgetary constraints to the other issue, which is, if the University has any money at all, the manner in which that money gets allocated. This year, he said, the decision was made that that money should be allocated to the deans and not to the PI's. As soon as this happened, he said his telephone rang constantly, and faculty who called him were saying they didn't understand it, and that the University doesn't acknowledge them for anything, even when faculty try very hard to do what they want do and what they think is in the University's best interest. Faculty also acknowledged that the University had finally started an inspired program that successfully communicated appreciation for faculty efforts, even if it did not financially compensate faculty as much as they deserved.

In fairness, Professor Wirtz said he understood that some of the deans have recognized some of the motivational problems involved and have turned funds back to the PI's. But he added that he was not sure that the administration recognizes the disincentive that has been created by channeling the funds to the deans. The faculty has viewed this as a slap in the face, he concluded, and it's a small one, but the administration must recognize that this is the way in which it's being viewed.

Vice President Lehman said that the agreement amongst the deans was first, that all of the money would go back to strategic objectives with regard to research within their schools; secondly, that it would all be used this year, and thirdly, if at all possible, it would be used in such a way that it would enhance what the faculty were doing in their research and scholarship. The decision was made in this particular case that there were other priorities that were higher in terms of what the University is doing to enhance academic excellence and higher priorities took precedence.

Professor Griffith said that the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee has not received any detailed breakout on the budget for FY '05, and he asked if the REIA for that year has been incremented by a significant amount, or if Academic Affairs would have to find \$645,000 to fund it. Vice President Lehman confirmed that the REIA is an unfunded priority, but it is also first on his list.

Professor Griffith then said that, although many seem to be bothered about the change in the distribution formula for these funds, it seemed to him that the first priority of the Senate should be to try to obtain full funding for the REIA and then the issue of fair distribution could be considered.

Professor Cordes asked if he was correct in understanding that there was nothing to preclude a dean from simply distributing the funds to PI's as before, if they so chose. Vice President Lehman confirmed this was correct. Professor Cordes then said he thought that perhaps the discussions about incentives need to occur between faculty and the deans on the school level. Vice President Lehman said his intention, which he believed Associate Vice President Sigelman shared, was that if full funding were obtained for the REIA, it would be distributed by the three-way division and the formula.

The question was called, a vote was taken, and Resolution 04/2 was adopted by unanimous vote, without absention. (The Resolution is attached.)

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. APPROVAL OF DATES FOR REGULAR SENATE MEETINGS IN THE 2004-05 SESSION

Professor Wilmarth asked for approval of the dates for the regular meetings of the Faculty Senate for the 2004-05 Session. The following dates were approved: May 7, 2004, September 10, 2004, October 8, 2004, November 12, 2004, December 10, 2004, January 21, 2005, February 11, 2005 (at 3 p.m.), March 11, 2005, and April 8, 2005.

II. NOMINATION FOR RE-APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE FACULTY SENATE PARLIAMENTARIAN FOR THE 2004-05 SESSION

Professor Wilmarth moved the nomination for re-appointment by the President of Professor Scott B. Pagel as Parliamentarian for the 2004-05 Session. The nomination of Professor Pagel was approved.

III. NOMINATION FOR ELECTION OF PROFESSOR JOAN E. SCHAFFNER (GWLS) TO SERVE A THREE-YEAR TERM ON THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION COMMITTEE COMMENCING MAY 1, 2004

Professor Wilmarth moved the nomination for election of Professor Joan E. Schaffner to serve a three-year term on the Dispute Resolution Committee commencing May 1, 2004. The nomination was approved.

IV. NOMINEES FOR ELECTION OF CHAIRS AND MEMBERS OF FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES FOR THE 2004-05

Professor Wilmarth moved the nominations for election of Chairs and members of Senate Standing Committees for the 2004-05 Session. The nominations were approved.

Professor Wilmarth then thanked Senate members for their Committee service during the 2003-04 session and expressed the Senate's appreciation to the other faculty members who have generously agreed to serve during the 2004-05 Session.

V. NOMINATION FOR APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE FOLLOWING ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES

Professor Wilmarth moved the nominations for appointment by the President to the following Administrative Committee: Joint Committee of Faculty and Students: Ralph O. Mueller, Faculty Co-Chair; Magdalene F. Ferretti, Mamoon Hammad, Amy J. Mazur,

Edward M. Robinson, Phyllis M. Ryder, and Harry E. Yeide. The nominations were approved.

VI. NOMINATION FOR APPOINTMENT BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES TO TRUSTEES' COMMITTEES

Professor Wilmarth moved the nominations for appointment by the Board of Trustees of the following Committees: Trustees' Committee on Academic Affairs: Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr.; Trustees' Committee on Student Affairs: Ralph O. Mueller; Trustees' Committee on External Affairs: Cynthia Lee; Trustees' Special Committee on Information Technology: Philip W. Wirtz. The nominations were approved.

VII. NOMINATION FOR ELECTION BY THE FACULTY SENATE TO THE STUDENT GRIEVANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Professor Wilmarth moved the nominations for election of the following faculty to the Student Grievance Review Committee: Mary Beth Bigley, Jeffrey Brand-Ballard, Katherine Goodrich, Catheeya Ismail, Susan LeLacheur, Stephen McGraw, Patrick McHugh, Mark Mullen, Thomas Quasney, and Edward Robinson. The nominations were approved.

VIII. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

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

IX. ANNUAL REPORTS OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Annual Reports were received from the following Senate Standing Committees: Athletics and Recreation; Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management; Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies; Fiscal Planning and Budgeting; Honors and Academic Convocations; Libraries; Physical Facilities; and Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom.

Professor Wilmarth said that he wanted to highlight a portion of the Report of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom. He reminded the Senate that when it adopted the Interim Policy on Scientific Misconduct in March, 2004, it directed the PEAFC Committee to determine whether any revisions to the Interim Policy needed to be made, and to report back to the Senate, if possible, at the May 7 meeting. The PEAFC Committee was not able to meet this optimistic deadline at the end of the semester, but Professor Wilmarth reported that the Committee held a very productive meeting on May 5. Associate Vice President Sigelman and Professor Briscoe, Chair of the Senate Research Committee, were present at the meeting, and consensus was reached on several points in the Interim Policy that needed to be amended in order to balance the interests of complainants, respondents, and the University. Professor Wilmarth added that Professor Englander, Chair of the PEAFC Committee, would be circulating a revised draft of the Interim Policy to Committee members. While it is expected that the PEAFC Committee will need to consult with the University General Counsel's Office before reporting to the Senate, Professor Wilmarth said he was hopeful that a final report with proposed amendments to the Interim

Policy could be presented as early as the September Senate meeting, but not later than the October meeting.

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Griffith asked Professor Wilmarth if the Executive Committee had discussed whether the Board of Trustees might revive the Trustees' Committee on Development and reinstate the Chair of the Senate Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee as a member. At this point, he added, the Senate is short of its historical representation to the Board of Trustees. Professor Wilmarth responded that this had not been discussed by the Executive Committee but added that he would be happy to contact the Chairman of the Board of Trustees and inquire about this matter.

Professor Griffith then asked the President to comment upon the fall enrollment picture, and the President said he thought that the incoming class is slightly larger than last year's, and that grades and standardized examination scores seemed solid as well. Vice President Lehman commented that he thought the positive news is that the new fixed tuition plan is a success. Professor Gupta, Chair of the Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management Committee, added that his Committee's Annual Report contains information on the topic that would be of interest to the Senate.

Registrar Geyer asked Senate members to pass along to their colleagues a reminder about the 72 hour rule for faculty to submit grades. The submission of grades in a timely manner is much appreciated, he added, and will reduce the number of telephone calls his office, and faculty, receive on the subject.

Speaking as a department chair, Professor Griffith said that he had not yet received an invitation to submit a Schedule of Classes for the Spring Semester, 2005, and he asked if this would be forthcoming anytime soon, before faculty left campus. The Registrar said the request has been verbally circulated and that paperwork is in the mail, to arrive in campus offices no later than May 10.

President Trachtenberg wished everyone a wonderful summer, as did Vice President Lehman.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, a motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 3:17 p.m.

Dennis L. Geyer
Dennis L. Geyer
Secretary

**A RESOLUTION ON CONSTRUCTION OF NEW SCIENCE FACILITIES AS
THE TOP PRIORITY AMONG NEW ACADEMIC STRUCTURES (04/1)**

WHEREAS, science and technology have a critical impact on all life, and;

WHEREAS, investment in science facilities and science programming is an investment in the future of students, of the Institution, and of society, because it creates the opportunity for:

- strengthening teaching and learning at the undergraduate and graduate levels;
- increasing the enrollment and retention of talented science majors, in general, and diversity among science majors, in particular;
- attracting and retaining accomplished undergraduate students, whatever their major;
- increasing the number of non-science majors who enroll in science courses;
- bringing to students a command of the tools of focused inquiry, mentored discovery-based learning, collaborative problem-solving, writing, quantitative and informational literacy, and information exchange essential for work and lifelong learning;
- improving post-graduate outcomes in graduate/professional school acceptances and job placements;
- recruiting and retaining outstanding faculty;
- attracting exceptional graduate students and postdoctoral researchers in the sciences;
- improving professional placement of doctoral graduates;
- enabling collaborations and emerging interdisciplinary interactions in teaching and research;
- increasing research involvement and productivity for students and faculty;
- increasing competitiveness for external grants for such purposes as research, curriculum and faculty development, and instrumentation;
- enhancing connections to area external partners, e.g., the NIH, the Smithsonian; The Institute for Genome Research, the Goddard Space Flight Center, the Children's National Medical Center, the Naval Research Lab, and National Institute for Standards and Technology;
- expanding technology infrastructure through state-of-the-art laboratories and general purpose classrooms;
- affecting the University community in a positive manner with respect to morale, inspiration, involvement, collegiality, cooperation, and social interaction;
- attracting benefactors, engaging alumni, and expanding the endowment; and;

WHEREAS, an investment in science facilities and science programming advances the Institution's Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence by creating the opportunity for:

- delivering engaged and consequential undergraduate education;
- becoming a tier-one research institution;
- promoting quality, highly visible, revenue-generating graduate education;
- recruiting and retaining a diverse, nationally and internationally known, faculty producing increased research;
- leveraging the D.C. environment to deliver a world-class education;
- integrating research and teaching to solve problems in the urban environment;
- fostering a sense of community through a unified approach to science, and;

WHEREAS, understanding the draw of science and the revolution that is occurring within it, local universities, competing universities, aspirant universities, and schools of lesser status have constructed or committed to construct new science facilities, and;

WHEREAS, new science facilities will benefit other Schools, other CCAS disciplines and disciplines within the Schools that depend on excellence in the basic sciences both in academics and research, by providing the opportunity for:

- access to additional technology-enabled general use classrooms;
- flexible arrangements to accommodate the changing landscape of science;
- greater integration of mathematics, statistics, and computational sciences with other disciplines across the University, and;
- enhanced opportunities for cross-disciplinary collaborations, and;

WHEREAS, the construction of new science facilities and the accompanying benefits would have such a major immediate and future impact on the Institution, that funding by revenues generated by individual gifts, capital campaigns, indirect cost recovery, reallocation of funds, and new revenues (e.g., financial value derived from the old hospital site, tuition-generating programs and certificates) is justified, and;

WHEREAS, the quality and quantity of existing science facilities and science programming deprive the students, the Institution, and society of the full-benefits cited above and thus, undermine the effort of the Institution to achieve the goals stated in the Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence, **NOW, THEREFORE**,

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

- (1) That the Faculty Senate endorses the investment in new science facilities that accommodate the physical, life, and mathematical sciences, ~~and~~ science programming, ~~and science-related engineering programs~~ ~~ming~~ as the **top** priority among future academic projects; and
- (2) That the new science facilities will be defined with respect to size, site, use (school-wide, university-wide) and program goals through a careful collaborative planning process that includes science and non-science faculty, academic deans, campus planners and architects, advancement staff, and budget officers.

Adopted, as amended, May 7, 2004

A Resolution on Research Priorities at The George Washington University (04/2)

WHEREAS, it is a stated goal in The George Washington University Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence to move GW into the ranks of the top-tier research institutions through continued and enhanced facilitation of faculty scholarship and research growth; and

WHEREAS, stated goals of The George Washington University Strategic Plan for Research include developing a more supportive research culture and environment at GW, increasing the quality and quantity of research by both faculty and students, increasing the amount of sponsored research at GW, and enhancing the reputation of GW as a research oriented university; and

WHEREAS, implementation of these goals requires that “GW will support increases in the quantity and quality of funded and unfunded faculty research and scholarship essential to the University’s overall prestige,” as stated in the Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence; and

WHEREAS, while recognizing the recent efforts of the Administration of The George Washington University to increase the support of research infrastructure on the University, School, and Departmental levels, a review by the Senate Committee on Research has determined that the amount budgeted for support of research has been and still remains only a fraction of that which would be sufficient to accomplish these goals; and

WHEREAS, in particular, the budget for the Research Enhancement Incentive Award (REIA) program, which gives PIs, departments, and schools funds to reinvest in research in proportion to their sponsored research activity for such critical needs as proposal development, startup packages for new faculty, and equipment cost sharing vital to many grant proposals, has remained flat while research activity, productivity, and external funding has increased; and

WHEREAS, the REIA budget (\$655,000) was insufficient in FY04 to fully fund REIA payouts under the current formula (which would have dictated a payment of \$1,121,000 for FY03 research activity); and

WHEREAS, there is currently no mechanism to ensure that the REIA budget grows in proportion to the growth of research activity; NOW, THEREFORE

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

1. **THAT**, as a first step in fulfillment of the above stated research goals, the Faculty Senate urges the University to institute a plan to fully fund REIA from indirect cost recoveries

and tuition paid by externally-funded grants and that a mechanism to ensure that the REIA budget grows in proportion to the growth of research, where, based on the current formula and an estimated 15% in the average growth in external grant indirect costs and tuition, the additional funding needed for FY05 is \$645,000 (an estimated payout of \$1,300,000 - \$655,000), and the additional funding needed for FY06 is \$195,000 (\$1,495,000 - \$1,300,000);

2. **THAT**, understanding the importance of prioritizing objectives, the Faculty will continue to work with the Administration to develop other specific research priorities to be pursued aggressively over the next 3-5 years and to recommend mechanisms for funding these priorities;
3. **AND THAT**, more generally, the Dean of each school or college be encouraged to continue to support research at The George Washington University and that the University endeavor to set budgeting priorities in accordance with the fulfillment of the above stated research goals.

Faculty Senate Committee on Research
March 26, 2004

Adopted May 7, 2004

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr., Chair
May 7, 2004

I would like to extend my congratulations and a warm welcome to the new members of the Senate. All of us look forward to working with you.

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

I. RESOLUTIONS

The Faculty Senate adopted eleven resolutions during the 2003-04 session. The Executive Committee has forwarded these resolutions to the President for his response. When the President's response is received, it will be distributed to members of the Faculty Senate with the Senate's agenda.

The Executive Committee has also forwarded to the President substitute Resolution 03/1 adopted by the Faculty Assembly, which provides for amendments to the Faculty Organization Plan. These amendments revise the list of Schools in Article III of the Faculty Organization Plan and also authorize representation of the School of Public Health and Health Services on the Faculty Senate and the Executive Committee. These amendments must be approved by the Board of Trustees.

II. STATUS OF PERSONNEL MATTERS

Grievances

The hearing for a grievance in the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences was recently completed. The hearing panel issued a unanimous decision in favor of the University. The grievant did not appeal, and the decision has become final. Another grievance in the Columbian College is proceeding through the hearing process.

A grievance in the School of Business has been recently filed, and mediation is expected to begin in the fall.

Nonconcurrences

No nonconcurrences have been received by the Executive Committee with respect to faculty recommendations for tenure or promotion issued during the 2003-04 academic year.

III. ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Senate Research Committee has provided the Executive Committee with a report indicating a strong need for revisions to the University's Patent Policy. The Executive Committee intends to appoint the following faculty members to an ad hoc committee to propose revisions to the Patent Policy: Professor William J. Briscoe (faculty

co-chair), Professor Robert F. Brauneis, Professor John H. Carson, Professor Jerald Feinstein, and Professor William B. Weglicki. The Executive Committee has asked Executive Vice President Lehman to designate the Administration's representatives to this ad hoc committee.

The Executive Committee has sent a memorandum, dated April 23, 2004, to the University's Office of Compliance regarding a new poster (entitled "What Would George Say") that is being used by the Office of Compliance to inform the University community about the existence of the Regulatory Compliance Help and Referral Line ("Referral Line"). The Executive Committee's memorandum expresses the understanding of the Faculty Senate that the Referral Line will continue to operate strictly in accordance with the guidelines set forth in the University General Counsel's memorandum dated November 5, 2002. The General Counsel's guidelines for the Referral Line were established after extensive consultation with the Faculty Senate. Assistant Vice President for University Compliance Colin T. Clasper has confirmed that the Referral Line will continue to operate in conformity with the General Counsel's guidelines.

IV. ANNUAL REPORTS

The annual report of the Chair of the Executive Committee for the 2003-04 session of the Faculty Senate will be distributed with the minutes of today's meeting.

Chairs of Senate Standing Committees for the 2003-04 session who have not yet submitted annual reports for their respective Committees should do so during the coming week, so that those reports can be distributed with the minutes of today's meeting.

The Executive Committee urges the newly constituted Standing Committees to begin their work as soon as possible and to hold their first meetings at the beginning of the fall semester. Over the course of the summer the Executive Committee will send to Committee Chairs various matters for consideration by their Committees.

A member of the Executive Committee has been assigned to each Standing Committee to serve as a liaison between the two Committees. Each Executive Committee liaison has been asked to meet with the Standing Committee's Chair by the beginning of the fall semester.

V. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next regular Senate meeting is scheduled for September 10, 2004. Resolutions and/or reports to be included on the agenda for the September meeting should be submitted to the Executive Committee not later than August 27, 2004.

In closing, I would like to extend my best wishes to all members of the Faculty Senate for a healthy, happy, and productive summer.

Thank you.