

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

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON  
SEPTEMBER 12, 2003, IN THE MARVIN CENTER, ROOM 310**

**Present:** President Trachtenberg, Vice President Lehman, Registrar Geyer, Parliamentarian Pagel; Deans Frawley, Futrell, Phillips, and Tong; Professors Briscoe, Castleberry, Duff, Englander, Friedenthal, Gallo, Garris, Griffith, Gupta, Harrington, Klarén, Lee, Marotta, Packer, Paratore, Paup, Robinson, Sell, Shambaugh, Swiercz, Wilmarth, Wirtz, and Zaghoul

**Absent:** Deans Harding, Katz, Scott, Whitaker, and Young; Professors Cordes, Simon, and Watson

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

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

The minutes of the May 9, 2003 meeting were approved as distributed.

**CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA**

Professor Robinson moved that the order of the Senate's agenda be changed so that Tributes to retiring faculty members could be considered as the next item of business. The motion was seconded, and passed.

**TRIBUTES TO RETIRING FACULTY**

Tributes to former Faculty Senate members who are retiring were offered, as follows: Dean William J. Frawley read a tribute to Professor Hugh Lilliefors, Professor Emeritus of Statistics. The tribute was prepared by Professor Nozer D. Singpurwalla of the Statistics Department. Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr. read two tributes he had prepared, to Professor Emeritus Robert E. Park, and Professor Emeritus David Robinson, Jr., both of the GW Law School. (The tributes are attached.)

President Trachtenberg assumed the Chair at 2:30 p.m., saying it was delightful to see everybody back, hale and hearty. He then called for the next item of business on the agenda.

**RESOLUTIONS**

**I. RESOLUTION 03/3, "A RESOLUTION FOR UNIVERSITY FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO ATTEND CONFERENCES AND MEETINGS AND TO RECEIVE STIPENDS FOR PURCHASE OF MATERIALS IN SUPPORT OF THEIR RESEARCH"**

On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Development and Support, Professor Jack Friedenthal, Chair, moved the adoption of Resolution 03/3. Professor Friedenthal reviewed the background of the Resolution, saying that the Committee had completed a two-year study of the matter under consideration, first under the Chairmanship of Professor Ginger Smith, who was present at the meeting. In the first year, the Committee surveyed what various schools and departments actually do to support faculty members attending meetings, conferences, and the like. The Committee then followed up last year by surveying what GW's marketbasket schools do, to provide some guidelines for comparison.

The Resolution, he continued, reflects a balanced concern: firstly, between fiscal problems with which the University is dealing, which have caused GW to postpone raises for all personnel, and secondly, the need of faculty members to fulfill their obligations as members of the larger academic community, both in the this country and abroad. This is important, he added, not only for individual faculty members, but also for the prestige of the University, which depends upon faculty relationships with the larger academic community.

Professor Friedenthal then said that the Resolution contains essentially two requests. The first is that, despite fiscal difficulties, schools of the University should not cut back on the level of funding they presently provide. Secondly, the Committee felt that there needs to be a more uniform policy among the different schools of the University. Therefore, he said, the Committee proposes that once current fiscal concerns are laid to rest, the University establish a policy which allows faculty members to request, not necessarily to receive, \$1,000, if this sum is reasonably necessary to attend meetings or conferences and take part in the larger academic community.

Finally, Professor Friedenthal noted that in addition to attendance at professional gatherings, in the modern world it is important to keep up-to-date with emerging technology, particularly software, books, and other materials which pose a significant expense. The Resolution, he concluded, is really rather modest in its scope, but it does take into account the present situation at the University while at the same time asking it to plan ahead for enhanced stipends, including travel stipends, for faculty.

Professor Wirtz said that he was sympathetic to the intent of the Resolution, but that it seemed to him that one of things the Senate does with these sorts of resolutions is to set standards, particularly for junior faculty, in terms of University expectations of them. He added that it does not appear that Resolution 03/3 delineates these expectations, and he added that he would feel better about the Resolution if some sense of the institution's expectations of the people who are being sponsored for conference attendance were expressed.

Professor Friedenthal said he thought this was a fair comment, and that these concerns had been discussed by the Committee. As phrased, he said, the Resolution does require

faculty to have sound reasons for conference attendance, but the Committee did not wish to dictate exactly what faculty would have to do to qualify for a stipend. Sometimes, he said, particularly for junior faculty, attendance alone is a significant part of their own faculty development. What are sound reasons for attendance, he said, was intentionally left to the various departments, in the hope that this criterion would provide the kind of flexibility necessary.

Professor Shambaugh asked if the proposed stipend from the University would be above and beyond stipends presently given by the individual colleges at the University, and if it was the Committee's idea that each college would receive appropriate funding for each faculty member.

Professor Friedenthal confirmed that the Committee conceived that the stipends would be a University obligation, as opposed to a school obligation, and that the additional resources should bring the schools into harmony. The fact that some schools may have more funds available individually than others, he said, ought not to be the ground as to how much support a particular faculty member should have.

Professor Shambaugh then asked how the Committee envisioned the stipends would be administered, i.e., at the school or University level. Professor Friedenthal responded that faculty members would make the case to their own school as to whether or not what they planned to do was reasonably necessary. Each faculty member could apply for up to \$1,000, and if they made their case, they could receive that much from the University. Professor Shambaugh asked if this meant that, in effect, each school would be responsible for interpreting what qualified for this type of support. Professor Friedenthal confirmed that this was the Committee's idea; the kind of research and activities expected of faculty, especially for young faculty seeking tenure, varies significantly from School to School, and this is where the determination of eligibility should be made.

Professor Briscoe said that it seemed to him that even if the money for these stipends trickled down from the University, it would have to come from somewhere, and he asked if the University would have to take money away from the schools in order to set up a fund from which to pay for the stipends. Professor Friedenthal responded that the Resolution expressed the Committee's view that the University should not cut back on what it is already doing in this area, and that when the University can afford to support these stipends for faculty, it should do so.

Professor Gupta said that, in principle, he liked the idea of increased faculty development and support funding. He also observed that the Committee's report surveyed fifteen marketbasket schools, but only one school's stipend funding at GW had been reported, and he added that he would like to have a better idea of the situation University-wide.

Dean Frawley said that he was of two minds concerning the Resolution. On the one hand, he said he supported it one thousand percent. On the other, he said he was very worried about the funding of these sorts of activities at the school and University level. The likelihood, he said, was that this would mean that substantial portions of funding already allocated to the colleges would be subject to internal reallocation.

A second set of concerns, he said, was that the Resolution perhaps presents a view of research that is contrary to where GW is, or where it wants to go. Nearly all of the schools listed in the Committee's report as offering no stipend to faculty are Research I universities, rather than quite good liberal arts schools, such as Franklin and Marshall, or Elizabethtown College, which have a very different view of what it means to have professional development/involvement, and offer an annual stipend.

Finally, Dean Frawley said he thought the Resolution needs to be more sensitive to the internal context and present levels of funding for the activities in question. Columbian College currently provides \$800 for faculty members for approved travel for participation at a conference. This amount has to be matched by \$125 from each department, with the result that present funding levels already approach \$1,000 for conference attendance. This is in addition to start-up packages and the submission of grants for matching money. The question, he said, is how does the University enhance the research environment, which includes looking at things such as indirect cost return, calculated end returns, how the University promotes grants management, and the overall management of the research environment. Dean Frawley then said that he would suggest that, if possible, the Resolution be broadened, and broadened in a more positive way to support research in general.

Professor Gupta then moved that Resolution 03/3 be referred to the Senate Research Committee for its consideration, and the motion was seconded. Professor Griffith said that he understood that if the central thrust of the Resolution is to enhance the University's research environment, then having it reviewed by the Research Committee made a lot of sense, and if so, he was in favor of this review. He added that he gathered from Professor Friedenthal's discussion that the thrust of the Resolution aimed not only to enhance ongoing research productivity, but also to make support available to young faculty members just getting a research program underway. Thus, he said, it might be reasonable for a senior faculty member to be required to present a paper in order to receive a stipend, but for junior faculty, some combination of encouraging future as well as current research and productivity might justify a stipend award. He concluded that he hoped such considerations would not get lost if the Resolution were referred to Committee.

Professor Robinson asked if it would not be helpful for both the Faculty Development and Support Committee and the Senate Research Committee to work on these issues together. Professor Griffith asked if she were proposing a joint subcommittee and Professor Robinson agreed that this would be a good idea.

Professor Wilmarth said he thought there had been a good discussion on Resolution 03/3, and he proposed that the joint subcommittee more specifically define the requirement that faculty must "demonstrate sound academic reasons" for requesting a stipend. He suggested that the joint subcommittee consider whether or not the Resolution should state explicitly that the applicable college, division, or school would have discretion to define the types of sound academic reasons justifying attendance at conferences or meetings.

The President then observed that there was a motion on the floor to send Resolution 03/3 to Committee which had been seconded. Professor Griffith asked if Professor Gupta, who made the motion, would accept, as a friendly amendment, Professor Robinson's suggestion that a joint subcommittee of the two committees be formed to perfect the Resolution.

Professor Gupta agreed to accept the friendly amendment. The question was called. A vote was taken, and the motion to refer Resolution 03/3 to the joint subcommittee was approved unanimously. (Resolution 03/3 is attached.)

### INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

### RESPONSE OF ADMINISTRATION TO SENATE RESOLUTIONS – 2002-03 SESSION

Professor Robinson noted that the Administration's Response had been distributed with the meeting agenda. Professor Griffith inquired about the administration's response to Resolution 02/01, concerning the provision of a requested statement of reasons to long-term contract faculty. As the response stated that the Resolution did not appear to serve the best interests of the University, and said that the administration would respectfully continue to study the matter, Professor Griffith asked when this study might be completed and a fuller response provided. The President said that he would report back to the Senate in January, 2004.

### GENERAL BUSINESS

#### I. NOMINATION FOR ELECTION TO SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES FOR THE 2003-04 SESSION

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Robinson moved the nomination of Professor Barry L. Berman as Acting Chair of the Honors and Academic Convocations Committee. The nomination was approved.

#### II. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

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

#### III. ANNUAL REPORTS OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Annual Reports of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom and the Research Committee were received for distribution with the minutes. (The Reports are attached.)

### BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

The President introduced Mr. Kris Hart, President of the GW Student Association, who was present at the meeting. He also recognized Deans Futrell, Frawley, and Tong, and the University Librarian, Jack Siggins.

The President then announced that the University had just received a permit to demolish the old GW Hospital building, and that demolition would begin within a few days. Implosion of the building had been considered, he added, but because of the proximity of the

Metro tunnel to the site, the University elected to employ a crew using cranes and wrecking balls to demolish the structure. This latter procedure, he noted, would be finished within the next three months.

The President then briefed the Senate on the most recent D.C. Court of Appeals ruling on the Campus Plan. While the ruling denied a number of the University's requests, in essence it deferred the implementation of the most draconian aspects of the City's requirements concerning University housing. Thus, if the University maintains its momentum, it is likely that all of the other issues in the case will be moot, as by 2006 the University will be in compliance with the requirement that it house 70% of full-time undergraduates on campus.

A related matter, the President continued, is the issue of whether or not to commence construction of the new School of Business and Public Management facility. While the University has been issued a permit to construct the foundation, it was previously deemed unwise to begin construction if work could be halted midstream for lack of University compliance with Board of Zoning Appeals requirements. He added that the University would now consult with counsel concerning commencement of this project.

The President noted that the new townhouses on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street are now open, and the students have moved in and seem very happy there. The construction of the new residence hall on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, deemed, for lack of a better name "Ivory Tower" is well underway, and with any luck, the President said it would be finished on budget and on time for students to move into in August of 2004.

The President also reported that the University has proposed to build another residence hall which would house 500+ students, located in the parking lot behind the Support building on F Street. Unfortunately, another city agency, not the BZA, has argued that the proposed building is too tall, and would therefore be a blight upon the city. So, he concluded, the University has gone back to the drawing board to seek a way to redesign the building to meet these concerns, perhaps by devising a setback for the building or sheathing it in black.

Finally, the President observed that the University is presently in litigation with the dentist who owns three townhouses on 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, adjoining the Ivory Tower construction site. This individual claims that University construction has extended (by inches) over the party wall onto his property, and while he has been able to move forward in Court with his claim, his request for a preliminary injunction to halt construction has been denied.

Professor Griffith asked that the President ask the Vice President and General Counsel's office to make available to the Senate a summary of the D.C. Court of Appeals decision as had been done previously. The President provided a summary statement for distribution to the Senate with the minutes. (The statement is attached)

Professor Griffith then said he wanted to make just a couple of comments about the Tributes previously read. He said he felt that probably many people might not understand Professor Singpurwalla's joke about the mind-boggling character of Professor Lilliefors' non-Bayesian statistics course. In order to get the joke, Professor Griffith said, one had to understand that Professor Singpurwalla feels about Bayesian statistics the way Pat Robertson

does about Christianity, i.e., there are believers, and nonbelievers, and the nonbelievers are just lost. But he added, that was the point of the joke.

Professor Griffith also said he wanted to say a word about the tribute to Professor Park, who he thought had contributed as valuably to the Senate, over the years, as anybody on the faculty. He added that while he was Executive Committee Chair, he was fortunate to have Professor Park as the Law School Committee member. Professor Park also served on the Committee that wrote the grievance procedures, and he was invaluable in helping the rest of the Executive Committee understand how to think about legal problems encountered.

Professor Griffith then said he also thought that Professor Robinson had also made invaluable contributions to the Faculty Senate. Even though he said he could not recall an occasion when they were ever on the same side of an issue, Professor Griffith said that Professor David Robinson was always prepared with his arguments, had a clear vision of where he wanted to go, and was eloquent in urging others to follow his lead. This certainly enlivened the Senate's debates, he added.

Professor Griffith then said he wanted to comment on the opinion/editorial piece written by President Trachtenberg, which appeared in the Washington Post in August. In this piece, he said, the President put forward a defense of the idea of the University adopting a different [academic] calendar. Whatever the merits of this idea, Professor Griffith said, he wanted to protest the rhetoric that the President used, which inevitably, he thought, portrays faculty in an unfavorable light. He then referred particularly to the sentence that said, "My point being that once we begin to understand how much more beneficial use we can grab from our faculty and physical plant by not letting them lie fallow a good part of the year, many wonderful opportunities come to . . ."

Professor Griffith continued, saying that the dictionary defines "lying fallow" as meaning dormant and out of use, and he then rhetorically asked his colleagues how many of them felt that their summer was spent in being dormant and out of use.

Professor Griffith said that his initial reaction to the piece was to think that the President, despite having been exposed to educational institutions for a long period time, still does not understand what faculty do. This reaction was tempered by reading further in the piece, which contained another sentence reading "We talk about living in the information age or a post-industrial society, yet we approach higher education as a kind of part-time, tepid, even languid, endeavor." Unfortunately, Professor Griffith said, this feeds the notion, held by large numbers of people outside academia, that faculty are basically dormant for one fourth of the year and they work at a languid and tepid pace the rest of the time. Professor Griffith said that it seemed to him that the President was attempting to drum up support for the notion of adopting an alternative academic calendar by, in effect, siding with the general public in their view that faculty typically don't do much, and that they oppose all change. Thus, the proposal to adopt an alternative calendar is one of the forces of good fighting against the forces of at least mediocrity, if not evil. Professor Griffith then concluded by saying he wanted to protest that kind of statement on behalf of the President, and said he thought it was uncalled for, and that maligning the faculty would no doubt not help win the assent of the faculty to proposed changes in the academic calendar. The President responded that he laid claim to academic freedom and first amendment rights. Professor Griffith assured the President that he had not

said that the President was constrained from speaking up for his point of view. The President then said he was most grateful, as always, for Professor's Griffith's editorial assistance and his commentary. All of us who utter public statements, he said, anticipate that there will be people who will critique them, as he had just done in pointing out some oversights and errors he thought had been uttered by Derek Bok in his new book on higher education.

Professor Paratore, Faculty Co-Chair of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, then took a moment to introduce Mr. Christian Berle, this year's student Co-chair of the Joint Committee. The Joint Committee, he added, had just met that morning, and this year there are a good number of students who are really active and very concerned about what goes on at the University. For example, he said, the academic calendar was one of the first things discussed. Students have also expressed some concern that a number of faculty seem to be having difficulty in keeping up with the latest technologies. This later issue, he added, is one which will be discussed throughout this year. The President noted that the University is certainly a community of scholars and learners, and that those who know teach. Professor Paratore then invited other Committees to get involved in issues before the Joint Committee, if they were so inclined.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, and upon motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Dennis L. Geyer  
Dennis L. Geyer  
Secretary

## A TRIBUTE TO HUGH LILLIEFORS, PROFESSOR OF STATISTICS

In 1988 Professor Lilliefors wrote a theoretical paper in stochastic simulation, entitled “*It’s Time to Stop*”. By the year 2003 he succeeded in modifying his theory and has now put it into practice by “*Choosing to Stop*”. This is after a distinguished career at GWU, starting from 1964. During this period he has achieved much, some of which is what GWU expects of its faculty, but much transcends expectations.

Professor Lilliefors has enlightened a large body of students to a spectrum of courses in statistics, ranging from the comprehensible to the truly mind boggling. He has supervised the dissertations of several doctoral students, some of whom were rescued from total oblivion by Hugh’s kind and gracious mentorship. He has also served as the Chair of the Department of Statistics, and during the course of his academic career here, he has also managed to think the unthinkable. He has served on the Faculty Senate (and some of its committees). Hugh has been a Visiting Professor in Sweden, Switzerland, and at the University of California at Davis.

On transcending expectations, Professor Lilliefors has upheld the tradition of his forerunners, Cornfield, Greenhouse, and Kullback, by bringing singular recognition to GWU via his famous test for “Goodness of Fit”. For this work, his reputation in the statistics profession is absolute and unparalleled. Hugh identified a gap in the great Soviet mathematician Kolmogorov’s approach to statistical testing. He then went on to fill this gap via his two papers in the “*Journal of the American Statistical Association*”. This made the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test practical, and assured for Hugh a historical position in the annals of statistical methodology.

We wish him well in his retirement years, but not without saying that maybe now, “*It’s Time to Start Again*”.

Nozer D. Singpurwalla  
Professor of Statistics

(Read into the record at the Faculty Senate Meeting, September 12, 2003)

**A TRIBUTE TO ROBERT E. PARK**  
**Professor of Law, Emeritus**

Professor Robert E. Park retired at the end of the 2002-03 academic year as Professor of Law, Emeritus, following thirty-eight years of service to the University and its Law School. Professor Park earned his B.S. degree from the University of Florida in 1952. He entered the Navy, and while stationed in Washington he took creative writing courses from Averett Howard at Columbian College. His attachment to the University dates from that time. He returned to the University of Florida, earned his B.A. and J.D. degrees, and taught undergraduate courses for three years. He was a graduate student at Yale Law School in 1964-65 and earned an LL.M. degree. When the opportunity arose to return to the University, Professor Park joined our Law School's faculty in 1965.

Professor Park has shown great distinction as a teacher and scholar in the fields of administrative law, constitutional law, privacy, jurisprudence and torts. He organized and taught one of the first law school courses in the United States on the law of privacy. He has published monographs, law review articles, contract studies for federal agencies, and book reviews. He has presented scholarly papers at numerous conferences sponsored by law schools, other university departments, bar associations and judicial organizations. He has made significant contributions to the field of administrative law in connection with his service as director of education for the American Bar Association's Center for Administrative Justice, and as consultant to the U.S. Administrative Conference, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and the Office of Administrative Law Judges of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management. He was twice the chairman and often a participant in the national Workshop for New Law School Teachers sponsored by the Association of American Law Schools.

Professor Park has earned the universal respect and affection of the faculty, staff and students at the Law School. He was a dedicated, rigorous and beloved teacher for generations of law students. On December 6, 2002, the faculty of the Law School adopted a resolution granting emeritus status to Professor Park. That Emeritus Resolution included, among many other commendations, the following statements: "Professor Park has served as an exemplary teacher and citizen of this University, engaging students and colleagues with his infectious intellectual curiosity, unflinching patience, and deep commitment to the practice of law. . . . We shall greatly miss Professor Park's warmth, intellectual vitality, professional and university service, and dedication to students." The Faculty Senate warmly concurs in these sentiments of appreciation for Professor Park's career as a faculty member.

Professor Park has long urged his students to enroll in courses outside the Law School, and he has consistently sought to strengthen the Law School's connection to other schools and divisions within the University. It is his deep conviction that affiliation with a university-wide community of scholars dignifies and liberates the study of law from a merely professional focus. In his view, a university community opens enormously the potential for law to serve the interests of justice and humane learning. To this end, he has taught administrative law in the University's off-campus programs for non-lawyers, as well as segments of the University's cross-disciplinary course in bioethics. He has also lectured on bioethics in the Medical School's continuing education programs

for physicians, served on the bioethics committee of the University's Hospital, lectured in continuing education programs for nursing professional associations, and presented papers on jurisprudence, law and morality to a University Faculty Seminar on Ethics. He sought to promote principles of liberal inquiry when he served as Assistant Director of the University's Afghan Legal Training Program during the 1970's, and as lecturer and consultant for a pan-African conference on law school curriculum reform in 1989. Professor Park believes that the various disciplines and departments of the University provide the most promising resources for interdisciplinary work at the Law School. He is convinced that interdisciplinary studies offer the greatest intellectual potential for successful reform of our legal system.

Professor Park has provided extraordinary service to the Law School and the University in carrying out a wide array of committee and administrative assignments. He was a member of many important Law School committees, including the Faculty Appointments Committee, the Faculty Development Committee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the Dean Search Committee. He also served on many University administrative committees, including the Benefits Review Committee (1992-2003), the Vice President for Academic Affairs' Forum for University Planning (1998-99), the Presidential Advisory Committee for Recommendations for a New Vice President for Academic Affairs (faculty chair, 1995-96), and the Commission for the Year 2000 (1984-86). He received the George Washington University Award for Outstanding Contributions to the University in 1990, and he was awarded the Oscar and Shoshana Trachtenberg Prize for Service to the University in 1996.

Professor Park has provided invaluable service to the Faculty Senate in many capacities. He served for sixteen years as an elected member of the Faculty Senate, and during six of those years he was the Law School's representative on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. He also served as the Faculty Senate's first Parliamentarian in 1965-67. Professor Park was a key member and sometime Chair of several Faculty Senate Committees, including the Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies, the Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting, and the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom. On several occasions, he served as a mediator for faculty grievances. The Faculty Senate adopted resolutions in 1967 and 1970 commending Professor Park for his faithful and effective service.

In his retirement, we know that Professor Park will pursue his many intellectual interests while demonstrating his love and commitment to his family, church and community. We hope that Professor Park will continue to take an active part in the life of the University and the Faculty Senate as a greatly esteemed friend and emeritus faculty member.

Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr.

Professor of Law and Member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
(Read into the record at the Faculty Senate meeting, September 12, 2003)

**A TRIBUTE TO DAVID ROBINSON, JR.**  
**Professor of Law, Emeritus**

Professor David Robinson, Jr. retired at the end of the 2002-03 academic year as Professor of Law, Emeritus, following thirty-eight years of service to the University and its Law School. Professor Robinson received his undergraduate degree from Reed College and his J.D. degree from Columbia Law School. He also earned an LL.M. degree from Harvard University as a Ford Foundation graduate fellow. Professor Robinson joined our Law School's faculty in 1965, after serving as a law clerk for the Oregon Supreme Court, as deputy district attorney and Assistant U.S. Attorney in his hometown of Portland, Oregon, and as a teaching fellow at Harvard Law School.

Professor Robinson has shown great distinction as a teacher and scholar in the fields of criminal law, criminal procedure, constitutional law and evidence. He has published more than twenty monographs, book chapters, law review articles and book reviews, along with several shorter essays on academic, legal and social issues. He has made significant contributions to the fields of criminal law and criminal procedure through his service as consultant to the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws and the U.S. Department of Justice, and as Reporter to the Planning Group of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. In connection with his efforts to reform the federal criminal code, Professor Robinson presented testimony on several occasions before the Judiciary Committees of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate. He also briefed and argued a leading criminal law case, *Powell v. Texas*, before the U.S. Supreme Court.

Professor Robinson has earned the universal respect and affection of the faculty, staff and students at the Law School. He was a challenging, rigorous and greatly admired teacher for generations of law students. On December 6, 2002, the faculty of the Law School adopted a resolution granting emeritus status to Professor Robinson. That Emeritus Resolution included, among many other commendations, the following statements: "Professor Robinson has always advocated those positions he thought best for George Washington University and its Law School in all forums, with tact and with great courage . . . [He] was always willing to offer advice and guidance on substantive legal issues or on questions concerning effective law teaching to junior colleagues, many of whom benefitted from his wise counsel over the years. . . . [W]e shall greatly miss the intellectual vibrancy, provocative views, collegiality, good humor, warmth and many kindnesses of Professor Robinson." The Faculty Senate warmly concurs in these sentiments of appreciation for Professor Robinson's career as a faculty member.

Professor Robinson has provided exceptional service to the Law School and the University in carrying out a wide array of committee and administrative assignments. He was a member of many important Law School committees, including the Faculty Appointments Committee, the Curriculum Committee, and the Tenure and Promotion Committee. He was the founder and longtime Chair of the Ceremonies Committee. In that capacity, as stated in the Law School faculty's Emeritus Resolution, Professor Robinson "helped the law school to celebrate the personal joys and mourn the personal sorrows of his faculty colleagues, and to mark the retirements, departures, and other career changes of former colleagues, in a way that has brought us all closer together and fostered a sense of community." Professor Robinson also served on a several University administrative committees.

Professor Robinson has provided invaluable service to the Faculty Senate in many capacities. He served for seven years as an elected member of the Faculty Senate, and during one of those years he was the Law School's representative on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. He was a member and sometime Chair of the Faculty Senate Library Committee and the Committee on Physical Facilities. Reflecting his steadfast commitment to the principles of academic freedom and faculty self-governance, he has been a key member of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom for sixteen years, and he continues to serve on that Committee as an emeritus faculty member.

In his retirement, we know that Professor Robinson will continue to pursue his many intellectual interests and to demonstrate his love of family, community, classical music and opera. We are delighted that Professor Robinson continues to take an active part in the life of the University and the Faculty Senate as a greatly esteemed friend and emeritus faculty member.

Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr.

Professor of Law and Member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee  
(Read into the record at the Faculty Senate meeting, September 12, 2003)

**A RESOLUTION FOR UNIVERSITY FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO ATTEND CONFERENCES AND MEETINGS AND TO RECEIVE STIPENDS FOR PURCHASE OF MATERIALS IN SUPPORT OF THEIR RESEARCH (03/3)**

**WHEREAS,** the faculty members of The George Washington University wish to enhance their academic skills by attending academic conferences and meetings and purchasing books, computer software, and other items that relate directly to their specific fields of study; and

**WHEREAS,** such attendance at conferences and meetings and the purchase of materials will strengthen the research capabilities of the faculty members and thus lead to the enhanced prestige of the university; and

**WHEREAS,** the level of support at The George Washington University for attendance at conferences and meetings differs among schools and departments and support for other related expenses is generally unavailable; and

**WHEREAS,** a survey of the level of support at other comparable universities indicates that the current level of financial support at The George Washington University for attendance at such conferences and meetings as well as for the purchase of materials is at best equal to and often less than at such other universities; and

**WHEREAS,** the level of financial support of faculty members at The George Washington University is below an amount necessary to provide for the research needs of its faculty members; and

**WHEREAS,** the University has announced the existence of a fiscal crisis that threatens the current amount of support provided, **NOW, THEREFORE,**

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

- 1.** That despite the current fiscal difficulties of the University, the University and its various schools and departments maintain the current level of financial support for its faculty members who have sound reasons to attend conferences and meetings, and to purchase necessary books, software, and other materials; and
- 2.** Once the University's immediate financial difficulties have been overcome, the University provide an annual travel stipend, in the sum of at least \$1000, to each faculty member who applies for such a stipend, for the purpose of attending conferences and meetings that relate directly to and enhance the faculty member's research activities or the prestige of the University; and, further,

- 3.** The University plan for an enhanced annual stipend to include money for books, software, and other expenses that relate directly to and enhance a faculty member's research activities.

Committee on Faculty Development and Support  
May, 2003

This Resolution is the result of a two-year study and analysis by the members of the Committee on Faculty Development and Support.

The 2001-2002 Committee, that initiated the topic and the study, included the following members:

Ginger Smith, Chair, College of Professional Studies and SBPM  
Prabir Bagchi, Business Administration  
Natalie Frank, Psychology  
Angelica King, Business and Public Management  
Amy Mazur, Education

The 2002-2003 Committee, that expanded the study and prepared the Committee report, included the following:

Jack Friedenthal, Chair, Law  
Charis Kubrin, Sociology  
Amy Mazur, Education  
Steve McGraw, Health Care Sciences  
Christopher Snyder, Economics  
Lynda West, Education

Referred to the Senate Standing Committee on Research with recommendation that a joint subcommittee be formed between it and the Faculty Development and Support Committee to refine language of the resolution.

The University Counsel's office sent the PEAFF Committee a memorandum explaining that "for cause" dismissal proceedings were burdensome and potentially embarrassing. The office suggested that a "constructive resignation" rule -- that is, a rule that would deem a faculty member to resign if the faculty member failed to meet certain obligations -- might eliminate these problems. The Committee, however, worried that any procedure other than "for cause" removal proceedings might endanger tenure rights. The Committee and the University Counsel's Office also agreed that the situation did not arise often enough to create an urgent problem. Accordingly, the PEAFF Committee decided not to recommend any changes to the Faculty Code.

(2) The second issue was whether the Graduate School of Education and Human Development (GSEHD) is in compliance with the rules in the Faculty Code concerning the percentage of tenured and tenure-track faculty. After the PEAFF Committee began work on this issue, it learned that the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee (ASPP Committee) already was studying it. The ASPP Committee subsequently found, and in April 2003 reported to the Faculty Senate, that the GSEHD was not in compliance. The ASPP Committee determined that the situation was regrettable, but that no clear solution for the problem existed. GSEHD's finances unfortunately make compliance in the near future all but impossible. The PEAFF Committee could not make any additional contribution to these conclusions.

(3) The third issue was whether the title of "Professor of Practice," sometimes used by the Elliot School of International Affairs, should be listed in the Faculty Code. The PEAFF Committee studied the issue, but does not recommend any changes in the Faculty Code. The title "Professor of Practice" appears

to be an informal designation used for identification purposes (usually for distinguished former government officials) and not a new category of faculty position.

(4) The PEAFF Committee designated its chair to serve as a member of the joint committee investigating the proposal to create a new School of Policy within the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. The Chair of the PEAFF Committee and the other members of the joint subcommittee met numerous times and consulted with various university officials and faculty members. A separate report, presented to the Faculty Senate in May, details its conclusions.

## Research Committee: Annual Report (2002-03)

The Research Committee met three times during the course of the 2002-03 academic year. During the course of the year the Committee addressed the following Issues:

1. The Committee reviewed The George Washington University Strategic Plan for Research 2001-2002 adopted by the Advisory Council on Research on May 18, 2001. After a heated discussion, it was decided that except for one or two items, no significant inroads have been made in fulfilling the objectives of this plan. The Committee will seek to find the reasons for this lack of response on the part of the University during the 2003-2004 term:
2. A subcommittee, chaired by Professor Roper, was charged with the review of the GW Policy on Patents. This committee was hampered by a lack of expert faculty willing to serve in review of the Policy on Patents. The membership of the 2003-2004 Committee is more suited to this task and the review will continue. Preliminary discussions indicate that the GW Policy on Patents is not a problem at this time. Rather, the lack of proper infrastructure at GW to follow through on the applications of this policy is more likely the cause of most of the problems that were brought to the attention of the Committee by GW faculty researchers. The 2003-2004 Research Committee will form a new subcommittee with more experience and expertise on these matters and continue the review of document and infrastructure.
3. In consideration of item 1, the Chair of this Committee would propose that the 2003-2004 Committee perform a review of the University's support of faculty research efforts at GW.

Respectfully submitted,  
William J. Briscoe  
Chair, Senate Committee on Research

Members of the 2002-2003 Research Committee:

William Briscoe (Chair)  
Barry Berman  
David Bjelajac  
Kie Eom  
William Roper  
Mona Zaghloul

Ex officio:  
Dan Barthell  
Stephan Ladisch  
Carol Sigelman  
Gary Simon (Executive Committee Liaison)  
Tim Tong  
Wasył Wasyłkiwski

*September 11, 2003*

**The following statement may be attributed to Bob Ludwig,  
spokesman for The George Washington University**

We are pleased that the D.C. Court of Appeals has recognized the University's original commitment to house 5,600 undergraduates on campus by 2006 and has effectively given the University until that time to meet the housing conditions of the Board of Zoning Adjustment order.

It also appears that we can now move forward without undue delay with planned academic, recreational and other facilities.

By striking the condition that required the University to provide housing for 70% of its full-time undergraduates in the period 2002-2006, the University now has until 2006 to meet the housing requirement. GW has demonstrated its commitment in this area by engaging in aggressive actions to provide more housing on campus. This order permits the University the opportunity to fulfill that goal in a reasonable amount of time.

The Court also continued the stay of the condition that required the immediate housing of freshmen and sophomores on campus, allowing for the University to seek relief from the BZA for the housing of freshmen in the Hall on Virginia Avenue (HOVA) at 2602 Virginia Ave., N.W. The court noted that a negotiated resolution to this issue "would undoubtedly be in the interest of justice."

Further, the Court struck down the BZA condition that could have blocked all permits for non-residential projects on GW's campus if a court found invalid any part of the Board's housing condition. The Court said that this condition is an "extraordinary provision" that "on its face chills the exercise by the University of its fundamental right to seek judicial redress against allegedly arbitrary agency action."

The University currently provides beds for more than 70% of its full time undergraduates, taking into account all University beds on and off campus. The University has an aggressive campaign to increase the number of beds on campus. Within the past two years the University has added 537 beds. Currently, a residence hall containing 728 beds is under construction and will be completed by fall 2004. A separate residence hall to contain 530 beds has been submitted to government authorities for approval. These projects total 1,795 new beds.

-GW-

---

**ANNUAL REPORT**  
**OF**  
**THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE FACULTY SENATE**  
**2002-2003 SESSION**

The Executive Committee established the agenda for eight regular meetings of the 2002-2003 session. The Senate considered four resolutions. One was amended and adopted; three were adopted without emendation. The resolutions are summarized in the attached tabulation. The response of the administration, and where appropriate, the Board of Trustees, will be reported when available.

These resolutions addressed topics of concern to the University. Two resolutions were presented by the Executive Committee. One addresses changes in the Faculty Organization Plan. It provides for correct designations for a number of Schools. Since the last publication of the Faculty Organization Plan there have been changes in the names of the three Schools and the School of Public Health and Health Services has been established. The resolution adds the School of Public Health and Health Services to Article I, Section 2. Additionally, the resolution provides for the inclusion of one representative to the Faculty Senate from the School of Public Health and Health Services.

The second resolution presented by the Executive Committee deals with the administration's proposed restructuring of University Governance. Prompted by widespread faculty concerns regarding the academic future of the University, this resolution addresses the creation of a new position, that of University Provost. The Faculty Code and the Faculty Organization Plan do not provide for this position. An underlying concern of the Executive Committee and the faculty at large was that, as contemplated by the administration, the Provost would have academic oversight of three schools, thus dividing the University academically and strategically. Furthermore, no national search was undertaken or planned. Following the passage of this resolution in September 2002 there were further discussions of this matter by President Trachtenberg with the Executive Committee and with the Senate. The faculty was assured by the President that the new position was strictly an

administrative position not involving academic governance and the appointment was an interim appointment.

During the course of the session, the Executive Committee referred numerous matters for consideration and action to standing committees. For example, the Executive Committee requested that the Committee on Educational policy review the Writing Proposal drafted by the Academic Excellence Committee. The report of the task force on establishing a School of Public Policy was transmitted for review and recommendation to the Committees on Educational Policy, Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, and Fiscal Planning and Budgeting. The Executive Committee also requested that the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students consider proposed changes to the Code of Academic Integrity. The Committee on Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management was asked to review criteria for undergraduate admissions, undergraduate financial aid, and graduate enrollments.

The Executive Committee also arranged for the presentation of twelve reports to the Faculty Senate. These consisted of an update on the Code of Academic Integrity a report on the goals of the Office for Advancement, a report on the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, an update on the work of the Special Committee on the Alternative Academic Calendar, the annual report by the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee on fiscal year 2003 operating and capital budgets, an update on the Compliance Line and Procedures, a report on administrative salaries, a report on the campus plan and recent adverse zoning decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals, an update on the Gelman, Mount Vernon and Virginia Campus libraries, the first annual report on the College of Professional Studies, the Annual Report on the Recruitment and Appointment of Women Faculty and Faculty of Color, and a report on the Incident Planning, Response, and Recovery Manual.

In addition, the Executive Committee continued a process, instituted in the 2001-2002 session, of presentation of school status reports by the Deans. During the course of the 2002- 2003 session the Senate received extremely informative updates from the Deans of the Law School, the Elliott School, and Columbian College.

In April 2003, in accordance with the Faculty Code, the Executive Committee was notified of two administrative nonconcurrences with faculty personnel recommendations in Columbian College. One, a nonconcurrency with respect to

promotion was withdrawn by the recommending department. The second, a nonconcurrency with a faculty tenure and promotion recommendation, continues in process.

With respect to other personnel matters, a grievance in the School of Business and Public Management has been settled at the mediation stage. Two grievances in Columbian College of Arts and Sciences are in mediation. A complaint from a visiting faculty member in the School of Business and Public Management was not mediated satisfactorily. However, that matter has not been pursued further through the University's dispute resolution process.

The 2002-2003 session of the Faculty Senate has considered and dealt with matters central to the success of the faculty role in governance at the University. The Executive Committee is grateful to Faculty Senate members and colleagues throughout the University for their hard work, dedication, and support. The Committee is appreciative of the time and effort extended by President Trachtenberg and Executive Vice President Lehman on the resolution of the difficult and challenging issues of this session. The Committee also extends special thanks to Sue Campbell and Nina Posidelow for their effective and conscientious assistance in the work of the Faculty Senate.

Respectfully submitted,

Lilien F. Robinson, Chair

Members of the Executive Committee:

Robert J. Harrington  
Peter F. Klarén  
Gary L. Simon  
Lynda West  
Arthur E. Wilmarth  
Philip W. Wirtz

Ex.Officio:

Stephen J. Trachtenberg, President

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

**May 1, 2003**

The Faculty Senate has met three times since the February meeting of the Board of Trustees, on February 14, March 14, and April 11.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

The Senate passed no resolutions. Two resolutions are on the agenda for the Senate meeting on May 9, 2003.

**DEAN'S REPORTS :**

Established during the 2001-2002 session by the Executive Committee, the program of presentations by the Deans has been continued during the current session.

Dean William Frawley presented a report on the current state of the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences as well as its future directions. He provided an analysis of the College over a period of ten years with respect to the number and composition of faculty and students, the latter's increased election of double majors, and the rate of admission of the College's graduates to law schools. The Dean outlined five directions for the future of the College, which were premised on departmental and College strategic plans and ongoing conversations with department chairs.

Interim Dean Richard Southby presented an update on the School of Public Health and Health Services. His report was focused on the School's ratio of tenure to non-tenure accruing faculty, an issue raised during the 2001-02 session of the Faculty Senate (Resolution 01/11). He indicated that there had been a review of the existing faculty composition and expected teaching needs. As a result of this process 16 current non-tenure accruing positions have been identified to be considered for conversion to tenure-accruing positions.

**OTHER REPORTS :**

-University Librarian Jack Siggins provided an update on the Gelman, Mount Vernon, and Virginia Campus Libraries. He noted that the University had added one million dollars to the base budget, beginning in 2002. However, he emphasized that to reach the level of a top-tier research institution the University must have a collection of high quality and broad scope. This is contingent on two conditions: sustained purchasing power and continuing increase in budget support.

-Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald Lehman presented the first annual report on the College of Professional Studies, giving an overview of its growth and development since the College's inception. The College had launched its first year of operation in 2001-02. He discussed the establishment of the governance structure of the College, the ongoing development of the by-laws, the positive assessment of the College's financial situation, and the acceptance of the College's report by the Middle States Commission.

-Dr. Lehman also provided the Annual Report on the Recruitment and Appointment of Women Faculty and Faculty of Color. Discussing the data provided to the Senate, Dr. Lehman emphasized that the University has had significant success in recruiting women faculty and faculty of color. As a result, in 2001-02, 28.3% of the new hires in full-time faculty positions and 16.9% of hires in new visiting positions were minority candidates.

-Assistant Vice President for Public Safety & Emergency Management John Petrie distributed and discussed the main portion of the Incident Planning, Response, and Recovery Manual along with related material from the D.C. Emergency Management Agency. He indicated that in addition to creating the Manual, the University had made tremendous advances in terms of pulling together a comprehensive emergency plan and methods of providing information to the campus community. He advised that the next step was for departments and schools to implement specific procedures applicable to their particular requirements. A model plan, produced under the auspices of the Academic Affairs unit, was provided as a guide for local implementation.

-The Senate received an update on the work of the Special Committee, appointed by the administration, considering an Alternative Academic Calendar. The committee is investigating the advantages and disadvantages of both calendar and course load alternatives to the current system.

-The Chair of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, Professor William Griffith, presented a Special Report on the FY '03 Operating and Capital Budgets. The written report and the oral presentation focused on a number of topics of special interest to the faculty. These include comparative endowment per full-time equivalent student, comparative analysis of gifts and pledges, comparative listing of debt to net assets, and summaries of the university's debt management and research expenditures, and the growth of faculty, course sections, and course enrollment. In the case of the latter, he noted that while the number of undergraduate course sections had increased significantly, the number of faculty had been growing at a slower pace. Furthermore, classroom space may be insufficient to meet projected needs.

-The Senate received a report by Senate colleague and member of the Committee on Appointment, Salary, Promotion, Professor Murli Gupta, on administrative salaries. The data were derived from the last university filing, the year ending June, 2000. The data indicate that senior administration salaries had increased some 32.5% over a 4.5 year period and the average regular full-time faculty salaries, excluding the School of Medicine, had increased by approximately 22% over a 5 year period.

-The Chair of the Educational Policy Committee and the Faculty Senate's representative to the Special Task Force on the Writing Proposal, Professor Paul Duff, presented a preliminary report on the work of the Task Force. He noted that the proposal, the product of the work of the Academic Excellence Committee, required broad faculty participation. A primary task of the faculty was the planning of new curricula. Accordingly, the current proposal was for a pilot program and would be directed to the curriculum committees of the various schools and colleges.

-Vice President and General Counsel Dennis Blumer briefed the Senate on the campus plan and the recent adverse zoning decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals.

-The Senate received an update on the Compliance Help and Referral Line from Professor Arthur Wilmarth, one of three faculty members working with the offices of the General Counsel and the Treasurer with respect to faculty concerns regarding the Compliance Line. He reported that the Line was being operated simply as a referral clearing house to refer individual complaints to appropriate departments or offices. The latter were handling complaints according to already-established procedures.

## **STATUS OF PERSONNEL MATTERS BEFORE THE FACULTY SENATE :**

### Grievances

A grievance in the School of Business and Public Management has been settled at the mediation stage. Two grievances in Columbian College of Arts and Sciences are in the process of mediation. A complaint from a visiting faculty member in the School of Business and Public Management was not settled satisfactorily at the mediation stage. However, that complaint has not been pursued further through the University's dispute resolution process.

### Nonconcurrences

Two nonconcurrences in the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences were received by the Executive Committee. One, an administrative nonconcurrency with respect to promotion, has been withdrawn by the department. The second, a nonconcurrency with a faculty tenure and promotion recommendation, is being scheduled for consideration by the Executive Committee.

## **MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION BY SENATE COMMITTEES:**

Among numerous matters under consideration are the following:

-Service by part-time faculty on Senate Standing Committees  
(Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee)

-Review of changes to the Faculty Code with respect to the extension of the tenure clock to accommodate parental leave. (Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee)

-Consideration of an alternative academic calendar. (Educational Policy Committee)

-Faculty participation in the planning for construction of new academic buildings.  
(Educational Policy Committee)

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilien F. Robinson, Chair  
Executive Committee  
Faculty Senate

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
**September 12, 2003**  
**Lilien F. Robinson, Chair**

**PERSONNEL MATTERS**

**Grievances**

There are presently two grievances in process, both originating in Columbian College. One is in the mediation stage, with the appointment of a hearing panel, the other case has entered the hearing stage.

**Nonconcurrences**

The tenure and promotion nonconcurrency case in Columbian College, reported on at the last Senate meeting, has been closed. The faculty member in question has resigned from the University and accepted another position.

**REPUBLICATION OF THE FACULTY CODE**

The Executive Committee transmitted the Faculty Code to the University's General Counsel's Office in February. The changes made by the Faculty Senate and approved by the Board of Trustees were reviewed by Counsel's office and the document returned to the Senate Office in August. One additional review was made by Professor Arthur Wilmarth at the request of the Executive Committee. We are now in the last phase of the process, working with the Printing and Graphics Office on the design, images, and type setting.

**COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

The Executive Committee transmitted the full report with appendices on the Alternative Academic Calendar to the Educational Policies Committee. Because of the great impact that these proposals, if implemented, would have on almost all aspects of instruction, including the role of the faculty, the Educational Policies Committee is viewing its consideration of the document as its priority matter. They are working under a deadline and would greatly appreciate receiving your comments on the report, as soon as possible. Please also urge your colleagues to contact Professor Duff or members of his Committee with their observations and suggestions. In the event that you do not have the full report with appendices, please contact the Senate office.

The Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom was asked by the Executive Committee review a number of items pertaining to our policies and procedures with respect to tenure and promotion. That request was prompted by the Executive Committee's experiences with nonconcurrency cases over the last two years.

**The Executive Committee has received a Resolution on the Code of Academic Integrity from the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students for the agenda of the October meeting.**

**As required, two members of the Senate Committee on Research have been designated by the Executive Committee to serve on the Advisory Council on Research. They are Professors William Briscoe and Frederick Joutz. Two members of the Advisory Council, Professors Hal Woolman and Nicholas Vonortas, have been appointed to serve on the Senate Research Committee.**

## **SENATE WEBSITE**

**The Executive Committee thought that the Senate would be interested to learn that we have some information on the Faculty Senate website usage. Sue Campbell and Nina Posidelow have compiled a very informative report on number of request and pages most frequently accessed. Overall requests for pages during the period of March 2002 through May 2003 the average number of requests per page per day ranged from a low of 1439 (June 2002) to a high of 6262 requests (May 2003) .The current minutes, agenda, and home pages are among the most frequently viewed pages. There is also a consistent interest in the Faculty Code and the Faculty Organization Plan.**

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**The Faculty Assembly is scheduled for Monday, September 29th, from 3:00-5:00 p.m. with a reception following. The location is to be announced.**

**As you know, one of our obligations as faculty members is participation in the Faculty Assembly. It is especially important that Faculty Senate members attend. I am hopeful that you will also urge the colleagues in your schools to attend, especially in view of the fact that we will be voting on changes to the Faculty Organization Plan. This is also the event at which new faculty members are introduced.**

**Please note that the annual report of the Executive Committee for the 2002-2003 session, as well as the Report of the Faculty Senate to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees at its May, 2003 meeting have been distributed to you today.**

**The next meeting of the Executive Committee is scheduled for Friday, September 26. Any items of business for the October 10 Senate agenda should be received by the Executive Committee before September 26.**