The meeting was called to order by Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman at 2:22 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

Vice President Lehman requested that his remarks in full paragraph five, page two of the November minutes be amended, by changing the word “instant” to “current.” The change was approved and the minutes of the meeting held on November 14, 2003 were approved as amended.

Update on the Office of Special Academic Initiatives

Associate Vice President Folkerts distributed a Powerpoint summary of her presentation, describing the programs overseen by her office, which include the University Honors Program, including the Undergraduate Fellowship Office, the Office of Special Academic Programs, which oversees the Study Abroad and Special Summer Programs, and Summer Sessions, the Academic Integrity Office, the Office of University Students, and the University Art Galleries. Special Academic Initiatives is also responsible for significant development and communication activity.

Vice President Folkerts then described each of these programs in some detail, including significant issues, goals, accomplishments, and outcomes. In particular, she noted that the Honors Program is in the midst of developing its own Strategic Plan, which is expected to be complete in March, 2004, or soon thereafter. This program has grown enormously, she noted, and currently enrolls over 900 students. Some of the goals of the Strategic Planning process are to review whether or not this enrollment is of an appropriate size and to ensure that Honors is a university-wide program, fully integrated with all of the schools, which involves GW’s best faculty. Also under development is a summer Honors initiative in Arabic, which is expected to serve as a model program for the development of other such summer initiative programs. Thus far, Honors students have welcomed the idea of establishing such special summer programs.

One very important component of the Honors Program is the Undergraduate Center for National Fellowship Competitions. While formerly Fellowship information has been made
available to both graduates and undergraduates by a lone staff member, that mission proved unwieldy for one person to administer. The new Center has been created to enhance student engagement and academic challenge, and the new Deputy Director, Francis DuVinage, has been meeting with faculty, organizing information sessions and working to increase the visibility of the office, while at the same time working to identify students early in the freshman year who might be eligible for fellowships.

Vice President Folkerts described the mission, program elements, goals, and significant accomplishments of the Study Abroad program, which has demonstrated a significant growth rate. Also described were the Special Summer Programs, where five new programs were launched in Summer 2003. Several new programs will come online in Summer 2004, including a special series on the Eleanor Roosevelt papers and another on the historical Supreme Court decision, Brown v. Board of Education. New distance learning courses have been developed for this Program, and that enrollment has increased by nearly 50%.

Vice President Folkerts then briefly touched on Summer Sessions programming and the need to build a robust summer core curriculum that will attract students to enroll in several courses for that term. She also invited the faculty to take a serious look at enhancing summer offerings.

Special Academic Initiatives also oversees the Academic Integrity Office which will publish an Academic Integrity guide this year, and continue seeking ways to publicize and promote academic integrity on campus. The University Art Galleries are also overseen by Vice President Folkerts, and a new gallery is now open in the Media and Public Affairs building, with several new shows under development for this year.

Vice President Folkerts concluded by giving an overview of her role in the oversight of programs and building connections between the University’s schools. She also touched upon her work with school development directors, and initiatives in improved communication about academic programs with various constituencies.

Professor Swiercz asked Vice President Folkerts what sort of scheduling format would be utilized in the summer programs, and Vice President Folkerts responded by saying that schedules were somewhat more fluid during the summer than during the academic year. She then described the special ten week programs along with the study abroad programs and graduate institutes which follow a different model, and the conventional first and second summer sessions. Discussion followed on various aspects of the summer programs between Vice President Folkerts and Professors Paup, Robinson, Gupta, Duff, and Griffith.

Professor Griffith noted the difficulty of recruiting students to attend summer sessions unless tuition was reduced, and then noted that it is also difficult to recruit faculty to teach unless incentives were offered. Under these circumstances, he said he wondered if summer programs could possibly produce significant revenue. Vice President Folkerts acknowledged that this was a difficult balance to negotiate. Further discussion followed between Vice Presidents Lehman, Folkerts, and Associate Vice President Scarboro on various aspects of the summer programs.

Professor Friedenthal asked if students who attended GW summer programs received full credit from their home schools for these courses. Thus far they did, according to Vice Presidents Scarboro and Folkerts, although Vice President Lehman said he thought this point
quite valid, as it seems GW is presently somewhat more liberal than other institutions in granting such transfer credit.

Professor Wirtz inquired about issues of academic evaluation given the 50% growth in the distance learning component. Vice President Scarboro said she thought that in general, faculty were at least satisfied with the work they received from students, who are taking the same kinds of examinations as in the fall and spring sessions. Course evaluations also have tended to fall within the normal range.

Vice President Lehman commented upon distance learning and what he termed mixed mode course development. A goal pioneered by his office is that of trying to develop introductory courses so that GW students are not forced to go elsewhere for these credits. This also would tend to preserve the quality of a GW education, as course content would be commensurate with the University's standards. In light of the looming classroom shortage, he added, a model where students would take half of the course via distance learning and the other half on campus could prove promising. While only one course is presently offered in mixed mode, this could prove an exciting development, although care would have to be taken with the assessment issues to which Professor Wirtz referred. (A copy of the Report distributed at the meeting is attached.)

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

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

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Englander said that he had received scheduling/timeband guidelines for the Foggy Bottom campus which he understood would go into effect for the fall semester, 2004. He asked if this was an issue that the Senate had examined in the past, because the timeband changes raise some fundamental faculty governance issues, particularly for the School of Business and Public Management (SBPM). Several years ago, for pedagogical reasons, the School decided that three credit courses should meet for two and a half hours. Core courses were then shifted to two credit hours. The most popular timeband for upper division graduate courses in the School is the 6:10 to 8:40 p.m. slot, which has now been eliminated and replaced by a 7:10 to 9:40 timeband. This slot will prove unpopular, he said, with students who have been working all day before class, and with faculty who will be teaching on campus until nearly 10 p.m.

Another fundamental change, Professor Englander continued, is a shift toward scheduling undergraduate classes on Mondays and Fridays, and on Wednesdays and Fridays. This raises a lot of issues, he said, particularly if GW aspires to be a research institution, and faculty need time to carry out research.
Another issue for the School is that there is no evening class time scheduled for employed undergraduates, and the School has always offered such an option. Overall, Professor Englander said that what he was hearing from SBPM faculty was that this change was overwhelming, and he asked if the Senate had vetted the guidelines.

Professor Paul Duff, Chair of the Senate’s Educational Policy Committee, said that he had received the scheduling information from Associate Vice President Linebaugh approximately a month and a half before, and he said he forwarded the information to Committee members and solicited their comments. There were a few complaints, he said, but on the whole there were very few strong opinions expressed, as everyone understands, and seems resigned to, the fact that the University has a shortage of classrooms, and Funger Hall classrooms will be unavailable beginning next year. Professor Duff added that he wished Vice President Linebaugh were present at the meeting, as he had understood that the new scheduling guidelines were a short term emergency measure which would be withdrawn when Funger classrooms were once again returned to the inventory. However, once the scheduling information to which Professor Englander referred was made available, this seemed not to be case.

Vice President Lehman said that Associate Vice President Linebaugh was presently in Morocco working on an exchange program, and thus was unable to attend the Senate meeting. He hastened to assure the Senate that his office had done what they thought was the very best vetting of the proposals that they could do on the short term basis they were allotted, which came about because of the judicial stay of legal requirements for on-campus student housing, which allowed the University to begin construction of a new building for SBPM. The proposed timebands had all been vetted by Associate Vice President Linebaugh with the Faculty Senate, and the Student Association. The Deans and Associate Deans had also been consulted, as well as other campus constituencies, as Associate Vice President Linebaugh was well aware of the significance of the proposed new schedule. The model had been constructed with great effort, and from the standpoint of evenly distributing classroom availability, it was not necessarily a bad thing to have classes on Fridays, particularly if this could be done in some manner that would permit faculty to be free on another day for their research and scholarly activities. By distributing classes over a five day period rather than a four day period, as before, the University could conceivably add capacity of some 21 percent, using the same classroom inventory.

As to the length of time class scheduling would be disrupted, Vice President Lehman said that the first impact would be on Funger Hall, and the second would be on classrooms housed in Monroe Hall and the Hall of Government. Realistically he said, it would probably be four years before the classroom shortage eased.

On the positive side, Vice President Lehman said that there is some flexibility in the revised schedule. For example, there is the possibility of holding classes on Saturday, a day when many students, especially graduate students, are more than willing to come to campus. The major difficulty, he added, is that nearly everyone wants to come to campus between 5 p.m. and 8 p.m., and there is simply not enough space for all of the classes to be held during that period. Rooms in use off campus by GW Solutions have been made available to the classroom inventory between 8 am. and 5 p.m., but after that hour, GW Solutions uses its space exclusively.

Professor Watson inquired if the University could utilize temporary classrooms, as D.C. public schools have done. Vice President Lehman said this had been considered, but that University Counsel had expressed the opinion that the D.C. government would not permit it.
Professor Marotta observed that the new scheduling guidelines seemed to have been modeled with undergraduate classes in mind, and she noted that since GSEHD is exclusively a graduate school, the guidelines would have a disproportionate impact, for example, destroying the school’s ability to hold back to back classes. Additionally, the new schedule may affect our ability to attract Master’s students, and increase the enrollment in these programs, which was a goal of the Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence.

Professor Griffith said that as a department chair, he had been aware that radical new timeband changes might be forthcoming, but that he and other chairs in the Columbian College (CSAS) had been shocked and dismayed to receive instructions on December 10th to prepare schedules using the new guidelines by December 22nd. The twelve days allotted, he noted, fall right in the middle of the final examination period for the fall semester, and he added that he thought this was outrageous.

Professor Griffith also pointed out that the University has known for a long time that a classroom space crisis was looming, and this should have been taken into consideration in the planning process that has resulted in the present situation. The Senate’s Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, of which he is Chair, has been drawing attention to this potential problem for years, as the University has relentlessly increased the size of the student body while at the same time reducing the amount of available classroom space. For some reason, the University has decided to go forward with renovations in Funger Hall, which will reduce classroom space, while at the same time commencing construction on the new Business School. The University also knew a space crisis was coming when the Elliott School building was finished, and classroom space in Stuart and Lisner Halls was transferred to the GW Law School, further reducing general classroom availability.

Finally, Professor Griffith said there needs to be a modicum of trust between the faculty and the administration when serious changes, whether an alternative calendar, 4 x 4 curriculum, or the new scheduling requirements, were proposed. Faculty need to be assured that these changes will be handled in a reasonable way, and that they will be given reasonable tools to achieve the University’s educational objectives. Professor Griffith concluded by saying that he hoped that someone can find some additional classroom space, or some alteration of the guidelines so that expectations built into the current schedule can be satisfied, as he could not express too strongly the dismay he had heard expressed about the new schedule by his fellow department chairs in CCAS.

Registrar Dennis Geyer said that he certainly shared the faculty’s pain, and then went on to explain that the guidelines had been formulated from the perspective of implementation of a timely registration schedule. In order to ease the burden of the new scheduling format on the faculty, both the fall preregistration period and the traditional deadline for scheduling have also been modified, in the latter instance, extended by an additional two and a half weeks. By placing this deadline on the Friday before the fall semester begins, administrative implementation of the registration schedule has been compressed for the actual assignment of the general purpose and special needs classrooms. This general outline was given to the schools and colleges, where the internal deadlines had been developed. Registrar Geyer emphasized that he and Vice President Linebaugh had conferred extensively with Dean Khatcheressian of CCAS as the guidelines were developed, as the burden of submitting that entire school’s schedules falls solely on him. Registrar Geyer added that decisions had been made to go forward with construction on Funger Hall, making the only 70 space classrooms on campus unavailable. Professor Griffith asked if there was any possibility that the Funger Hall project
could be delayed, and Vice President Lehman said that he did not know, but would check with Vice President Katz on this question.

Professor Robinson said that she understood very well the faculty’s distress, but noted that the administration had taken the step of consulting the Educational Policy Committee about the scheduling guidelines. She said she also thought that some of the department chairs had received the preliminary projected schedule, as it had been circulated in her own department. Vice President Lehman confirmed that the schedule had been disseminated to as many people as possible. Professor Robinson then observed that entire departmental faculties would be required to meet together, in all likelihood repeatedly, in order to develop the new class schedules, and it would be difficult to do this within the short deadlines imposed. She added that she thought the faculty really did need more time to develop the fall schedule.

Professor Wirtz asked Vice President Lehman if the University was making a sound business decision in allowing GW Solutions to retain use of their classrooms after 5 p.m., rather than returning these to the regular campus inventory. Discussion followed between Vice President Lehman and Professor Wirtz, with Vice President Lehman pointing out that the classrooms did not belong to the University, but rather were rented by GW Solutions. While Academic Affairs has been able to sublease some of the space during the day, commitments made last summer will extend through May. Professor Wirtz said he thought it important for the University to look very carefully at whether or not it was appropriately using the resources that are now apparently being offered to GW Solutions. A second point was that the University had made these commitments to GW Solutions in the recognition that there would likely be a classroom shortage, and this suggested, he said, that someone had dropped the ball during the planning process.

Professor Englander asked if the Law School classrooms were on the campus classroom inventory, and Vice President Lehman said that they were not. Professor Englander said he thought if the classroom shortage were a short term issue, then the University should consider including these classrooms on the inventory of available space. Professor Englander then asked if a conscious decision had been made to eliminate undergraduate, part-time evening programs. Discussion followed by Professor Englander, Vice President Lehman, and Registrar Geyer on the scheduling of the vast majority of undergraduate courses during the daytime.

Professor Englander then reiterated the negative effect that switching to two-hour timebands would have on SBPM students and faculty, inasmuch as classes would have to begin at 7:10 p.m. Further discussion followed with Registrar Geyer and Vice President Lehman on this point, which concluded with Registrar Geyer emphasizing that the University was committed to collaborating with faculty in working out the details of the new schedule. In SBPM’s case he said that if pedagogically it were necessary for classes to meet for a 2.5 hour time period, the University would work with faculty to meet this requirement with classes beginning at 7:10 p.m.

Echoing Professor Marotta’s observations, Professor Duff said he had found in trying to work out the new schedule that if a department relies heavily on part-time faculty, particularly faculty who teach more than one course, it is virtually impossible to schedule classes back-to-back. This could become quite burdensome if it continued for a significant length of time.

Professor Marotta noted that GSEHD already schedules quite a number of classes on Saturdays. The School also utilizes a 4 p.m. timeband, which is probably unique, because of its
student population. She emphasized again that back-to-back two hour classes beginning at 5:10
would not be feasible; for example for those students with a long commute who teach high
school and are required to begin teaching quite early in the morning.

Professor Paup observed that there was one group that would not benefit from the new
timeband systems and that was the approximately 400 student athletes on campus.

Professor Castleberry then said he thought the discussion had been quite extensive, but
could not change the reality that this classroom shortage had been developing for four to five
years, and that no matter what was said in the Senate, there are simply no other options other
than finding additional space and the money to lease it, neither of which was likely. Moreover,
he said, with more students coming to campus in the evening, it was problematic where these
students would park their cars.

Professor Griffith said that he somewhat disagreed with Professor Castleberry’s view that
that the University has no options. It would be possible for the University, within a budget of
some $450 to 500 million (excluding the Medical Center), to provide resources to rent additional
classroom space if that were deemed an important priority. Vice President Lehman noted that it
was not just a matter of financial resources, but of available space to lease, and he said if suitable
classroom space could be found in close proximity to the campus, he would welcome, and act
swiftly upon, any suggestions.

Professor Englander then asked why the Law School classrooms were not included in
the inventory. Vice President Lehman said he believed it was because of an agreement between
the University and the American Bar Association which concerned revenue returns to the school
and its facilities. The buildings assigned to the Law School are being fully utilized, he added.

Professor Wirtz said he thought two avenues of inquiry might be useful, the first on the
issue of the December 22nd deadline, and the second being the possible creation of a short term
Senate task force that might review and report on potential scheduling problems. Discussion
followed by Vice President Lehman, Registrar Geyer, and Professor Englander, with the
conclusion that this deadline was a school-dependent issue. Vice President Lehman also said
that if the Senate elected to appoint a task force to study the matter, that group should definitely
consult with both Associate Vice President Linebaugh and Registrar Geyer during their review.

Professor Englander, Vice President Lehman, and Registrar Geyer then discussed the
impact of minimum course enrollments on the space crunch, and whether or not the current
ones were appropriate. Vice President Lehman said he thought such a review would be a very
good idea.

Registrar Geyer then noted that everyone has also been asked to look at what is termed
the maximum enrollment capacity for courses, as at times classes are capped at 45 persons, but
have far fewer students actually enrolled. This results, of course, in the assignment of larger
classrooms than necessary to these classes, so a review of these numbers is in order so as to
maximize available space.

Professor Griffith said he wished to note that Professor Paul Duff was recently appointed
as Interim Associate Dean for Student Affairs in the Columbian College. Professor Griffith
noted that Professor Duff has been one of he Senate’s most valued members over the last
several years, and that the Senate owes him a great deal for the extraordinary work he has done
and the burden he has borne as Chair of the Senate's Educational Policy Committee. Professor Griffith added that the Senate would greatly miss Professor Duff. These sentiments were greeted by general agreement and a round of applause.

Professor Gupta, on behalf of the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee, distributed an Interim Report comparing administrative and faculty salaries at the University. Professor Gupta briefly summarized the information appended to the Report. Over a 5.5 year period, he said, senior University administrators received a cumulative 64.4% increase, compared to professorial compensation, which increased over that period only 21%. At present, faculty salaries are frozen, he added.

Professor Swiercz said he recognized that in corporate America, executive compensation far outpaces that of other workers, but the discrepancy between academic administrators and academicians is nothing short of astounding. At the very least, he said, it should be explained to the faculty why such an extraordinary disparity exists, and he suggested that the Senate request such an explanation. Vice President Lehman said he thought it inappropriate to comment on this matter, as the Board of Trustees' Compensation Committee works with the President to determine administrative salaries. Professor Robinson said she thought it might be appropriate for the Senate Executive Committee to direct an inquiry through the President to the Board’s Compensation Committee, asking for an explanation of these administrative/faculty salary disparities.

Professor Gupta inquired about the merit pool increase for next year, noting that the merit pool for this year is 0%. Vice President Lehman noted that the University has been fortunate to have a merit increase pool every year, except for two years in which salary increases were delayed by 6 months (each year). The aim for the coming year, he said, is to have a pool of 4% available for merit increases, and the University is doing this while at the same time sifting through competing and sometimes conflicting academic priorities, such as compensation for part-time faculty, and the effort to bring University faculty salaries in line with AAUP norms. Significant progress in the latter areas continues to be made by Academic Affairs, he noted. (The Committee Report is attached.)

Registrar Geyer then noted that, even though the final examination period had not yet ended, students were anxious to see their final grades, and he reminded faculty that final grades should be submitted within 72 hours of final examinations.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, a motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 4:06 p.m.

Dennis L. Geyer
Dennis L. Geyer
Secretary
Special Academic Initiatives
- Programs
- Accomplishments
- Issues
- Goals
- Outcomes

University Honors Program
- GOAL: To enhance the undergraduate experience at GW through intellectual engagement and academic challenge. The Honors Program will provide a rigorous intellectual environment for our best students and will help them to develop a strong sense of academic community. As a vital part of the Honors Program, the Undergraduate Center for National Fellowship Competitions will enhance opportunities for GW's best students and will increase GW's stature and visibility.

Honors Program Priority: Completing the Strategic Plan
- Timetable:
  - Draft plan being discussed by Advisory Board.

Other Priorities
- Integrating the Honors Program with the Various Schools
- Involving GW's Best Faculty
- Creating summer Honors initiatives (Arabic)

Significant Accomplishments
- Recruiting students through close relationship with admissions. (Honors as a Recruiting Tool.)
- Expanding number of courses
- Fall Symposium
Issues

- Relationship between Foggy Bottom and Mount Vernon Campuses
- Size of Program (Now 950 students)
- Space – Elements of the Program are not unified and student social space not available.
- Visibility and Ownership
- Diversification of Course Offerings
- Inclusion in University Strategic Planning so that it has the potential to be designated as a “signature” program

Undergraduate Center for National Fellowship Competitions

1) Develop an advisory council of experienced faculty and administrators.
2) Recruit faculty to serve as “fellowship liaisons.”
- Larger group of students inquiring about and applying for a wider range of fellowships than in the past.
- For 2003-04, maintaining the number of fellowships received and increasing the numbers of faculty and students involved in the process.
- For 2004-05, increasing the number of fellowships applied for and received.

Office of Special Academic Programs

- Study Abroad
- Special Summer Programs
- Summer Sessions
- Academic Integrity
- Art Gallery
- Office of University Students

Study Abroad

MISSION

In support of the University's mission to “promote the process of lifelong learning from both global and integrative perspectives,” the Office for Study Abroad offers international educational opportunities to GW students through the University’s overseas study centers, international exchange partners, and affiliated organizations.

Program Elements

- Significant growth rate—234 fall 2003; 50 academic year; 514 spring.
- Consistent female to male ratio
- Significant (10%) year-long participation
- 89% go during junior year
- Over 250 programs in 50 countries
- Top 5: Spain, Italy, Australia, England and France

Significant Accomplishments

- Revision of new approved Study Abroad programs, adding eleven countries, tripling the options, but setting standards for quality and approval.
- Data indicate an increase of 10% to 20% in enrollment over last year.
Goals

- Develop and implement parent communication plan.
- Expand reflective and integrative activities for students returning from study abroad.
- Develop benchmarks with and conduct analysis of study abroad programs of Market Basket Schools.
- More fully involve faculty in program review.
- Complete arrangements for England Study Center.
- Select possible partners for Latin American Study Center and visit possible sites.

Special Summer Programs

- GOAL: To offer a variety of special summer programs that will enrich the academic experience at GW for undergraduates and for selected graduate students and that will increase revenue.

Significant Accomplishments

- Increased Distance Learning Enrollment by nearly 50%.
- Created new distance courses.

Summer Scholars

- The program is housed at the Mount Vernon Campus and gives students an opportunity to take college courses for credit, participate in a college residential experience, and have special access to study skills seminars and other activities.

Goals

To grow this program through early and continuous marketing and recruitment. Pursuing collaboration with undergraduate admissions and development; expanding web based marketing and visits to high schools. Target: 34 students in Summer, 2004 and 60 students Summer 2005. Target regional cities such as Houston and Kansas City.

Summer Sessions

- Total university credit enrollment up (3.2%) from 2002.
- Goals:
  - Increase on-campus enrollment
  - Better identify and market to Summer student population
  - Increase distance learning courses
Goals
- Publish a guide to academic integrity
- Increase the number of speaking engagements university-wide on the topic to give higher profile
- Seek ways to promote academic integrity in proactive, positive manner
- Process cases in timely manner.

Art Galleries
- Issues of
  - Space
  - Budget
  - Staff

Role of AVP
- General oversight of programs
- Building bridges across schools
- University seminars
- Development & Communication
- Addressing needs of signature programs

Outcomes
- Conversations with principals in all signature programs and proposals written for endowed chairs or other distinctive activities for at least five of the seven programs.
- Working with the Office of Advancement, donors identified.
- Donors approached.
- Increased contributions to signature programs.

Special Initiatives
- Through special initiatives, students will encounter a challenging intellectual environment and be able to participate more fully in a global world.
Compilation of Top Administration Salaries and Comparison with Faculty Salaries

(ASPP Committee)

The enclosed table contains a compilation of data obtained from the annual reports GW files to the Internal Revenue Service on Form 990. The information reported here is contained in schedule A (compensation of the five highest paid employees other than officers, director and trustees) and part V (compensation of the president and administrative officers).

Until the 1999 IRS filing, GW reported this data annually for the years ending June 30 of the previous year. Starting with the 2000 IRS filing, GW started reporting salary data ending December 31 of the previous year. There is a lag of about 1½ years in the reporting date of the data, and the latest filing currently available is for the tax year ending 12/2001.

The faculty salaries information is obtained from VP Lehman’s annual reports to the ASPP committee and to Faculty Senate. This information is available online at http://www.gwu.edu/~ire/fsas.htm.

An examination of the enclosed data would reveal that our president received a 20.4% raise in the year 2001 and thereby joined the $500,000 club (as reported annually by Chronicle of Higher Education Nov 14, 2003 and also by The Washington Post Nov 19, 2002). Other members of his senior staff received got even larger raises, the average raise being 28.0% for the one year. Taken over a 2.5 year period (6/99-12/01), the president and vice presidents received an average of 40.9% raise. Over a 5.5 year period this group received a 64.4% increase.

The faculty, on the other hand, continues to have a much smaller collective increase of 4% or less each year. One year increase (6/01-6/02) in the average faculty salaries was 3.5%; over 5 years (6/97-6/02), the faculty collectively received a 21.0% raise. The faculty salaries have been frozen currently and VP Lehman has stated that there will be no new salaries report to the Senate this year. It may be concluded that the one year increase for the present year would be close to 0.0% and the faculty raise collectively over the 6 years (6/97-6/03) would still be close to 21.0%. This stands in sharp contrast to the senior administration salary increases of 64.4% over a 5½ year term.
The George Washington University

Compilation of Top Administration Salaries and Comparison with Faculty Salaries
(ASPP Committee)
November 24, 2003

GW Compensation Data from Schedule A (IRS Form 990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President and Vice Presidents</th>
<th>Year Ending Dec-01</th>
<th>Year Ending Dec-00</th>
<th>1 year % Change 1200-1201</th>
<th>Year Ending Jun-00</th>
<th>2.5 year % Change 699-1201</th>
<th>Year Ending Jun-06</th>
<th>5.5 year % Change 9/96-1201</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Joel Trachtenberg</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>$516,904</td>
<td>$429,445</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>$421,035</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>$322,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Williams</td>
<td>VP Health Affairs</td>
<td>$507,200</td>
<td>$357,155</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>$320,948</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>$233,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Katz</td>
<td>VP and Treasurer</td>
<td>$411,246</td>
<td>$328,310</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>$278,515</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>$194,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Chernak</td>
<td>VP Stud Supp and Acad Serv</td>
<td>$290,943</td>
<td>$255,494</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>$227,657</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>$162,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Lehman</td>
<td>VP Acad Affairs</td>
<td>$283,915</td>
<td>$217,536</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>$197,204</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>$162,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Blumer</td>
<td>VP and General Counsel</td>
<td>$278,582</td>
<td>$207,972</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>$181,450</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>$162,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Freedman</td>
<td>VP for Communications</td>
<td>$187,127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Administration Increases:

Over 1 year -> 28.0%
Over 2.5 years -> 40.9%
Over 5.5 years -> 64.4%

Other highly compensated individuals
(Schedule A lists top five highest paid employees other than officers, directors and trustees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Salary 2001/02</th>
<th>Salary 2000/01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Penders</td>
<td>Basketball Coach</td>
<td>$696,165</td>
<td>$418,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Aronovitch</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>$573,312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Ackins</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winfield Towles</td>
<td>S. Medical Director</td>
<td>$348,806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph McKeown</td>
<td>Athletic Coach</td>
<td>$293,492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Young</td>
<td>Dean, Law School</td>
<td>$262,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Mitchell</td>
<td>Professor of Law</td>
<td>$244,587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Krasnoz</td>
<td>Athletic Director</td>
<td>$241,081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Salaries Data from GW Fact Book (Average Regular Full Time Salaries, excl School of Medicine)
http://www.gwu.edu/~lwe/ssas.htm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Average Salaries 2001/02</th>
<th>Average Salaries 2000/01</th>
<th>1 year % Change 01/02</th>
<th>Average Salaries 1999/2000</th>
<th>Average Salaries 1998/97</th>
<th>2 year % Change 97-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$103,314</td>
<td>$98,315</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>$90,139</td>
<td>$84,229</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>$74,213</td>
<td>$72,223</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>$65,355</td>
<td>$60,728</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$68,386</td>
<td>$56,964</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>$52,665</td>
<td>$49,384</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Faculty Increases:

Over 1 year -> 3.5%
Over 5 years -> 21.0%
To view

Average Regular Full-Time Faculty Salaries by School and Rank,

please select the following link:

http://www.gwu.edu/~ire/fsas.htm
REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
Lilien F. Robinson, Chair  
December 12, 2003

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

As reported at the November meeting, the Executive Committee forwarded the unanimous Senate Resolution on the Alternative Academic Calendar and the accompanying report of the Educational Policy Committee to President Trachtenberg for his consideration and response. Although we still have received no response, our understanding from an article in The Hatchet is that "the University is indefinitely postponing further research of the alternative calendar as well as a four-class, four-credit course structure." The faculty has never been so united on major academic issues, and we hope that this is the case.

The Executive Committee has sent a letter to President Trachtenberg regarding future construction on the site of the old GWU Hospital. As faculty throughout the campus are very aware of the critical need for additional academic space, we requested that the faculty be included in discussions regarding use of the hospital site at the commencement of such discussions. We have further requested that the representative be a member of the Faculty Senate.

STATUS OF PERSONNEL MATTERS

Currently there are two grievances in process. Both are in Columbian College. One is at the hearing stage. The selection of the hearing committee is underway in the second case.

JANUARY MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The Executive Committee anticipates that we will be placing the Resolution on the Extension of the Tenure Clock to accommodate parental leave on the agenda for the January meeting. The Resolution is the result of the work of the Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies Committee and the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom.

OTHER MATTERS

Letters have been sent to the Deans requesting that they place on their faculty meeting agendas election of Faculty Senate representatives for terms beginning in the 2004-05 academic year. Please note that the School of Public Health and Health Sciences will also be electing a representative to the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Organization Plan was amended by the Faculty Assembly to include representation from the School of Public Health and Health Sciences.
ANNOUNCEMENTS

Please note that the annual University Holiday Party is scheduled for Tuesday, December 16, from 2:00-4:30 p.m. on the third floor of the Marvin Center.

I would like to extend birthday wishes to President Trachtenberg, whose birthday is on Sunday and to Vice President Lehman, whose birthday is tomorrow.

May I also extend best wishes to all of you for a wonderful holiday season and a healthy and productive new year.