THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
APRIL 14, 2006 IN THE ALUMNI HOUSE

Present: President Trachtenberg, Vice President Lehman, Registrar Amundson, and Acting Parliamentarian Pagel; Deans Futrell, Phillips, and Tong; Professors Artz, Biles, Castleberry, Cordes, Delaney, Englander, Friedenthal, Gallo, Garris, Griffith, Gupta, Kim-Renaud, Klarén, Marotta, Mueller, Pagel, Robin, Robinson, Rycroft, Simon, Vergara, Wilmarth, Wirtz, and Zea

Absent: Parliamentarian Johnson; Deans Brown, Frawley, Katz, Lawrence, Scott, and Whitaker; Professors Briscoe, Helgert, and Shen

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by President Trachtenberg at 2:20 p.m. As Parliamentarian Johnson was unable to attend, the President advised that Professor Scott B. Pagel of the GW Law School would serve as Acting Parliamentarian for the meeting.

SHORT RECESS FOR THE PURPOSE OF HAVING A GROUP PHOTOGRAPH TAKEN OF THE 2005-06 FACULTY SENATE

A short adjournment was declared in order to have the annual photograph of the Senate taken.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Professor Wilmarth reminded the Senate that attached to the minutes of the March 10 meeting is the revised text of Resolution 05/6, entitled, “A RESOLUTION ON ESTABLISHING CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENTS, REAPPOINTMENTS, AND PROMOTION OF REGULAR, ACTIVE-STATUS FACULTY SERVING IN NON-TENURE-ACCRUING APPOINTMENTS” as well as a revised legislative history. This Resolution was adopted as amended at the March 10 Senate meeting with the understanding that further technical revisions requested during the meeting would be prepared by Professor Gupta and Professor Wilmarth, Chairs of the originating Committees. Professors Gupta and Wilmarth subsequently revised Resolution 05/6 in order to remove the phrase “professor of practice” in all places where it appeared in the Resolution and legislative history, and also to delete all references to the Elliott School of International Affairs, pursuant to the Senate’s request. All revisions made by Professors Gupta and Wilmarth are shown on the marked version of Resolution 05/6 and its legislative history, attached to the March 10 meeting minutes. Professor Wilmarth said that the Executive Committee had reviewed these revisions and found them to be satisfactory, but he wanted to bring the revisions to the attention of the entire Senate and to invite any questions or comments that members of the Senate might have. There being no such questions or comments, a motion to approve the minutes was
made and seconded; a vote was taken, and the minutes of the regular meeting of March 10, 2006 were approved as distributed.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION 05/7, “A RESOLUTION ON LIBRARY ENDOWMENT FUNDS”

On behalf of the Senate Committee on Libraries, Professor Isabel R. Vergara, Chair, introduced Resolution 05/7. She reported that the Libraries Committee met three times this year, and discussed information attached to the Resolution which lists FY 2004 Academic Library Endowments (excluding law and medical libraries) in the U.S., as well as a summary of results of the Faculty LibQUAL+ Survey from the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). She then yielded the floor to Professor Scott Pagel, a member of the Committee, and Director of the GW Law Library.

Professor Pagel summarized findings set forth in the two attachments to the Resolution, the first of which shows that Gelman Library’s endowment is approximately $4 million, whereas those institutions with which GW associates itself have Library endowments of $10 or $20 million, and sometimes even more.

The second attachment to the Resolution summarizes the results of LibQUAL+, which is described as a national web-based survey which is administered by the Association of Research Libraries and seeks to measure library user perceptions and expectations. Professor Pagel observed that the survey of faculty satisfaction shows that GW faculty feel that Gelman Library leaves much to be desired in its collections, and in the availability of resources.

Professor Pagel said he thought there are many things calling for the attention of the University, but as everyone has heard so often, many believe that the Library is the heart of the University, and its endowment deserves the attention of the Senate and the University. In putting forward Resolution 05/7, the Libraries Committee understood that the University would have a very hard time bringing the expenditures of the Library to an appropriate level out of operating funds, and therefore, the thrust of the Resolution is to encourage the University to work with Gelman Library to increase its endowment.

The Resolution also calls upon the University Librarian to provide a five-year plan, beginning in FY 08, to bring the collections budget into line with a level equal to the mean level of ARL libraries in GW’s market basket group. The Resolution also calls for annual progress reports to the Senate by the University Administration, and it asks that the Gelman Library System be given a high priority in fundraising so that the endowment may be increased.

In conclusion, Professor Pagel said that the Resolution pertains to Gelman Library, because the Law Library and the Himmelfarb (medical) Library both can look to their parent schools for support, but the Law and Medical Schools also depend on Gelman. If Gelman is not strong, then none of the Libraries are.
Professor Griffith asked what sort of increase in the endowment was contemplated in the Resolution, and if, in working out the proposed five-year plan, the Committee worked out a percentage increase in the endowment that would need to be adopted in each of the years to meet the goal. University Librarian Jack Siggins responded that an increase of approximately 50% in the Gelman budget is needed; in terms of the Library endowment, the amount sought would amount to some $2 or $3 million.

Professor Englebard noted that the survey showed that his colleagues in the School of Business stood out in terms of their dissatisfaction with Gelman's holdings in the area of journals and electronic resources. He asked if there was any thought on the part of the Committee to giving more direction for use of the funds raised to particular areas. Professor Pagel responded that the Committee thought it would be best to merely state the goal of Gelman's funding reaching a level equal to the mean of ARL libraries in GW's market basket, leaving the details to be worked out by Librarian Siggins and his staff.

Professor Mueller asked if input from the Schools would be sought during the planning process, and Librarian Siggins affirmed that this is a critical element in the planning process, as Gelman must be familiar with programmatic plans in the Schools so that its collections can meet existing and emerging needs.

President Trachtenberg said that he thought the Resolution was clearly insightful in some ways, but in others misses the point. The issue, he said, is not the size of the endowment, although the University raises as much money as it possibly can for Gelman. In fact, Gelman has held its own fundraiser for several years.

The more interesting question, he said, is not the source of funding for Gelman, whether operating funds or endowment, but the amount devoted to Library operations. The President then distributed a copy of a survey of holdings of research libraries in the U.S. and Canada, which appeared in the Chronicle of Higher Education in May 2005. (The chart is attached.) He pointed out that the University's total expenditures for its Libraries exceeded $20 million per year in 2003-04. The President noted that the institution immediately ahead of GW in the rankings, the University of Alabama, which has roughly 300,000 more books than the GW Libraries, has a permanent staff of 135, compared to GW's permanent staff of 213. The University of Massachusetts, which has three million books in its collection, has a budget of $11 million and its permanent staff numbers 126. President Trachtenberg said he thought it might be useful to revisit the operating budget of the Library, as it may be that the Gelman Library has more staff than it needs, and perhaps the appetite for journals can be satisfied by reducing the staff and redirecting funds. Referring again to the chart he distributed, the President compared GW's rank of 91 with the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, which ranks 85th, with a budget of $13 million, 2,800,000 books, and 153 permanent staff. Although he said he did not want to challenge the Resolution because he thought it was well intentioned, he concluded that he thought there are prior questions that need to be asked, to see if the University is perhaps devoting too many resources to personnel, and not enough to the issues which faculty believe are important.

Professor Pagel responded to the President's observations by noting that the chart distributed does not separate data about Gelman Library from that of the two supporting Libraries [Law and Medical]. The Law Library has a permanent staff of 40 people, which is...
necessary both because it is the fourth largest law school in the country and it needs this many staff to fulfill its mission as a research law library. The expenditure of $20 million in the chart also includes approximately $5 million devoted to the Law, and not Gelman, Library. Professor Pagel also informed the Senate that Gelman is no longer considered a research library as its budget of $15 million is not adequate to sustain it in this category; it is now classified by Jack Siggins as an undergraduate library. He added that he hoped that rather than compare itself to the University of Alabama, GW would look to total expenditures devoted to library purposes, and compare itself to institutions such as Northwestern University, the University of Virginia, or the University of Chicago. A brief exchange followed between the President and Professor Pagel, followed by a question posed by Professor Robinson, who asked Librarian Siggins about the number of staff employed at Gelman.

Librarian Siggins said he appreciated the question, because he thought the President had fallen into a trap many Presidents do when reviewing the chart from the Chronicle. The rankings in the chart reflect a weighted index, and it includes educational institutions in Canada which generally have lower budgets than libraries in the U.S. Because of the way in which the index is constructed, if Gelman had fewer staff, it would fall even lower in the rankings than its present 91st place. He added that he thought a more thorough analysis would show that the key figure in the chart is the number of volumes in a library collection rather than the number of staff. Another important factor is the fact that Gelman has a constant turnover in staff, and at any given time, a chronic 15 to 20% of positions are unfilled.

Professor Griffith noted that the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee had examined the GW Library budgets in the past, as it was especially concerned with the relatively low proportion of the $20 million overall budget that was being spent for added volumes and serials, compared to other universities with similar library budgets. The Committee eventually came to the same conclusion President Trachtenberg has often voiced, deciding that, where, as here, the situation was essentially a management problem, there was no role for the Senate.

Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald R. Lehman briefed the Senate on results of a study of the index under discussion, which was undertaken by Professor Parviz Ansari, an American Council on Education fellow at GW this year. The chart taken from the Chronicle is developed from data from the original 32 founding institutions of the ARL, and from this data a multiple regression equation is derived. These institutions define the scale relative to the rankings, and a 5 parameter formula plus a constant is used to place other institutions in rank order. Professor Ansari is preparing a report, which is almost finished, which will give a much clearer picture of where Gelman Library stands comparatively, once data relative to the Law and Medical libraries are removed. Vice President Lehman said he hoped to be able to finalize and distribute this report within a couple of weeks.

Professor Simon said he realized that the Chronicle chart was derived from some arcane index, but he said it struck him that Georgetown University, ranked 59, lists about $1.6 million more in its total expenditures, or about 8% more than the GW Libraries, but it has approximately 30% more volumes and about 133% more serials. The number of
permanent staff – 211 – is comparable to GW’s, and it is puzzling that GW’s holdings are so meager in comparison.

President Trachtenberg called on Vice President for Advancement Laurel Price Jones, who observed that many gifts given in support of library operations are not to its endowment, but to fund current operations. A gift to current use funds is equivalent to twenty times that amount if it were placed in the endowment and a portion paid out each year. The Vice President suggested that the Resolution be amended to include fundraising for current use funds.

Professor Griffith moved that the third Resolving Clause of the Resolution be amended to add the words, “both funds for current use and” following the word “increase” in the third Resolving Clause, and the motion was seconded. President Trachtenberg called for a vote on the amended Resolution, and it was adopted by unanimous vote. (Resolution 05/7, as amended, is attached.)

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

On behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chair, introduced Resolution 05/8 with the request that it be approved by the required two-thirds vote of the Senate for consideration at the meeting. The motion was seconded, a vote was taken, and the motion was adopted. Professor Robinson then yielded the floor to Professor William B. Griffith, Chair of the Senate Fiscal Planning and Budget Committee (FP&B) who had agreed to speak to the Resolution in lieu of his Report scheduled as a later agenda item.

RESOLUTION 05/8, “A RESOLUTION REGARDING THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET FOR FY 07

Professor William B. Griffith distributed a brief chronology on recent budget discussions [the chronology is attached] and began by identifying the other four faculty representatives serving as members of the Budget Working Group. They are: Professors Joseph Cordes, Edward Cherian, Roger Lang, also from the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee; and Donald Parsons, Chair of Economics.

The chronology details budget discussions beginning with the Senate's adoption of Resolution 04/7 in January, 2005, which recommended improved timing of the budget cycle to permit better consultation with faculty, and ends with the third meeting of the Budget Working Group established in March, 2006. This group, which is co-chaired by Executive Vice President and Treasurer Louis Katz and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman includes the five faculty representatives listed above. At the last meeting of the Budget Working Group, the faculty representatives presented a proposal to reduce the FY 07 budget “gap” of $8.2 million, the provisions of which have served to a large extent as the basis for the clauses of Resolution 05/8.

Professor Griffith advised that during the Budget Working Group’s discussions, Vice President Katz had proposed that the gap for FY 07, as well as projected gaps for FY 08, and FY 09 [a total projected gap of $12 million] be closed by cutting operating expenses as
follows: $4 million would come from the academic side of the University, $4 million from the capital and debt service budgets, and a remaining $4 million, without specifying how these cuts would be made, would be taken from the budgets of the Senior Vice President for Student and Academic Support Services and the Executive Vice President and Treasurer.

By contrast, faculty representatives to the Budget Working Group proposed that the gap be closed without budget reductions to the academic programs of the University. The academic side of the University has been under tremendous pressure because of rising enrollments and very slow increases in faculty resources. Money in the academic budget has also been reallocated to fund strategic initiatives, leaving regular academic programs hard pressed to meet their basic needs.

In order to close the gap of $8.2 million for FY 07 [rather than the projected long-term gap of $12 million] faculty representatives recommended that $5 million be saved by reducing projected transfers of funds from the operating budget to the budget for capital expenditures and debt service. As the University has made some $6 million in discretionary principal payments on debt which was not mandated by the note agreements, this seems a likely source of funds. Faculty representatives also recommended that an additional $.5 million in net revenues be obtained from auxiliaries, which Vice President Katz had indicated he thought could be done. The remaining gap would be closed by reductions in expenditures in administrative offices reporting to the Executive Vice President and Treasurer and the Senior Vice President for Student and Academic Support Services, which could include possible reductions in the discount rate for incoming students.

Professor Griffith noted that as these budget discussions have taken place, more extensive information has been provided than previously, with the result that the University's budget process is now more transparent than before. He then discussed in some detail how transfers are made during the fiscal year from operating revenues to the capital and debt service budgets, so that the resulting expenditures in the latter accounts are much greater than are shown in the initial budget lines. For example, the interest rate for debt service is usually budgeted at a considerably higher level than actually expected, and the savings from this budget account, usually running to several millions, as well as funds from a separate account called “interest rate reserve” ($1.9 m, always budgeted but never used for that) are then redirected into the capital accounts. Similarly, when revenues from bad-debt collection recently improved, those monies were also sent to the capital budgets. Another example he mentioned were the interest returns from internal loans the University makes to various units to initiate capital projects, which were recycled into the capital accounts rather than made available to the operating budget. In effect, every bit of “loose change” as he put it, is devoted to capital, rather than operating, purposes. Professor Griffith also noted that a considerable amount of money is expended on merit-based student financial aid, in addition to that spent on need-based aid.

Discussion followed by Professors Cordes and Griffith on the University’s strategy of financing projects with internal funds. This is not a bad strategy, but the question is whether or not the University can keep doing this at the same rate in the future without adverse consequences. Vice President Lehman explained that the total required payment on debt service in FY 05 was approximately $30 million, but the total amount actually paid amounted to some $50 million. In future years, because the gap between the budgeted
interest rate and the actual interest rate at which the University is able to borrow funds has narrowed, the amount of money that can be redirected in this particular way will be reduced to something on the order of $6 million this year, and $3 million next year. This is part of a strategy on the part of the University to pay down debt as quickly as possible in order to preserve its borrowing capacity for the future.

President Trachtenberg said he thought that every well-managed organization ought to have a healthy conversation of this sort about its budget on a periodic basis. Professor Griffith pointed out that continuation of information sharing about the budget in the future was a key component of Resolution 05/8.

Further discussion followed between Professors Englander, Cordes, and Griffith on the capital budget and debt service. Professor Cordes noted that, obviously, contractually obligated principal and interest payments must be made, but there are a number of other mechanisms in the budget, particularly in below the line items not well understood previously, that in effect take additional sums from the operating budget and put them into the capital budget for a variety of uses. The key issue is what kinds of choices the University is making, and what tradeoffs are involved in these. A discussion between Professors Mueller, Griffith, and Cordes ensued about the provisions of Resolution 05/8. Professor Cordes summed up by saying that, as the educational enterprise is the heart of the University, it would be highly desirable not to cut academic programs further. The core issues are balancing the University’s priorities, and continuing the conversation about the budget that has begun this year.

There being no further discussion, the question was called, a vote was taken, and Resolution 05/8 was adopted by unanimous vote. (Resolution 05/8 and the Budget Chronology are attached.)

REPORT BY FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES ON THE WORK OF THE 4 X 4 CURRICULUM TASK FORCE

Senate member Robert W. Rycroft, one of the four members of the 4x4 Task Force, distributed a copy of the Report, and closely followed its outline. The Report is reproduced in the minutes below.

THE UNIVERSITY 4X4 TASK FORCE:
STATUS REPORT TO THE G.W.U. FACULTY SENATE
(Ed Cherian, Bob Dunn, Roger Lang, Bob Rycroft)
April 14, 2006

Introduction and Background

The University 4x4 Task Force, formed in April 2005, has thus far held 17 two-hour meetings, in addition to other sub-committee meetings. The charge to the Task Force members, as stated in the formation memo of March 16, 2005, is to “.work with me (EVP Lehman) on an in-depth analysis of the pros and cons of shifting GW’s Undergraduate education curricula from a 5x3 course structure to a 4x4 course structure.”
The Task Force chaired by Executive Vice President Lehman, currently consists of 25 members, including faculty, administration officers and staff, and three students. The original membership was enlarged from 22 by the addition of two administrative appointees, another student, and an additional Dean's appointee. One faculty member (Michael Feldman) recently withdrew.

The issue of conversion to a 4x4 curriculum for undergraduates has been studied twice before: the Four by Four Curriculum Study Project (1992) and the Alternative Academic Calendar Study (2003), and twice rejected by the faculty.

Until yesterday (April 13) we were operating on the assumption that the last scheduled meeting of the Task Force would be on April 21, at which time EVP Lehman had scheduled a vote on various goals and scenarios for 4x4 implementation (more on this below).

The 4x4 Issue

A 4x4 curriculum for undergraduates requires each student to take four four-credit hour courses per semester, for a total of 32 courses in four years (128 credit hours), as opposed to GWU’s current 5x3 curriculum model of 40 three-credit courses (120 credit hours) for the undergraduate curriculum. There is a 20 percent reduction in the number of required courses in a 4x4 curriculum model, which is purportedly a way of getting students to focus more on a fewer number of courses, resulting in greater academic achievement.

In reviewing the experience of universities which adopted the 4x4 model, it is evident that there is no “pure form.” There are in fact numerous variations on how the 4x4 has been implemented. For example, at universities with 4x4 models:

- Only some have converted the undergraduate courses, while others have converted both graduate and undergraduate curricula;
- Only some schools within a given university have converted to 4x4, while others have maintained a 5x3 format;
- Some schools within a university converted to 4x4 as long as 10 years after other schools within the same university adopted 4x4;
- Some universities offer a variety of 2, 3, 4, and 5-credit courses and purport to be a 4x4 school;
- There are a variety of “seat-time” models for four-credit courses.

Several universities, including some in the “Ivy League,” have adopted a 4x4 curriculum; however, there are no data available to substantiate any improvements in student achievements. There are, however, substantial cost savings that are possible through reduced faculty needs if four-hour courses are offered with class seat time equivalent to three-credit hour courses.

Task Force Deliberations

The agenda for Task Force meetings and the meeting discussions and minutes are controlled by EVP Lehman. The Task Force has followed a deliberate agenda in an attempt
to cover all the issues of a 4x4 implementation initially brought out by discussion. The issues were categorized as pertaining to:

- Faculty
- Students
- Administration and Staff
- Resources

The Task Force spent numerous hours discussing the first three issues in detail, but only some 30 minutes recently discussing the cost implications (the Resource issue).

Presentations were made to the Task Force by representatives of various groups, including:

- GWU Honors Program
- University Writing Program
- DC Community Research and Learning Network Program
- Northeastern University Vice President

Task Force members visited eight universities, seven of which had implemented 4x4 programs. Reports on these trips are available, and present a very mixed picture of success, motivation, and degree of implementation. Data from ten other universities were also presented for review.

The Task Force was presented with numerous reports and documents, and books to review. Members of the Task Force were also asked to respond to two written “home work” assignments. Data on GWU student enrollments, retention, class size, faculty teaching loads, and grade inflation were also made available to Task Force members.

**Major Faculty Issues in Implementing a 4x4 Curriculum**

EVP Lehman has stated, more than once, that his purpose in addressing the 4x4 issue (again) stems from the University’s Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence, which includes the need to “enhance student engagement and learning through academic challenge and a rigorous intellectual environment that permeates every aspect of student life.” President Trachtenberg, on the other hand, recently stated that he directed EVP Lehman to form the 4x4 Task Force because of the need to reduce the cost of higher education—specifically faculty costs (Faculty Assembly, October 31, 2005).

There are numerous major and minor issues associated with the implementation of any major curriculum change. In the case of a move to a 4x4 model for undergraduate education at GWU, some of the major issues are:

- Will the 4x4 really provide the enhanced student engagement sought by this change?
- Will the faculty respond and truly modify curriculum and teach four-credit hour courses?
• Assuming a reduction in seat-time for four-credit hour courses to the three-credit hour level (2.5 hours per week), can there be sufficient “outside class” work to justify the reduced seat time?
• Will faculty course loads change? Will there be a reduction in faculty (full-time and part-time) numbers?
• Will graduate programs follow the undergraduate program in such a revision?
• Will individual School elections for adoption of the 4x4 (instead of University-wide) be counter-effective in implementation?
• Will the inevitable reduction (almost elimination some say) in elective courses lead to a narrow education for GWU students?
• Can we successfully handle transfer credit and combination bachelor/master programs?
• How large a reduction in research productivity will accompany a transition to 4x4?
• What will be the impact on dual majors and Study Abroad programs?
• What will be the distribution of the substantial cost savings resulting from the implementation of 4x4?

Our Major Findings

The faculty members selected by the Faculty Senate for the 4x4 Task Force offer the following summary of major findings:

1) Student Engagement and Academic Rigor. We have been convinced by these deliberations that an increase in student engagement and academic rigor for GWU students is called for. The goal of increasing academic excellence can be addressed within the existing 5x3 curriculum structure. There is a need to restructure virtually all our curricula with a focus on learning outcomes; a difficult change that will take time, resources, and detailed assistance in the process.

There is also a need to change the student recruiting emphasis; academics must be first—before location and other opportunities. We need to attract the right students as well; we need the GWU identity to be that of a “top tier” school, not just one that happens to be located in Washington. We can’t have it both ways.

These changes represent modifications in organizational culture, perhaps the most difficult modifications to successfully implement.

2) The 4x4 solution. As has been stated many times in Task Force deliberations, we believe the 4x4 is a solution looking for a problem. There is no proof whatsoever that a 4x4 implementation will result in improved student engagement. Nor is there any evidence that 4x4 will induce students to divide their time differently between classes and the city. The reduced class time per credit hour proposed and reduced breadth of courses offered under 4x4 clearly offer an inferior educational experience; profitable for the University, but inferior academically. If the issue we are addressing is student engagement and academic rigor, we believe it can and should be addressed without a change to 4x4. However, it is possible that a thorough assessment of possible changes in the curriculum might lead to the adoption of
part or all of a 4x4 format. But we should not go to 4x4 before making serious curricular changes. And the changed curriculum must go to the faculty before any elements of the 4x4 are adopted. Although elements of 4x4 might make sense when coupled with curricular change, it would be a useless and expensive nuisance without such change.

**The Next Steps**

The latest plan is that on May 5 the Task Force will “discuss and vote on recommendations from our work” to “delineate the recommendations that we consider making.” Later a report is to be prepared, followed by iterations of critique, input and suggestions leading to a “consensus document” distributed to the GW community. It is not at all clear that the Task Force will have an opportunity to vote on the 4x4 proposal itself—something we have been repeatedly assured would take place. It is absolutely essential that there be an opportunity for the Task Force and school faculty to vote on the concept of a 4x4 curriculum. A more immediate concern is that the end of the academic year is in sight. This process should not be carried over into the summer period, when the Faculty Senate and its representatives can’t participate.

Professor Rycroft summed up by saying that faculty representatives to the Task Force are just about convinced that adoption of a 4x4 curriculum would be unwise. While student engagement is an important issue which needs attention, the case has not been made for adopting a 4x4 curriculum, particularly since there is no demonstrated connection between such a curriculum change and the goals of academic challenge and student engagement. In conclusion, Professor Rycroft reiterated that the group is not sure an up or down vote will be taken recommending (or not) the 4x4 curriculum itself. He added that he thought the Senate ought to be very conscious of the fact, and focused on the fact, that faculty representatives believe strongly such a vote should be taken, both in the Task Force and in the Senate on the issue of 4x4 as a specific option.

After reviewing the origin of the Task Force's work in the Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence, and some of the discussions held by the Task Force as it seeks to determine if adoption of a 4x4 curriculum can meet the key objective of enhancing student engagement, Vice President Lehman assured the Senate that a vote would be taken in the Task Force on a number of issues, including whether or not a 4x4 curriculum should replace the current 5x3 structure. Work is currently underway on examining the resource issue, and it is expected that the Task Force will issue a consensus report on its findings, which will be shared with the GW community.

Discussion followed between Professors Rycroft, Wilmarth, Zea, and Vice President Lehman on various aspects of the Task Force’s work. President Trachtenberg said he thought that whether the University elects to adopt a 4x4 curriculum rather than 5x3, as he thought prudent, it would be a mistake to ignore GW’s natural advantage and pretend that it is not located in Washington, D.C. When GW was a significantly lesser institution than it is today, people elected to come to GW because of its location. The enhancement of the academic environment at the University, in addition to its location, attracts a much richer mix of students than a focus on academics alone. Vice President Lehman said that, far from
turning its back on the University’s location, the Task Force seeks to focus on creating greater connectivity between what students study and their experiences off campus.

Professor Robinson said that she understood that a draft report by the Task Force would be prepared over the summer and shared with the Schools and the Faculty Senate. Vice President Lehman affirmed this timetable. President Trachtenberg indicated that he had to leave to attend another meeting, and he asked Vice President Lehman to assume the Chair. Professor Rycroft said he and the other faculty representatives on the Task Force would welcome comments and questions from faculty members. Vice President Lehman thanked Professor Rycroft for his report.

PROPOSED STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE HONORS PROGRAM

Executive Director of Undergraduate Honors, Fellowships and Research Grants Baxter thanked the Senate for the opportunity to present her report on a Friday afternoon with a very packed agenda. She added that she welcomed the opportunity to initiate with the Senate the conversation and collaboration that has begun with the individual schools, which will provide the Plan’s ultimate design and academic content. She advised that Professor Leslie Jacobson, Chair of the Advisory Committee for the University Honors Program, could not be present due to a teaching commitment on Friday afternoons which could not be rescheduled.

Ms. Baxter briefly reviewed the origins of the Proposed Strategic Plan for the University Honors Program. The program is about 15 years old. Four years ago, then-director Peter Rollberg led an extensive self-study of the program. This study was followed by an academic program review by an internal faculty committee and then by a supplemental program review conducted by staff and members of the Advisory Committee. The latter review involved extensive student and honors faculty interviews and surveys, as well as researching undergraduate Honors Programs at comparable institutions. The result was a proposed Strategic Plan for the Honors Program, which was presented to Vice President Lehman in August, 2005. Since that time the proposal has been introduced to the deans of the five undergraduate schools, the Columbian College Council of Chairs, the Council of Associate Deans, and faculty representatives of the School of Engineering and Applied Science, the Business School, the School of Public Health and Health Services, and the Elliott School of International Affairs. Ms. Baxter briefly reviewed the Executive Summary extracted from the Proposed Strategic Plan for the Honors Program distributed with the agenda for the meeting. This describes a University Honors Program serving all of the undergraduate schools and is restricted to participation by a self-selected cohort of students numbering approximately 5% of the student body. The program will include a general education core of five 4-credit courses the first year, and four 4-credit courses in the second. The program for the last two years is also set forth in some detail in the Summary.

As a next step, the Honors Program staff and the Advisory Committee will continue to pursue their collaborations with the Schools. A number of Advisory Committee members have been identified to lead development of the Program’s Proseminars, including Professor John Ziolkowski, who will lead the faculty team working on the Humanities Proseminar, Professor George Stevens on the Science Proseminar, Professor Sameh Badie on the Quantitative Analysis and Methods Proseminar, Professor Dina Khouri on the Social and
Behavioral Sciences, and Professor Leslie Jacobson, on the development of the Arts and Literature Proseminar. The individual schools will be asked to identify faculty interested in working with the Honors Program, with the plan that implementation of the Program will begin in Fall, 2007 for the incoming class. Students in the present Honors Program will be allowed to finish their work under the current Program.

Discussion followed by Professors Gupta, Cordes, Griffith, Kim-Renaud Robin, and Vice President Lehman about various aspects of the Honors Program proposal. Ms. Baxter confirmed that the blueprint for the program is intentionally broad, with details to be worked out in collaboration with the participating schools. As a University program, the Honors Program when finalized will be presented to the Faculty Senate for its approval. It is expected that the Program will require no infusion of new funds, but will be funded by reallocation of existing monies.

Vice President Lehman noted the declining number of applicants to the Honors Program over the past three years, at a time when incoming students are increasingly better qualified. Ms. Baxter said she thought two primary reasons for the decline were that students were no longer required to participate in the Program as a condition of receiving scholarships, and also the fact that participants no longer have the opportunity for priority registration. This has left a core of students enrolled in the Program because they value the intellectual experiences offered.

In conclusion, Ms. Baxter invited Senate members to share their thoughts and comments with her, Professor Jacobson, or other members of the Advisory Committee. The Program needs the faculty’s creativity and ideas, so that the highest academic aspirations can be put to good use in the Honors Program. (The Executive Summary is attached.)

REPORT ON CLASSROOM SCHEDULING FOR THE FALL SEMESTER, 2006

Registrar Elizabeth A. Amundson noted for the record that the Report which she was about to give concerned classroom scheduling for the fall semester, 2006, rather than fall 2007. (The Report is attached.) The Registrar told the Senate that scheduling for fall ’06 [which began on March 31, 2006] was the first semester that the centralized scheduling initiatives that were adopted from the recommendations of the Faculty Senate Task Force on Classroom Scheduling had been implemented. As reflected in the Report which she distributed at the meeting (the Report is attached), of approximately 3500 course sections, the initial room placement rate was over 97%, and the 78 Foggy Bottom courses that could not be placed initially were relatively equally distributed between six schools in a limited number of timebands. The Report also describes how problems with classes lacking room assignments were resolved. In particular, the Registrar’s Office was able to offer viable options for placing the unassigned classes, rather than asking the Schools to request a new timeband or location, which has in the past led to frustration when these “blind” requests could not be met and repeated requests had to be made.

Among concerns about classroom scheduling listed in the Report are lack of compliance with deadlines, late submission of changes, cancellations and additions to the schedule, and functional scheduling liaisons in the schools. While the report notes that the Task Force recommendations adopted called for the appointment of a scheduling liaison at
the assistant or associate dean level and each school made such an appointment, in all but one school, the Scheduling Office is actually working with staff at much lower levels who lack the authority to carry out the required tasks. In addition, the R25 hardware and software which has been acquired to run the schedule continues to present problems in that it runs slowly and the transactional interface between it and Banner has been limited to a uni-directional process. The Registrar said she hoped that a newer version of the software issued in March, 2006, would help to resolve this issue.

In summary, many fewer assigned classes remain after improvements recommended by the Task Force have been implemented, and fewer registration problems have been encountered by GW students. While there is still room for improvement, significant progress has been made.

Discussion followed by Professors Garris, Gupta, and Marotta concerned the long lead time needed to request equipment, the Spring ’07 schedule, the call for which has just been submitted to the schools, and utilization of the Grant School on G Street, where there have been instances where classes were moved without advance notice to instructors. The Registrar promised to look into the latter as her staff always tries to work with scheduling liaisons in the schools so that no instructional time is lost because classroom assignments have been changed with proper notice to instructors.

Professor Griffith asked when Monroe Hall and the Hall of Government would come back online for classroom use, and Vice President Lehman said this was scheduled for Fall, 2007.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. NOMINATION FOR ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE 2006-07 SESSION

Professor Philip W. Wirtz, Convener of the Nominating Committee, thanked all of the Committee members for their hard work in bringing together the slate of nominees for next year's Executive Committee. On behalf of the Nominating Committee, Professor Wirtz moved the nomination of Professor Lilien F. Robins (CCAS) as Chair of the Executive Committee. The nomination was approved. Professor Wirtz then moved the nominations of the following faculty members for election to the Executive Committee for the 2006-07 Session: Brian L. Biles (SPHHS), Michael S. Castleberry (GSEHD), Ernest J. Englander (SB), Charles A. Garris, Jr. (SEAS), Robert W. Rycroft (ESIA), Gary L. Simon (SMHS), and Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr. (GWLS). The entire slate was approved.

II. NOMINATION FOR ELECTION OF NOMINEES TO THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION COMMITTEE

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Robinson moved the nomination of Professor Kurt J. Darr as Chair for a one-year term commencing May 1, 2006. The nomination was approved. Professor Robinson then moved the nominations for election of the following faculty members to the Dispute Resolution Committee for three-year terms
commencing May 1, 2006: Professors Ravi S. Achrol, Brian L. Biles, Patrick Cook, and Milos Doroslovacki. The entire slate was approved.

III. NOMINEES FOR APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE FOLLOWING ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Robinson moved the nomination for election of the following faculty members for appointment by the President to the following Administrative Committees: Committee on the Judicial System (for a two-year term): Michael S. Castleberry, Chair; University Hearing Board: Professors Katherine Goodrich and David Truncellito; Marvin Center Program Board: Professor Stuart Umpleby; Marvin Center Governing Board: Professors Bradley Sabelli, Stephen McGraw, Julie Ryan, and Catherine Turley. The entire slate was approved.

ANNUAL REPORTS OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Professor Ralph O. Mueller, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee, submitted the Annual Report of the Committee for inclusion with the minutes of the meeting. (The Report is attached.)

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

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

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Englander asked if there is still a Faculty Committee on Technology he could consult, as he is experiencing a problem with Blackboard where e-mails sent out disappear into the ether. Vice President Lehman responded that Geralyn Schulz of Speech and Hearing is the Chair of the Academic Technologies Committee, which meets monthly. She would be the person to put such an issue on the Committee's agenda. Vice President Lehman noted that all of the schools have elected or appointed faculty members to this Committee, but unfortunately, attendance is poor and thus the Committee does not learn of such issues as it should.

Vice President Lehman reported that the Search Committee to find a new Dean for the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences has now been elected and would hold its first meeting in two weeks.

Professor Gallo reported that representatives of the Physical Facilities Committee had met with Executive Vice President and Treasurer Louis Katz and Associate Vice President Eve Dubrow and presented them with a number of facilities issues that are in need of attention. Both of them have been responsive to the representative’s concerns. Professor Gallo asked if faculty members had received an Email from AVP Dubrow which included contact information and phone numbers so that people would know what to do in order to get a facilities problem resolved. Professor Gallo inquired if all Senate members had received this communication, and all said that they had.
ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, and upon motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary
A RESOLUTION ON LIBRARY ENDOWMENT FUNDS (05/7)

Whereas, The George Washington University aspires to “move solidly into the ranks of first-tier educational institutions” (Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence, Goal 1); and

Whereas, the University further seeks to “strengthen GW’s infrastructure, including the University’s libraries” (Goal 5); and

Whereas, neither goal can be attained without first-tier library resources; and

Whereas, both endowments and university allocations are vital sources of funding for the libraries; and

Whereas, funding for the Gelman Library System from both endowments and university allocations are significantly lower than libraries at peer institutions (see attachment # 1); and

Whereas, surveys of faculty and students have consistently shown dissatisfaction with the depth and breadth of the collection of the Gelman Library (see attachment # 2 for faculty responses); and

Whereas, it is in the interest of the Faculty Senate and the University that library resources available for research and instruction be of the highest quality; NOW THEREFORE

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

1. That the University Administration request that the University Librarian provide a 5-year plan through which, by gradual increases in the library collection budget beginning in FY 2008, the collection budget will reach a level equal to the mean level of ARL libraries in GW’s market basket group; and

2. That the University Administration prepare an annual report for the Faculty Senate on its progress in meeting the goals set out in the 5-year plan provided by the University Librarian; and

3. That the University Administration further makes the Gelman Library System a high priority in fundraising in order to increase both funds for current use and the endowment for it so as to help meet the goals set out in Resolving Clause 1.

Faculty Senate Committee on Libraries
March 31, 2006

Adopted, as amended, April 14, 2006
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Operating Expenditures</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Operating Expenditures</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>30,986,373</td>
<td>10,864,543</td>
<td>41,850,916</td>
<td>14,730,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>18,929,584</td>
<td>6,606,345</td>
<td>25,535,929</td>
<td>8,469,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>14,562,932</td>
<td>4,760,483</td>
<td>19,323,415</td>
<td>6,520,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>12,919,891</td>
<td>4,030,234</td>
<td>16,950,125</td>
<td>4,982,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>11,986,321</td>
<td>3,605,182</td>
<td>15,591,503</td>
<td>4,832,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>9,339,345</td>
<td>2,660,453</td>
<td>12,003,800</td>
<td>3,570,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>8,462,370</td>
<td>2,355,470</td>
<td>10,817,840</td>
<td>3,275,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>7,106,500</td>
<td>1,998,690</td>
<td>9,105,190</td>
<td>2,722,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>7,106,460</td>
<td>1,998,690</td>
<td>9,105,190</td>
<td>2,722,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>6,793,300</td>
<td>1,565,650</td>
<td>8,358,950</td>
<td>1,795,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>6,438,250</td>
<td>1,233,570</td>
<td>7,671,820</td>
<td>1,567,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>6,438,250</td>
<td>1,233,570</td>
<td>7,671,820</td>
<td>1,567,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>6,438,250</td>
<td>1,233,570</td>
<td>7,671,820</td>
<td>1,567,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>6,438,250</td>
<td>1,233,570</td>
<td>7,671,820</td>
<td>1,567,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>6,438,250</td>
<td>1,233,570</td>
<td>7,671,820</td>
<td>1,567,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>6,438,250</td>
<td>1,233,570</td>
<td>7,671,820</td>
<td>1,567,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>6,438,250</td>
<td>1,233,570</td>
<td>7,671,820</td>
<td>1,567,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>6,438,250</td>
<td>1,233,570</td>
<td>7,671,820</td>
<td>1,567,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>6,438,250</td>
<td>1,233,570</td>
<td>7,671,820</td>
<td>1,567,110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Changes in Spending, 1998-99 to 2003-04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Change in Operating Expenditures</th>
<th>Change in Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>4,956,373</td>
<td>1,723,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>4,199,584</td>
<td>1,422,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2,940,373</td>
<td>1,149,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>2,490,891</td>
<td>881,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>2,379,460</td>
<td>811,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1,856,345</td>
<td>659,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1,438,250</td>
<td>519,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1,265,500</td>
<td>394,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1,265,500</td>
<td>394,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1,265,500</td>
<td>394,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1,265,500</td>
<td>394,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1,265,500</td>
<td>394,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1,265,500</td>
<td>394,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1,265,500</td>
<td>394,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1,265,500</td>
<td>394,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The data provided is an estimate and does not represent the actual amount of funds exchanged. The values are approximate and may have rounding errors. For a more accurate representation, please refer to the official documents or reports.
WHEREAS,

Current University budget projections estimate a “gap” between revenues and expenses of $8.2m for FY 07 and slightly larger gaps for FY 08 AND FY 09, indicating that the University is currently on an unsustainable path; and

WHEREAS,

These gaps have been the subject of intense and helpful discussions between the Faculty Senate and Administrative Officers; and

WHEREAS,

It seems appropriate to focus on closing the gap for FY 07, where the estimates are less speculative than for later years, noting that the gap is small relative to the total University revenue budget of some $467m; and

WHEREAS,

There are a number of options for closing this gap, including devising enhanced revenues and/or changes in assumed/projected expenditures in different areas, including capital expenditures, general administrative expenses, student financial aid, and academic programs; and

WHEREAS,

The University faculty is deeply committed to improving or at least maintaining the quality of education provided to University students, and is troubled by recent trends in full-time faculty resources growing at a much slower rate (17%) than enrollments (60% for undergraduates) over the last ten years; and

WHEREAS,

Additional reductions in support for academic programs in FY 07 would inevitably lead to a reduction in the quality of education for University students, especially undergraduate students; and

WHEREAS,

Current projected transfers from the operating budget to capital expenditures and debt service for FY 07 exceed the amounts required by current University commitments, NOW, THEREFORE
BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

1. That the revenue/expense gap in the University budget for FY 07 should be closed without a reduction in support for academic programs, and

2. That non-academic cuts in expenses by which the gap in the University budget for FY 07 may be closed include:
   
   A. Reducing projected transfer of funds from current revenues to capital spending and debt service by $5 m
   
   B. Deriving another $3.2 m from:
      
      1) reductions in expenditures in Administrative Offices reporting to the Executive Vice President and Treasurer, and from
      
      2) increasing net revenues from Auxiliary Services
      
      3) reducing projected expenditures in the Office Student and Academic Support Services, including possible reductions in the discount rate for incoming students

3. That the projected university budget gaps for FY 08 AND FY 09 should be addressed:
   
   - Beginning in May 2006, by a budget process that includes full and active participation by representatives of the faculty designated by the Faculty Senate
   
   - Such process should include, starting in October, 2006 and continuing thereafter on a regular basis, reports to the Faculty Senate by the faculty representatives and the University Administration, covering both the status of the University budget for future years and the advantages and disadvantages of possible options to address any gaps in future years

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
April 12, 2006

Adopted, April 14, 2006
BRIEF CHRONOLOGY ON RECENT BUDGET DISCUSSIONS

BACKGROUND:
Jan 21, ’05: Fiscal Planning & Budgeting Committee (FP&B) proposes and Faculty Senate approves Res 04/7: “Recommending Improved Timing of the Budget Cycle to Permit Better Consultation with Faculty”

Apr 8, ’05 Faculty Senate queries EVP Katz on his April 7 HATCHET interview in which he alludes to plans to postpone faculty and staff raises and move them to an 18-month cycle.

May 9, ’05 Faculty Senate holds Special Meeting to discuss postponement of raises

May 13, ’05 Faculty Senate approves Res. 05/2 making a recommendation about timing of raises but also asking for “a systematic working relationship” of administration with FP&B Committee with regular reporting to Faculty Senate on financial planning.

Sept ’05 Budget Office publishes a “Calendar of Budget Events” which sets out target dates for providing budget estimates and updated results to VPs. the FP&B Cte and the deans

Oct 05 Budget Office provides FP&B Cte with first estimates of FY 07 budget, showing a gap between expected revenues and expenses of approx. $6m.

Nov 11 05 FP&B reports on these estimates to the Faculty Senate, suggests a broader discussion of how to close this gap is needed

Feb 3 06 Faculty Senate holds Special Meeting to discuss the University budget, at which EVP Katz, EVPAA Lehman, and Sr VP Chernak provide extensive briefings

Feb 11 06 EVP Katz, after briefing on Sq 54, is quizzed further, focusing especially on the capital budget lines

Mar 2 06 A Budget Working Group is established, to include representatives from the Faculty Senate and to be chaired by EVP Katz and EVP Lehman

Mar 23, Mar 28: First two meetings of the Budget Group are held, with extensive briefings submitted by EVP Katz and SrVP Chernak

Apr 4: Third and last (scheduled) meeting of Budget Group, at which faculty reps propose a “solution” for FY 07 gap of $8.2m, along lines of today’s Resolution to be introduced with motion to take up immediately
THE UNIVERSITY HONORS PROGRAM

Proposed Strategic Plan

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Maintain a university-wide Honors Program serving all the undergraduate schools.

- Restrict the program to a smaller, more select and self-selected cohort of students, approximately five percent of the undergraduate student body.

- Provide for these students a general education “core” through a first and second year required honors course sequence of five four-credit courses year one and four four-credit courses year two.

- After year two, require students to qualify for major or “special” honors as currently defined by their major departments.

- Sustain and expand the honors “community” for all upper division honors students (those who enter as honors students and others who begin in departmental honors) through targeted co-curricular programming, speaker series, social activities, a newsletter and other student publications.

- Require all students who wish to graduate as University Honors Scholars (meaning they entered as honors students and have had a four-year honors experience) to earn departmental honors, produce a substantial departmental or alternative honors research paper or project, participate in the Honors Global Issues Practicum and present their capstone work in an honors showcase or other public, community event that recognizes and celebrates “honors”-worthy achievement at GW.
Proposed “New” Honors Program

[Honors components in bold.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1:</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities Proseminar</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Humanities Proseminar</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences Proseminar</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Sciences Proseminar</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Writing 20</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Quant. Analysis Prosem.</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Lit. Proseminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years 3-4:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[------------- Current Departmental Honors -------------------]

Honors Capstone:  Global Issues Practicum (4)
Honors Senior Thesis Option (4)*

* If major department(s) approve.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honors Program Requirements by Year:</th>
<th>Current Program Curriculum “Enrichment”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Current Program</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freshman</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Honors Courses</td>
<td>Proseminar 1 and Proseminar 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sophomore</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Honors Courses or Equivalent</td>
<td>One of the following each semester:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Credits</td>
<td>Honors course, course conversion, symposium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Honors Courses or Equivalent</td>
<td>One of the following each semester:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Credits</td>
<td>Honors course, course conversion, symposium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental or Honors Thesis</td>
<td>Departmental Thesis or Honors Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Credits</td>
<td>One of the following: Honors course, course conversion, symposium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### University Honors Program

#### Honors Curriculum Proposal - Comparison with Current Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW Proposed Curriculum</th>
<th>Honors Program Requirements by Year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Honors General Education Core</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Proposed Curriculum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities Proseminar 1 / Humanities Proseminar 2</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Proseminar 1 / Science Proseminar 2</td>
<td>5 Honors Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Analysis and Methods Proseminar</td>
<td>20 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral Sciences Proseminar / Social Sciences Proseminar</strong></td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Literature Proseminar 1 / Arts/Literature Proseminar 2</td>
<td>4 Honors Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Departmental Honors Opportunities</strong></td>
<td>Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(None)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Issues Practicum</strong></td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Honors Requirements or Honors Senior Thesis Seminar</td>
<td>1 Honors Capstone / Departmental or Honors Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-8 Credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schedule25 Room Scheduling results

Of the approximately 3500 course sections, we had an initial room placement rate of over 97%. There were 78 Foggy Bottom courses that could not initially be placed. There were 51 courses from CCAS, 8 from GSEHD, 8 from GWSB, 5 from SEAS, 3 from SPHHS and 3 from ESIA. The vast majority of classes that could not be placed met within a limited number of timebands:

- TR 11:10-12:25pm: 15 courses
- MW 12:45-2:00pm: 18 courses
- TR 2:20-3:35pm: 12 courses
- W between 5-9pm: 19 courses
- T between 5-9pm: 13 courses

Resolution of Homeless Classes

A new approach was taken to address classes lacking room assignments. Through the refinement of timebands and relocation of some other assigned courses, the Academic Scheduling Office was able to place over 20 courses without involvement of the schools. The Director of Academic Scheduling and his staff contacted each school to arrange a meeting to discuss the remaining homeless classes. Through individual meetings with 4 of the schools, 90% of the initial homeless courses were placed, as the school representatives elected to delete some courses, change meeting times and/or negotiated movement of other classes. One other school met with the ASO, but elected to make no changes to their schedule and wait to see if rooms later became available. The remaining school with homeless classes failed to respond to repeated requests to meet.

Fall 2006 registration began on March 31, 2006. Only two of the initial homeless courses had to be inactivated, as room assignments could not be made. Within 5 days of the start of the registration process, both of these courses were placed.

Concerns

1) **Lack of compliance with deadlines.** School creation of the Fall 2006 schedule was to take place from October 15 to December 9. Of the 92 subjects offered, schedules were submitted by the deadline for only 54. Two schools were unable to submit schedules until approximately one month after the deadline.

2) **Late submission of changes, cancellations and additions** to the schedule. Several schools added courses to the schedule after the room scheduling software was run and during the homeless placement process. Registration began two weeks ago, and since that time, we have received 10-20 requests to add classes every day.

3) **Functional scheduling liaisons in schools.** The Task Force recommendation adopted by VP Lehman called for the appointment of a scheduling liaison at the assistant or associate dean level. While each school has appointed
someone at this level, in all but one school the ASO is actually working with staff at much lower levels who lack the authority to make decisions about course offerings or command compliance from department chairs or individual faculty members.

4) **Capacity of the R25 software and hardware** to meet GW needs. The system continues to run exceedingly slowly. The transactional interface between R25 and Banner has been limited to a uni-directional process. On March 8, 2006, CollegeNet released the newest version of the software and interface, which may address this issue.

**Successes**

Many fewer homeless classes resulted from the centralized entry of the schedule into Banner. The improved process for the resolution of these homeless classes reduced the trauma of placement of these classes.

Significant improvements have been realized during this first semester of Centralized Scheduling in the form of improved service to our students. While it is recognized that continued improvements in the accuracy of the data entry done by the ASO team are necessary, the quality control measures and data checking efforts already in place resulted in a significant decrease in the registration problems encountered by our students. Errors with course links and cross-listings were dramatically reduced, as were the numbers of classes with missing course caps, inaccurate course comments and erroneous course dates.

Through the stricter controls on course additions and changes, those courses that were submitted by the deadlines were given priority in the assignment of classrooms. Late submissions were added only at underutilized timebands, or placed on a waiting list to receive a room assignment only after all timely submissions were accommodated.
1. The Educational Policy Committee met four times during AY 05/06
   a. 10/14/05
   b. 11/4/05
   c. 12/2/05
   d. 2/3/06

2. The main agenda items for the year were as follows:
   a. Academic Calendar: Problems with Monday-only classes
   b. Online Course Evaluations

3. Other items of interest to the committee were initially proposed but were not placed on the final agenda due to still ongoing discussion in other units of the university:
   a. Doctor of Professional Studies
   b. 4x4 Curriculum

4. Main Conclusions
   a. Academic Calendar
      i. A faculty member brought forth the concern that Monday-only courses start very late in the semester due to the holiday schedule (e.g., when fall classes start after Labor Day), thus requiring the semester’s last Wednesday be designated a Monday. Academic concerns related to having the semester’s last two class days with such short time in-between were expressed. After hearing from Craig Linebaugh, Assoc. VP for Academic Planning and Special Projects, and Beth Amundson, University Registrar, regarding the complexities of the summer and academic year calendars, the committee decided to recommend no change to the current policy of having a designated Monday on a Wednesday, if required.

   b. Online Course Evaluations
      i. The committee was charged to follow up on a Senate Resolution adopted March 8, 2002 dealing with the possibility of departments
adopting online teaching evaluations with enough flexibility to possibly allow student access to parts of the evaluations. During their deliberations, committee members worked closely with Cheryl Beil, Executive Director of Academic Planning and Assessment. After lengthy discussions, it was ultimately decided that it is not in the purview of this committee or the Senate to allow/disallow certain evaluation instruments for teaching evaluations. Instead, decisions on how to evaluate courses remain in the University’s departments (or other units). However, the committee felt that it might be useful for departments (or other units) to have some guidance on the possible adoption of online teaching evaluations. In collaboration with Cheryl Beil, the committee endorsed a document distributed with this year’s invitation to department chairs to use online evaluations that outlined (a) potential reasons for using these instruments and (b) remaining challenges with the online evaluation process (attached).

Respectfully submitted,

Ralph O. Mueller, Educational Leadership
Chair, Educational Policy Committee

Voting Members:
Lowell Abrams, Mathematics
Michael Castleberry, Teacher Preparation and Special Education
Subhasish Dasgupta, Management Science
Morgan Delaney, Medicine
Stephen McGraw, Health Care Sciences
Richard Tollo, Geosciences
Barbara von Barghahn-Calvetti, Art History
Laura Youens, Music
Maria Cecilia Zea, Psychology

Ex officio Members:
Elizabeth Amundson, Registrar
Cheryl Beil, Academic Planning and Assessment
Robert Chernak, Student and Academic Support Services
Gale Etschmaier, Gelman Library
Mary Futrell, Graduate School of Education and Human Development
Donald Lehman, Academic Affairs
Kathryn Napper, Undergraduate Admissions
Robert Rycroft, International Science & Technology Policy and International Affairs
Carol Sigelman, Graduate Studies & Academic Affairs
Daniel Small, Enrollment Management Administration
Joy Langley, Student Representative
Benefits to and Challenges of Using the Online Course Evaluation

The Educational Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate agreed that departments or faculty that wish to use the online course evaluation should do so. In the interest of obtaining information that will prove most useful in course development, it is recommended that departments and faculty review the benefits and challenges of using the online evaluation before they proceed.

Reasons to consider using the online course evaluation:

- An online course evaluation does not take up valuable class time. It also provides students with a longer and more flexible timeframe to complete the survey, so they can consider their responses and provide more thoughtful feedback.
- It has the potential to reach a wider audience (e.g., students who were absent the day the paper evaluation was distributed in class).
- Instructors and departments can customize the evaluation by adding up to 20 questions of their choosing. In addition, there is a Question Pool of 200+ questions culled from paper evaluations from many GW departmental surveys. Items in the pool can easily be added to the online evaluation. Moreover, faculty or departments that create new questions may add them to the question pool.
- It standardizes the method of distributing evaluations and of collecting the data.
- It provides a faster turnaround time for producing summary data of the evaluations. This benefits faculty who may want to consider and act upon students’ feedback in a timely fashion and departments that are hiring part-time or adjunct faculty on a semester-basis.
- It frees up valuable staff time, as the distribution of surveys, tabulation of results, including comments, are done electronically.
- It has the potential to produce specialized reports including analyses across different types of classes, course sections, and departments.
- Summary reports are accessible on line and are available 24/7.
- It saves natural and financial resources as paper versions of the evaluations do not need to be printed.
- It frees up valuable office space. The data are stored in a secure server that is operated by ISS, thus eliminating the need to store paper versions of the evaluations and eliminating the possibility of faculty or staff inadvertently losing evaluations or selecting out certain responses. In addition, the evaluations are stored indefinitely and are readily assessable.
- A standardized process of course evaluations will contribute to GW’s ability to meet the assessment expectations of the Middle States accrediting process.
- Faculty who wish to do so have the option of sharing summary data with students for selected questions.
- The “net” generation of students is more comfortable and accustomed to completing surveys online.
Challenges for using the online course evaluations:

- Response rate: Although the response rates have increased steadily over the past three semesters, the most recent overall response rate in ESIA is 58%. However, response rates vary considerably by department, ranging as low as 29% in one department and as high as 85% in another. We are still in the process of piloting online course evaluations. Faculty and departments which offer minimal extra credit for completion receive the best responses. High response rates are found in those classes where the instructors encourage their students to participate. Survey data collected from other universities using an online system report that sending out frequent email communication, publicizing it through campus posters and in campus newspaper ads, educating students about the importance of the course evaluations and how the information will be used by department chairs and faculty all help to improve the response rate.

- The data is inconclusive about whether students’ comments are compromised in an online venue. In some courses faculty found that students typed in more comments, while in others, the opposite occurred. Many faculty identified bias among respondents as a major problem: students who took the time to fill out the online survey tended to be either very positive or very negative. Some faculty worried that the online course evaluations yielded fewer comments than the paper evaluations, while others praised the comments as more extensive and thoughtful; one instructor summed it up, “Fewer students wrote comments, but those who did wrote in greater detail about the course.”

- The survey is too long. At the present time the survey includes 38 questions, five of which are open-ended. While it takes less than five minutes to complete, some faculty and students have complained about its length. A shorter version will be developed in the near future.

Educational Policy Committee
3.15.2006
ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Presidential Search Process

Pursuant to Faculty Assembly resolutions passed in 1986 and 1987 and the presidential search process that was followed in 1987, the Executive Committee has sent letters to the deans of the eight schools and to the Faculty Senate representatives for the 2005-2006 session. The letters address the role of the schools, deans, Faculty Senate, and Faculty Assembly in establishing the process and conducting the search.

In brief, each School elects one representative to the Consultative Committee, which elects three of its members to serve on the Trustee Search Committee, consisting of seven trustees, three faculty members, one alumnus/alumna, and one student.

The task of the Senate representatives from each School is to present a slate of two or more nominees at a School meeting in which nominations are also requested from the floor. The Senate representatives submit these names to the Chair of the Executive Committee and the entire slate of eight candidates is then presented for confirmation/ratification at a meeting of the Faculty Assembly.

As we must complete this rather complex process as quickly as possible, the following schedule has been approved by the Chair of the Board of Trustees:

May 5, 2006– submission by the Faculty Senate representative/s of the name of the person elected in their School to the Consultative Committee to the Chair of the Executive Committee

May 8, 2006- meeting of the Faculty Assembly to confirm the slate

May 9, 2006- meeting of the Consultative Committee, convened by the Chair of the Executive Committee, to elect the three faculty members to serve on the Trustee Search Committee

May 19, 2006 meeting of the Board of Trustees and presentation of the names of faculty elected to the Consultative Committee and the Trustee Search Committee

I urge you to meet with the other Senate representatives from your School as early as possible in the next week to produce a slate for presentation at your School meeting.
**FY 2007 Budget**

As indicated, the Executive Committee has been following the work of the special budget group and consulting with the faculty members of that group. The resolution presented today was the result of the collaborative efforts of the latter and the Executive Committee.

**PERSONNEL MATTERS**

**Grievances**

Of the two grievances in the School of Business, one has been settled. I would like to extend congratulations and appreciation to Professor Charles Craver of the Law School who served as mediator. The other grievance in the School of Business is in hearing process.

**Nonconcurrences**

The Executive Committee has received notice of an administrative nonconcurrence with respect to tenure and promotion from the School of Business.

**OTHER MATTERS**

**Annual Reports**

Please be reminded that annual reports of standing committees are due prior to the first meeting of the new session on May 12.

**Executive Committee Meeting**

The 2005-2006 and the 2006-2007 Executive Committees will meet on April 28 to set the agenda for the May 12 Senate meeting and to provide nominations for membership on Senate committees. Resolutions, reports, and other matters for the May 12 Senate meeting should be submitted prior to that time.