

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

The Faculty Senate

November 1, 2012

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, November 9, 2012 at 2:10 p.m. in the State Room, 1957 E Street N.W., 7th Floor

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on October 12, 2012 (minutes to be distributed)
3. A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE *PROCEDURES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FACULTY CODE* WITH RESPECT TO DEAN SEARCHES (12/4); Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, Charles Garris, Chair (Resolution 12/4 and accompanying exhibits attached)
4. Introduction of Resolutions
5. Report on the Reading Leaders Pilot Program: Kathryn Newcomer, Chair, University and Urban Affairs Committee
6. Report of the Physical Facilities Committee: Hermann Helgert, Chair,
7. General Business
 - (a) Nominations for election to Senate Standing Committees: University and Urban Affairs: Professor Marshall W. Alcorn
 - (a) Report of the Executive Committee: Michael S. Castleberry, Chair
 - (c) Interim Reports of Senate Committees: Libraries (the report is attached)
 - (d) Provost's Remarks
 - (e) Chair's Remarks
8. Brief Statements (and Questions)
9. Adjournment

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

**A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE PROCEDURES FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FACULTY CODE WITH RESPECT TO
DEAN SEARCHES (12/4)**

WHEREAS, Article IX.A. of the *Faculty Code* provides: “The regular, active-status faculty shares with officers of administration the responsibility for effective operation of the departments and schools and the University as a whole. In the exercise of this responsibility, the regular, active-status faculty plays a role in decisions on . . . the appointment of . . . deans”;

WHEREAS, Part C.2.b) of the *Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code* (“*Code Procedures*”) provides that the University may appoint the dean of a School only after a search committee consisting of tenured faculty members of that School (“Faculty Dean Search Committee”), who have been elected by the regular, active-status faculty of that School, has “considered nominations, and reported its recommendations . . . to the faculty that elected it or to the appropriate academic administrative officer” as provided in the School’s bylaws; and

WHEREAS, Resolution 90/9 adopted by the Faculty Senate on December 14, 1990 (copy attached as Exhibit A), approved guidelines that (i) permit representatives of students and alumni to provide recommendations to the Faculty Dean Search Committee and to participate in interviews of decanal candidates, and (ii) permit the Vice President for Academic Affairs to “name an academic administrator . . . to participate as an advisor” to the Faculty Dean Search Committee; and

WHEREAS, in recent years representatives of students and alumni, academic administrators and members of the Board of Trustees have been appointed to serve as nonvoting members of Dean Search Committees in several Schools; and

WHEREAS, the participation of nonvoting members on Dean Search Committees is not expressly authorized by the *Code Procedures*; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that the *Code Procedures* should be amended to authorize the inclusion of nonvoting members on Dean Search Committees and to establish appropriate guidelines for their participation; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that the *Code Procedures* should also be amended to permit students, staff, untenured faculty members and alumni (with the approval of the Dean Search Committee, after consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs) to meet with candidates who have been selected for final interviews and provide their recommendations

to the Faculty Dean Search Committee in accordance with Resolution 90/9;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate endorses the “Recommended Model Principles and Procedures for Dean Searches,” which have been recommended by the Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom and are attached to this Resolution as Exhibit B; **NOW, THEREFORE**,

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

- (1) That Part C.2. of the *Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code* be amended by adding a new paragraph c), which shall read as follows:

“c) The committee of tenured faculty members elected pursuant to the first sentence of paragraph b) above shall be designated as the “Faculty Dean Search Committee,” and those elected tenured faculty members shall be the voting members of the committee organized to conduct a dean search (the “Dean Search Committee”). The Dean Search Committee may also include (with the concurrence of the Faculty Dean Search Committee) the following nonvoting members: appropriate representatives of interested constituencies, including students and alumni, as well as an academic administrator appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and a University Trustee appointed by the Board of Trustees. After receiving recommendations from the nonvoting members of the Dean Search Committee, the Faculty Dean Search Committee shall hold executive sessions to vote on (i) criteria for selecting a new dean, (ii) the selection of candidates for preliminary and final interviews, and/or (iii) the selection of nominees to be presented to the faculty or to the appropriate academic administrative officer in accordance with the first sentence of paragraph b). In addition, the Dean Search Committee (after consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs) may invite students, staff, untenured faculty members and alumni to meet with candidates chosen for final interviews and provide their recommendations to the Dean Search Committee.

- (2) That Part C.2. of the *Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code* be amended by designating existing paragraph c) as paragraph d).

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
October 5, 2012

A RESOLUTION TO ENDORSE GUIDELINES FOR SEARCHES FOR
DEANS OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY (90/9)

WHEREAS, The Faculty Senate Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty has reviewed the process for searches for Deans and has developed general guidelines; NOW, THEREFORE

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

That the attached Guidelines are endorsed for use by Dean Search Committees.

Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty
November 11, 1990

Adopted December 14, 1990

SEARCHES FOR DEANS OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Preamble

In an effort to improve the search process for Deans and to promote cooperation and coordination within the University community in this matter, the Faculty Senate Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty recommends the adoption of the following guidelines. These guidelines serve to expand on the procedures stipulated in the Faculty Code.

Background

Based on discussions with various parties involved in recent dean searches, several issues have surfaced which support the adoption of Guidelines for Dean searches. The following list highlights the key points:

Deans play a critical role in relation to university administration, faculty, students, and alumni. Therefore the dean search process should encompass participation of these four groups.

Dean searches are not conducted frequently in any given school or college. As a result these units are unable to develop procedures to facilitate efficient operation of the process.

It is important for faculty search committees to understand what is expected of Deans in our University.

Expeditious processing and review of applications is critical to assure that potentially qualified candidates are not lost from the applicant pool because of earlier job offers from other institutions.

Use of an executive search firm can be useful in developing a large pool of qualified applicants.

Given the large number of persons involved in the dean search process, confidentiality of information about candidates for these positions is critical.

Recommendation

The Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty hereby recommends the adoption of the following Guidelines:

GUIDELINES FOR SEARCHES FOR DEANS OF
THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

All schools and colleges are requested to develop a mechanism for the selection of a committee of students which will play a formal supporting role to the elected faculty search committee. This student committee would have the opportunity to participate in interviews of candidates, reporting their recommendations to the faculty search committee. The identity and mandate of the student committee would be made known to all students in the unit.

All schools and colleges are requested to develop a mechanism for the selection of a committee of alumni which will play a formal supporting role to the elected faculty search committee. This alumni committee would have the opportunity to participate in interviews of candidates, reporting their recommendations to the faculty search committee. The identity and mandate of this alumni committee would be made known to the alumni in the unit.

At the time that faculty search committees are elected by any school or college following the bylaws of that unit, the Vice President for Academic Affairs may name an academic administrator from outside that school or college to participate as an advisor to the committee with regard to the definition of selection criteria, screening of resumes, interviewing of candidates, and other functions of the committee.

Support services for Dean searches will be provided by the office of the Assistant to the Board of Trustees. This office will provide staff assistance for scheduling campus visits for interviews and other administrative services required by the search process. This office will also facilitate the utilization of an executive search firm, should the faculty committee choose to contract for such services.

The Chair of the Dean Search Committee should report at least monthly to the respective faculty and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs on the status of the search.

Each faculty search committee should develop procedures to assure confidentiality of information about candidates for dean positions.

EXHIBIT B to “A Resolution to Amend the *Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code* with Respect to Dean Searches”

RECOMMENDED MODEL

PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES

FOR DEAN SEARCHES

The Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom

April 9, 2012

PREAMBLE:

Article IX.A. of the George Washington University *Faculty Code* and Part C.2.b) of the *Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code* affirm the central role of the Faculty in the dean search process. However, the Faculty Senate recognized in Resolution 90/9, adopted on December 14, 1990, that students and alumni should have an opportunity to advise the Faculty during the dean search process. In addition, the participation of representatives of the University Administration, the School Advisory Council, the Board of Trustees (BOT) and other important stakeholders is desirable in order to ensure the success of the search. The Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom supports an inclusive dean search process that allows all major stakeholders to contribute substantially to the process. To achieve this goal, the Committee recommends the following model dean search principles and procedures, which are based on principles and procedures adopted by the School of Engineering and Applied Science in February 2008:

I. DEFINITIONS:

FACULTY COMMITTEE (FC): A special or standing committee elected by the regular, active status faculty of THE SCHOOL from among THE SCHOOL faculty's tenured members [Faculty Code, Procedures for Implementation of the Faculty Code, Art. C.2.b)]

REPRESENTATIVES (REPS): One representative from each of the following groups will be solicited:

- a. Undergraduate Students
- b. Graduate Students
- c. GW Administration
- d. Board of Trustees
- e. SCHOOL Advisory Council
- f. Alumni

The student representatives will be sought from the STUDENT ORGANIZATION, the Administration representative will be appointed by the EVP for Academic Affairs, the Trustee Representative will be sought from the Chair of the Board of Trustees, the SCHOOL Advisory Council Rep will be sought from the Chair of the SCHOOL Advisory Council, and the Alumni Rep will be sought from the President of the SCHOOL Alumni Association. An individual may serve as the representative for more than one group.

SEARCH FIRM (SF): A firm hired by GW to assist the Search Committee in various administrative tasks.

DEAN SEARCH COMMITTEE (DSC): A committee consisting of three components: The FC, the REPS, and the SF. As the Faculty Code² imposes a special responsibility on the FC [Faculty Code Section IX.A., and Faculty Code Procedures, Part C.2.b)], the FC will be the only component to vote.

CHAIR: A Faculty member elected from among the FC who serves as the representative of the DSC. The Chair is responsible for the coordination and administration of the search. The Chair will prepare reports to the Faculty and the Administration, schedule meetings, coordinate and assign subcommittees, coordinate inputs from representatives and from the search firm, and serve as a liaison with candidates.

II. CHARGE OF COMMITTEE

The DSC is charged to establish criteria for the selection of the dean, consider nominations, and report its recommendations in accordance with the SCHOOL bylaws to the SCHOOL faculty and the President of the University. [Faculty Code. Procedures, Art. C.2.b)]

III. STANDING RULES

- a. Meetings will be conducted according to Robert's Rules of Order.
- b. Votes will be taken by secret ballot upon the request of any member of the FC.
- c. In the event that members of the FC cannot attend a meeting, their votes by proxy are permitted, and should be conveyed directly to the Chair of the DSC prior to the meeting.
- d. Executive sessions may be called by the Chair in which only FC members will participate.
- e. The highest level of confidentiality commensurate with careful scrutiny of candidates shall be maintained. In the early phases of the search, it is expected that the level of confidentiality will be higher than in the later stages.
- f. The Chair will report the progress of the search to the PROVOST monthly or as necessary, and to the Faculty at every scheduled SCHOOL Faculty meeting.
- g. The Chair may call information-gathering meetings with the DSC and appropriate university faculty and administrators in order to be better informed in marketing THE SCHOOL to potential candidates.

IV. CRITERIA [See Faculty Code. Procedures, Art. C.2.b]

- a. An initial draft of the dean search criteria will be created by a subcommittee formed by the Chair, and the draft will be distributed to DSC members. A meeting of the DSC will be called to discuss the criteria.
- b. The FC will consolidate the results of the discussion and will adopt proposed criteria for approval by the regular, active-status SCHOOL faculty.
- c. The resulting Criteria will be presented to the regular, active-status SCHOOL faculty as a resolution at the earliest scheduled meeting, for debate and approval. Once approved, the resulting criteria will serve for the remainder of the search.

V. PROCESS OF SEARCH

- a. The committee will conduct a national search for a dean for the school. With the assistance of SF, it will prepare advertisements to be placed in national professional periodicals and national newspapers requesting nominations and applications for the position of dean.
- b. Funding for the Search will be provided by Academic Affairs.

STAGE 1

- a. Applications and nominations shall be sent to the Office of Academic Affairs, which will place all applications and nominations on Blackboard. Access to Blackboard will be provided to all DSC members. The names of the applicants will be held strictly confidential.
- b. The SF will contact by telephone every person nominated and solicit an application, and shall gather and provide to the DSC background information about each applicant. This information shall be placed in Blackboard under the candidate's file.
- c. The SF will assist the DSC to establish a dean search Web site that will feature information about the search, the position, SCHOOL, and the University.
- d. All members of the DSC will be asked to review all applications. However, in order to ensure that each application receives a thorough and timely review, the Chair shall assign the applications to DSC members for review such that each application will be reviewed by at least three FC members. These reviewers shall present their findings and assessments to the DSC.

The Chair will call periodic meetings of the DSC to discuss the individual applications. Every member of the DSC shall rate each applicant on a scale from 1 to 3, based on the Criteria, where 1 is highly recommended, 2 is recommended, and 3 is not recommended.

- e. After completing the previous step (Step d), the Chair will convene a meeting of the FC to rank the Stage 1 applicants, with the goal of selecting approximately 12-16 candidates for STAGE 2 interviews. The FC's ranking of applicants and selection of candidates for Stage 2 interviews will be based on the ratings and the comments of the DSC members, and on the applications themselves.

STAGE 2

- a. The full DSC shall participate in Stage 2 interviews as provided below. Confidentiality of the names of candidates will be emphasized.
- b. The SF will be asked to obtain at least five telephone references for each of the candidates. The SF will be requested to take careful notes on their finding. These results will be posted on Blackboard.
- c. The SF may be asked to make certain inquiries about the candidates as deemed appropriate.
- d. The SF will prepare a brief prospectus on THE SCHOOL to be given to the candidate. The Chair will consult with the DSC to determine which information is to

be provided.

- e. The initial interviews will be held at a convenient location where the candidate is unlikely to encounter SCHOOL colleagues. These meetings might occur in Rice Hall, Virginia Campus, or in rented space near an airport.
- f. Private meetings with each candidate by each group shall be conducted as follows:
 - a. DSC (1.0 hr)
 - b. FC (0.5 hr)
 - c. Administrative REP (0.5 hr)
 - d. Private meetings with other REPS as requested.
- g. The Chair will convene the DSC to discuss the results of the STAGE 2 interviews.
- h. The Chair will convene a meeting of the FC to rank the Stage 2 candidates and select candidates for Stage 3 consideration, based on the input and discussions of all the DSC members in the previous step (Step g). The goal of the FC will be to select approximately five candidates for STAGE 3 interviews and presentations on campus.

STAGE 3

- a. A detailed Prospectus on THE SCHOOL shall be prepared by the SF in collaboration with the DSC which will be provided to each STAGE 3 candidate.
- b. Each STAGE 3 candidate shall be invited to campus. The following activities may be scheduled:
 - 1. A public seminar, by the dean candidate, on his/her education philosophy, research accomplishments, administrative philosophy, leadership, and vision for THE SCHOOL.
 - 2. Private meeting with DSC
 - 3. Lunch with Department Chairs
 - 4. Meeting with THE SCHOOL Associate Deans and THE SCHOOL Administrative staff
 - 5. Private meetings with faculty of each department.
 - 6. Private meeting with President and PROVOST.
 - 7. Private meeting with students.
 - 8. Private meeting with trustees.
 - 9. Private meeting with NAC members.
 - 10. Private meeting with Alumni.
 - 11. Visit to VA Campus & meeting with AVP for VA Campus.
 - 12. Dinner with DSC.

- c. After each visit, each group will be polled and written evaluations solicited according to the SCHOOL criteria. The Chair will compile these evaluations.
- d. At the conclusion of the STAGE 3 interviews, the DSC will convene to discuss the findings. The FC will then move into executive session and rank the candidates for the purpose of selecting nominees to be recommended to [the Faculty OR the Administration] in accordance with Part C.2.b) of the Faculty Code Procedures and SCHOOL bylaws.
- e. Depending on the ranking, the DSC, in accordance with Faculty Code Procedures, Part C.2.b) and SCHOOL bylaws, will make its recommendation of nominees to [the Faculty OR the Administration]. The DSC will provide a detailed explanation of the reasoning behind its recommendation. The DSC will endeavor to provide [the Faculty OR the Administration] with a recommendation of at least three unranked nominees. However, in the event, for example, that one nominee is not deemed to be comparable to the other two, only two nominees' names may be forwarded for the consideration of [the Faculty OR the Administration].
- f. In the event that [the Faculty OR the Administration] does not find the recommendations acceptable, or the Administration is unable to negotiate favorably with the nominees submitted, the DSC will reevaluate lower-ranked STAGE 3 candidates and (subject to the prior approval of the FC in executive session) may provide additional recommendations. If the DSC considers the remaining candidates in the pool to be unacceptable, the DSC will decide on appropriate further action.

Faculty Senate Libraries Committee interim report, Fall 2012
Minutes of Oct. 19, 2012 meeting

As there are two important library-related processes going forward this year, namely the search for a new University Librarian (UL) and the Provost's Strategic Library Review committee, much of the Committee's attention was focused on getting a sense of what is happening, primarily with the Strategic Review. The Committee was joined at this meeting by members of the Executive Committee of the Librarians' Council, which represents all the professional librarians in Gelman; that group had approached the Senate's Libraries Committee to see whether talking together would prove fruitful.

The Strategic Review Committee has met several times, and has begun to work in subcommittees on specific areas (Budgeting for Access to Academic Resources, Human Interface, and Library[like] Learning Spaces; a fourth subcommittee will work on whatever surveys of faculty and students may come to seem useful). All the subcommittees are including relevant IT concerns as aspects of their areas. These subcommittees aim to prepare the ground for two consultants who have agreed to conduct external reviews of the Gelman system (the consultants are Jim Neal, from Columbia, and Karin Wittenborg, from the University of Virginia); the consultants' visits will probably occur early in 2013. The subcommittees will continue into the spring 2013 semester, helping to draft the final report of the Strategic Review Committee, which is to be completed by the end of that semester.

As for the UL search, a second committee appointed by the Provost is working with a professional "headhunter" firm. Ads and announcements of the vacancy have been placed, and the search committee will soon begin evaluating applications. Finalists are to visit the campus in January and/or February, 2013. The plan is that the incoming UL would be able to help shape the Strategic Review Committee's report.

Information gathered so far reveals that Gelman has been hampered by low funding for many years; symptoms include GW's consistently ranking in the top 5 of heaviest users of Inter-Library Loan (ILL) among Association of Research Libraries (ARL) libraries, and our being the heaviest borrower of materials through the Washington Research Libraries Consortium (WRLC). Anecdotal evidence suggests many faculty, and perhaps also graduate students, routinely turn to outside sources in order to obtain the materials they need to conduct their research. It also seems to be the case that various departments, programs, and schools of the University acquire datasets and other material through separate fundraising or grant activity, with the result that resources that might be of use to a range of researchers are only available to specific subsets of the University.

Other problems include the fact that many faculty members are to some degree at least unaware of the current capabilities for research provided through Gelman, and the fact that at least some apparently free materials are actually being provided through Gelman, though not "branded" so as to reveal the fact. (J-STOR, for instance, a primary source of full-text articles in many humanities fields, reports that 80% of its use at GW comes

through Google searches that they honor – and then charge for – because those searches originate from GW IP addresses.)

The Committee's discussion was certainly enriched by the presence of professional librarians from the Librarians' Council, and we hope to include them in future meetings of the Committee.

Finally, the Committee received an impromptu tour of the renovation work underway on Gelman's new entrance floor – the current second floor – which promises to be a very exciting and useful transformation, slated to be ready for the Fall 2013 semester.

David McAleavey, English (Chair)

Simon Berkovich, Engineering and Applied Science

Vincy Fon, Economics

Carmen Gomez, Theatre and Dance

Chunlei Liang, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering

Non-voting:

Steve Ehrmann, Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning

Anne Linton, Director, Library Services, Himmelfarb Health Sciences Library

Scott Pagel, Director, Law Library

Andrea Stewart, Interim University Librarian