

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

The Faculty Senate

April 5, 2012

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, April 13, 2012 at 2:10 p.m. in the State Room, 1957 E Street, N.W., 7th Floor

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Short recess for the purpose of having a group photograph taken of the 2011-12 Faculty Senate
3. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of March 9, 2012 (minutes to be distributed)
4. **A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN TO CLARIFY THE ALLOCATION OF SEATS FOR SCHOOLS ON THE FACULTY SENATE (11/2)**
Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr., Chair, Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (Resolution 11/2 is attached along with the Minority Report of the Committee which includes on page 13 the minority resolution defeated in Committee)
5. Introduction of Resolutions
6. Update on the Athletics and Recreation Strategic Plan: Athletics Director Patrick Nero
7. Update on the University Budget: Professor Joseph Cordes, Chair, Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee
8. General Business:
 - a) Nominations for election of members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for the 2012-13 Session:

Professor Michael Castleberry (GSEHD) as Chair;
Professors Kimberly Acquaviva (SON), Bruce Dickson (ESIA), Roger Fairfax (Law), Charles Garris (SEAS), Alan Greenberg (SPHHS), David McAleavey (CCAS), Scheherazade Rehman (SB), and Robert Shesser (SMHS)
 - b) Nominations for election of five faculty members to the Dispute Resolution Committee: Professor Kurt J. Darr (SPHHS) as Chair for a one-year term; Professors Ravi S. Achrol (SB), Brian L. Biles, (SPHHS), Patrick Cook (CCAS), Milos Doroslovacki (SEAS), and Robert W. Tuttle (GWLS) for a three-year term to end May 1, 2015

- c) Nomination for re-appointment by the President of Professor Steve Charnovitz as Parliamentarian for the 2012-13 Session
 - d) Report of the Executive Committee: Michael S. Castleberry, Chair
 - e) Annual Reports of Senate Standing Committees
 - f) Provost's Remarks
 - g) Chair's Remarks
9. Brief Statements (and Questions)
10. Adjournment

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

**A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN TO CLARIFY THE ALLOCATION
OF SEATS FOR SCHOOLS ON THE FACULTY SENATE (11/2)**

- WHEREAS,** Article III, Section 2, subsection (a) (3) of The George Washington University Faculty Organization Plan was last amended by action of the University’s Board of Trustees on October 21, 2011, to read as follows:
- “The faculty members of the Senate shall be elected by and from their faculties as follows: the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, nine; the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, School of Engineering and Applied Science, School of Business, School of Medicine and Health Sciences, and Law School, three each; the Elliott School of International Affairs and the School of Public Health and Health Services, two each; and the School of Nursing, one. The faculty members shall be professors, associate professors, or assistant professors in full-time service who have tenure as of the academic year next succeeding the date of election....”;
- WHEREAS,** the Faculty Senate plays a crucial role in shared governance at the University; and
- WHEREAS,** the Faculty Senate considers that shared governance is strengthened when implemented through a senate rather than a proportional representation approach; and
- WHEREAS,** the historical allocation of seats on the Faculty Senate has reflected a general tendency towards allocating three Senators per School, with the exception of smaller allocations of seats for certain schools that were in the early stages of their organization; and
- WHEREAS,** the allocation of three senators per School is considered beneficial since it allows for a rotation of School representatives on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, incorporates a broader diversity of views from each School, and ensures continuous representation for each School despite any scheduling difficulties that individual Senators might experience;
- WHEREAS,** the Faculty Senate believes that nine seats should be allocated to the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences (CCAS), in recognition of the fact that CCAS consists of three major divisions (humanities, social sciences, and mathematics and physical sciences); and
- WHEREAS,** the Faculty Senate believes that the above-described approach will produce a well-functioning deliberative body that will be successful in serving the needs of the University’s Schools, their faculties, and the University as a whole; and

WHEREAS, Article III, Section 2, subsection (a) (3) of The George Washington University Faculty Organization Plan fails to explain the rationale behind the historical and/or current allocation of seats on the Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, The George Washington University Faculty Organization Plan plays a significant role in ensuring the preservation of the Faculty Senate as a strong deliberative body; and as such, it should be written in a manner that is clear, fair, and able to stand the test of time; **NOW, THEREFORE,**

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

(1) That Article III, Section 2, subsection (a) (3) of The George Washington University Faculty Organization Plan be amended to read as follows, with such amendment to take effect commencing with the 2013-2014 session of the Faculty Senate:

“The faculty members of the Senate shall be elected by and from their faculties as follows: the Columbian College of Arts and Science, nine seats (reflecting an allotment of 3 seats per major “division”); the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, 3 seats; the School of Engineering and Applied Science, 3 seats; the School of Business, 3 seats; the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, 3 seats; the Law School, 3 seats; the Elliott School of International Affairs, 3 seats; the School of Public Health and Health Services, 3 seats; and the School of Nursing, 3 seats. The faculty members shall be professors, associate professors, or assistant professors in full-time service who have tenure as of the academic year next succeeding the date of election....”;

(2) That, upon adoption by the University’s Board of Trustees of the foregoing amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan, the Faculty Handbook should be revised to reflect the change set forth in that amendment.

(3) That the President, as Chairman of the Faculty Assembly, is petitioned to place on the agenda of the Faculty Assembly at its meeting on October 2, 2012, the foregoing proposed amendments to the Faculty Organization Plan.

(4) That, upon approval by the Faculty Assembly, the President is requested to forward the foregoing proposed amendments to the Faculty Organization Plan for final approval by the Board of Trustees as soon as conveniently possible.

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom

March 6, 2012

Minority Report

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF)

April 3, 2012

General Statement

Four members of the PEAFF Committee dissented from the Committee's vote to approve "A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Organization Plan to Clarify the Allocation of Seats for Schools in the Faculty Senate." The Committee's vote (7-4) was relatively close, reflecting a fundamental philosophical disagreement as to the best way to structure representation on the Faculty Senate for schools and their tenure-track faculty. The majority believes that the Faculty Senate should follow a strict senatorial model, and each school should therefore receive an equal representation of three senators (except for the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, which should receive nine senators in view of its three major divisions of humanities, social sciences, and mathematical and physical sciences).

The minority believes that the strict senatorial model creates very significant and undesirable disparities among the schools with regard to the representation of tenure-track faculty on the Faculty Senate. For example, the proposed resolution would provide the School of Nursing (which has fewer than 15 tenure-track faculty members) with representation on the Faculty Senate that is equal to the School of Business (which has more than 100 tenure-track faculty members) and the School of Medicine and Health Sciences including the MFA (which has more than 90 tenure-track and approximately 300 full-time, active status faculty members). The minority is concerned that the exclusion of any consideration of proportional representation from the Faculty Senate might well cause schools with large tenure-track faculties to disfavor the Senate as a forum for their participation in University governance.

The Faculty Organization Plan already follows the strict senatorial model with regard to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, where each school receives equal representation of one senator. In addition, the Administration gives each school equal representation on the Dean's Council. Accordingly, the minority believes that representation on the Faculty Senate should reflect, to an appropriate degree, the number of tenure-track faculty within each school. The minority proposed that each school should receive a minimum of two faculty members in order to ensure each school's ability to rotate its representatives on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. As explained in its proposed resolution (Attachment 1 to this minority report, which was defeated by a vote of 4-7), the minority recommended that additional senators should be allocated among the various schools based on the number of tenure-track faculty within each school. As a result, the Senate would become somewhat larger and would follow a hybrid model of representation that would encourage a greater diversity of representation by discipline, gender and race. In the minority's view, the Faculty Senate is the primary forum that enables the University's tenured faculty (its longest-serving stakeholders) to take an active role in University governance. Therefore, representation on the Faculty Senate should be structured to encourage a greater range and diversity of participation by the tenure-track faculty of the various schools.

A more detailed explanation of the minority's reasoning appears below.

I. **Analysis**

a. **What are (or should be) the role and objectives of the GWU Faculty Senate?**

Within the overall University there are numerous stakeholders (1) students, (2) alumni, (3) Schools and Departments (with administrative structures, agenda, authority, and resources), (4) University Administrators (with more authority, larger agendas, and resources), (5) employees (who provide important services but who can be hired and fired), (6) non-tenure track faculty, and (7) tenured and tenure track faculty (who often have career long commitments to the University and who have important employment protections). Each of the above groups has mechanisms for making their views known and exerting influence on the University Administration.

Our view is that the University Senate is (or should be) the primary mechanism by which the University tenured faculty participate actively in University governance. In view of that mission, the Senate should consider and reflect appropriately the diversity of the faculty in terms of disciplines, gender, and race as well as the interests of their respective Schools and other University stakeholders (students, alumni, and other University employees).

b. **To achieve the identified roles and objectives of the GWU Faculty Senate it is important to define an appropriate structure.**

Decisions on structural issues have very long-term impacts. We have no reason to believe that any one group of faculty is smarter, wiser, or fairer than others. In principle, and with a long term view, we believe that it is best to place our faith in the faculty as a whole. Some understandably argue for proportional representation (similar to the U.S. House of Representatives). Others argue for equal representation for each school (similar to the U.S. Senate) regardless of the number of tenured and tenure track faculty, number of students taught, revenues generated and contribution to the general University budget. ***Given that G.W. has a single body to represent the faculty, we believe that a middle ground is appropriate where all Schools receive a minimum representation of two Senators and additional Senators are allocated across the schools in a manner roughly proportional to the sizes of their tenured and tenure track faculty. Table 1 illustrates the methodology assuming that the target number of Senators is 40.***

Table 1: Illustrative Methodology for Calculating the Number of Senators per School

Input Assumptions																										
Target Total Number of Senators																										
Minimum Number of Senators Per School																										
Allocation of Senate Seats for NTA faculty																										
Column																										
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14													
	Number of Tenure Track Faculty (Fall 2010)	Minimum Number of Senators	School's Percentage of Total Tenure Track Faculty	Does School Qualify for Additional Faculty Senate Seats?	Number of Tenure Track Faculty in Schools that Qualify for Additional Senate Seats	Estimated Number of Additional Senate Seats Allocated to Schools	Final Number of Additional Senate Seats Allocated to Schools	Total Senate Seats By School (Formula)	TTF per Senator (Formula)	Total Senate Seats By School (Executive Committee Consensus)	TTF per Senator (Executive Committee Consensus)	Total Senate Seats By School (Current)	TTF per Senator (Current)	Column 9 - Column 11	Column 10 - Column 12											
School																									School	
CCAS	322	2	39.36%	yes	322	8.79	9	11	29.3	12	26.8	9	35.8	-1	2.4	CCAS										
ESIA	42	2	5.13%	yes	42	1.15	1	3	14.0	2	21.0	2	21.0	1	-7.0	ESIA										
SB	105	2	12.84%	yes	105	2.87	3	5	21.0	4	26.3	3	35.0	1	-5.3	SB										
SEAS	75	2	9.17%	yes	75	2.05	2	4	18.8	3	25.0	3	25.0	1	-6.3	SEAS										
GSEHD	45	2	5.50%	yes	45	1.23	1	3	15.0	3	15.0	3	15.0	0	0.0	GSEHD										
LAW	75	2	9.17%	yes	75	2.05	2	4	18.8	3	25.0	3	25.0	1	-6.3	LAW										
CPS	1	0	0.12%	no	0	0.00	0	0						0	0.0	CPS										
SMHS/MFA	91	2	11.12%	yes	91	2.48	3	5	18.2	4	22.8	3	30.3	1	-4.6	SMHS										
SON	11	2	1.34%	no	0	0.00	0	2	5.5	2	5.5	1	11.0	0	0.0	SON										
SPHHS	51	2	6.23%	yes	51	1.39	1	3	17.0	2	25.5	2	25.5	1	-8.5	SPHHS										
NTA		0		no	0	0.00	0	0		3	0.0			-3		NTA										
TOTAL TTF	818	18			806	22.00	22.00	40	20.5	38	21.5	29	28.2	2	-1.1	TOTAL										

Note: The TTF per school are those reported by Assistant Provost Dianne Martin.

c. Is the current Structure of the Senate adequate? Do we need a change?

The current structure of the G.W.U. Senate is given in Table 1 below.

Table 2: Analysis of the Number of Senators and TTF by School

Column 1	2	3	4	5	6
	Number of Tenure Track Faculty (Fall 2011)	Total Senate Seats By School (Current)	School's Percentage of Total Tenure Track Faculty	School's Percentage of Total Senate Seats	Ratio of Percentage of Senate Seats to Percentage of TTF (Column 5/ Column 4)
School					
CCAS	322	9	39.36%	31.03%	0.79
ESIA	42	2	5.13%	6.90%	1.34
SB	105	3	12.84%	10.34%	0.81
SEAS	75	3	9.17%	10.34%	1.13
GSEHD	45	3	5.50%	10.34%	1.88
LAW	75	3	9.17%	10.34%	1.13
CPS	1		0.12%	0.00%	0.00
SMHS/MFA	91	3	11.12%	10.34%	0.93
SON	11	1	1.34%	3.45%	2.56
SPHHS	51	2	6.23%	6.90%	1.11
NTA					
TOTAL TTF	818	29	100.00%	100.00%	1.00

Note: The TTF per school are those reported by Assistant Provost Dianne Martin.

The above information indicates that the CCAS, SB, and SMHS/MFA are under-represented while ESIA, GSEHD, and particularly the SON are over-represented relative to the size of their total tenure track faculty. Nevertheless there are strong parallels between the size of the TTF and the number of Senate seats in the various schools.

A simple linear regression of Total Number of Senators versus Total TTF by School finds the following relationship:

<i>Regression Statistics</i>								
Multiple R	0.977887647							
R Square	0.95626425							
Adjusted R Square	0.950797282							
Standard Error	0.527511807							
Observations	10							
<i>ANOVA</i>								
	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance F</i>			
Regression	1	48.67385035	48.67385	174.9167	1.01847E-06			
Residual	8	2.226149654	0.278269					
Total	9	50.9						
	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>Lower 95%</i>	<i>Upper 95%</i>	<i>Lower 95.0%</i>	<i>Upper 95.0%</i>
Intercept	0.799820151	0.230311065	3.472782	0.008408	0.268721881	1.33091842	0.268722	1.33091842
Total TTF by School	0.02567457	0.001941277	13.22561	1.02E-06	0.021197977	0.03015116	0.021198	0.030151163

Thus, approximately 95% of the variation in the number of senate seats per school is accounted for by variation in the number of TTF per school. ***While there are structures that would produce a closer alignment between the number of senators and the number of TTF by school, the current structure is a plausible alternative and should not be discarded out of hand.***

d. Is the size and diversity of the Senate appropriate?

Table 3 below gives an analysis of the distribution of Senators by department.

Table 3: Fall 2011 Tenure Track Faculty by School and Department*									
School	Department	Count	Total	Current Number of Senators	Senators 2011-12 SESSION (http://www.gwu.edu/~facsen/faculty_senate/pdf/Roster.pdf)	Senators per TTF (%) By Department	Senators per TTF (%) By School	Departments with 11 or more TTF and zero senators (0=no, 1=yes)	Total Number of Departments with 11 or more TTF and zero senators (0=no, 1=yes)
BUSINESS SCHOOL	ACCOUNTANCY	16				0.00%			1
BUSINESS SCHOOL	DECISION SCIENCES	11		1	Philip W. Wirtz	9.09%			0
BUSINESS SCHOOL	FINANCE	16		1	Theodore M. Barnhill	6.25%			0
BUSINESS SCHOOL	INFO SYS TECH MGT	7				0.00%			0
BUSINESS SCHOOL	INTERNATIONAL BUS	15		1	Scheherazade Rehman	6.67%			0
BUSINESS SCHOOL	MANAGEMENT	11				0.00%			1
BUSINESS SCHOOL	MARKETING	9				0.00%			0
BUSINESS SCHOOL	STRAT MGT&PUB POL	13				0.00%			1
BUSINESS SCHOOL	TOURISM&HOSP MGT	7				0.00%			0
			105	3			2.86%		3
COLL OF PROF STUDIES	GSPM	1				0.00%			0
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	AMERICAN STUDIES	12				0.00%			1
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	ANTHROPOLOGY	12				0.00%			1
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	BIOLOGICAL SCI	19		1	Diana L. Lipscomb	5.26%			0
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	CHEMISTRY	13				0.00%			1
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	CLASS&SEMITIC L&L	7				0.00%			0
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	E ASIA LANG & LIT	3				0.00%			0
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	ECONOMICS	21		3	Joseph J. Cordes, Donald O. Parsons, Anthony M. Yezer	14.29%			0
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	ENGLISH	28		1	David W. McAleavey	3.57%			0
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	FINE ARTS&ART HIS	13		1	Dean Kessmann	7.69%			0
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	FORENSIC SCIENCE	4				0.00%			0
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	GEOGRAPHY	6		1	Marie D. Price	16.67%			0
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	HISTORY	20				0.00%			1
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	JUDAIC STUDIES	1				0.00%			0
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	MATHEMATICS	14				0.00%			1
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	MEDIA & PUB AFF	14				0.00%			1
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	MUSIC	4				0.00%			0
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	ORG SCI & COMM	6				0.00%			0
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	PHILOSOPHY	8		1	Jeffrey C. Brand-Ballard	12.50%			0
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	PHYSICS	14				0.00%			1
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	POLITICAL SCIENCE	22				0.00%			1
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	PSYCHOLOGY	19				0.00%			1
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	PUB POL&PUB ADM	12		1	Kathryn Newcomer	8.33%			0
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	RELIGION	7				0.00%			0
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	ROM,GERM&SLAV L&L	13				0.00%			1
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	SOCIOLOGY	7				0.00%			0
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	SPEECH/HEARING SC	6				0.00%			0
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	STATISTICS	12				0.00%			1
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE	THEATRE & DANCE	5				0.00%			0
			323	9			2.79%		11
ELLIOTT SCHOOL	INT AFFAIRS	42		2	Bruce Dickson (Political Science and International Affairs), Peter F. Klarén (History and International Affairs)		4.76%		0
ENGIN & APPLIED SCI	CIVIL&ENVIR ENGR	9				0.00%			0
ENGIN & APPLIED SCI	COMPUTER SCIENCE	16				0.00%			1
ENGIN & APPLIED SCI	EE & COMPTR ENGR	22		2	Robert J. Harrington, Hermann J. Helgert	9.09%			0
ENGIN & APPLIED SCI	ENGR MGT&SYS ENGR	13				0.00%			1
ENGIN & APPLIED SCI	MECH&AEROSP ENGR	15		1	Charles A. Garris, Jr.	6.67%			0
			75	3			4.00%		2
GRAD ED & HUMAN DEV	COUNSEL/HUMAN DEV	8				0.00%			0
GRAD ED & HUMAN DEV	CURRIC & PEDAGOGY	5				0.00%			0
GRAD ED & HUMAN DEV	EDUC LEADERSHIP	19		2	Michael D. Corry , James H. Williams	10.53%			0
GRAD ED & HUMAN DEV	HUMAN & ORG LEARN	6				0.00%			0
GRAD ED & HUMAN DEV	SPEC ED&DISAB STU	7		1	Michael S. Castleberry	14.29%			0
			45	3			6.67%		0

Table 3: Continued

LAW SCHOOL	LAW	75							1
			75	3	Roger A. Fairfax (criminal law, constitutional and adjudicatory criminal procedure), Miriam Galston (legal theory, the history of legal ideas, and public policy issues affecting exempt organizations), Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr. (banking law, American constitutional history, and corporate law).			4.00%	
MEDICINE	ANATOMY	11					0.00%		1
MEDICINE	BIOCHEMISTRY	15					0.00%		1
MEDICINE	CLIN RSCH&LEADSHP	5					0.00%		0
MEDICINE	EMERGENCY MED	2		1	Robert M. Shesser		50.00%		0
MEDICINE	HEALTH CARE SCI	6					0.00%		0
MEDICINE	INTNL PUBLC HLTH	1		1	Peter J. Hotez		100.00%		0
MEDICINE	MEDICINE	16		1	Gary L. Simon		6.25%		0
MEDICINE	MICROBIOLOGY	6		0			0.00%		0
MEDICINE	NEUROLOGY	1					0.00%		0
MEDICINE	OBSTET & GYN	2					0.00%		0
MEDICINE	ORTHOPEID SURGERY	1					0.00%		0
MEDICINE	PATHOLOGY	7					0.00%		0
MEDICINE	PHARM/PHYSIOLOGY	10					0.00%		0
MEDICINE	PSYCH & BEHAV SCI	3					0.00%		0
MEDICINE	RADIOLOGY	3					0.00%		0
MEDICINE	SURGERY	2					0.00%		0
		includes MFA	91	3				3.30%	2
PUBLIC HLTH&HLTH SVC	ENVIR OCCUP HLTH	4					0.00%		0
PUBLIC HLTH&HLTH SVC	EPIDEMIOLOG&BIOSTAT	9		1	Alan E. Greenberg		11.11%		0
PUBLIC HLTH&HLTH SVC	EXERCISE SCIENCE	3					0.00%		0
PUBLIC HLTH&HLTH SVC	GLOBAL HEALTH	4					0.00%		0
PUBLIC HLTH&HLTH SVC	HEALTH POLICY	15		1	Leighton Ku		6.67%		0
PUBLIC HLTH&HLTH SVC	HLTH SVC MGT&LEAD	4					0.00%		0
PUBLIC HLTH&HLTH SVC	PREVENT&COMM HLTH	12					0.00%		1
			51	2				3.92%	0
SCHOOL OF NURSING	NURSING	11		1				9.09%	
Total GW Faculty			818	29				3.55%	19

Table 3 lists 71 departments plus three schools that do not have departments. Of the 71 departments 19 have at least one senator. Thus, 52 (71-19) departments do not have a senator. Of these 52 departments, there are 19 departments with more than 10 tenure track faculty not having direct representation on the Senate, including Accountancy, American Studies, Anatomy, Anthropology, Biochemistry, Chemistry, Computer Science, Engineering Management and Systems Engineering, History, Management, Mathematics, Media and Public Affairs, Physics, Political Science, Preventive and Community Health, Psychology, Romance, German, and Slavic Languages, Statistics, and Strategic Management and Public Policy.

In our opinion, the Senate would be stronger if it had the expertise, voices, and votes of a larger and more diverse group of our colleagues drawn from a variety of disciplines. Encouragement should also be given for broad representation by gender and race. Moving to a total senate size of 40 or more would allow for the possibility of representation from a number of departments not currently represented.

e. Has the issue of the size and allocation of Senators across schools been addressed in the past?

After a search of University archive information, Professor Kim Acquaviva found that:

In 1956, the "Committee on Composition, Responsibility and Functions of the University Faculty and the Academic Council" put forward its formal recommendations regarding the creation of the Faculty Senate. The report sheds light on the origins and organization of the Faculty Senate, as well as on the intent of the founders regarding the allocation of seats:

Prior to the creation of the Faculty Council, there was an "Academic Council" consisting of "administrative officers and two full-time faculty members elected by the faculty of each school" (p.4)

In 1956, the Committee undertook a study of the practices of Universities nationwide and documented that research on pages 7-9 of the attached report. As you will see on page 8, the Committee discovered with regards to "proportional representation" that 156 institutions did NOT take this approach and 76 institutions had SOME degree of proportional representation.

The Committee summarized the data collected and presented a list of "most-used practice[s], beginning with the following two items of relevance to our discussions in PEAf: "(1) Has a general faculty **without proportional representation**, (2) **in the form of a Senate...**"(p. 9).

Based on the extensive research and deliberations, the Committee ultimately recommended:

"That a University Senate consisting of elected delegates from the faculties and certain ex officio members should be formed as the representative body of the University Faculty" (p. 10).

Furthermore, the Committee wrote that "the University Senate shall be constituted as follows:

Membership

a) The President of the University, the Dean of Faculties, the Secretary of the Assembly and the Deans of the Schools, Colleges, and Divisions of the University shall be members of the University Senate ex officio.

b) There shall, in addition to the above, **be two members of the University Senate elected by the Faculty of each School, College and Division of the University where such exists**" (p.11)

As far as we can determine, the above recommendation has not been followed in the Faculty Senate for most of its history. As shown below, the Senate has not provided equal representation for schools at least since 1965.

f. How as the Senate actually been constituted historically?

The earliest record we have found to date is that in 1965 the Senate was comprised as shown in Table 4 below:

Table 4: Structure of the Senate in 1965

Schools (1965)	Number of Senators (1965)
CCAS	9
Education	3
Engineering and Applied Science	3
Law	3
Medicine	3
Government, Business, and International Affairs	2
Graduate Council	1
Total	24

Thus, for most of its history the Faculty Senate has not provided an equal number of senators per school as recommended in the 1956 report. Nine senators have been allocated to CCAS since at least 1965, and some Schools have received fewer than three senators. For example, ESIA, SPHHS and SON each received one senator upon their initial formation. ESIA and SPHHS have subsequently received a second senator, but none of the three schools has received a third senator.

g. What was the distribution of faculty by school in 1965?

We do not currently have the distribution of faculty by school in 1965. The distributions of faculty by school in 1962-63 and 1974-75 are given in Tables 5a and 5b below:

Table 5a – Number of Faculty Listed as Full, Associate, and Assistant Professor in The George Washington University Bulletin 1962-63

	Number of Full, Associate, and Assistant Professors
CCAS	162
School of Education	34
School of Engineering	25
School of Government, Business, and International Affairs	65
The School of Medicine (and School of Pharmacy)	38 (plus 7 clinical)
NLC	27
Graduate Council	81

Table 5b

1974-75 Tenure/Tenure-Track Faculty			
		TOTAL	TENURED
CCAS/GSAS		242	172
SEHD		46	34
SEAS		32	24
SGBA		55	35
MED		386	140
GWU		220	96
AFFIL		166	44
NLC		33	31
SPIA		16	12
TOTAL		810	448
From WorkForce Analysis			

The 1962-63 data on faculty sizes are consistent with Education, Engineering, Medicine, and Law initially having the same number of senators in 1965 (i.e. consistent with proportional representation). The data on faculty sizes are also consistent with CCAS having many more senators (indeed, the CCAS' allocation of nine senators in 1965 was close to proportional representation based on the 1962-63

data). The reasons for Business, Government, and International Affairs getting only two seats and for the Graduate Council receiving only one seat are not clear.

The 1974-75 Data on Tenure/Tenure-Track Faculty (below) are similarly consistent with SEHD, SEAS, and NLC having the same number of senators in 1965 (i.e. consistent with proportional representation). The 1974-75 data on faculty sizes are also consistent with CCAS having many more senators in 1965 (i.e., close to proportional). The reason for Business, Government, and International Affairs getting only two seats is not clear. The School of Medicine was clearly underrepresented in 1974-75, for reasons that also are not clear from the historical record. The lack of greater representation for the Medical School may have resulted in part from the fact that the Medical Center had its own Senate until 2011.

h. Should students taught and revenues generated be considered as relevant factors in determining the number of senators from particular schools?

Our view is that the senate is primarily the mechanism by which the tenured faculty interacts with the Administration. That said we believe that the positions taken by the Senate should come from a perspective of what is in the best interests of the entire University and other stakeholders, including students, alumni, non-tenure track faculty and other University employees.

For illustrative purposes, we have attached, as Schedules 1 and 2 to this report, tables showing enrollments and total credit hours taught per school during the Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 semesters. Those tables indicate that (i) CCAS has the largest enrollments and credit hours taught by a substantial margin, (ii) SB and ESIA have the next largest enrollments and credit hours taught, (iii) GSEHD, Law, SEAS, SMHS and SPHHS have substantial enrollments and credit hours taught, and (iv) SON has much smaller enrollments and credit hours taught compared to the other schools.

Data on revenues generated, operating budgets, and contribution to the University overhead by school is not currently available. We will provide this information if it becomes available.

Senate representation has not reflected the numbers of students taught by, or revenues generated by, the various schools. In contrast, the senates of some other Universities do allocate representation among their schools based (at least in part) on such factors. A case could be made that these factors should be considered in the allocation of Senate seats.

We do not make such a recommendation, but we do note that an allocation of Senate seats that reflects, at least in part, the size of the tenure-track faculty of each school can serve as a proxy for these other factors, which are very significant for the long-term welfare of the University. For example, in deciding on the allocation of tenure-track faculty positions across the various schools, the Board of Trustees and the Administration do take into account the number of students enrolled in, and the amount of revenue generated by, each school.

i. How should Senators be allocated to the School of Medicine and Health Science and MFA?

The School of Medicine and Health Sciences and the Medical Faculty Associates have special features that need to be addressed. The MFA is a non-profit corporation that administers the faculty medical practice plan. Although there are more than 500 physicians in the MFA, there are approximately 300 physicians in the MFA who are also full-time faculty of the University. (These physicians are not simply clinical faculty members. That is a distinctly different group of physicians who teach as part-time faculty, and most of them are in private practice.) More than 20 years ago, a decision was made that all faculty members in the clinical departments in SMHS who were hired after 1985 would not be granted tenure, with a few exceptions for individuals who were appointed with tenure. Thus, at the present time, most full-time faculty in the MFA are not eligible for tenure.

The appropriate representation of SMHS and MFA in the Faculty Senate is a topic that deserves more information and discussion if we move to CHANGE the manner in which the Senate is structured. While we believe that it may be desirable to grant “tenure while employed at the MFA,” to additional full-time MFA faculty with the appropriate qualifications, the University has not yet made a decision to do this.

Although the clinical budget of the MFA is outside of the University, there are many budgetary ties between the University and the MFA. All federally funded research at the MFA goes through the University. There is a Memorandum of Understanding between the MFA and the University regarding fundraising. In addition, since the incorporation of the MFA into a separate non-profit corporation, the MFA has transferred \$27.5 million to the University in the form of a “Dean’s tax.”

Thus, the question of how the MFA faculty should be represented in the Faculty Senate has not been fully resolved, in part because there is a pending proposal to provide a path to tenure for qualified full-time MFA faculty and thereby provide an option that has not been open to them since 1985. The total number of tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Basic Science and Health Care Science departments, plus the tenured and non-tenured active status faculty in the MFA is probably greater than 300. Given the uncertainties regarding the pending proposal to provide “tenure while employed at the MFA,” we believe it is prudent to allocate 5 Senators to SMHS (including the MFA) at this point.

j. Minority Proposal for the Allocation of Senate Representation among the Schools

See Attachment 1 (alternative resolution proposed by the minority).

Theodore M. Barnhill

Kurt J. Darr

Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr.

Attachment 1

PEAF Committee Minority Proposal

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN TO CLARIFY THE ALLOCATION OF SEATS FOR SCHOOLS ON THE FACULTY SENATE

WHEREAS, Article III, Section 2, subsection (a) (3) of The George Washington University Faculty Organization Plan was last amended by action of the University’s Board of Trustees on October 21, 2011, to read as follows:

“The faculty members of the Senate shall be elected by and from their faculties as follows: the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, nine; the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, School of Engineering and Applied Science, School of Business, School of Medicine and Health Sciences, and Law School, three each; the Elliot School of International Affairs and the School of Public Health and Health Services, two each; and the School of Nursing, one. The faculty members shall be professors, associate professors, or assistant professors in full-time service who have tenure as of the academic year next succeeding the date of election....”;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate plays a crucial role in shared governance at the University; and

WHEREAS shared governance is strengthened by the diversity of discipline and experience manifested by the University faculty;

WHEREAS to be effective the Faculty Senate needs to be viewed by all parties as fairly representing the entire University faculty;

WHEREAS as shown in Attachment 1 to this resolution [see Table 2 above], the current allocation of Senate seats results in a wide range of faculty per Senator across schools resulting in over representation of the voices and opinions of some faculties and under representation of other faculties;

WHEREAS as shown in Attachment 2 to this resolution [see Table 3 above], the current allocation of Senate seats results in a large number of small and large departments having no direct representation on the Senate;

WHEREAS there are 19 departments with more than 10 tenure track faculty not having direct representation on the Senate currently including Accountancy, American Studies, Anatomy, Anthropology, Biochemistry, Chemistry, Computer Science, Engineering Management and Systems Engineering, History, Health Services

Management and Leadership, Management, Mathematics, Media and Public Affairs, Physics, Political Science, Preventive and Community Health, Psychology, Romance, German, and Slavic Languages, Statistics, and Strategic Management and Public Policy;

WHEREAS the current allocation of Senate seats denies the Senate the opportunity to hear directly from our colleagues in many disciplines and raises questions as to whether the Senate accurately represents the views of the entire University faculty;

WHEREAS the current allocation of Senate seats denies the Senate the benefit of the votes of our colleagues in many disciplines and raises questions as to whether the Senate accurately represents the views of the entire University faculty;

WHEREAS the allocation of a minimum of two senators per school is considered beneficial since it allows for rotation to the Executive Committee;

WHEREAS, Article III, Section 2, subsection (a) (3) of The George Washington University Faculty Organization Plan fails to explain the rationale behind the historical and/or current allocation of seats on the Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, The George Washington University Faculty Organization Plan plays a significant role in ensuring the preservation of the Faculty Senate as a strong deliberative body; and as such, it should be written in a manner that is clear, fair, and able to stand the test of time; **NOW, THEREFORE,**

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

(1) That Article III, Section 2, subsection (a) (3) of The George Washington University Faculty Organization Plan be amended to read as follows, with such amendment to take effect commencing with the 2013-2014 session of the Faculty Senate:

“The faculty members of the Senate shall be elected by and from their faculties as follows: the Columbian College of Arts and Science, 11 seats; the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, 3 seats; the School of Engineering and Applied Science, 4 seats; the School of Business, 5 seats; the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, 5 seats; the Law School, 4 seats; the Elliot School of International Affairs, 3 seats; the School of Public Health and Health Services, 3 seats; and the School of Nursing, 2 seats. The faculty members shall be professors, associate professors, or assistant professors in full-time service who have tenure as of the academic year next succeeding the date of election....”;

- (2) That, upon adoption by the University's Board of Trustees of the foregoing amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan, the Faculty Handbook should be revised to reflect the change set forth in that amendment.
- (3) That the President, as Chairman of the Faculty Assembly, is petitioned to place on the agenda of the Faculty Assembly at its meeting on October 2, 2012, the foregoing proposed amendments to the Faculty Organization Plan.
- (4) That, upon approval by the Faculty Assembly, the President is requested to forward the foregoing proposed amendments to the Faculty Organization Plan for final approval by the Board of Trustees as soon as conveniently possible.

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom

Minority Proposal (defeated by a vote of 4-7)

March 6, 2012

		Enrollment				Continuing Research	Credit Hours				Continuing Research	Average Hours Spring 2012	Average Hours Spring 2011
		Spring 2012	Spring 2011	Change			Spring 2012	Spring 2011	Change				
				#	%				#	%			
UG-FT	CCAS	4,761	4,752	9	0.2		71,633	71,923	-290	-0.4		15.0458	15.1353
	SEAS	635	607	28	4.6		10,016	9,663	353	3.7		15.7732	15.9193
	SB	1,449	1,402	47	3.4		21,914	21,551	363	1.7		15.1235	15.3716
	ESIA	1,943	2,010	-67	-3.3		29,179	30,416	-1,237	-4.1		15.0175	15.1323
	CPS	26	11	15	136.4		344	132	212	160.6		13.2308	12.0000
	TOTAL	8,814	8,782	32	0.4		133,086	133,685	-599	-0.4		15.0994	15.2226
UG-PT	CCAS	211	210	1	0.5		1,584	1,527	57	3.7		7.5071	7.2714
	SEAS	28	18	10	55.6		200	132	68	51.5		7.1429	7.3333
	SB	51	40	11	27.5		377	305	72	23.6		7.3922	7.6250
	ESIA	66	68	-2	-2.9		482	497	-15	-3.0		7.3030	7.3088
	CPS	33	35	-2	-5.7		257	253	4	1.6		7.7879	7.2286
	TOTAL	389	371	18	4.9		2,900	2,714	186	6.9		7.4550	7.3154
Masters	CCAS	1,300	1,219	81	6.6	15	10,621	9,950	671	6.7	15	8.1700	8.1624
	GSEHD	795	862	-67	-7.8		5,560	6,204	-644	-10.4		6.9937	7.1972
	SEAS	1,133	1,049	84	8.0	3	7,475	6,564	911	13.9	3	6.5975	6.2574
	SB	1,860	1,798	62	3.4		15,031	14,293	738	5.2		8.0812	7.9494
	EMBA	90	40	50	125.0		1,156	607	549	90.4		12.8444	15.1750
	ESIA	753	754	-1	-0.1		6,568	6,483	85	1.3		8.7224	8.5981
	CPS	910	884	26	2.9		5,880	5,495	385	7.0		6.4615	6.2161
	TOTAL	6,841	6,606	235	3.6	18	52,291	49,596	2,695	5.4	18	7.6438	7.5077
	Certs	CCAS	78	78	0	0.0		337	327	10	3.1		4.3205
GSEHD		290	283	7	2.5	2	1,597	1,382	215	15.6	2	5.5069	4.8834
SEAS		387	506	-119	-23.5		1,288	1,659	-371	-22.4		3.3282	3.2787
SB		1	1	0	0.0		3	3	0	0.0		3.0000	3.0000
ESIA		17	21	-4	-19.0		87	118	-31	-26.3		5.1176	5.6190
CPS		78	89	-11	-12.4		393	469	-76	-16.2		5.0385	5.2697
TOTAL		851	978	-127	-13.0	2	3,705	3,958	-253	-6.4	2	4.3537	4.0470
Docts	CCAS	533	526	7	1.3	230	4,209	4,229	-20	-0.5	230	7.8968	8.0399
	GSEHD	496	480	16	3.3	85	2,776	2,671	105	3.9	85	5.5968	5.5646
	SEAS	358	353	5	1.4	8	2,019	1,956	63	3.2	8	5.6397	5.5411
	SB	48	62	-14	-22.6		437	526	-89	-16.9		9.1042	8.4839
	TOTAL	1,435	1,421	14	1.0	323	9,441	9,382	59	0.6	323	6.5791	6.6024
LAW	JD-FT	1,457	1,411	46	3.3		20,258	19,621	637	3.2		13.9039	13.9057
	JD-PT	288	277	11	4.0		2,692	2,662	30	1.1		9.3472	9.6101
	Post JD	272	307	-35	-11.4		2,520	2,903	-383	-13.2		9.2647	9.4560
NON-DE G OUS	626	694	-68	-9.8		3,167	3,669	-502	-13.7		5.0591	5.2867	
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	20,973	20,847	126	0.6	343	230,060	228,190	1,870	0.8	343	10.9693	10.9459	
MEDICAL CENTER													
UG-FT	SMHS	49	56	-7	-12.5		705	839	-134	-16.0		14.3878	14.9821
	SON	68	38	30	78.9		1,088	722	366	50.7		16.0000	19.0000
	SPHHS	146	142	4	2.8		2,232	2,168	64	3.0		15.2877	15.2676
	TOTAL	263	236	27	11.4		4,025	3,729	296	7.9		15.3042	15.8008
UG-PT	SMHS	156	130	26	20.0		853	739	114	15.4		5.4679	5.6846
	SON	1	0	1	-		2	0	2	-		2.0000	-
	SPHHS	17	6	11	183.3		152	46	106	230.4		8.9412	7.6667
	TOTAL	174	136	38	27.9		1,007	785	222	28.3		5.7874	5.7721
Masters	SMHS	452	435	17	3.9		3,763	3,596	167	4.6		8.3252	8.2667
	SON	246	183	63	34.4		1,587	1,094	493	45.1		6.4512	5.9781
	SPHHS	776	779	-3	-0.4	6	6,096	6,079	17	0.3	6	7.8557	7.8036
	TOTAL	1,474	1,397	77	5.5	6	11,446	10,769	677	6.3	6	7.7653	7.7087
Certs	SMHS	13	21	-8	-38.1		58	206	-148	-71.8		4.4615	9.8095
	SON	32	25	7	28.0		206	178	28	15.7		6.4375	7.1200
	SPHHS	173	96	77	80.2		1,204	751	453	60.3		6.9595	7.8229
	TOTAL	218	142	76	53.5		1,468	1,135	333	29.3		6.7339	7.9930
Doct	SMHS	102	96	6	6.3		1,304	1,229	75	6.1		12.7843	12.8021
	SON	86	71	15	21.1		451	364	87	23.9		5.2442	5.1268
	SPHHS	35	42	-7	-16.7	5	189	234	-45	-19.2	5	5.4000	5.5714
	TOTAL	223	209	14	6.7		1,944	1,827	117	6.4		8.7175	8.7416
MED	MD	691	694	-3	-0.4		13,996	16,205	-2,209	-13.6		20.2547	23.3501
	MD-Spec Pgm	13	15	-2	-13.3		133	159	-26	-16.4		10.2308	10.6000
Non-Deg	HSci-Sp Pgm	15	88	-73	-83.0		22	489	-467	-95.5		1.4667	5.5568
	SON	29	0	29	-		191	0	191	-		6.5862	-
TOTAL MEDICAL CENTER		3,100	2,917	183	6.3	11	34,232	35,098	-866	-2.5	11	11.0426	12.0322
TOTAL STUDENTS		24,073	23,764	309	1.3	354	264,292	263,288	1,004	0.4	354	10.9788	11.0793

All data exclude continuing research and continuous enrollments, unless noted.
PhD in Counseling students included in GSEHD, not CCAS (35 students, 203 credit hours).