

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

The Faculty Senate

September 1, 2011

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, September 9, 2011 at 2:10 p.m. in the State Room, 1957 E Street, N.W., 7<sup>th</sup> Floor.

**AGENDA**

1. Call to order
2. **IN MEMORIAM:**  
  
Salvatore F. Divita, Professor Emeritus of Marketing (SB)  
Herman Hedberg Hobbs, Professor Emeritus of Physics (CCAS)
3. **A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE *FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN* WITH REGARD TO THE COMPOSITION OF THE FACULTY SENATE (11/1):**  
Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr., Chair, Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (Resolution 11/1 is attached.)
4. Introduction of Resolutions
5. Update on the Parking Transition: Executive Vice President and Treasurer Louis Katz
6. Status of the Human Resources Office During 2011-12: Executive Vice President and Treasurer Louis Katz
7. Response of the Administration to Senate Resolutions for the 2010-11 Session (Response and Resolutions are attached.)
8. General Business
  - a) Nominations for election to Faculty Senate Standing Committees  
  
**Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies:** Professors Ravi Achrol, Derek Malone-France, Sylvia Marotta, Moses Schanfield, Eva Cincze, and Wasyl Wasylkiwskyj, **Research:** Professor Hiromi Ishizawa, Sociology
  - b) Report of the Executive Committee: Michael S. Castleberry, Chair
  - c) Chair's remarks

- d) Annual Reports of Senate Standing Committees: Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (The Report is attached.)
  - e) Tributes to retiring faculty who have served on the Faculty Senate
10. Brief Statements (and Questions)
  11. Adjournment

*Elizabeth A. Amundson*  
Elizabeth A. Amundson  
Secretary

Attachments

**A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN TO  
PROVIDE REPRESENTATION FOR THE SCHOOL OF NURSING ON THE  
FACULTY SENATE AND THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE  
COMMITTEE (11/1)**

**WHEREAS,** Article III, Section 2(a)(3) of the Faculty Organization Plan currently provides for representation on the Faculty Senate from the following eight Schools: the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, the Elliott School of International Affairs, the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, the Law School, the School of Business, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, and the School of Public Health and Health Services; and

**WHEREAS,** Article III, Section 5(b) of the Faculty Organization Plan currently provides that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee consists of eight faculty members elected by the Faculty Senate, including one member from each of the foregoing Schools;

**WHEREAS,** the University recently created a new School of Nursing (“SON”), and SON should be assigned representation on the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee;

**WHEREAS,** SON is beginning the second year of its operation and is working to achieve compliance with Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code; and

**WHEREAS,** SON has reported that it currently has 13 tenure-accruing faculty members, representing 72% of the 18 regular, active-status members of its faculty; and

**WHEREAS,** SON currently does not have any non-administrative tenured faculty members who are eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate under Article III, Section 2(a)(3) of the Faculty Organization Plan, but SON expects to have in place one or more non-administrative tenured faculty members who would be eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate beginning with the 2012-2013 session; and

**WHEREAS,** in view of the current stage of SON’s development, SON should be assigned one representative on the Faculty Senate and one representative on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, with such representation to take effect beginning with the 2012-2013 session; **NOW, THEREFORE,**

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

- (1) That the first sentence of Article III, Section 2(a)(3) of the Faculty Organization Plan be amended to read as follows, with such amendment to take effect commencing with the 2012-2013 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 Sciences, nine; the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, Law School, School of Business, School of Engineering and Applied Science, and School of Medicine and Health Sciences, 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.”

- (2) That the first four sentences of Article III, Section 5(b) of the Faculty Organization Plan be amended to read as follows, with such amendment to take effect commencing with the 2012-2013 session of the Faculty Senate:

“The Executive Committee shall consist of nine faculty members of the Senate and the President ex officio. The following nine schools shall have one representative each on the Executive Committee: the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, the Elliott School of International Affairs, the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, the Law School, the School of Business, the School of Engineering and Applied Science, the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, the School of Nursing, and the School of Public Health and Health Services. Any faculty member of the Senate shall be eligible to be elected to the Executive Committee. The Chairman shall be elected first by the Senate; and the Senate shall thereafter elect the other eight elective members of the Executive Committee, subject to the restriction that the Executive Committee may not include two or more members who have been elected to the Senate by the same school or faculty group.”

- (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 4, 2011, 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  
August 24, 2011

**RESOLUTIONS 2010-11 SESSION**

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Title of Resolution</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Response of Administration</b>
10/1	5-12-10 Special Meeting	A Resolution Presenting Recommendations on the Proposal For a New School of Nursing (10/1)	Adopted May 12, 2010  Forwarded immediately to the Administration; approved by the Board of Trustees May 14, 2010 with decision memorandum (now appended to the Resolution)
10/2	5-15-10	A Resolution on Faculty and Staff Compensation Increases and Compensation Policy (10/2)	Adopted May 14, 2010  The Resolution was discussed with members of the Board's Finance Committee. The Committee concluded that a three percent increase was consistent with prevailing economic and market conditions.
10/3	10-8-10	A Resolution Requesting Additional Information on the Budgetary and Financial Implications of the Proposed Science and Engineering Complex (10/3)	Adopted as amended October 8, 2010  The Administration will provide the requested additional information to the Faculty Senate.
10/4	4-8-11	A Resolution to Clarify the Procedures Governing Awards of Emeritus Status to Retiring Faculty	Adopted April 8, 2011  Forwarded immediately to the Administration. Recommendation accepted; presented to the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Committee at the May 2011 meeting by Professor Wilmarth. Approved by the Board of Trustees May 13, 2011.

**A RESOLUTION PRESENTING RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE PROPOSAL FOR  
A NEW SCHOOL OF NURSING (10/1)**

**WHEREAS**, a proposal to establish a new School of Nursing was presented to the Faculty Senate on April 13, 2010, and was amended on April 16, 2010;

**WHEREAS**, Article IX.A of the *Faculty Code* provides that:

“The Faculty Senate or an appropriate committee thereof is entitled to an opportunity to make recommendations on proposals concerning the creation, consolidation, or elimination of schools or other major components of the University.”

**WHEREAS**, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee appointed the Faculty Senate Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing (the “Special Committee”) to review and evaluate the proposal to establish a new School of Nursing;

**WHEREAS**, the Special Committee prepared a report dated May 3, 2010 (the “Special Committee Report”), a copy of which is attached to this Resolution as Appendix A, which described the Special Committee's evaluation of the proposal and presented the Special Committee's recommendations for further action;

**WHEREAS**, for the reasons explained in the Special Committee Report, the Special Committee concluded that the proposal presented a persuasive case for the concept of a School of Nursing but did not sufficiently address a number of significant concerns set forth in the Special Committee Report;

**WHEREAS**, on May 10, 2010, the leadership of the proposed School of Nursing met with the Special Committee and provided additional information in an effort to address the concerns expressed in the Special Committee Report; **NOW,  
THEREFORE**

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

1. That the Faculty Senate supports the establishment of a School of Nursing, conditional upon the following understandings:
  - (a) At least three tenured faculty members who are not academic administrative officials shall be appointed to the faculty of the School of Nursing by August 31, 2011;
  - (b) At least 75% of the regular, active-status faculty of the School of Nursing shall hold tenured or tenure-accruing appointments by August 31, 2014; and
  - (c) By August 31, 2010, the Dean of the School of Nursing shall submit a supplemental memorandum to the Faculty Senate Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing, and that memorandum shall address in

sufficient detail the remaining concerns specified in the Special Committee Report dated May 3, 2010; attached to this Resolution as Appendix A.

2. That the Faculty Senate's support for the School of Nursing expressed in this Resolution is contingent upon final approval of the amendment to the asterisked footnote on page 18 of the Faculty Code proposed in Resolution 09/3, adopted by the Faculty Senate on March 12, 2010, so that said footnote will not apply to the School of Nursing.

Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing

Professor Edward J. Cherian, Chair  
Professor Brian L. Biles  
Professor Gary L. Simon  
Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr.  
Professor Philip W. Wirtz

May 10, 2010

Adopted May 12, 2010

## APPENDIX A

# The George Washington University Faculty Senate

### Report of the Special Senate Committee Regarding the Proposed School of Nursing

May 3, 2010

To: Michael S. Castleberry, Chair  
Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Re: Review of the Proposal for a School of Nursing

The April 13, 2010 proposal for a School of Nursing (as amended by 3 pages and supplemental information received on April 16, 2010) has been reviewed on an expedited basis by the members of the Special Committee, working both independently and in two meetings during the past 14 business days.

The proposal contains a great deal of information which responds to that requested in Appendix A of the Senate Resolution of April 9 concerning the proposed School of Nursing. The proposal presents a persuasive case for the concept of a School of Nursing. However the Special Committee has identified several major concerns that have not been sufficiently addressed in order to ensure the successful formation and operation of an independent School of Nursing outside the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.

- 1) The proposed School of Nursing should have a core of tenured faculty (in addition to the Dean and Senior Associate Dean) in order to have the requisite academic stature to be able to attract additional highly qualified faculty, to perform faculty appointment, promotion and tenure (APT) functions and decisions, and to establish Faculty Senate representation.
- 2) The School of Nursing should be in full compliance with the University's Faculty Code including compliance with the following requirements:
  - at least 75% of the School's regular active-status faculty must be tenured or tenure-track faculty;
  - APT committee composition, independence and process;
  - search committee composition and process for searches for faculty and academic administrators;
  - curriculum development process.
- 3) The standards for student admissions to the various degree programs should be consistent with other GW established programs, and clearly specified.
- 4) The proposed School's stated goal of achieving top 25 academic status (US News and World Report) should be fully described and the academic rigor and standards in

## APPENDIX A

admission, instruction and degree qualifications for students should be specified. In addition aspiration schools and competitive schools should be identified.

- 5) The School should be a financially self-sustaining unit, including costs of admissions, fiscal management, instructional design, student services, learning systems & support, and career development and placement. The School should be able to fully cover its direct costs and also to make substantial indirect cost contributions toward the University's overhead. Funding sources to accomplish this requirement of financial independence should be fully identified including; endowment, tuition, University contributions, donor contributions and other sources. Proposed scholarships and tuition discount rates should be specified and data (including market studies) to support projected enrollments should be provided.
- 6) The proposed School plans to occupy space at the Virginia Science and Technology Campus (STC) for some 55% of their space needs and the Foggy Bottom campus for 45% of their space needs. Enrollment, faculty and staff head count growth proposed for the School at the Foggy Bottom campus would place added strain on the University's ability to comply with the DC BZA order limits, and should be justified as being consistent with the University's overall campus development plan. Development and future growth of the proposed School should be primarily directed at the Virginia STC.
- 7) A senior Board of Advisors, totally independent of business connections with the leadership of the Department of Nursing and the Medical Center, is a necessary asset for successful School formation.
- 8) Letters of intent from INOVA Fairfax Hospital System and from other partner hospitals indicating their intent to participate with the School for student rotations and clinical experiences are needed in order to demonstrate the viability of the proposed School's instructional and business plans.
- 9) The proposal for the School of Nursing identifies a potential governance conflict in the duality of the Medical Center Faculty Senate and the University Faculty Senate. It is essential that this conflict be resolved and the proposed School of Nursing should affirm that it participates in shared governance of the University through the University Faculty Senate.

The formation of an independent School of Nursing operating outside the School of Medicine and Health Sciences should be predicated and conditioned upon achievement of the following benchmarks related to the above concerns:

- 1) A minimum of three tenured professors (exclusive of the Dean and Senior Associate Dean) should be part of the regular active status faculty of the School.

## APPENDIX A

- 2) The School's faculty composition, APT criteria and process, search committee composition and process for academic administrators, and curriculum development process should be in full compliance with the University Faculty Code.
- 3) Detailed descriptions of student admissions standards should be available for review.
- 4) A detailed plan, including timeline, for achieving the School's stated goal of top 25 academic status (US News & World Report), describing aspiration and competitive schools, should be available for review.
- 5) The School should demonstrate its financial independence (including its ability to cover all direct costs of essential School functions and to make substantial indirect cost contributions toward the University overhead) based on sources of revenue and funding details in its financial and operational plans; if the School cannot yet achieve full financial independence, its financial and operating plans should describe in detail the amounts, sources and duration of needed University subsidies until full financial independence is achieved and a credible timeline for achieving such independence.
- 6) The essential primary functions of the school including faculty, staff and students should be established at the Virginia STC and any proposal to locate School programs at the Foggy Bottom campus must demonstrate compliance with the University's campus plan and DC BZA limits on faculty, student and staff headcounts.
- 7) Activation of a fully independent Board of Advisors.
- 8) Receipt of letter(s) of intent from INOVA Fairfax Hospital System and other partner hospitals, indicating their commitment to participate with the School for student rotations and clinical experiences.
- 9) Resolution of the potential conflict in governance by affirming that the School participates in shared governance through the University Faculty Senate.

Until all of the foregoing benchmarks are satisfied as determined by a subsequent review by the Faculty Senate, the Special Committee recommends that the proposed School of Nursing should operate as a school within the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.

---

Edward J. Cherian, Chair

Committee Members:

Brian Biles,  
Gary Simon  
Arthur Wilmarth  
Philip Wirtz

**A RESOLUTION ON FACULTY AND STAFF COMPENSATION INCREASES AND  
COMPENSATION POLICY (10/2)**

- WHEREAS,** due to prudent and sound financial decisions, the University is in a strong financial position, as evidenced by the accumulation of reserves in excess of \$250 million and excellent credit ratings from S&P and Moody's; and
- WHEREAS,** the University administration and the Board of Trustees have noted that the current relative financial strength of the University presents an opportunity for The George Washington University to improve its position relative to that of other market-basket schools; and
- WHEREAS,** for Fiscal Year 2010 the University administration and the Board of Trustees were able to continue the past policy of providing for a 4% merit salary pool for faculty and staff while maintaining a balanced budget, and
- WHEREAS,** the quality of education and life at the University is inextricably linked to the quality of the faculty and staff which form its core, and compensation policy is crucial to maintaining that quality, and allowing the University to improve its ability to continue to compete for the best available faculty and staff; and
- WHEREAS,** the Board of Trustees is in the process of developing the University budget for Fiscal Year 2010-2011; and
- WHEREAS,** current budget projections indicate that the University's financial position for Fiscal Year 2011 will continue to be strong, **NOW, THEREFORE,**

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

1. That the Faculty Senate commends the University administration and the Board of Trustees for the decision to continue the past policy of providing for a 4% merit pool in the budget for Fiscal Year 2010; and
2. that the Faculty Senate strongly urges the University administration and the Board of Trustees to stay the course by providing for a 4% merit pool in the budget for Fiscal Year 2011, subject to the University continuing to maintain its strong current financial position.

Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting

April 20, 2010

Adopted May 14, 2010

## **Background Statement on the Faculty Senate Resolution 10/2 on Faculty Compensation Increases and Compensation Policy**

The quality of faculty and staff is an essential ingredient in the University's aspiration to move to the next level among institutions of higher education. It is laudable that the Board of Trustees and Administration decided to continue the recent policy of providing for a 4% faculty and staff merit pool for 2010. There are, however, indications that consideration is being given to providing for a merit pool of 3% instead of 4% in the next university budget. Possible reasons for doing so might include: (1) Many other colleges and universities have either frozen salaries, or reduced them so that the higher annual increase of 4% is not needed to keep the University competitive; and (2) it is prudent in uncertain financial times for the University to budget for more modest increases in faculty and staff compensation.

The counter arguments for "staying the course" as recommended in the resolution are as follows.

1. It is certainly true that many other universities have had to freeze or reduce faculty and staff compensation for financial reasons. At such institutions, these actions have also been accompanied by austerity in other areas, such as plans for expansion of programs, construction of new buildings, etc. However, as the Resolution notes, thanks to prudent financial management, The George Washington University does not find itself in such circumstances. Indeed the Administration has stated several times that the current relatively strong financial position of the University offers a somewhat unique opportunity for the University to move forward relative to its competition.

This argument applies to faculty and staff salaries as well to other parts of the University budget. In commenting on GWU faculty salaries relative to its market basket the Middle States Accreditation report (Chapter 4) notes that while considerable progress has been made in improving average faculty compensation at the University compared to other similar universities nationally, progress has been considerably slower in making the University truly competitive compared with its market basket

*In a fiercely competitive environment, one must be willing to do all one can, and more, to come out on top. It is not clear that GW is in fact doing all it can and more or that it is progressing more rapidly than its competition.*

The attached spreadsheet of GWU faculty salaries compared with its market basket shows that in 2010, some improvement was achieved as a result of GWU providing for a 4% merit pool compared with raises offered at other market-basket institutions; but there was clearly room to do even better. The third panel of the spreadsheet shows what might happen if (a) GWU were to stay the course for 2011, and (b) the market basket schools behaved in 2011 as they did in 2010. This simple back-of-the-envelope exercise shows that there would be continued improvement in the University's competitive standing, and hence its ability to compete for the very best faculty.

2. Concern about the financial capacity of the University to stay the course is of course always relevant. The Resolution provides for this concern in the resolving clause. What is known at this point is that the University's financial performance for fiscal year 2009-2010 was extremely positive, and preliminary indications are that enrollments (a key variable) for 2010-2011 remain strong.

Submitted: May 7, 2010

Joseph Cordes

Chair, Faculty Senate Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting

**AAUP Faculty Average Salaries GWU vs. BWU Market Basket Schools  
2008-2009, 2009-2010, and Projected 2010-2011**

	AAUP 2009-2010			AAUP 2008-2009			Percent Chng. 2009/10 vs.2008/09			"Projected Avg. AAUP Salaries for 2010-2011"***		
	Full	Associate	Asst	Full	Associate	Asst	Full	Associate	Asst	Full	Associate	Asst
American University	\$146.5	\$96.4	\$67.2	\$142.9	\$92.6	\$67.6	2.5%	4.1%	-0.6%	\$150.2	\$100.4	\$66.8
Boston University	\$140.6	\$95.5	\$82.1	\$135.7	\$91.2	\$76.4	3.6%	4.7%	7.5%	\$145.7	\$100.0	\$88.2
Duke	\$160.8	\$102.6	\$89.8	\$161.2	\$107.3	\$89.5	-0.2%	-4.4%	0.3%	\$160.4	\$98.1	\$90.1
Emory University	\$154.8	\$99.4	\$83.4	\$153.4	\$100.5	\$84.1	0.9%	-1.1%	-0.8%	\$156.2	\$98.3	\$82.7
George Washington University	\$142.9	\$98.6	\$81.0	\$134.7	\$97.0	\$78.7	6.1%	1.6%	2.9%	\$151.6	\$100.2	\$83.4
Georgetown University	\$155.5	\$100.7	\$83.6	\$155.9	\$101.0	\$80.5	-0.3%	-0.3%	3.9%	\$155.1	\$100.4	\$86.8
New York University	\$171.1	\$101.5	\$92.7	\$170.7	\$103.7	\$93.5	0.2%	-2.1%	-0.9%	\$171.5	\$99.3	\$91.9
Northwestern University	\$166.3	\$106.9	\$95.3	\$161.8	\$105.3	\$93.5	2.8%	1.5%	1.9%	\$170.9	\$108.5	\$97.1
Southern Methodist University	\$133.4	\$89.9	\$84.4	\$127.5	\$88.8	\$84.2	4.6%	1.2%	0.2%	\$139.6	\$91.0	\$84.6
Tufts University	\$127.2	\$95.3	\$75.7	\$128.0	\$95.3	\$75.8	-0.6%	0.0%	-0.1%	\$126.4	\$95.3	\$75.6
Tulane University	\$128.0	\$84.0	\$67.8	\$125.9	\$83.4	\$65.2	1.7%	0.7%	4.0%	\$130.1	\$84.6	\$70.5
University of Miami	\$132.5	\$86.9	\$79.1	\$132.8	\$86.2	\$79.5	-0.2%	0.8%	-0.5%	\$132.2	\$87.6	\$78.7
University of Southern California	\$145.8	\$98.6	\$89.6	\$145.0	\$95.8	\$86.7	0.6%	2.9%	3.3%	\$146.6	\$101.5	\$92.6
Vanderbilt University	\$145.1	\$93.1	\$73.1	\$145.9	\$93.5	\$72.5	-0.5%	-0.4%	0.8%	\$144.3	\$92.7	\$73.7
Washington University	\$160.7	\$97.1	\$85.4	\$159.3	\$96.5	\$85.0	0.9%	0.6%	0.5%	\$162.1	\$97.7	\$85.8
<b>Market Basket Median</b>	\$145.8	\$97.1	\$83.4	\$145.0	\$95.8	\$80.5	0.9%	0.7%	0.5%	\$150.2	\$98.3	\$84.6
<b>GWU Ranking</b>	10	6	10	11	6	10	1	4	5	7	5	9

Projected average AAUP salary for 2010-2011 arrived at by applying the percentage changes in average salaries for 2010 to the AAUP averages for 2010

**A RESOLUTION TO REQUEST REQUESTING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
ON THE BUDGETARY AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF  
THE PROPOSED SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING COMPLEX (10/3)**

**WHEREAS**, the Administration has announced plans to build a Science and Engineering Complex (“SEC”) building, which is expected to include offices, classrooms and laboratory space for the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences and the science departments of the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, with a gross capacity of 480,000 square feet and a projected initial construction cost of \$275 million; and

**WHEREAS**, the description initially provided by the Administration with respect to the projected initial construction cost of the SEC building does not include: (1) the complete costs of construction, including costs associated with replacing the parking that is currently located on the site of the proposed SEC; (2) the future costs of “building out” unfinished floors, and (3) annual costs of operating and staffing the SEC; and

**WHEREAS**, the sources of funding for the SEC building have recently been described to the Faculty Senate in a letter from Provost Lerman and Executive Vice President and Treasurer Katz to the Faculty Senate as:

- (1) The annual endowment payout from the Square 54 ground lease of \$9 million per year to support debt service payments of approximately \$150 million;
- (2) Additional support from a combination of:
  - (a) Fundraising for philanthropic contributions of up to \$100 million; and
  - (b) Additional research activity that will produce new Federal funded project indirect cost recoveries of \$9 million per year that will support debt-service payments for debt of nearly \$150 million; and

**WHEREAS**, the projected \$100 million of philanthropic contributions represents a larger sum than the University has ever raised in contributions dedicated to a specific building in the past; and

**WHEREAS**, the sources of additional debt-service related indirect cost recoveries of \$9 million per year would require an increase in Federally funded research of over \$30 million per year and would require 60 or more new senior faculty researchers, more than the University has ever recruited for a single academic area; and

**WHEREAS**, the Administration and the University's faculty have articulated specific ambitious goals, as described in the University Strategic Plan and the report to the Middle States Accrediting Commission, to increase the scope and quality of education and faculty in many Schools and departments of the University in addition to engineering and science, and the initiatives to achieve those goals will require new support of millions of dollars a year; and

**WHEREAS**, Article IX.A of the *Faculty Code* provides that:

“The regular, active-status faculty shares with the 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 . . . participates in the formulation of policy and planning decisions affecting the quality of education and life at the University. . . .”; and

**WHEREAS**, Article IX.B of the *Faculty Code* further provides that:

“The faculty cannot perform an effective and responsible role in University decision making without the cooperation of the administrative officers of the University. This cooperation includes the provision of such information as is necessary to the development of sound, well-informed recommendations.

“Faculty bodies charged with responsibilities for particular policy and planning areas are entitled, to the extent feasible, to be informed sufficiently in advance of important decisions within their areas of competence to be able to provide their advice or recommendations to the appropriate University officials.”; and

**WHEREAS**, Article III, Section 1 of the *Faculty Organization Plan* provides that:

“The Faculty Senate, on behalf of the Faculty, shall, with respect to matters that are of concern to more than one college, school, or division, or to the Faculty:

- (1) Formulate principles and objectives and find facts, so as to recommend policies to the President; . . .
- (2) [O]n its own initiative – consider any matters of concern or interest to more than one college, school, or division, or to the Faculty, and make its recommendations or otherwise express its opinion with respect thereto, to the Assembly, the President, or through the President to the Board of Trustees. . . .”; and

**WHEREAS**, the Administration has informed the Faculty Senate that it intends to request final approval for the construction of the SEC building from the Board of Trustees in October 2010;

**NOW, THEREFORE**

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

That, if there is a University commitment to construct the SEC building, the Administration provide for continued, frequent, regularly scheduled reports to the Faculty Senate and meetings with a Special Committee of the Senate on the financial and budgetary impact of the SEC building including:

- (1) The direct costs of construction, as well as related costs associated with furnishing, operating and staffing the SEC building, together with the replacement costs of parking facilities;
- (2) The status of fundraising for philanthropic contributions to meet the goal of \$100 million; and
- (3) The status of additional Federally funded research activity that will produce new debt-service related cost recoveries of \$9 million per year; and
- (4) Any other options or plans under consideration to finance the direct and related costs of the SEC building.
- (5) A risk and contingency analysis for funding the construction and operating costs of the SEC building, including an explanation in detail of how potential future shortfalls in sponsored research revenue or philanthropic contributions or potential increases in costs will be funded.

Faculty Senate Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting  
September 28, 2010

Adopted as amended, October 8, 2010

**A RESOLUTION TO CLARIFY THE PROCEDURES GOVERNING AWARDS  
OF EMERITUS STATUS TO RETIRING FACULTY (10/4)**

- WHEREAS,** the first sentence of Article VII.B. of the *Faculty Code* provides: “A member of the faculty with long and distinguished service to the University may, upon retirement, be awarded emeritus status”; and
- WHEREAS,** the second sentence of Article VII.B. provides: “Emeritus status is recommended by the regular, active-status members of the faculty concerned and, with the concurrence of the administration, is awarded by the Board of Trustees”; and
- WHEREAS,** Article VII.B. does not specify the procedures governing the presentation and consideration of faculty recommendations for awards of emeritus status; and
- WHEREAS,** faculty recommendations for awards of emeritus status have customarily been presented and considered in accordance with procedures followed in the relevant school(s) and/or department(s) for faculty appointments; and
- WHEREAS,** such recommendations, when accompanied by evidence of the recipients’ long and distinguished service to the University, have typically been concurred in by the Administration and approved by the Board of Trustees; and
- WHEREAS,** the Faculty Senate and the Administration agree that the procedures governing the presentation and consideration of faculty recommendations for awards of emeritus status should be clarified;
- WHEREAS,** the Faculty Senate and the Administration also agree that future faculty recommendations for awards of emeritus status should be presented and considered in accordance with the procedures set forth in Part B of the *Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code* governing recommendations for faculty appointments; **NOW THEREFORE**

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

That the *Faculty Code* be amended by inserting the following new sentences after the second sentence of Article VII.B. thereof:

"Each faculty recommendation for an award of emeritus status shall be accompanied by evidence of the recipient's long and distinguished service to the University. Each such recommendation shall be presented and considered in accordance with the procedures set forth in Part B of the *Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code* governing faculty recommendations for appointments."

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom  
March 28, 2011  
**Adopted April 8, 2011**

**ANNUAL REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON  
PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM  
2010-2011**

The Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (“PEAF”) held three meetings during the 2010-2011 academic year. Following is a summary of the Committee’s activities during the year:

1. At the request of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the PEAFF Committee reviewed the question of whether the *Faculty Code* should be amended to clarify the applicable procedures for resolving administrative nonconcurrences with faculty recommendations for awards of emeritus status to retiring faculty members. Article VII.B. of the *Faculty Code* provides that each faculty recommendation for an award of emeritus status must receive the Administration’s concurrence in order to be forwarded to the University’s Board of Trustees for final action. However, Article VII.B. currently does not specify the procedures to be followed in resolving administrative nonconcurrences with such faculty recommendations. The PEAFF Committee determined that such nonconcurrences should be resolved in accordance with the procedures applicable to administrative nonconcurrences with faculty recommendations for appointments under Part B of the *Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code* (pages 18-19). On March 28, 2011, the PEAFF Committee approved a proposed Resolution to amend Article VII.B. of the *Faculty Code* by adding the appropriate clarifying language. The Faculty Senate adopted the PEAFF Committee’s proposal as Faculty Senate Resolution 10/4 on April 8, and the Board of Trustees subsequently approved Resolution 10/8 on May 13.
2. On May 5, the PEAFF Committee appointed a Subcommittee on *Faculty Code* Compliance. This Subcommittee will assume responsibility for the work of the Joint Ad Hoc Subcommittee of the PEAFF and Physical Facilities Committees, which previously addressed *Faculty Code* compliance issues at the School of Public Health and Health Sciences (SPHHS) and the new School of Nursing (SON). The PEAFF Committee appointed the following persons to serve renewable one-year terms as members of the new Subcommittee on *Faculty Code* Compliance: Professor Edward Cherian, Chair, and Professors Kimberly Acquaviva, Brian Biles, Gary Simon, Arthur Wilmarth and Philip Wirtz.
3. On May 5, the PEAFF Committee directed the Chair to prepare a resolution for consideration by the Committee before the end of August. The planned resolution will propose an amendment to the *Faculty Organization Plan* to provide for the election of one Senator to represent SON in the Faculty Senate and on the Faculty

Senate Executive Committee. The planned resolution, if approved by the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Assembly and the University's Board of Trustees, would take effect on May 1, 2012, the commencement of the Faculty Senate's 2012-2013 session.

4. During our meetings this year, the PEAFF Committee discussed broader issues concerning the representation of the various Schools in the Faculty Senate, particularly in light of the anticipated replacement of the existing Medical Center with three independent Schools (the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, SON and SPHHS) that will report directly to the Provost. The PEAFF Committee did not attempt to reach a consensus regarding possible changes in the allocation of Senators among the various Schools in the University. At its meeting on May 5, the PEAFF Committee recommended that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee should appoint a special ad hoc committee with members from the various Schools to address representation issues in the Faculty Senate. Professors Kimberly Acquaviva, Charles Garris and Richard Windsor volunteered to serve on such a committee.
  
5. During our meetings this year, the PEAFF Committee reviewed the procedures followed in recent dean searches in several Schools and determined that such procedures are not consistent with the existing language of Part C.2.b. of the *Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code* (pages 20-21) and the guidelines for dean searches set forth in Resolution 90/9 adopted by the Faculty Senate on December 14, 1990. At its meeting on May 5, the Committee agreed on basic principles for dean searches and directed the Chair to prepare a proposed resolution for consideration by the Committee in the early fall. The contemplated resolution will propose an amendment to the *Code Procedures* to embody the basic principles agreed upon by the Committee. Professor Garris will prepare a committee report to accompany the resolution. The committee report will describe the dean search procedures approved by the faculty of the School of Engineering and Applied Science, which are consistent with the principles agreed upon by the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr., Chair

May 16, 2011

cc: Professor Michael Castleberry (Chair, Faculty Senate Executive Committee)  
Members of the PEAFF Committee  
Ms. L. Sue Campbell, Faculty Senate Coordinator