

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D.C.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON  
JANUARY 11, 2013 IN THE STATE ROOM

Present: Provost Lerman, Registrar Amundson, and Parliamentarian Charnovitz;  
Deans Barratt, Dolling, and Johnson; Professors Acquaviva, Barnhill,  
Brazinsky, Castleberry, Dickinson, Dickson, Fairfax, Garris, Greenberg,  
Hamano, Harrington, Kim, Lantz, McAleavey, Parsons, Shesser, Sidawy,  
Simon, Stott, Williams, and Yezer

Absent: President Knapp; Interim Dean Akman, Deans Berman, Brown,  
Eskandarian, Feuer, Goldman, and Guthrie; Professors Briscoe, Cordes,  
Dhuga, Helgert, Newcomer, Rehman, and Swaine

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Provost Lerman at 2:17 p.m. At the suggestion of Professor Castleberry, Provost Lerman sought and received the unanimous consent of the Senate to stand and observe a moment of silence in honor of President Emeritus Lloyd H. Elliott, who served for 23 years as GW's President and passed away on January 1, 2013. Professor Castleberry also included comments in the Executive Committee Report about President Elliott's years of dedicated service to the University, which is included with these minutes.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on December 14, 2012 were approved as distributed.

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

Professor Garris, Chair of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, noted that a revised Resolution 12/4 was distributed with the meeting agenda. He briefly reviewed the Senate's discussion of the Resolution at the November 2012 Senate meeting, and noted that several helpful suggestions were made. At the December Senate meeting, the Committee presented an alternate Resolution. Amendments were made and approved, but due to the loss of a quorum, the Resolution as amended could not be adopted.

Professor Garris briefly summarized the Senate discussions about Resolution 12/4 by reminding everyone that the Resolution was basically intended as a matter of housekeeping, in that, when Resolution 90/9 was adopted by the Senate, the *Faculty Code* was not amended to incorporate its provisions. Prior to 1990, all Dean Searches were conducted by the faculty in accordance with the *Code*, by committees of tenured faculty. Over time, the view developed that Dean Searches should be more inclusive and include various

constituencies within the University such as students, alumni, administrators, and trustees. Resolution 90/9 provided for the participation of such representatives as non-voting members who could provide advice to the tenured faculty, for whom the right to vote was preserved.

Over the years, this inclusive methodology has been used quite extensively in all of the Dean Searches, however, there has been some uncertainty about the roles of members of the enlarged Search Committees. In order to clarify this, the PEAFF Committee put forward Resolution 12/4 which adds a paragraph to the *Faculty Code* which codifies this.

At the December Senate meeting, several points of view were expressed, particularly by Dean of the School of Public Health and Health Services Lynn Goldman, who said she thought that research and contract faculty should be given voting roles in the selection of a Dean. Professor Garris said the PEAFF Committee considered this and basically rejected the proposition that non-tenured faculty should be voting members on Dean Search Committees because of the unique role of the tenured faculty. This is so for several reasons: because the tenured faculty enjoy academic freedom and considerable freedom of expression, and they are not subject to coercion as non-tenured faculty whose appointments are uncertain from year to year may be. Tenured faculty are also subject to a very extensive and rigorous selection process that research, contract, and other non-tenured faculty may or may not be, and they are required to excel in teaching, research and service. Non-tenured faculty generally are not – they may excel in one area but not all, as tenured faculty are required to do. They are also generally not as familiar or involved with administrative and shared governance issues as tenured faculty members are.

Probably the most important factor is that once faculty members are tenured, their careers are intimately linked with the University and this is a rite of passage where they assume an ownership role in the University. Thus, they tend to concern themselves with everything that goes on at the institution, and this breadth of interest is a very important part of their responsibilities and one that non-tenured faculty do not share.

Professor Garris then commented on a collateral issue raised by Professor Simon previously, and that is the fact that Medical Faculty Associates have not been granted tenure since the mid 1980's. He added he thought that basically there is a recognition that the resulting diminishing pool of tenured faculty in the Medical School will, if not corrected, eventually have a significant impact and disenfranchise faculty members in that School. This may be resolved by finding a way to define a tenure equivalent for the MFA faculty, but that issue is not before the Senate in connection with Resolution 12/4 which deals solely with the composition of Dean Search Committees.

A short discussion followed. Professor Simon asked if the provisions of Resolution 12/4 would take precedence over the bylaws of the Medical School approved by the Trustees. Provost Lerman said it was his understanding that the *Faculty Code* supersedes bylaws of the Schools so the issue would have to be resolved. One proposal has been to create a form of tenure for governance purposes for clinical faculty in the Medical School.

Professor Yezer indicated a preference for the term “Dean Search Committee” to denote tenured faculty members, (rather than the Faculty Dean Search Committee) and designation of non-voting participants as *ex officio* members of the group. Dean Barratt said that in the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences bylaws, there is a Faculty Search Committee with *ex officio* members who are understood not to have a vote. Discussion followed, with Professor Castleberry pointing out that the term *ex officio* is often misunderstood. It is meant to designate members who are included by virtue of their position, and according to Robert’s Rules of Order, the term does confer a vote. That is why Senate Committee members are designated non-voting rather than *ex officio*. Parliamentarian Charnovitz agreed with Professor Castleberry, as did Provost Lerman – to be technically correct, “non-voting” would have to be specified for *ex officio* appointments if the intent would be if these individuals would not vote. Following other brief comments by Senate members, the question was called on Resolution 12/4, a vote was taken, and Resolution 12/4 was adopted by unanimous vote. (Resolution 12/4 is included with these minutes.)

### INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

### DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC PLAN

Provost Lerman noted that the draft plan had been released in October, and that more than 100 comments, primarily through a combination of meetings and conversations, had been received. The draft has undergone significant editing and the administration is very close to finalizing the version of the plan to be submitted to the Board of Trustees at their meeting in February.

At the heart of the plan is a series of recommendations. About 90% of these have not changed from the draft circulated, although in many cases their intent was clarified. The editing process on the text of the plan is proceeding very well, and copyediting has been completed. In the next stage, exhibits and graphics will be added, and this process has been launched, using GW’s own design services.

A short discussion followed. Professor Yezer asked about the status of the search underway for a budget officer in the Provost’s office as, presumably, that individual would have to figure out how to implement provisions of the plan. Provost Lerman said a round of final interviews was held earlier in the week, and he expected an offer would be made to the chosen candidate. Because people applying for this position typically are currently employed at other higher education institutions in a similar capacity, he said he did not expect the candidate to be immediately available, but had every expectation they would be at GW by summer 2013.

Professor Castleberry said his inbox was full of questions about financing dimensions of the Plan. Most of the goals in the plan really have a monetary component to them which is not yet spelled out in detail, so he asked how that would be done. Provost Lerman responded that the last section of the plan contains rough estimates of the financing needed. The biggest single item is the hiring of more faculty -- that will be funded predominantly through two major sources. The first will be reallocations from the budget in

the Office of the Provost, with the highest priority being the funding of new faculty lines. Savings produced by the work of the Innovation Task Force will be a second major source of funding for academic priorities. In addition, there is certainly an aspiration in the coming capital campaign to raise money for endowed chairs, something GW has not had very large numbers of historically, and other priorities in the strategic plan.

Although the Strategic Plan will not include detailed budget projections, it does provide a range of potential funding sources for initiatives to be undertaken. Provost Lerman said he thought the University can meet the lower end of the range, but the single uncertain item is philanthropy. With some success in the capital campaign, more can be achieved. Of course, the new budget officer will have to flesh out those broad-brush estimates and work with implementation committees to turn those into detailed budgets.

Professor Castleberry noted that when the draft plan was released in October, Senate Committees were asked to review aspects of the plan pertaining to each Committee's work. Some were able to have at least one meeting in the fall, and they are now beginning to work in earnest on implementation aspects of the plan. Provost Lerman observed that the plan is reaching its final stages, and this Senate meeting would probably be the last formal chance for additions to the plan. A plan always changes, and this one will be periodically reviewed over the coming ten years.

Professor Kim said she thought the plan was very good, however, she added that the University has several campuses and many instructional centers, and she would like to see more emphasis on the integration of all of these and a focus on building community efforts between all constituencies across the University.

## GENERAL BUSINESS

### I. NOMINATIONS FOR ELECTION OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Professor Castleberry moved the nomination of Professor Kanungo to the Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Committee, and the nomination was approved.

### II. NOMINATIONS FOR ELECTION BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO THE STUDENT GRIEVANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Professor Castleberry moved the nomination of himself, Megan C. Leftwich and Igor Strakovsky to the Committee, and the nominations were approved.

### III. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Castleberry presented the Report included with these minutes.

### IV. INTERIM REPORTS OF SENATE COMMITTEES

Professor Garris gave an update on the work of the PEAFF Committee in three areas. He noted that the Committee has produced a report that includes a sample model for setting up a Dean Search that may be useful for schools embarking on a search. This

document was distributed at the December Senate meeting, and was included with the minutes of that meeting.

The Committee has also forwarded its recommendations concerning the proposed Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence Policy to Vice Provost Terri Reed and awaits a response from the University Administration.

With reference to the Patent Policy, the Committee expects to make its recommendations to the Administration in a week or so for review and feedback.

#### V. PROVOST'S REMARKS

Provost Lerman reported briefly on the admissions picture for the fall 2013 semester. He noted that January 11 was the deadline for undergraduate admissions applications, so the final numbers are not yet compiled. However, there is every reason to believe that the University's applications are holding up thus far. There has not been great growth in applications, as the number of 18 year olds in the U.S. population has passed its demographic peak. There will likely in future be a flattening and in some cases declining undergraduate enrollment numbers. In view of this, the University is looking to the enrollment of nontraditional learners, particularly veterans who are will be returning to the U.S. in large numbers, many of them re-entering civilian life. This outreach is a means by which the University can continue its historic mission of being of service to that population.

Provost Lerman also commented that this is an interesting time for the departments and schools as hiring decisions are made and recommendations forwarded. It is also the time when the promotion and tenure process for faculty is moving forward and graduate admissions are under review. Provost Lerman said he thought that the freshman class has settled in pretty well and his sense is that students are engaged and excited about their activities.

#### VI. CHAIR'S REMARKS

Provost Lerman conveyed the President's regret at not being able to be present at the meeting and make his customary remarks, as he was attending to University business out of town.

#### BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Simon questioned the sustainability of the current higher education model, observing that when he graduated from Medical School, more than half of his class entered primary care specialties, family medicine and family practice. Presently, only about 15 to 20% of medical school graduates choose these fields. A driving feature in this development is the fact that when he graduated from Medical School, Professor Simon said he had \$4,500 in debt. Current graduates have \$200,000 in debt. He added that he did not think the current model is sustainable at the Medical School, or the University level either. The danger is that tuition and debt is so great for graduating students, the University may see fewer admissions, and students will turn to state institutions where the tuition is lower.

A short exchange followed. The Provost urged care in assessing tuition costs. The median debt of GW students is below \$30,000 for four years of study for those students who have debt; some have none. The problem is in the Medical and Law Schools where debt levels are much higher. Overall, tuition levels have been kept very low over the last five years since President Knapp arrived, and the net cost of a GW education has actually been declining, net of financial aid. Of course what that has meant is that the University has had to put more money into financial aid as tuition has gone up. However, the percentage of tuition devoted to financial aid cannot grow forever, as GW is still a very tuition dependent University. The University has kept undergraduate tuition levels more moderate while increasing graduate tuition in the non-professional schools somewhat faster.

Professor Parsons asked if the University had not cut down sharply on financial aid for freshman admitted in fall 2013, and would do so again in fall 2014. Provost Lerman confirmed this, noting that last year was the largest one-year change. In future years, as the University moves its discount rate back to historic levels, this will mean decreased operating margins for the University. The Provost asked Senior Vice Provost Maltzman to comment, as admissions and financial aid now report to him.

Senior Vice Provost Maltzman said he believed that GW will be aiming for a long-term steady state discount rate of approximately 37.5% which, compared to many universities, is quite generous. In 2008, this rate rose to nearly 40%, which was unsustainable.

Professor Barnhill said he thought the question important. Historically the investment people make in their education has been one of the most profitable investments they could make, as this leads to intellectual and economic opportunities. The difficulty faced by the U.S. is that it is most likely entering a slow growth period of indefinite duration. The uncertainty about the return on an investment in education is fairly significant as some studies suggest that the middle class in the U.S. and developed countries is likely to be stagnant over the next 20 or 30 years. The real growth in the middle class in terms of income levels will occur in Asia and some of the emerging economies, and these are the places that will experience dramatic income growth. It would be useful for the University to analyze the actual and expected return on the investment that students are making and consider whether adjustments in tuition levels are appropriate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, and upon motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 3:17 p.m.

*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”; and,

**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 Provost 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 non-voting members of Dean Search Committees in several Schools; and

**WHEREAS,** the participation of non-voting 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 non-voting 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, non-tenured faculty members and alumni (with the approval of the Dean Search Committee, after consultation with the Provost) 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; and,

**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”). Non-voting members of the Dean Search Committee may be invited for membership (with the concurrence of the appropriate Faculty, or, if so designated by the Faculty, the Faculty Dean Search Committee) and may include appropriate representatives of interested constituencies, including non-tenured faculty, students and alumni, as well as an academic administrator appointed by the Provost and a University Trustee appointed by the Board of Trustees. After receiving recommendations from the non-voting members of the Dean Search Committee, the Faculty Dean Search Committee shall hold executive sessions to deliberate and 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 Provost) may invite students, staff, non-tenured 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

December 20, 2012

Adopted, January 11, 2013



## APPENDIX A

### 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.

Report of the Executive Committee  
Michael S. Castleberry, Chair  
11 January 2013

We will continue to discuss the Strategic Plan in the next Senate session. We have received communication from many Committee Chairs that the receipt of the Committee charges re the plan and the end of the Fall Semester did not permit extensive discussion by members of their Committees. We will be requesting that Committee Chairs present feedback from their Committees to the Executive Committee for formal presentation before the Senate. We invite Committee Chairs to come and present feedback during future Senate meetings. Our intent is to have the most expansive discussion of the Plan, the implications of the Plan on faculty and academic programs, etc., and to offer feedback on suggestions and additions to the Plan before the end of the semester. We remind all members of the Senate to carry this message to their schools. It is our hope that responses to the Plan will come from all of the departments and schools of the university as we continue to discuss the ideas and concepts that will guide us over the next decade.

The death of former President Lloyd Hartman Elliott at ninety-four saddens those of us who served in the Senate during his administration and observed his dedication to building a modern university. He put in place the changes that have enabled the growth and expansion of buildings and programs that have shaped what we do today. He dramatically altered the Foggy Bottom campus during his tenure, including constructing the three University libraries: the Estelle and Melvin Gelman Library, the Jacob Burns Law Library and the Himmelfarb Health Sciences Library as well as Fungler Hall, the Smith Center, Ross Hall, the Academic Cluster, and the Marvin Center. He provided a financial base for the University by increasing the university's endowment from \$8 million to \$200 million between 1965 and his retirement in 1988. He presided over the Senate with calm efficiency, always eager to move the agenda. He was dedicated to this University and, at the end of his tenure, was the longest-serving president of a major university in the United States. He also had a wicked jump shot even at seventy! His contributions to the well-being of the university, and to all of us who labor here today is enormous. We honor him for his lasting contributions and mourn his loss. In remembering him, we acknowledge again the significance of his contribution to what we do today and will do in the future as the university he helped bring into the modern era continues to aspire to the greatness of which he believed we were so capable.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is Friday, January 25. Please submit any resolutions or topics for consideration at the February meeting to Sue Campell before that time. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate is February 8th. We have invited Vice-President Chalupa to discuss the research agenda of the University and Senior Associate Vice President for Finance Lawlor, Chair of the Innovation Task Force, to present the ways in which funds have been utilized and distributed to academic programs since the ITF was created three years ago.

The Executive Committee has recommended that the following faculty members serve on the Trachtenberg Prize selection Committees: Teaching: Michael Castleberry; Research: Bruce Dickson; Service: Charles Garris.

Welcome back! We have much to do over the next four months!