

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, DC

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING
HELD ON JANUARY 15, 2016
IN THE STATE ROOM

- Present: President Knapp, Registrar Amundson, and Parliamentarian Charnovitz; Executive Committee Chair Garris; Professors Barnhill, Brazinsky, Costello, Dickinson, Harrington, Hawley, Hopkins, Marotta-Walters, McAleavey, McDonnell, McHugh, Newcomer, Packer, Price, Pulcini, Roddis, Rohrbeck, Sidawy, Squires, Swaine, Swiercz, Williams, Wilmarth, and Wirtz.
- Absent: Interim Provost Maltzman, Deans Akman, Brigety, Dolling, Eskandarian, Feuer, Goldman, Jeffries, Livingstone, Morant, Vinson; Professors Downes, Ellis, Galston, Griesshammer, Katz, Khourey, Miller, Perry, Rehman, Rice, Rimal, Sarkar, Shesser, Welsh, and Zeman.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:17 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the October 9 and November 13, 2015 Faculty Senate meetings were approved without comment.

President Knapp introduced the Senate's new Director of Senate Operations, Liz Carlson, who began work for the Senate on January 6th.

DISCUSSION OF A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE *FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN* TO AUTHORIZE NON-TENURED REGULAR FACULTY IN THREE SCHOOLS TO SERVE IN THE FACULTY SENATE (16/6) (Professor A. Wilmarth on behalf of PEAFF)

Professor Wilmarth indicated that he would not repeat the resolution introductory remarks he made at the December Senate meeting but would answer any questions that members of the Senate might have at this point. President Knapp noted that the resolution did not require a second as it emanated from a committee and opened the floor for discussion and debate of the resolution.

Professor Swiercz expressed several concerns about the resolution. First, the exemption proposed by the resolution is permanent and represents a fundamental change in the nature of GW's faculty governance system. Second, the non-tenurable members faculty in the School of Medicine (SMHS) – namely, the physicians of the Medical Faculty Associates (MFA) appear not to be full employees of the university. Third, the problem of too few tenured faculty in the School of Nursing (SON) and the Milken Institute School of Public Health (GWSPH) will be solved over time as current tenure-track faculty attain tenure and become eligible for service on the Faculty Senate. Finally, the proposed exemption leaves non-tenurable faculty in the remaining schools without a similar benefit, creating a third class of faculty. Professor Swiercz closed his remarks by noting that there are

governance questions before the Senate but that the current resolution is not a favorable solution to a very legitimate concern.

Professor Sidawy responded by noting that the MFA's charter defines the MFA as an independent group that exists solely for the education of the students in the medical school. It does not have a governance provision that would cover issues related to benefits or promotion.

Professor Barnhill noted that the problem with the SON not having adequate tenured faculty to provide adequate membership on the Faculty Senate is a temporary problem. A longer-term problem is that the faculty of the Medical Faculty Associates are not tenurable. However, Professor Barnhill noted his opinion that the current resolution is weak. If the Senate wishes to provide a broader advisory board, then it should reach out to students, staff, alumni, faculty of all ranks, friends of the university, and even paid consultants for certain issues. These constituencies should be included more effectively in order for the Senate to provide better advice on issues.

Professor Barnhill also expressed his concern over the inclusion of non-tenured faculty with regard to the Senate's managerial responsibilities. The Senate occasionally has to make difficult and occasionally controversial decisions, and tenure provides a protection for the faculty members voting on those decisions.

Professor Barnhill concluded his remarks by suggesting that the Senate should consider tabling the current resolution and sending it back to the PEAFC committee with the objective of coming back with a resolution that more narrowly focuses on the two real problems that need to be solved – the representation of SON and MFA faculty in the Senate. Professor Barnhill noted his concern that proceeding with this resolution would result in proposals to amend it so that it applies to the entire university. Finally, he noted that the School of Business (GWSB) faculty conducted a written survey regarding the current resolution, the results of which indicated 71% opposition to the resolution as written.

Professor McAleavey commented that members of the Columbian College (CCAS) faculty discussed the resolution in December and expressed hesitation about the resolution, primarily along the lines that the non-tenurable contract faculty in CCAS were excluded from the privilege being proposed for those in other schools. He noted his sense that the resolution is very well intentioned but that he would like to allocate more time and effort to its design this semester.

Professor Wirtz noted that, had the resolution come to the Senate in the form of an exemption for SMHS alone, he would be very inclined to support it. He noted, however, that he doesn't find the same principle basis applying for the inclusion of SON and GWSPH in the proposed exemption. The issue of too few tenured faculty members in SON is a short-term problem that can be solved with a temporary solution. Professor Wirtz further noted that GWSPH is not explicitly referenced in the first "whereas" clause of the resolution and that the justification for an exemption in GWSPH is not as strong as that in SMHS.

President Knapp clarified that the Senate is able to amend or table the resolution. Professor Wirtz motioned that the current resolution be amended so that it pertains to the SMHS alone and not to SON or GWSPH. The motion was seconded by Professor Sidawy, and the floor was opened for discussion of the amendment.

Professor Squires suggested that the resolution should be tabled while the participation discussion considers the question of the Senate's function as something more than an advisory and less than a decision-making body. He therefore opposed the amendment in favor of tabling the resolution for further discussion. He declined to make a motion to table so that discussion of the current proposed amendment might continue.

Professor McAleavey agreed with Professor Wirtz that the case for an SMHS exemption seems much more compelling than that for SON and GWSPH. However, he opposed the amendment in favor of tabling the current resolution.

Professor Pulcini noted that SON is a largely clinical faculty. Of its six tenured faculty, four are in decanal positions, and one is part-time. Twenty-seven additional faculty are not tenurable at present. This may be a temporary situation, but it is not clear how long it will take to resolve the issue, and SON feels strongly about having more representation in the Senate.

Professor Wilmarth noted that sending the resolution back to the PEAf committee would be difficult at this stage without explicit instructions from the Senate on how further work on this resolution should be conducted. He supported the proposed amendment to limit the ongoing exemption to SMHS but wondered whether a friendly amendment to allow a three-year exemption for SON would be acceptable in order to give SON time to increase its tenured faculty count. This proposal was accepted by both Professors Wirtz and Sidawy, and the amendment under discussion was expanded to include a three-year, temporary exemption for SON as well as the permanent exemption for SMHS.

Dr. Sidawy noted that GWSPH's exclusion from the first "whereas" clause was an oversight in the text of the resolution and that the PEAf committee had agreed to attach GWSPH to the exemption in the resolution.

Dr. Sidawy also expanded on the nature of clinical practice that results in a fundamental difference in tenurable faculty in the clinical professions. New MFA faculty members need at least three to five years to develop a practice in clinical medicine. Should a clinical faculty member on a tenure track not receive tenure, they have to leave the institution, and a replacement faculty member begins anew on the three- to five-year process of building a practice. This is a problem unique to clinical faculty and is the reason that faculty at universities across the country are more and more often exempted from tenure consideration. Excluding full-time faculty who are there, by definition, to educate GW medical students, creates a fundamental problem in governance.

Professor Barnhill made a motion to recommit with instructions to the PEAf committee to take into account the points that have been made in discussion. The motion was seconded, and the floor was opened to debate on the motion to recommit. Upon request, Professor Barnhill clarified that instructions to the PEAf committee should include a request to explore the possibility of narrower resolutions to the representation problem, including the amendment proposed during this meeting, a type of tenure for clinical faculty, and others not yet discussed.

Professor Wilmarth spoke against the motion to recommit, asking instead for a vote on the proposed amendment. The amendment vote would indicate whether a narrower solution to the problem is the will of the Senate.

Professor Marotta-Walters also spoke against the motion to recommit, indicating that a feeling of disenfranchisement within two schools is a problem for the entire university. She suggested that GWSPH be included in the temporary exemption under consideration for SON.

Professor Swiercz spoke in favor of the motion to recommit with a specific charge to the PEAFF committee to come back with an answer regarding the technical question of the status of MFA faculty as GW employees. The Yeshiva Supreme Court decision was designed under the assumption that faculty in a shared governance position are employees of the institution. It would follow therefore that if MFA faculty – non-tenurable, non-employee faculty – are permitted membership in the Senate, the Senate’s role is stepped back into a purely advisory role. Professor Swiercz also asked that the PEAFF committee return with a forum to discuss the general trend away from tenure at GW.

Professor Knapp responded by noting that GW has not moved away from tenure and that since his arrival, approximately 140 tenured lines have been added to the GW faculty. The removal of tenure from the clinical medical faculty took place well over ten years ago and is not a recent development. The Board of Trustees has made clear its commitment to tenure and to maintaining tenure, one of the reasons it took a strong interest in the standards for tenure in the last rounds of discussions with the Senate.

Professor Wirtz inquired whether Professor Barnhill might be willing to temporarily withdraw his motion to recommit so that a vote on the amendment might take place, providing counsel to Professor Wilmarth for the PEAFF committee should the motion to recommit ultimately succeed. Professor Barnhill declined to withdraw his motion.

The motion to recommit failed in a vote (6 in favor, 19 against), and the debate returned to the amendment to restrict the permanent representation change to SMHS and provide a temporary three-year exemption to SON.

Professor McHugh asked for clarification on the question of how important tenure is for Senate service. Professor Swiercz responded that he felt tenure to be extremely important to Senate service given that Senate members openly discuss controversial matters and express opinions that may not be well received by those with budgetary authority at the university.

Professor Barnhill spoke in favor of the amendment in anticipation of then voting again on recommitting the resolution to the PEAFF committee for further work.

Professor McDonnell motioned for a friendly amendment to add the GWSPH to the three-year temporary exemption under discussion for SON. The motion was seconded by Professor Wilmarth, and debate was opened on this question. Professor Wirtz asked what the rationale was for including GWSPH in the temporary exemption. Professor McDonnell responded that GWSPH faculty are largely research faculty and have spoken clearly on how they would like their faculty represented in the Senate. Professor Barnhill noted that GWSPH has adequate tenured faculty who are eligible for Senate service and does not require an exemption matching that for SON. Professor Pulcini expressed her support for the additional amendment, noting that SMHS, SON, and GWSPH are fundamentally and structurally different from the other GW schools and therefore require different consideration with regard to Senate representation.

The amendment to add GWSPH to the proposed temporary three-year exemption period failed in a vote (8 in favor, 13 opposed). Debate returned to the original amendment proposing permanent exemption for SMHS and a three-year temporary exemption for SON.

Professor McAleavey noted that the resolution as written is overcomplicated and feels like a series of patches to a simple problem. The current system requiring tenure is the simplest route, and a solution to the MFA problem might be to find a way to award tenure while in service at the MFA for the purposes of governance. This tenure would have different criteria than the rest of the university.

Prior to the vote, Parliamentarian Charnovitz clarified the changes to the resolution that would result from the amendment. Specifically, there would be no change on page one of the resolution. On page two, the fourth recital, the reference to MISPH would be deleted, leaving “Whereas SMHS and SON.” In the actual operative part of the resolution, the first paragraph would be amended to read, “An exemption to the foregoing rule regarding eligibility for services of faculty members of the senate is provided for the School of Medicine and Health Sciences and the School of Nursing to the extent...” At the end of that sentence, the following sentence would be added: “This exemption for the School of Nursing shall expire after three years from the date of enactment by the trustees.”

Professor Rohrbeck asked for clarification on the status of MFA faculty as GW employees. President Knapp responded that members of the MFA have faculty appointments in SMHS. They engage in all three areas typically expected of tenure track and tenured faculty – teaching, research, and, in the case of the MFA, patient care in lieu of the service component – but they are not GWU employees and have not been employees of the university for approximately fifteen years.

Professor Hopkins suggested that the Senate is fractured on the representation question in that some Senate members feel that the question of representation for all GW non-tenurable faculty has not been adequately addressed and could result in a slippery slope should the current resolution succeed. Professor Sidawy responded to this concern, noting that the MFA faculty as a whole do not have the ability to become tenured, while faculty in the other schools have tenure track lines.

The amendment carried in a vote (18 in favor, 7 opposed). Professor Barnhill made a motion to recommit, which was seconded. Professor Roddis spoke in favor of the motion to recommit, noting that the issue has become divisive because issues regarding representation and governance have become conflated with issues around the nature of tenure at GW. She noted an issue with how tenure is supported in all the schools and how stakeholders who are broadly interpreted as faculty – even if they are not narrowly interpreted as faculty under Yeshiva – are best represented.

Professor Garris responded to this concern, noting that the current resolution is actually quite narrow and solves two important problems, specifically the representation of the MFA and SON faculty in the Senate. Professor Garris spoke against recommitting the resolution and called for a vote. Professor Wilmarth supported this sentiment and noted that the medical center had its own faculty senate that was essentially disbanded several years ago with the dissolution of the Medical Center. That senate permitted representation by untenured faculty members, so MFA faculty were represented. He noted that the configuration of SMHS is not going to change and is consistent with that of other medical schools across the country; the ongoing representation problem can therefore be solved by the current resolution. SON will arrive at a point in time when it has adequate tenured

faculty members for traditional Senate membership, and the temporary exemption provides a solution until that point. Professor Brazinsky spoke in support of these points.

Professor Barnhill asked what the response should be when other schools ask about representation for non-tenurable faculty. Professor Wilmarth responded that a broader look could then be taken at that issue but that the possibility of that question shouldn't delay a fix to the medical school's representation problem. Professor Barnhill spoke again in favor of a motion to recommit in order to bring an alternate resolution back to the table that would address every school.

Professor Costello asked whether the passage of this resolution would require a vote in the faculty assembly as it would require a change to the Faculty Organization Plan. President Knapp responded that there are two routes to this vote, either a presentation of the motion on the floor (requiring a two-thirds majority to pass) or a mail ballot (requiring a simple majority to pass).

Professor Hopkins asked whether enfranchising the approximately 275 members of the medical faculty would have an effect on the number of representatives SMHS, SON, and GWSPH would have in the Faculty Senate. Professor Wilmarth responded that the allocation of representatives is governed by Article 3, Section 2(a)(3), which appears in the resolution's first "whereas" clause. The resolution does not propose amending that allocation. Professor Barnhill noted that the topic of representation based on the size of each school's faculty would be a topic raised in the future.

The vote to recommit failed (11 in favor, 12 opposed), and debate returned to the amended resolution. Professor Barnhill spoke against the resolution on the grounds that the issue will be brought back to the Senate with regard to every school. Professor Price suggested that the "whereas" clauses be edited to clarify why SMHS and SON are receiving these exemptions, which will help avoid the slippery slope to all non-tenurable faculty that has been raised as a concern. Professor Wilmarth responded that he, Professor Garris, and possibly Professor Wirtz could revise the "whereas" clauses and circulate them for comment. President Knapp noted that Parliamentarian Charnovitz would prefer delegating the editing of the "whereas" clauses to the Senate Executive Committee should the resolution pass.

Professor Roddis inquired about the number of MFA faculty who currently participate in the governance opportunities open to them. Dr. Sidawy noted representation on the PEAFF, libraries, and ASPP committees as well as on internal medical school governance committees.

Professor Newcomer noted her discomfort with the exclusion of GWSPH from the tenure exemption, given that this faculty will continue to be comprised largely of research faculty.'

The amended resolution passed in a vote (14 in favor, 7 opposed).

REPORT OF GW DEVELOPMENTS AND INITIATIVES IN ON-LINE EDUCATION

Outgoing Vice Provost for Online Education and Academic Innovation Paul Schiff Berman spoke to the Senate about GW's online education initiatives. Vice Provost Berman noted that, at the time he began working on online initiatives in the Office of the Provost, each school had its own distinct online strategy and operations. GW had neither a centralized online education strategy nor a centralized accounting of online education activities across the university. Now, there is a coherent

strategy, a set of centralized resources, and for the first time the ability to track all hundred-plus GW online programs on a single website searchable by topic area as well as type of degree.

Vice Provost Berman reported that, based on reviews of the schools' five-year plans, online programs are projected to gross almost \$70 million in revenue in FY16 and over \$100million by FY20, exclusive of several programs that are currently under development. Online education therefore represents a significant portion of GW's educational enterprise, particularly as the enrollment cap in Foggy Bottom requires that GW look strategically at other avenues for increasing enrollments.

Vice Provost Berman addressed the preconception that online education consists of watching a lecture online and therefore doesn't represent sound educational delivery. On the contrary, he reported, both the pedagogical thinking underlying online education and the technology for delivering it have gotten better and better and are progressing all the time. The new GW eDesign shop includes an instructional design team, video, computer animation, and production supervision and allows for the creation of truly state-of-the-art courses that are as good or better than any online courses being built anywhere in the world. Camera crews can be deployed to demonstrate practical applications of concepts being taught. Students and a faculty member can log in together to engage in real-time, face-to-face online seminar-style conversations. Panels of experts can be convened regardless of location. The shop has proved so successful that the demand for its services has outpaced its staffing; Vice Provost Berman anticipated that more support will be required to ensure the shop's ability to continue to provide services to those requesting them.

The Online Education office has also been providing central support for a range of activities connected to online program delivery that was previously decentralized within the schools. These services include planning online programs, determining which existing programs will work well online, and deciding whether using external vendors for program delivery makes sense for a given program and at what level. In addition, state authorization paperwork and funding has been centralized, as has disability accessibility of online program materials and online exam proctoring.

Vice Provost Berman reported that he has been very involved in creating a standardized faculty license so that potential new and innovative programs wouldn't be hindered by faculty concerns about intellectual property. The new default faculty license gives the faculty member full intellectual property rights in all of the material for their courses, even if the eDesign shop helped create those materials.

A strategic plan for online education was developed through a planning committee chaired by Vice Provost Berman. The strategic plan for online education asked that the eDesign shop create as much course material as possible in-house but left the door open for outsourcing other services such as student recruitment. Some of GW's online programs do work with outside vendors, but Vice Provost Berman's office has been working to ultimately have fewer of these and to deploy them more strategically with real intentionality about when using an external vendor makes sense.

GW's online education focus has been on degree-based education and not on large-scale massive open online courses (MOOC)s, which are freely available to the public. The degree programs charge full tuition and have the same admission standards as GW's on-campus degree programs, and they are treated as full GW degrees. GW has, though, also presented a few MOOCs, raising money to support them so that they are not a drain on GW's budget. The MOOCs GW has chosen to present

are in areas that are of a strategic value to GW, functioning almost as marketing tools as well as information delivery systems. SON is planning to create a series of open courses that are non-degree based but will offer certificates of completion. These courses will be stackable and presented through Coursera, an outside company with a platform for open courses. SON and Coursera would split the revenue from these courses.

Vice Provost Berman noted that he believes online education at GW is likely to grow in importance. Online is significant because it allows GW to reach qualified students who can't or don't want to physically come to our campus. But beyond this key strategic rationale, the sharp distinction between online and on-campus education is eroding as more faculty use elements of both traditional and online delivery to educate students, and students grow to expect a mix of online and on-campus elements in their on-campus education. The ability for an on-campus student to do some coursework online opens up the possibility for scheduling externships, for example, and that flexibility is an attractive draw for many students. GW must therefore ensure that its online offerings are top quality, going beyond simply recreating what's done in the classroom.

Professor Costello inquired about how state authorizations will be handled going forward with the disbanding of the current office of online education. Vice Provost Berman noted that some of these critical authorization issues may dissipate somewhat when DC joins the State Authorization Reciprocity Act. Nevertheless, this is a key compliance matter, and Jennifer Lopez, in the GW tax office, will be taking the lead on state authorization issues upon Vice Provost Berman's departure from his role.

Professor Wirtz extended his thanks to Vice Provost Berman, noting that the university is now far ahead of where it was with regard to online education compared to the point at which the online education office was created. Professor Wirtz noted that Vice Provost Berman has briefed the Educational Policy committee on a number of online education initiatives. Professor Wirtz introduced Lorena Barba, professor of mechanical and aerospace engineering and a member of the Strategic Planning Committee for Online Education, and requested the privilege of the floor be accorded to Professor Barba.

Professor Barba asked how, with Vice Provost Berman's departure from the position, the university will ensure that online initiatives in each school continue to benefit from a central knowledge base and enforce quality. She further asked how agreements with for-profit corporations fit into GW's strategy for online and digital education. She also asked how GW can move strategically in online education without a central leader for that area, given Vice Provost Berman's departure and no plans to name a replacement in the Office of the Provost.

President Knapp indicated that Interim Provost Maltzman, who was unable to attend this meeting, would be the best person to speak to the Senate regarding plans for the future of online education at GW. This question can be revisited at a future Senate meeting.

Vice Provost Berman addressed the question regarding external vendors and GW's online programs. He expects that the eDesign shop at GW will continue; this group is doing very high quality work but will require more resources to continue to meet these high standards. In addition, Vice Provost Berman noted that the eDesign shop is run by a staff member, not a faculty member, and he discussed the importance of having a faculty person in a leadership position on online education.

Coursera is in use for free, open courses in SON, and the school has no plans to move online degree programs to this vendor. SON Dean Jeffries worked with Coursera at Johns Hopkins prior to her arrival at GW and found it very useful for open courses. Coursera is widely known and receives a lot of traffic, which assists with marketing for GW's non-open online course offerings. Vice Provost Berman noted that he would certainly not recommend moving an entire degree-based program onto Coursera, which would have revenue implications.

Professor Pulcini thanked Vice Provost Berman for his work in this area and agreed that the MOOC offerings on Coursera will help to publicize SON outside of GW.

Professor Barnhill noted that online delivery would permit guest speakers from outside the GW faculty (e.g., Nobel laureates) to easily engage students in a valuable experience. He asked for Vice Provost's observations on online education and the recitation model, which requires more intensive interaction between students and instructors. Vice Provost Berman noted that several online delivery options are available for these types of interactions and that each department determines which framework will work the best for their subject matter.

Professor Garris inquired about quality assurance for online doctoral programs as well as about what intellectual property rights translates to for a given faculty member (e.g., might that faculty member be able to sell course modules to other institutions).

Vice Provost Berman responded that he was not aware of any online doctoral programs at GW but that interactivity is not an issue online. With that said, the student/faculty ratios of doctoral programs tend to be quite low, and the economics of putting a doctoral program online may not make sense. Professor Pulcini noted that SON has an online doctorate of nursing practice. Students do come to campus periodically throughout the program, but it is fully online.

Vice Provost Berman further responded that he was not aware of any barrier to a faculty member choosing to sell online courses in much the same way that faculty members write textbooks and receive royalties from sales. Selling courses to other universities, however, could present the issue of a faculty member appearing to be teaching at two different institutions.

Professor Packer asked whether there have been any projections for what it might cost to increase the gross revenue of GW's online programs by 30% over the next four years. Vice Provost Berman responded that this would require only modest investment over the coming years. The eDesign shop would need to be doubled in size, some administrative and additional technical support funds would need to be provided, and additional faculty stipends would be required, but these investments would likely be in the \$5million/year range, far less than the expected growth in revenue.

President Knapp asked the Senate to join him in thanking Vice Provost Berman for his three years of service in his position.

REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FISCAL PLANNING AND BUDGETING: BENCHMARKING HEALTH PLANS OF MARKET BASKET INSTITUTIONS

Professor Harrington introduced the report by noting that the ASPP and Fiscal Planning & Budget committees established a joint task force to look at the issue of fringe benefits at GW. The task force members were Professors Anbinder, Cordes, and Marotta-Walters. Professor Cordes

presented the report of the joint task force. He noted that his report would cover the issue of benchmarking fringe benefits and the next steps of the benefits task force.

Professor Cordes noted that the question of where GW sits compared to peer institutions with regard to fringe benefits is a complicated question. Preliminary work done by the joint task force relied on the annual surveys produced by the AAUP both of salaries by rank and compensation. The latest survey came out in May 2015, and the numbers presented reflect that survey's data.

A first complicating factor is that there isn't a standard list of fringe benefits beyond the clear-cut categories of retirement and health insurance. The "other cash benefits" category can encompass a broad range of benefits that are not consistent across institutions, which makes comparing them difficult. Looking at the total amount of compensation across the market basket schools, GW ranks eleventh of eighteen schools in terms of the percentage of salary that is paid in benefits.

Another statistic to look at is the Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (NICRA), the rates that institutions negotiate with the federal government for overhead, which includes the fringe rate. Variations across institutions exist here, as well, with some rates including sabbaticals, tuition benefits, family care, sick pay, housing, etc. and others not. GW performs at a similar level to the AAUP survey on this measure.

The benchmark obtained from the benefits consultant followed a different approach and therefore produced different results. This comparison focused on just three benefit items: retirement, health, and tuition remission. The approach for this benchmark was to try to estimate a simulated value of each of these items that can be used to compare institutions. This model attempts to determine what an employee would have to pay to recreate the benefits that the institution didn't provide them as part of a benefits package, or a market replacement value. Under this model, GW ranks eighth out of the eighteen market basket schools. Significant variances can occur based on different benefits options available, and the simulation model with regard to health insurance, for example, uses the plan with the highest participation level as the basis for the market replacement value calculation. This can, however, result in non-parallel health plans from different institutions being compared with each other. Another factor to control for is the employee demographic at different institutions. One university might have a much younger, healthier population than another university. The model controls for this by creating a statistically average employee and applying that individual to each university's benefits structures.

Cost differences across locations have been averaged in previous attempts to obtain standard cost levels; this national average of costs can be applied at each of the market basket schools along with the average employee data.

The report GW received calculated the walk-away benefits value for GW of \$8061. This is not what it would cost someone at GW to replace the PPO basic plan if it was taken away. Rather, it's the simulated cost of what the GW PPO basic plan would cost under these assumptions. Each institution in the market basket therefore has a simulated number based on average employee data and benefits value, and this allows for comparison across institutions.

One thing that ultimately determines the relative rank is the actuarial value, or the percentage of each dollar of health spending that's covered by the plan. For example, an actuarial value of .8 would mean that for every dollar you spend on health care the plan will cover 80 cents. The next step is to

determine what the premiums are that need to be paid to purchase plans at different actuarial values. The GW PPO basic plan ranks low in terms of actuarial value (15 out of 18). However, GW ranks better than many other schools in terms of the employee's share of the cost. The resulting relative rank brings GW up into the middle of the market basket.

These complicated methodologies demonstrate that comparing plans and benefits across universities is not easy. However, benchmarking will continue. Professor Sara Rosenbaum is of the opinion that GW will see some changes in rankings because other universities are grappling with some of the same things that GW is facing with regard to benefits costs. One recent development is that the current planning for the five-year budget plan is contemplating changes to increase the fringe benefit pool. These changes could include applying the full fringe range (25+%) to categories that are currently charged at the lower (8.3%) fringe rate. These changes would be phased in over a period of five years. The upside is that this increase would generate more funds for the benefits pool. However, funds would have to come from the operating budget, which has already been pretty tightly and closely balanced. The need to increase this expense category could be drawn from other expense categories or possibly from increased endowment support. More information will be forthcoming from the next Budget Advisory Committee meeting in March.

Professor Newcomer asked whether part-time instructors would receive additional benefits if their positions are charged the higher fringe rate. Professor Cordes responded that the fringe rate change possibility for part-time faculty is anecdotal at present and that he did not have this information.

Professor Brazinsky asked how the fringe rate change would interact with the new budget model. Professor Cordes responded that any change along these lines would have to be factored into the budget models of each school. Responses to an increased fringe pool could include reducing the amount of supplemental compensation to avoid the increased fringe rate or reducing other expense areas to be able to hold supplemental compensation at its current levels.

Professor Wilmarth inquired about the Benefits Task Force recommendation that non-Medicare covered employees should be moved to a high-deductible health plan and asked whether this is a necessary move due to the fact that Congress has postponed the "Cadillac" tax and seems likely to repeal that tax. Professor Wilmarth's follow-up question involved the up-front out-of-pocket costs that faculty and staff would be likely to incur under a high-deductible plan and the adverse impact such costs would have on employees' out-of-pocket expenditures. Professor Cordes responded that the Budget Advisory Committee is looking at whether existing plans might indeed be replaced by a high-deductible plan, and one question of concern is the transaction cost for the employee.

Vice President for Human Resources Sabrina Ellis responded by noting that the deductible met by the employee can be paid directly from the employee's Health Savings Account (HSA), eliminating the need for the employee to front large costs out of pocket.

Professor Barnhill noted that, anecdotally, United Healthcare is perceived as costly and of lower quality, raising concerns about their being the only option available at GW. He also raised concerns about the lack of transparency on what the employee's deductible requirements actually are.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions introduced.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. Introduction of new nominations for election of faculty members to Senate Standing Committees:

Professor Garris noted that four staff members are nominated for inclusion in Senate committees. Article 3c, paragraph 3 of the Faculty Organization Plan (FOP) notes that the Senate may elect any person to membership in the Senate committees. The only firm requirement is that committee members be elected by the Senate. In the interest of diversity and in getting expertise from a broad range of people who can contribute, it seems that the FOP was designed to be as inclusive as possible on this point. The executive committee unanimously supported the nomination of these four staff members: Kimberly Fulmer, executive coordinator for the accelerated Bachelor of Science and Nursing program in SON (ASPP); Nicholas Mellon, Solutions Center in Academic Technologies (FPB); Delores Magobet Gibson, assistant director of operations in the Institute for Information and Infrastructure Protection in the Graduate School of Education and Human Development (GSEHD) (Physical Facilities committee); and Candace Johnson, director of operations for online learning in the GWSPH dean's office (Educational Policy committee). All four nominations were approved by unanimous vote.

II. Reports of Senate Standing Committees

None.

III. Report of the Executive Committee: Professor C.A. Garris, Chair

Professor Garris presented the report of the Executive Committee. He noted that the committee addressed faculty governance issues, health care benefits, and the Provost transition process. The written report provides these details.

Two grievances are pending, one from SMHS (in mediation) and once from GSEHD (previously in mediation and now on hold pending further planning of the grievant). Professor Garris reports that he inaccurately reported at the December 11 Senate meeting that a grievance from SEAS had completed mediation and had been resolved to everyone's satisfaction. In fact, the members of the Dispute Resolution Committee voted to deny the professor's grievance, which asserted infringement of the grievant's academic freedom and injury to the grievant's reputation concerning attention to professorial responsibilities. The committee members believed that the actions of SEAS and the university administrators were necessary for compliance with federal regulations. However, the committee voted that letters of reprimand or other adverse statements related to the series of incidents be deleted from the professor's personnel file. To date, the professor has not appealed the decision.

In a separate incident, there was an allegation of research misconduct under the GW Policy and Procedures Regarding Research Misconduct. The Senate has a role in determining the inquiry committee. The Chair of the Executive Committee and the Chair of the Senate Research Committee were indeed consulted and met this requirement.

Professor Garris welcomed Liz Carlson to the role of Director of Senate Operations and thanked Vice Provost Dianne Martin, and especially Jackie Akyea, Jennifer Sieck, and Cassandra Wiseman for their assistance in providing administrative support to the Senate in the six months since Sue Campbell's passing.

Upcoming Senate meetings will include presentations from Vice President Aristide Collins (on development), Dean Linda Livingstone (on new directions in the GWSB), and Director of Athletics and Recreation Patrick Nero (on GW athletic programs). Also planned for future meetings are presentations from President Knapp (on reducing bureaucracy at GW), Interim Provost Maltzman (on the core indicators of academic excellence), and Associate Provost Doug Shaw (on international programs).

IV. Provost's Remarks

None due to Interim Provost Maltzman's absence.

V. Chair's Remarks

President Knapp noted that the project the deans and vice presidents are working on to reduce bureaucracy is closely related to another joint effort designed to reduce the cost structure of the central administration.

He referenced his recent statement explaining that, with the new budget model that is now built into the five-year plans of the university and all the schools, the university is providing more control over tuition revenues to the schools. This will result in less tuition revenue coming to the central administration, which will require budget adjustments. These adjustments should be made in a way that does not have unintended consequences in terms of reductions of services, so it will be important that the deans are involved in discussions with the vice presidents seeking those savings. The plans for administrative cost-cutting are fairly robust; divisions have been asked to identify 3-5% in budget reductions for each of the next five years.

President Knapp noted that the university will again observe the Martin Luther King, Jr., holiday with a day of service. This year's participation levels are the highest yet and has registered so much student, faculty, and staff participation that the opening assembly had to be moved to a larger venue. President Knapp noted that this event is a very important part of the culture of service that has been established at GW over the past several years.

BRIEF STATEMENTS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:58pm.

**A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE *FACULTY ORGANIZATION PLAN* TO
AUTHORIZE NON-TENURED REGULAR FACULTY IN THREE SCHOOLS
TO SERVE IN THE FACULTY SENATE**

WHEREAS, Whereas, Article III.2(a)(3) of the *Faculty Organization Plan*, entitled “Membership,” currently provides:

“3. The faculty members of the Senate shall be elected by and from their faculties as follows: the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, 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 Elliott School of International Affairs, 3 seats; the Milken Institute School of Public Health, 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 the election. Vice presidents, assistant vice presidents, deans, associate deans, assistant deans, and other faculty members whose duties are primarily administrative in nature shall be ineligible for election as faculty members of the Senate.”

WHEREAS, the academic programs of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences (SMHS) and the School of Nursing (SON) are different from the academic programs of other schools in the University because intensive clinical training represents a very large component of the academic programs of SMHS and SON, and the clinical training programs of SMHS and SON require a low student-faculty ratio as well as a large number of Regular Faculty who hold non-tenure-track appointments; and

WHEREAS, SMHS and SON each has a comparatively small percentage of tenured faculty who are eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate, and the percentage of tenured faculty at each School is expected to decline or not increase significantly in future years; and

WHEREAS, On June 18, 2015, the University’s Board of Trustees approved amendments to Article I.B. of the *Faculty Code*, including an amendment that exempted SMHS, SON, and the Milken Institute School of Public Health (MISPH) from the provisions of Article I.B. requiring that at least 75% of the Regular Faculty in each school must hold tenured or tenure-track appointments and at least 50% of the Regular Faculty in each department must hold tenured or tenure-track appointments; and

WHEREAS, As a result of that amendment to Article I.B. of the *Faculty Code*, SMHS, SON and MISPH do not have maximum limits on their authority to appoint Regular Faculty with non-tenure-track positions;

WHEREAS, Before MISPH and SON became independent schools, the University's public health and nursing programs were part of the University's former Medical Center, which included SMHS; and

WHEREAS, The former Medical Center established its own Medical Center Faculty Assembly and Medical Center Faculty Senate, which functioned as separate governance bodies until the Medical Center was disbanded several years ago; and

WHEREAS, Full-time faculty with non-tenure-track positions in the former Medical Center (including faculty from the medical, nursing and public health programs) were eligible to serve in the former Medical Center Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, SMHS, SON and MISPH each has Regular Faculty with non-tenure-track appointments at the rank of Associate Professor and Professor who have more than three years of full-time service to the University and are willing to serve in the Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, On September 11, 2015, the Faculty Senate approved Revised Substitute Faculty Senate Resolution 16/4, which endorsed the concept of expanding Senate membership to permit the inclusion of non-tenured Regular Faculty from each school at the rank of Associate Professor and Professor with at least three years of full-time service to the University, provided that at least half of the faculty members of the Senate from each school would be required to hold tenured appointments, but that proposal was not adopted by the Faculty Assembly at its meeting on November 10, 2015;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

1. That paragraph 3 of Article III, Section 2(a) entitled, "Membership" be amended by the addition of the following sentence at the end of the paragraph:

An exemption to the foregoing rule regarding eligibility for service as a faculty member of the Senate is provided for the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, the School of Nursing, and the Milken Institute School of Public Health to the extent that, from those three schools only, Regular Faculty with non-tenure-track appointments shall be eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate, provided that such Regular Faculty shall have completed at least three years of full-time service to the University and shall have attained the rank of Associate Professor or higher, and provided further, that at least half of the faculty members of the Senate from each of those three Schools shall be tenured faculty members.

2. That the Faculty Senate Executive Committee consult with the Administration as to an appropriate time for consideration of this proposal by the Faculty Assembly and that the Executive Committee be authorized, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, to issue a formal petition to the President, as Chairman of the Faculty Assembly, to place this proposal on the Agenda of the next regular or special meeting of the Faculty Assembly.

References:

A Revised Substitute Resolution on Recommended Changes to the *Faculty Organization Plan* Regarding Faculty Participation in the Faculty Senate (Revised Substitute 16/4), approved by the Faculty Senate on September 11, 2015.

ONLINE EDUCATION & ACADEMIC INNOVATION

- ▶ GW currently offers over 100 online degree and certificate programs, projected to gross almost \$70 million in revenue in FY16 and over \$100 million in FY20, with more in the pipeline.
- ▶ The new eDesign Shop is a comprehensive production shop for state-of-the-art online course creation; the Instructional Technology Lab provides support for course operation, including synchronous online. Both units need to expand.
- ▶ Central support is currently provided for program planning, state authorization/accreditation, disability accessibility, exam proctoring, technical support, video streaming, promotional videos, contract negotiation, faculty licenses, and administrative logistics.
- ▶ The strategic plan for online aims to consolidate the number of different online vendors and deploy them more strategically.
- ▶ The new GW Online website provides links to every online program.
- ▶ Three MOOCs have been produced, with more in development.
- ▶ Online education is likely to grow in importance as the sharp distinction between online and on-campus education erodes.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Charles A. Garris, Chair

January 15, 2016

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Faculty Governance:

As a follow-up to the November Faculty Assembly meeting, the Executive Committee took the following actions:

1. In view of the interest of the GW Community in expanding membership in the Faculty Senate, and in putting forward Resolution 16/6, the Executive Committee discussed possible amendments that might better consolidate divergent views. A straw pole among Senate members was taken, and the conclusion was to proceed with Resolution 16/6 as it was presented at the November Faculty Senate meeting.
2. The Task Force on Remote Voting, Chaired by Professor Wirtz, has met and is considering models used at other universities. The challenge is to achieve the goal of making use of modern and certifiably reliable technology to achieve maximum participation; sustaining the quality of deliberation; and having a workable process not requiring unproven or costly resources.

Health Care Benefits:

The Executive Committee has been keeping in communication with the ASPP, Benefits Task Force, and the Benefits Advisory Counsel in connection with health benefits. We will make sure that Benefits continue to be an issue at the forefront of Senate study.

Provost Transition Process:

The Executive Committee continues to interact with the Administration to discuss changes within the Office of the Provost and how the Senate can most productively ensure meaningful input during the interim period. We will also be following the search process for a new Provost.

FACULTY PERSONNEL MATTERS

Grievances

There are currently two grievances pending. The first, from the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, is in the mediation stage. The second, from the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, was previously in the mediation stage but is currently on hold pending further planning of the grievant.

At the December 11 Faculty Senate meeting, I inaccurately reported that a grievance from the School of Engineering and Applied Science completed the mediation process and was resolved to everyone's satisfaction. A more accurate description of what actually happened is that the members of the Grievance Committee voted to deny the professor's grievance which asserted infringement of the grievant's academic freedom and injury to

grievant's reputation concerning attention to professional responsibilities. The committee members believed that the actions of the SEAS and university administrations were necessary for compliance with federal regulations. However, the Grievance Committee voted that letters of reprimand or other adverse statements related to this series of incidents be deleted from the professor's personnel file. To date, the professor has not appealed the decision. It was probably inaccurate for me to have stated that this case was resolved to everyone's satisfaction.

Allegations of Research Misconduct

There has been an allegation of Research Misconduct. Under the GW POLICY AND PROCEDURES REGARDING RESEARCH MISCONDUCT, this allegation is currently in the inquiry stage. The Research Integrity Officer of GW is in the process of setting up an inquiry committee. In accordance with the GW Policy, the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Chair of the Senate Research Committees have been duly consulted by the Research Integrity Officer. At the conclusion of the inquiry process, an Inquiry Report will be produced. The Research Integrity Officer will transmit the final report with his or her recommendations to the Provost. The Provost will make a determination of whether findings from the inquiry provide probable cause to believe that research misconduct has occurred in order to justify conducting an investigation and/or whether other actions are appropriate. The inquiry is completed when the Provost makes this determination.

ANY OTHER MATTERS

- In December, I reported that the Faculty Senate Coordinator position has been filled by Liz Carlson. I am very pleased to introduce her to you. Liz stand up and be recognized. Liz is now on the job for us, and I am sure that we can look forward to many improvements and innovations in the operations of the Senate Office. As I mentioned to you last time, Liz has been at GW for over 14 years, most recently in the Provost's Office. Prior to coming to GW, Liz worked at the Yale School of Medicine and at MIT. During her 14 years at GW, she has worked with Don Lehman, Craig Linbaugh, and many others, so she knows her way around the administration of GW. She is very computer savvy, so we can expect to see changes in our Senate website, in our On-Line Forum, and other areas. She holds a BA in Psychology from Yale University. Liz will seek an assistant's position to work under her. We have many big ideas for improving the Senate and the services we provide to the faculty and hope to enlist your support in providing new ideas. Also, we appreciate your help in assisting Liz in getting up to speed and in being patient. Liz is a fast learner, and I am sure we will find the Senate administration in ship-shape condition and smooth sailing very soon.
- Again, I would like to thank Dianne Martin for her help in providing excellent administrative support during the long period between Sue Campbell's tragic death and the present. In particular, I would like to thank Jacqueline Akyea for her very hard work on the Senate minutes. She did a terrific job with a very challenging task in view of the importance of the discussions and her recent arrival to the Senate arena; and to Jennifer Sieck and Cassandra Wiseman who have been of immense help in everything from the Senate budget, website, to arranging meetings, and many other matters.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The following are some tentative upcoming reports:

February 12, 2016:

Vice President Aristide Collins – Report on GW Development

Dean Linda Livingstone – Report on New Directions in the School of Business

Director of Athletics & Recreation Patrick Nero – Report on GW Athletic Activities

March 11

President Knapp – Report on Initiatives to Reduce University Buracracy

Interim Provost Maltzman – Core Indicators of Academic Excellence

Senior Associate Provost Douglas Shaw – Report on GW International Programs

Thank You.