

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D.C.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON  
FEBRUARY 10, 2012 IN THE STATE ROOM

Present: President Knapp, Provost Lerman, Registrar Amundson, and Parliamentarian Charnovitz; Deans Barratt, Feuer, Goldman and Johnson; Professors Barnhill, Brand-Ballard, Castleberry, Cordes, Corry, Dickson, Fairfax, Galston, Garris, Greenberg, Harrington, Kessmann, Klaren, McAleavey, Newcomer, Parsons, Price, Rehman, Shesser, Simon, Williams, Wirtz, and Yezer

Absent: Interim Dean Akman, Deans Berman, Brown, Dolling, Eskandarian, and Guthrie; Professors Helgert, Hotez, Ku, Lipscomb, and Wilmarth

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by President Knapp at 2:15 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on December 9, 2011 were approved as distributed.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE UNIVERSITY'S SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY AND CORRESPONDING PROCEDURES

Provost Lerman related that, on April 4, 2011, the University received new guidance from the Department of Education concerning changes it expected all Universities to make in their policies to bring them into compliance with Title IX. Most of the guidance centered around what colleges must do to prohibit, investigate and redress incidents of sexual assault, which is now considered a form of sexual harassment.

The University's Title IX Coordinator is Vice Provost Terri Harris Reed, and she has been leading the effort to achieve policy compliance by drafting proposed changes. A working group that includes University Counsel has been formed and has been at work for quite some time. Compliance will require changes to two policies: student judicial procedures set forth in the Guide to Student Rights and Responsibilities, and the University's Sexual Harassment Policy. Draft changes to these policies were submitted to the Department of Education in mid-December, and the expectation was that the Department would provide a response within thirty to sixty days. The process has moved along more quickly than anticipated and the exchange of draft policies is now in its third

iteration. Provost Lerman said that Vice Provost Reed is doing an outstanding job coordinating this effort, particularly since the guidance received from the Department outlines objectives, but does not always provide crystal clear guidance on what the expectations will be of the University.

The Senate Executive Committee has been briefed on the ongoing progress of this process, as has the Board of Trustees. Once the Department of Education returns its commentary on proposed changes, the policy changes to the two documents would be adopted through regular University processes. The drafts will be forwarded to the Senate Executive Committee for consideration by the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (Harassment Policy changes), and the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students (student judicial procedures in the Guide to Student Rights and Responsibilities). The Committees will provide their recommendations to the Senate concerning the proposed changes. The Board of Trustees is the ultimate authority on these policies, because it has the right to approve or disapprove any policy change.

Professor Parsons asked about the nature of the policy changes involved. Provost Lerman characterized them as significant, not editorial. For example, in some of GW's student judicial processes there is an asymmetry between the rights of the alleged perpetrator and the rights of the person bringing a complaint. The parties have different rights to information, and different appeal rights. The goal is achieving symmetry in these rights, and this represents a substantive change in the way the University handles these matters.

Vice Provost Reed observed that, under present procedure, the alleged victim has typically not been a party to the complaint; the University is the complainant. Under new procedures, alleged complainants will have the opportunity to be a party, rather than just a witness. Should they choose to be a party in the case, this will mean that complainants will have a right to investigative materials they do not have access to at present.

Provost Lerman added that under the current Sexual Harassment Policy, an option made available to complainants is that of mediation. Under the new policy, this will still be true for harassment cases, but when the conduct escalates to sexual violence, this will no longer be an option and student judicial process must be invoked.

Professor Castleberry asked for more information on the timeline for the policy revision process. Vice Provost Reed confirmed that the Department of Education responded to the University's December submission at the end of January, and the University has already responded to the Department. Thus, the drafting process is now in its third iteration. Professor Castleberry noted that the time frame left for consideration by the Senate and its Committees is quite short if the policy changes are to be finalized by June, 2012.

#### INTRODUCTION OF SABRINA ELLIS, VICE PRESIDENT FOR HUMAN RESOURCES

President Knapp introduced and welcomed the newest member of his senior staff, Vice President for Human Resources Sabrina Ellis, who has been at GW for approximately a

month. Ms. Ellis came to the University from her previous role as an Assistant Vice President of City College, which is now a part of the CUNY system. Prior to that she worked at New York University, after working in the pharmaceutical industry.

Ms. Ellis thanked the Senate for the opportunity to speak briefly. She said that her work in the pharmaceutical industry had given her an opportunity to work with researchers, and this proved a very good training ground for her later work in higher education. She observed that researchers are very focused on their work, and prefer not to take time from their research activities to deal with administrative minutiae. She added that she was able to bring this perspective to both of the universities, and it proved quite beneficial.

Ms. Ellis said that working with faculty has been one of the things she has enjoyed most about her career in higher education. Universities have one of the most highly-educated and intelligent work forces, and faculty members tend to have very high expectations of Human Resources staff. Ms. Ellis said she hoped to be a very good partner and ally to the faculty, and would work to develop a very good and strong relationship in assisting faculty to accomplish the academic mission of the University.

Ms. Ellis noted that Human Resources in a higher education environment is a very different service delivery model when HR staff are working with faculty as opposed to working with staff alone. It is important to eliminate a lot of the layers faculty have to negotiate that take them away from their primary academic pursuits. Human Resources can help to eliminate layers by bringing in talent to the organization. In addition to gathering data to support administrative processes such as accurate record-keeping, benefits planning is a significant part of the Human Resources mission, as is providing assistance in navigating complex processes that can be unfamiliar intimidating, and overwhelming. The role of Human Resources is to provide expertise and assistance, so that a positive experience can occur.

In terms of benefits planning, Ms. Ellis said that February marks the beginning of the process of planning for next year. This involves looking at the entire benefits portfolio to ensure that the University's offerings are competitive. Claims experience from the prior year is also reviewed. There are two Committees that Human Resources works with as the benefits planning process moves forward: the Benefits Advisory Committee (BAC), which includes faculty representation, and the Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies, (ASPP) whose Chair, Professor Gupta, also serves on the BAC. Ms. Ellis said she had already met with members of the ASPP Committee and hoped very soon to have the opportunity to meet with the BAC.

Professor Yezer said that he had found it useful to consult a fee-based financial planner, and had suggested this might be offered as a benefit for faculty. There are a number of very good fee-based planners in the Washington Metropolitan area, and he asked if this benefit is one Ms. Ellis had encountered elsewhere.

Ms. Ellis noted that GW presently offers non-fee-based financial planning resources through two of its vendors, TIAA-CREF, and Fidelity. The possibility of providing a fee-based benefit to faculty was raised at a recent ASPP meeting, and Ms. Ellis said she and a number of her partners in the Benefits Office would look into it.

## GENERAL BUSINESS

### I. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Castleberry presented the Report of the Executive Committee; the Report is included with these minutes. The Faculty Senate Report presented to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees at its meeting February 9, 2012 (referenced in the Executive Committee Report) is also included with these minutes.

### II. PROVOST'S REMARKS

Provost Lerman provided a brief update on the progress of formulating the University's new Strategic Plan. He noted that the process plan has already been shared with the Senate. The Steering Committee has been meeting weekly, and a series of forums and dinners have been held to gather input. Meetings have also been held with several departments, schools and administrative units so that the Steering Committee could gather information together and develop a coherent statement of what it thinks the themes should be for the Strategic Plan and why. The idea is to use this document, which is in the final editing stage, as a backdrop and preparation piece for charging and populating four working groups to move into the next planning stage, which will be conducted during the spring semester.

These four working groups will include faculty, including Senate members, and faculty members from each of the schools, not so much in a representative mode, but in order to include faculty who have contributed to the process, who are thoughtful, or who have interest in one of the areas chosen for further development. Each working group will receive a set of charge questions which will represent what the Steering Committee believes represent its thinking about some of the major issues and questions the working groups will be asked to grapple with. The idea is that these working groups will work individually and together to develop their recommendations. The leaders of these working groups will be gathered at the end of this stage to produce a series of opinions, recommendations, and pros and cons for the various ideas that appear in the charge questions.

While the working groups are deliberating, the Steering Committee will be running processes to gather input with the Board of Trustees, the Deans, Vice Provosts and Vice Presidents and student groups. Although there will be student representation on each of the four working groups, broader student opinion will be sought. In addition, the Administration will also engage alumni in conversation about the ideas that working groups are asked to deliberate on.

Once this planning stage is complete, the Steering Committee will sort through the inputs and prepare briefing information for the Board of Trustees retreat in June. The primary focus will be on conveying the up-to-date thinking about the Plan, and to seek Board input. Over the summer work on a draft Plan will be completed, and it is expected the Plan will be presented at the fall Faculty Assembly so that faculty will have an opportunity to ask questions and submit further comment on it. The Plan will also be presented at the October Board meeting.

Provost Lerman said he would share the most recent planning document with the Senate when it is final. It will also be posted electronically, and electronic forums will be established to gather further input. In conclusion, Provost Lerman said he would welcome the opportunity to discuss the Plan as it moves through the planning stages in the spring and fall semesters.

Professor Williams asked about the focus of the four working groups to be established. Provost Lerman said each group would address one of four broad thematic areas, which the Steering Committee has chosen based on its assessment of the University's strengths and weaknesses, and what it believes can be used as the foundation for GW to become truly great over the next ten years. The four thematic areas are globalization, policy and governance, interdisciplinary collaborations, and citizenship.

Professor Barnhill asked to what extent a perspective will be provided on the programmatic structure, the resource requirements, revenue projections and how the activities selected for the Strategic Plan will be operationalized and funded. This is necessary in order to get a sense of the feasibility of actually accomplishing the objectives the Plan lays out.

Provost Lerman said this part of the process would occur later, once the ideas under the themes have been developed. There will be one last phase after deliberations on the Plan that will consider metrics and resources.

Given the University's investment in technology, Professor Barnhill said he wondered why that is not a topic that rose into the list of the top four thematic areas. Provost Lerman said this issue pervades the research and education component of the Plan areas. Two other dimensions to be explored in the thematic areas are outreach and institutional change. The way in which these components all fit together will become clear when the charge questions are finalized.

### III. CHAIR'S REMARKS

President Knapp noted that Board week had just concluded. Trustees have been on campus the past three days, attending Committee meetings on Wednesday and Thursday, and the full Board meeting on Friday. This is the meeting in each year's cycle in which tuition for the next academic year is set.

President Knapp offered background information for those faculty members new to the Senate. He said that when he arrived on August 1, 2007, he met that very first day with all of the Vice Presidents to discuss the issue of GW's tuition. The University was receiving very negative press coverage because its tuition had crossed the threshold of \$50,000 per year. What was missing from that coverage was recognition that when that was done, fixed price and guaranteed aid programs were put into place so that, for continuing students there would be no increase over the course of up to five years for undergraduate students who remained in good standing. Several approaches to the affordability issue were developed, and these were discussed with the Board, which approved them. GW would maintain the fixed tuition program and increase fundraising for student aid by means of the

establishment of the Power and Promise campaign. [Since its establishment, the campaign has grown every year in providing philanthropic support for scholarships and also for fellowship aid at the graduate level.] Another goal was to moderate the debt burden for currently-enrolled students by moderating tuition increases. As a result, for each of the past four years, tuition increases have been kept below 3% and the overall cost of attendance has also been within this range.

This year's tuition increases for incoming students will remain very close to the 3% level of prior years. However, because there is a need for additional investments in academic programs, including funding athletics, academic initiatives and the expansion of Career Services programs for students, this year the overall cost of attendance for newly-enrolled students will rise by 3.4%; the tuition portion of that cost of attendance will increase by 3.7%. Continuing students will not be affected.

On the graduate level, the University has discovered that over time its tuition for graduate programs has fallen pretty significantly below that of competitors for those programs. This in turn affects and limits the University's ability to provide financial aid at the graduate level, which has a bearing on the University's ability to attract the best graduate students and improve graduate programs. So this year's graduate tuitions will rise in some cases more than the undergraduate tuition, depending on what the market can bear.

President Knapp also briefly discussed the Board's review of the recently completed Athletics Strategic Plan. Last year, the Board of Trustees created a Committee chaired by Trustee Randy Levine, a member of the Board and President of the New York Yankees.

President Knapp said that the Athletics program is a source of avid interest, not just in varsity sports, but in club sports, and all of the University's recreational and health activities for students, including offerings of the Lerner Health and Wellness Center. The process for developing the Plan involved holding a number of town meetings and convening focus groups over several months. Considerable input was received from students, and significant input was received from alumni, many of whom the University had not heard from.

The University discovered during this process that it was ranked 13 out of 14 fellow members of the Athletic Ten Conference in terms of its spending on its athletes, and, clearly, this is a gap that needs to be closed. Another aim of the Plan is to make sure that students in club sports or varsity sports have the resources they need so they will have appropriate transportation to athletic competitions, and adequate accommodations and meals once they get there.

President Knapp said he thought the University has a very good leader for this project in Athletic Director Patrick Nero. He characterized Mr. Nero as a very thoughtful individual who is interested in the culture of student athlete's programs, and also in measuring results. Last fall, Director Nero took all 450 of the University's varsity athletes to Mount Vernon so they could spend the day touring the property and learning about George Washington from historians and other experts about his role in American history. A class in leadership was also included. The aim was to be sure that GW's athletes are as prepared as

possible to serve as leaders and ambassadors in many ways of GW's student body as they travel around the country.

President Knapp said he thinks the University is in a very good position to develop its athletic programs as planned; the goal is for the University to win, both on the field and in the classroom. Mr. Nero and Executive Vice President and Treasurer Katz have worked closely together to develop a gradual funding plan to bring GW's Athletics programs up to a comparable level with the other teams in the A-10 conference.

In addition to the University's Strategic Plan and the Athletics Strategic Plan, the Board was also briefed on the development of a new plan to change its visual identity. Thus far a working group of 75 individuals under the leadership of Vice President Voles has considered possible changes to the University's logo and other materials to make these more compatible with digital formats and reduce the cost of reproduction. Focus groups will be convened in the near future to gather feedback from faculty members and other members of the University community.

In Development news, President Knapp reported that last year the University surpassed its all-time record for fundraising. Five years ago, GW began to invest seriously in developing a fundraising staff and engaging the Deans more in fundraising than had previously been the case. This year, the University is on track to meet and likely exceed last year's record, as fundraising is already ahead of totals at the six-month mark. An announcement was also made at the Board meeting that Trustee James Humphries has made another million dollar contribution to the Law School. President Knapp congratulated the Law School on its receipt of this gift, and said he thought it was a sign that the Board is increasingly getting involved in a very personal way in the fundraising process. Strong Board engagement is very critical as GW moves into a capital campaign of the magnitude that the University is contemplating.

In conclusion, President Knapp announced that, after 24 years of service, Senior Vice Provost and Senior Vice President for Student and Academic Support Services Robert Chernak has announced that he will step down from that position effective July 1. He will spend six months on sabbatical, after which he will teach in the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, where he's been a very well regarded and effective teacher for a number of years. Under Dr. Chernak's leadership over 24 years there have been extraordinary changes in the nature and the stature of the University. This is reflected in admissions statistics. When Dr. Chernak arrived, the University had 6,000 applications for admission to undergraduate classes. That total has increased to 22,000. Selectivity has also improved during his tenure in that over 80% of applicants were admitted when he arrived, and currently the University admits 30% of applicants. Other metrics have also improved in terms of applicant SAT scores, and the number of entering freshmen who have graduated in the top 10% of their classes.

During his years at the University, Dr. Chernak has also overseen GW's athletics programs, and most recently taken a leadership role in the renovation of the Smith Center and the completion of the Athletics Strategic Plan. In the area of student life, he created a parent's committee program that has become a national model, and overseen the very well-regarded Colonial Inauguration orientation program for entering freshmen and their

families. Six residence halls have been added to the student housing system during his years here. Dr. Chernak was also instrumental in developing the program of fixed tuition for students mentioned earlier. All across the University, not only on this campus but beyond, President Knapp said he thought it evident that Dr. Chernak's leadership has been really important. A scholarship in his honor has been made possible by a generous gift from an anonymous donor, and the University will be building on that in addition to holding some celebrations for his many years of service.

Professor Castleberry noted that as Chair of the Senate Executive Committee he attends meetings of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board. He said he found it interesting that the Board has a number of people who are very successful in their lives and they make wonderful Trustees, but they are not academics and their knowledge of what faculty do is not great. So, they spend a lot of time reviewing materials, learning about the business before the Board, and asking questions about University operations. Professor Castleberry said he did not think that faculty fully appreciate how hard the Trustees work and what they bring to the table when they come to campus for several days of intense meetings at a time. They make a very significant contribution and they take their work very seriously. Professor Castleberry encouraged faculty members to interact with Trustees who share an interest in their school and/or their work and get to know them better.

President Knapp said he appreciated these remarks and was particularly happy to see the development of the Board over the last several years. During that time there has been tremendous turnover, and this has greatly increased the diversity and geographical scope of the Board. The result is that the University is benefiting from very good advice from people who have a lot to contribute.

#### BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Price commented that she did not know how often there are opportunities for interaction between faculty and Board of Trustees members, and added that she thought consideration should be given to providing opportunities for Board and faculty members to talk about what faculty members are doing and experiencing in their labs and research.

President Knapp observed that last year Chairman of the Board Ramsey addressed the Senate, and a fruitful discussion ensued. In addition, when Trustees come to campus for dinners, the Administration always engages faculty in the process. Just the previous evening, students and faculty attended a Trustees dinner at the Organization of American States Building. At the end of each academic year, the Board holds its annual retreat, usually in June. Faculty are invited for two days of interaction with Trustees; this includes serving on panels making presentations to the Board. Trustees are increasingly becoming involved with Committees whose membership includes faculty. For example, a Trustee is currently serving on a Dean's Search Committee. President Knapp added that he thought this was a good way for Trustees to develop a relationship with a school in which he or she has a strong interest. The Administration is also open to other suggestions about other venues where faculty and Board members can interact.

Professor Price noted that President Knapp had mentioned that there would be an increase in graduate tuition. She said that her experience and that of many of her

colleagues, at least in Columbian College, is that the best way to build a graduate program is to offer more research assistantships and graduate teaching assistantships. This is really the way to recruit the best students. Professor Price said she had often seen how GW has lost students because of a lack of funding opportunities to attract them.

President Knapp said that part of the goal of increasing the University's research support is to make it possible to do this. Success in building resources for the schools will the University can be more generous in providing teaching and research assistantships. Provost Lerman said that the previous year he had gone to the Board and asked that a larger fraction of total graduate revenue be funneled back to the schools for aid. Stipends have been fixed for several years at \$18,000 for graduate students and are no longer competitive. Another \$2,000 was provided to increase these stipends to \$20,000. The number of funding packages also has been increased. Another enhancement under consideration is increasing the subsidy for graduate students to purchase health insurance, as many of them are over 26 years old and no longer eligible for coverage under their parents' health care plan.

### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, the meeting was adjourned at 3:19 p.m.

*Elizabeth A. Amundson*

Elizabeth A. Amundson  
Secretary

## REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

10 February, 2012

Michael S. Castleberry, Chair

### ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

#### Reports

We have tentatively scheduled Development Vice-President Morsberger for the March meeting where he will present development information and the progress toward meeting the gift totals for the SEH and other projects. In addition, Provost Lerman is expected to present the annual Core Indicators of Academic Excellence Report at the March meeting.

#### Report to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees

The Report made to the Academic Affairs Committee at its meeting yesterday will be included with the minutes of today's meeting. The Provost presented an update on the strategic planning process, the goals of the Office of the Provost, and on Core Indicators of Academic Excellence (which we will hear at the next Senate meeting). There was significant discussion on the topic of faculty load, differences between schools, the impact of funding and research project leadership on faculty teaching, etc. The committee was quite interested in the topic and they will be provided further information about these matters.

#### Other Matters

At its meeting in December, the Executive Committee discussed draft Bylaws of the School of Public Health and Health Services submitted by Dean Goldman. Further review will take place by the PEAFF Committee.

In addition, PEAFF continues to discuss the issue of Senate representation. There is much discussion on this topic but it is important to allow the members of the committee to study the issues before they make recommendations to the Senate. We will keep you apprised of developments in this area.

The Executive Committee recommended the following members to serve as members for the Selection Committees for the three Trachtenberg Prizes, as follows:

Teaching	Professor McAleavey
Research	Professor Greenberg
Service	Professor Castleberry

*Committee Service Forms*

These forms will be distributed electronically this afternoon. Committee service plays a crucial role in the Senate's contribution to shared governance, so please continue to volunteer for service and encourage your faculty colleagues to do so as well. Please note that, with the exception of the Dispute Resolution Committee, tenure is NOT required for Committee service.

*Personnel Matters*

There is a grievance in the School of Public Health and Health Services which was referred to the Dispute Resolution Committee and is in process at this time. We will keep the Senate informed about the progress of this case.

There are no nonconcurrences to report at this time.

*Next Meeting of the Executive Committee*

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is scheduled for February 24, 2012. Please submit resolutions, reports and any other matters for consideration prior to that meeting. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be on March 9, 2012.

**REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE TO THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

**Michael S. Castleberry, Chair of the Senate Executive Committee  
February 10, 2012**

On behalf of the Faculty Senate I offer the following report.

**ACTION ITEMS**

The Faculty Senate has adopted no resolutions since the last report in October.

**REPORTS**

*Update on Debt Restructuring and the Financing of New Construction on the Science and Engineering Hall, School of Public Health and Health Services, and the Textile/GW Museum Financing*

Executive Vice President and Treasurer Louis Katz provided information on the status of the financing for the SEH and future funding for the SPHHS building. He reviewed the original funding plan and elaborated on the university's plan to self-finance the initial phases of the project while still holding to the funding-raising goals of the development office (\$100 million). He also elaborated on the cost-recovery from an increase in sponsored research and the impact this would have once the building is constructed and there is opportunity for expanded sponsored research activity. He participated in a question and answer session with senators to further expand on his comments.

*Update on the Status of the Human Resources Office*

Executive Vice President and Treasurer Louis Katz also presented an update on the search for a Chief Human Resources Officer, announcing the selection of Sabrina Ellis. The Faculty Senate was represented on the search committee by Professor Murli Gupta, Chair of the Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies. The Executive Committee has been in contact with Ms. Ellis and she will be invited to present to the Senate once she is established on campus.

*Review of the Composition and Membership of the Faculty Senate*

Following discussion at the October meeting the Executive Committee has referred to the Senate Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF) Committee a charge to review the way in which the membership of the Faculty Senate is determined in terms of equity and overall representation. Included in the charge is the question of whether there is a way in which contract faculty could be represented or have a voice in matters which affect the faculty. The Executive Committee had a subsequent meeting with the Chair of PEAFF to discuss the charge at the December meeting.

**GRIEVANCES**

There is one grievance in SPHHS that has been referred to the Dispute Resolution Committee. We will keep the Committee informed of the progress of the case.