

**THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**  
**Washington, DC**

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR FACULTY SENATE**  
**MEETING HELD ON FEBRUARY 11, 2011**  
**IN THE STATE ROOM**

- Present: President Knapp, Provost Lerman, Registrar Amundson and Parliamentarian Charnovitz; Deans Barratt, Burke, Dolling, Feuer, and Guthrie; Professors Barnhill, Biles, Castleberry, Cordes, Corry, Costanza, Dickson, Galston, Garcia, Garris, Harrington, Helgert, Johnson, Klaren, Ku, Lipscomb, McAleavey, Pagel, Parsons, Simon, Wilmarth, Wirtz, and Yezer
- Absent: Dean Brown, Interim Deans Akman and Maggs; Professors Boyce, Hotez, Kessmann, Rehman, and Shesser

**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 of January 14, 2011 were approved as distributed.

**INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS**

No resolutions were introduced.

**REMARKS BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE GW BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

President Knapp introduced Chairman of the Board W. Russell Ramsey, who is an alumnus of the University and is now serving his second term as Chairman. Mr. Ramsey is a graduate of the GW Business School and was also a star athlete and All-American baseball player during his undergraduate years at the University.

Chairman Ramsey thanked the Senate for the invitation to speak at the meeting. Board members have been on campus several days this week, beginning on Wednesday and Thursday for Committee meetings, with the full Board meeting that morning. Mr. Ramsey confirmed that he was a 1981 alumnus of the GW Business School and the first in his family to go to college. He added that this experience transformed his life. After graduating, Mr. Ramsey said he had spent some 30 years as an entrepreneur, mainly in financial services. This career included working in many financial sectors on the “sell” side, including capital markets, venture capital, IPO’s, mergers, acquisitions and business restructuring in a wide variety of businesses. Over the last ten years, Mr. Ramsey said he has managed a hedge fund with the goal of maintaining a balanced portfolio in equities in such a way that it makes money for the fund’s investors.

Mr. Ramsey recounted that he had found his way back to GW a little over a dozen years ago when former Trustee (and now Senator) Mark Warner shared with him why he personally had thought it was important to serve on the Board of his alma mater. Mr. Ramsey said that he agreed to serve on the Board even though he had only a vague notion of what that involved, as he felt very passionate about using his skills and background to try to help lead the University to fulfill its potential.

GW is a private University and as such does not report to a state legislature or governor. It is the largest non-government employer in the District of Columbia, and also a very large landowner. While GW is not a business, it is a very large entity with a huge number of moving parts and pieces, all organized to further the University's academic mission.

Ultimate responsibility for the organization rests with the Board, which holds three regular meetings a year as well as an annual leadership retreat in June. The Board consists of limited term Trustees. Trustees are elected for four year terms and may serve no more than three terms (12 years) in total. Board officers are elected annually, however, the Board Chair is elected for a three-year term. Mr. Ramsey said he was now at the beginning of his last three-year term on the Board. With a limited term structure, the Board must constantly renew itself, and this year recruited what is probably its largest class of new Board members, from different walks of life. Among new Board members this year are a Goldman Sachs partner, an award-winning motion picture actress, and a former acting secretary of the Navy. This reflects the fact that the Trustee selection process is designed to recruit a diverse set of people with an interest in the University who are willing to devote their time and their venture and intellectual capital to advance the University toward its goals.

The Board presently consists of 36 members, the maximum number being 42. This allows room for the Board to add individuals who want, on a volunteer basis, to participate in overseeing all of the components of the University. Even though Trustees are not compensated for their service, the Board is the fiduciary for all stakeholders, and there is no favorite child.

The Board could not fulfill its responsibilities without the work of a number of permanent Committees – these include Committees on the Medical Center, Investments, Finance & Audit, Real Estate, Academic Affairs, and External Relations, among others. When appropriate, from time to time the Board also authorizes the formation of Special Committees – one such Committee was formed, for example, when President Trachtenberg retired and a search was launched to find his successor. Mr. Ramsey said he was offered the opportunity to lead a collaborative search process which involved stakeholders from the University community, including several Senate members. The Committee finished its work six months ahead of schedule and turned out to be one of the better experiences Mr. Ramsey said he had had. This Special Committee came out of the permanent Committee on Governance, Compensation and Nomination (GCN) which is responsible for making sure the University's governance is exercised according to the Board's bylaws, and ensuring that it is as transparent as possible.

Mr. Ramsey said he believes that GW's Board today, as a private Board at a private University, incorporates all of the best practices in fulfilling its responsibility to everyone; this includes current students and alumni, faculty, and, of course, all of the senior

administrators who are responsible for carrying out the academic and other missions of the University. He added that he was proud to say that he thought the Board has a very rigorous and incentive-based compensation plan for all of the senior people in the organization, and this has become something of a model for higher education.

Mr. Ramsey concluded his remarks by saying that, in the year 2021, GW will celebrate its 200<sup>th</sup> birthday. GW is unique in many, many ways and has clearly articulated its set of goals and aspirations. Mr. Ramsey said that his goal, which has been stated publicly and repeatedly, is for the University to become the most admired and respected educational institution in the world. GW is now building on what is successful in each one of its schools, each of which is changing and has its own near-term challenges and opportunities.

Several questions followed. Professor Wirtz inquired about the composition of the Board, asking how many Board members have earned doctorates. He also asked about the relationship between two Committees of the Board – the Medical Affairs Committee and Academic Affairs Committee. He said there would seem to be some overlap between the two in terms of academic issues and asked under that circumstance how academic issues would be resolved.

Chairman Ramsey asked Provost Lerman to comment, but said that ultimately, most academic issues are the responsibility of the Academic Affairs Committee. Provost Lerman said it appeared to him that the Academic Affairs Committee deals with all of the Schools, including the Medical School. The Medical Affairs Committee concerns itself with all aspects of the Medical Center, including the University's relationship with the Medical Faculty Associates the University Hospital and other University partners. In prior years it was not possible for the Vice President for Academic Affairs to attend both Committee meetings as they occurred at the same time. Beginning this year, Committee schedules have been changed to permit the Provost's attendance at both.

The exact answer to Professor Wirtz's first question was not readily available. Several Board members have M.D. and J.D. degrees, and at least three other Board members have earned doctorates. Professor Wirtz followed up by asking if there is some mechanism in place requiring that a Board member chairing the Academic Affairs Committee have an earned doctorate. Mr. Ramsey said he did not think the Bylaws contained such a requirement, but indicated he would be open to suggestions or input about this. Professor Wirtz said that he thought that Trustee Lydia Thomas, who is no longer on the Board, provided extraordinary leadership as Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee. Dr. Thomas's credibility was enhanced by her academic credentials and she contributed a much-needed non-administrative academic perspective to her guidance of the Committee's work. Professor Wirtz said that his personal view was that continuing that credibility would be something that would be in everybody's best interests as that sort of perspective and guidance is essential to the oversight responsibilities of the Board of Trustees of an academic institution.

Professor Parsons said that he sensed a general lack of academic stars on the Board of Trustees and suggested that the composition of governing boards at other institutions be examined. Chairman Ramsey responded by saying that his e-mail inbox was open to suggestions about additional Board members for consideration in the Trustee selection

process, which is an open one. With the University's commitment to raising its research visibility and capability, it is particularly desirable to recruit Trustees with academic qualifications to the Board.

Professor Helgert asked about the Board's view of the Science and Engineering Complex. Chairman Ramsey responded that there has been a long history of this concept at GW for the last 35 or 40 years. He said his first Special Board Committee assignment was to participate in the evaluation of the old GW hospital center and its site on Square 54. Even back then there was a notion that the University needed a big academic space. The University chose a well-regarded advisor from among some 50 interested parties to provide an opinion on the highest and best use of Square 54. The result was demolition of the old hospital and the construction of a mixed use complex there where the University incurred no financial risk and would reap a 60 year income stream that it could use for academic purposes. The hospital itself was sold to an outside entity and a new hospital facility was constructed across 23<sup>rd</sup> Street from Square 54.

The concept of the SEC rose to the top as the highest priority project following a very interactive process looking at ways to use a part of Square 54 revenue. There was no doubt that engineering facilities were in great need of improvement. There was also thought about how to use a new facility in a collaborative way to meet science and engineering needs, and possibly obtain research revenue to help cover some of the ongoing expense of the facility. The financial analysis by the Board determined that even if research funding could not be secured, which is not expected, there are other possible academic uses for the building. Support for the SEC was unanimous on the Board.

Professor Yezer congratulated Chairman Ramsey and the Board on the decision to sell the Hospital and their choice of Boston Properties as the developer for Square 54.

Professor Yezer said a matter of concern to some faculty is the University's instructional expenditure per student as a percentage of net tuition revenue per student is very low, standing at approximately 32.1%. This is in comparison to Georgetown University and American University who both are at 49% instructional expenditure per net tuition dollar. Professor Yezer said he wondered if these figures should not be looked at and the University's business model made to look more like the competition. Chairman Ramsey asked the President to respond, and a short discussion followed. President Knapp said it was clear that the University is committed to invest more resources in its academic priorities. The work of the Innovation Task Force which seeks to identify an additional \$60 million per year for these purposes will help to achieve that, as will increased philanthropic support.

Professor Wilmarth thanked Chairman Ramsey for making time in his very busy schedule to address the Senate. He asked what the Board views as the greatest opportunity for the University, and its greatest challenge, over the next few years. Chairman Ramsey responded that the SEC, new School of Nursing, and the new building for the School of Public Health and Health Services will all provide significant new opportunities for the University. Leadership by the new Deans will also be important in increasing the visibility of GW's academic programs. Undertaking a capital campaign to obtain additional resources is likely, to fund, among other things, new endowed professorships. The

opportunity is there to bring the University's resources to bear so that GW is not just keeping pace but is excelling in providing the substance that everybody is looking for.

Chairman Ramsey said he thought that if there is a challenge, it is that GW is committed to being a University which would ideally be available to all, and one that has an appropriate focus on diversity. The goal is not just to match the University's peer group in its percentage of multicultural students, but to exceed that norm. The reality is that in order to do that, the University needs to have the resources to be able to go out and recruit applicants who have many other choices.

In terms of philanthropy, Chairman Ramsey said that recently, there have been a number of major gifts and more are expected in the future. These will be made public in the next several weeks and months. These will be a source of pride to those associated with them and provide real benefits to the University as has the recent gift by the Smith-Kogod family for the renovation and improvement of the Charles E. Smith Center. The facility is not just the home of basketball, but also is the home of all of GW's 22 Division I sports. It is a great resource for all of the University's student athletes and the University will continue to enjoy it as a center for campus community activity because of the commitment and vision of the Smith-Kogod family.

Professor Barnhill noted that the Chairman was a very successful entrepreneur skilled at recognizing opportunities and taking advantage of them. He asked what the Chairman saw as the major opportunities for GW in the Washington D.C. area, nationally, and globally over the next ten to twenty years. Chairman Ramsey said that Washington D.C. is increasingly a regulatory and financial capital, and a center of political power and leadership in an increasingly global world. He said he thought it was not a question of whether but of when emerging markets would dominate the economy as the growth engines of the world. GW is uniquely positioned on many fronts and where other educational institutions have in recent years had to cut spending and make hard financial decisions due to the economic climate, GW is financially strong and has been able to keep building and growing its academic programs, as it will continue to do in the future.

President Knapp said that he has had a unique opportunity to observe the Board in action, not just at large formal meetings, but also on a day to day basis. He said that it is important, as has been mentioned, that whatever the psychic rewards may be, these are not positions that are financially compensated. To see the amount of time and effort that goes into the work of the Board and its multiple Committees and the day to day effort of engaging donors and connecting GW with important contacts that help the University academically as well as with financial and other kinds of support is impressive, and this is something that colleagues do not have the opportunity to observe frequently. President Knapp thanked Chairman Ramsey for taking the time to address the Faculty Senate, and added that the efforts of the Chairman and his fellow Trustees to advance the University are very much appreciated.

Professor Castleberry also thanked Chairman Ramsey for coming to the Senate meeting, and said that he has also gained a better appreciation for the Board's work on behalf of the University through participation in several Board meetings, their summer retreat, their planning retreat, and the Academic Affair Committee, as well as participating in other Committees and groups. He said he thought the Board's work is very similar to

that of the Senate; members are not compensated, but they care just as much as Senate members do about the University. While their work may be more concentrated in Board meetings and the Senate's work is more spread out, they spend as much time, if not more, than faculty members working for the greater good of the University. This is a very impressive group of people, particularly in the way they involve students, and they devote enormous energy to their task.

### UPDATE ON THE GW SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

Dean Doug Guthrie presented the update in PowerPoint format, saying his report would focus on what the vision for the Business School would be over the next 4 to 5 years. Referring to Chairman Ramsey's stated goal of making GW the most admired University in the world, Dean Guthrie agreed that many people say that about their universities, but he had never been part of a University that has such a common vision and a common message. At his former institution, Dean Guthrie said that University was very balkanized; the Business School was built around Wall Street, the Law School was built around a very different kind of intellectual orientation, and even though everybody was doing well on their own, it was a very, very fractured place. GW has a message which is a unified one, and Dean Guthrie said that as he thought about what the Business School can be, he could not think of a more exciting opportunity for a Business School at this moment, in this City.

For the better part of the last four decades, Business Schools in the United States have tracked to focusing more and more narrowly on finance. That started to change about the turn of the century when attention was turned to the political and social embeddedness of markets – where students are taught about the complexity of markets and the ways in which social and political embeddedness are the centerpieces of building a healthy market economy. Dean Guthrie added that there was no place he would rather build that than at GW. As Chairman Ramsey pointed out, the Nation's Capital is now not just the political capital of the global economy, but it is truly a place where finance and regulatory issues are central. From a sociological perspective Dean Guthrie said he also thought Washington is also a place where the notion of political embeddedness is really key to how everything functions in the economy. The overall goal for the Business School is not just to become one of the top 20 schools in the nation, but more important by far, to be the best Business School in the Nation's Capital at the center of the largest economy in the world. If that is achieved, the rankings will be there.

Dean Guthrie said he had inherited a good portfolio when he came to the School. GW has a very strong International Business Department, and that is a strength that can be built upon. The School also wants to increase its ties with the Elliott School of International Affairs. Global social responsibility will certainly be a cornerstone of the School's offerings. There are a number of faculty members who will allow the School to seize the opportunity of building a Business School on the intersection of business and public policy, supported by a strong international agenda, sustainability, social responsibility, and leadership, and ethics. GW is the only Business School in the top 50 that offers ethics as a core course.

Dean Guthrie said that when he arrived at GW, the substantive picture of the School looked grand to him. On the other hand, questions were raised about the relative underfunding of the School. Housekeeping was also necessary to improve the School's internal financial controls. It was necessary to do a "deep dive" and think aggressively

about how to assess the School's current state of affairs, how to undertake an organizational restructuring process, and develop new initiatives that would grow the School's portfolio by about 30%. The goal for growth over the next five years is to move from generating approximately \$90 million per year to about \$120 million. It was also necessary to work with the University administration in figuring out how new initiatives could be funded and obtaining some kind of investment to do this, with a plan for paying back the funds. All of these activities ultimately seamlessly link to the development of a philanthropy plan for the School.

During the six months he has been at the University, Dean Guthrie said he worked to develop a deep knowledge about the inner workings of the School. In order to do this, he met with every single faculty member. This was a painstaking process, but Dean Guthrie said he thought it was important for him as a new Dean to have deep knowledge about the School, develop a good sense of the direction in which it should go, and provide transparency about these two things. The Dean acknowledged that there was a lot of consternation over what it meant that the Dean and his team were writing a business plan when the faculty should really be in control of strategy. Dean Guthrie said he has always been very clear about this; this was done not only to further his own information gathering, but also for expediency, because he wanted to initiate conversations with the Provost about the financial state of the School. From this point forward, Dean Guthrie said that the process will be faculty-driven, particularly through the work of several task forces. Dean Guthrie said it was wonderful working with the University administration because it basically found that the School's plan for reorganization and re-structuring was a good one, and that enough research had been done to justify giving the School a bit of latitude to invest in areas which would allow it to grow.

In terms of development goals, Dean Guthrie said his key targets would be leadership, international programs, the Career Center, scholarships, and public policy engagement. Another thing he hopes to do in the next five years is to name the School.

Several initiatives for the School are being explored. The School projects significant growth over the next five years, but the University's enrollment at the Foggy Bottom campus is very close to the maximum permitted, and that poses a problem. Fortunately, the University has a footprint that extends beyond Foggy Bottom, including the Virginia Science and Technology campus in Loudoun County, the Mount Vernon campus, as well as Arlington and Alexandria. In order to expand, particularly in the MBA program, the School will need to move some faculty and students to other locations. Professor Cherian is leading the School's Off Campus Relocation Task Force, and its recommendations are expected in March. These may not be implemented immediately, but will have to be discussed with faculty members in the School to ensure full engagement with the goals.

Dean Guthrie observed that many institutions have been very uninterested in thinking aggressively about online space. He added that he was thankful to have inherited an institution that has thought deeply about this. The School currently has two online education programs that are quite excellent that utilize two completely different technologies. Online education is an opportunity not only to grow the School's revenue, but also to take a thought leadership position in this area. Professor Wirtz is leading a Task Force on Distance Education to explore opportunities for the School. Dean Guthrie also said he thought this work could not be done without thinking about partnerships, so he has

been meeting recently with Embanet and a couple of other organizations to explore developments in the online instruction world.

A third Task Force on International Programs is at work to explore growth opportunities for the School. Dean Guthrie said he had met with this group a couple of times because, as a China scholar, he has a special interest in this particular area. GW does have the seemingly limitless resources of some other institutions, so choices must be made about the areas of regional focus that will build upon the expertise of the School's faculty. Even more important is substantive focus. The School has a very interactive International Business department and taking core ideas that really drive the international agenda forward, such as international development issues, is one place where new opportunities may be found.

In conclusion, Dean Guthrie said he thought the School is on track to achieve its goals, but a lot of hard work will be required to bring about the expansion necessary. Many of the School's faculty members are very excited about new developments and ready to step up to the challenges that lie ahead. While the dream of building a Business School that is relevant for the public policy world and really thinking about how to engage questions of politics and public policy is always daunting, Dean Guthrie said he found it exciting to be part of the conversation about the expansion of jobs in Washington and thinking about D.C. as a global city that can take innovative positions and influence how people think about things like jobs in the energy and the clean and renewable technology sectors. The update may be viewed at:

[http://www.gwu.edu/%7Efacsen/faculty\\_senate/pdf/GWSBUpdate.pdf](http://www.gwu.edu/%7Efacsen/faculty_senate/pdf/GWSBUpdate.pdf)

Several questions followed. Professor Garris commented on the widespread perception that the recent economic crisis was basically caused by very greedy people, many of whom are graduates of the Harvard Business School. He said he had read an article that said the School decided to try to look at the kind of graduates its curriculum was producing, and more fully integrate ethics into its program. He added that said he was glad to see that the GW Business School already includes ethics in its curriculum. Dean Guthrie responded that, rather than blaming corporate greed, he thought the problem was that organizations are great at separating people from the outcomes of their actions. The solution lies in how students are trained; it is necessary to transmit technical knowledge but also important to train them to think about systemic risk and the implications of their actions. A Business School curriculum that includes complexity analysis and takes into account the embeddedness of social and political considerations is key.

Professor Yezer said he did not hear real estate mentioned in the update, and asked whether the Business School curriculum includes this. Dean Guthrie responded that this is a huge area of emphasis at the Business School in its center for real estate and urban analysis. The latter is important because it studies regional economic development and the embeddedness of real estate organizations within a larger political context. This center has recently received several gifts to further its work.

Professor Lipscomb identified herself as an evolutionary biologist with a specialty in biodiversity and the environment, and she inquired about the School's interest in sustainability. Dean Guthrie said the School is in transition right now. Popular interest

seems to focus on green buildings, but Dean Guthrie said he thought the deeper question is about renewable energy. A large number of students in the Business School have self - identified as being interested in sustainability. GW has programs in several different schools, in renewable energy, solar energy, and sustainability. Conversations are underway to leverage the University's resources in a way that will provide students with technical knowledge, as well as familiarity with business considerations, regulatory, policy, and legal issues in these areas.

#### REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Castleberry presented the report of the Executive Committee, which is enclosed. In connection with his remarks about draft bylaws for the School of Public Health and Health Services, Dean Goldman offered a minor clarification – these bylaws have been circulated and comments solicited, but no vote has yet been taken to adopt them. It is expected this vote will take place at the SPHHS spring faculty meeting.

#### CHAIR'S REMARKS

Due to the length of reports presented at the meeting, President Knapp noted without providing detail that quite a number of events have taken place at the University in the past month, more than usual.

As Chairman Ramsey alluded to some of the University's successes in fundraising, President Knapp said that some of these have been announced and other announcements would be forthcoming in the next several weeks. In the last month alone, the University has received approximately \$24 million, which is more than is usually raised. While it cannot be presumed that this trend will continue to the end of the semester, GW appears to be on track to equal or outperform in fundraising compared to the past year.

Giving an update on personnel searches underway, President Knapp said the Law School is now interviewing semifinalists for the Dean's position, and he expected to speak with four of these by the end of the day. All are very strong candidates. The Law School has a very strong faculty search committee and a successful outcome is expected in fairly short order.

The search for a Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion has been concluded. President Knapp said the University was not yet at liberty to announce the outcome, but that he thought the search committee and others involved in the search process were very pleased with the result.

#### BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Wirtz noted that *The Hatchet* had recently published an article about questions raised by the D.C. Zoning Commission in connection with planning details for parking facilities at the Law Learning Center to be constructed on G Street, and he asked if the President could comment on that. President Knapp responded that if Vice President Katz were present he could probably give more detail than he could, but the question raised had to do with the best place for entering and exiting the facility. The University's plan was

that access and egress would be from the alley parallel to G Street in the middle of the block, because parkers would be able to enter and exit from both 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> Streets. President Knapp said he thought that an alternative plan to provide access and egress from G Street had been proposed by members of the Foggy Bottom community because it was believed that would result in less traffic congestion. It is expected that this question will be resolved without substantially interfering with the timing of the project, or its cost.

Professor Simon commented about Professor Yezer's observations concerning the new University Hospital. He said that the initial cost of the Hospital was \$116 million, and with a profit of \$30 million, the Hospital reaped a very good return on investment. Professor Simon said he was not so sure that selling the Hospital was such a wise decision at the time, and it would certainly be desirable for GW to follow the example of USC, which bought back their Hospital from Tenet. That is because the goals and aspirations of the Hospital are very different from the goals and aspirations of the University.

On behalf of the Committee on Libraries, Professor McAleavey, Chair, commented that the Committee is this year addressing problems facing the Gelman Library. Reports in *The Hatchet* and *GW Today* have detailed plans for renovation of the first floor of the Library and it sounds as if there is forward movement on this project. However, it is clear that there is no coherent plan for improvements to the rest of Gelman Library, or for the future of the facility over the long term. That is something that the Senate Committee on Libraries has tried to address in previous years, with Resolutions adopted in 2006 and 2009 on the subject.

Professor McAleavey said he thought it startling and well worth noting that in the last six years there has been no increase in the acquisitions budget for Gelman. Given that the cost of all the materials which Gelman receives, online and in print, increases at least 5% every year, obviously, the Gelman collection is effectively shrinking. Professor McAleavey said the Committee was hard at work preparing a Resolution to urge that the administration strengthen this critical aspect of the University. Professor McAleavey also invited members of the Senate to submit useful ideas they might have to the Committee while it is crafting the Resolution, which he said he hoped would be ready for Senate consideration before the end of Spring semester, 2011.

Professor Yezer said that about two years ago he had complained quite strenuously about the problems faculty members encountered trying to schedule classes and extra sessions and seminars on campus. He said he could not speak for other faulty members, but that based on his recent experience, the scheduling office has since then been completely transformed and service by that office has improved tremendously.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, and upon motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

*Elizabeth A. Amundson*  
Elizabeth A. Amundson  
Secretary

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
Michael S. Castleberry, Chair  
11 February, 2011

## **REPORTS**

The School of Public Health and Health Services has provided the Executive Committee with its report, dated January 31, 2011, concerning its efforts to bring the School into compliance with the *Faculty Code*. Dean Goldman also included the bylaws approved by the faculty of the School. The Special Joint Subcommittee and the Executive Committee will be reviewing these documents and will inform the Senate of any recommendations that go forth to the School.

The Faculty Senate Report presented yesterday to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees is available for distribution and will be appended to the minutes of today's meeting.

## **ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

In a previous report I commented on a decanal nonconcurrence on an emeritus recommendation by a department. After discussions with and between the school's dean, the Provost, and the Executive Committee on the need for further clarification in the *Faculty Code* on criteria for emeriti appointments, a) the Executive Committee has requested that the PEAF Committee develop criteria for consideration by the Senate and b) the Dean has withdrawn his nonconcurrence and allowed the departmental request to proceed.

## **UPCOMING MATTERS**

I mentioned at the last meeting the scheduling of newly-appointed deans to speak before the Senate. With Dean Guthrie's presentation today we have now heard from two of the three new deans. Dean Goldman of the School of Public Health and Health Services has indicated her willingness to speak before the group and we are endeavoring to establish a date, hopefully in April. We will keep you informed.

## **OTHER MATTERS**

### *University Parking Transition Plans*

In the January 27 *Hatchet* there was a report on the University's presentation to the D.C. Zoning Commission that include information about implications for campus parking following the demolition of the University Parking Garage on the site of the Science and Engineering Complex.

The Executive Committee has invited Alicia O'Neil Knight to brief the Senate on this topic at the March Senate meeting. Some faculty were involved in discussions already held, most from the Medical Center and the Hospital. Discussions will continue and Professor Simon was selected by the Executive Committee to be involved in future

discussions so as to provide greater feedback to the Senate and GW faculty members. I am sure that he would welcome any input you choose to share.

#### *Gelman Library Concerns*

In the February 3 edition of *The Hatchet* there was an article on initial plans for first floor Gelman renovations. Professor McAleavy, Chair of the Libraries Committee, will elaborate on the Committee's meeting with the University Librarian and we hope to have Librarian Siggins come to the Senate in March for a discussion of the impact on the library of the University's increased research plans. At the same time, we note with concern the need to further limit the number of subscriptions to scholarly journals due to increased costs. This seems to suggest that we are moving further away, rather than closer to, a capacity to support greater research participation by more of the university's faculty. The Executive Committee requests that Senate members seek input from the faculties of your schools on research usage of library resources as well as faculty use of the library so as to allow for a thorough discussion with Librarian Siggins next month.

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

Committee service forms were distributed via campus mail beginning early this week. Again, please encourage your fellow faculty members, particularly new faculty, to volunteer for Committee service and participate in this valuable channel for providing input to the administration on matters of importance to the faculty and staff.

The next Executive Committee meeting is scheduled for February 25. Please submit resolutions, reports, and other matters to the Senate office for consideration prior to that date.