

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR FACULTY SENATE
MEETING HELD ON MARCH 21, 2014
IN THE MARVIN CENTER, ROOM 403

Present: President Knapp, Provost Lerman, Registrar Amundson, and Parliamentarian Charnovitz; Deans Feuer and Goldman; Professors Brand, Brazinsky, Castleberry, Cordes, Costello, Dickinson, Downes, Galston, Garris, Gee, Harrington, Hawley, Helgert, Katz, Lantz, Lindahl, Marotta-Walters, McAleavey, McDonnell, Miller, Newcomer, Price, Prasad, Pulcini, Rehman, Roddis, Simon, Stott, Swaine, Weiner, Williams, and Yezer

Absent: Deans Akman, Brown, Dolling, Eskandarian, Johnson, and Vinson, Interim Deans Kayes and Maggs; Professors Briscoe, Fairfax, Jacobson, Parsons, Shesser, Sidawy, and Swiercz

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:12 p.m.

IN MEMORIAM

Professor Paul Churchill of the Philosophy department read the memorial tribute to William Byron Griffith, Elton Professor of Philosophy and Professor of Public Policy.

As noted in the tribute, the department of Philosophy is planning to hold a Memorial Service and Reception in Bill's honor at 4 p.m. on Friday, May 2nd in the Harry Harding Auditorium at 1957 E St. Members of the University community are invited. The department is also compiling a book of tributes from Bill's GW colleagues for his wife Pati, his daughter Flannery, and his sister, and the department welcomes remembrances from members of the University community. Statements to be included should be sent to the Philosophy Department's Executive Aide, Amanda McLaughlin, at philosop@gwu.edu by mid-April.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on February 14, 2014 were approved as distributed.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Professor Rehman moved to change the order of the agenda so that item 7 could be heard as the next item of business.

GW BOARD OF TRUSTEES CHAIR NELSON A. CARBONELL, JR. CONCERNING THE WORK OF THE FACULTY GOVERNANCE TASK FORCE

President Knapp acknowledged the presence of members of the Board of Trustees at the meeting before calling upon Board Chair Nelson Carbonell. Trustees Mark Hughes and Madeleine Jacobs, Professors Michael King, Alan Greenberg and Ed Swaine (ex-officio), members of the Faculty Governance Task Force, were present at the meeting.

Chair Carbonell began his remarks about the work of the task force by thanking President Knapp and wishing everyone a good afternoon. He said he had learned a lot since his last Senate meeting, and hoped to demonstrate that at this meeting. Chair Carbonell then read the following opening statement:

The George Washington University will enter its third century in 2021. Our strategic plan for the period leading up to this milestone reflects our aspirations to provide a unique, rigorous education to every one of our students and to secure our position as one of the world's premier research universities.

During the course of his remarks, Chair Carbonell utilized a power point presentation and distributed a short summary of five guiding principles developed from meetings with faculty to those present at the meeting. (Both of these documents are included with these minutes.)

Chair Carbonell said that the task force has been very active during the spring semester in meeting with the faculty of each of the schools, and that he would describe for the Senate the process the task force has engaged in to get to this point. He added that he would present to the Senate a draft of principles the task force has established after an extensive three-month listening tour with the faculty, and that he would seek the Senate's feedback on these principles.

Chair Carbonell highlighted two key elements that drove the task force's work. The first is the Strategic Plan for the university. The more the task force discussed this with the faculty, the more it became obvious that the direction the university is heading in today is very different that it was even a decade ago. The university still plans to provide a unique and rigorous education for students. In addition, the institution now aspires to become world-renowned amongst research universities. That aspiration has resulted in a different method of thinking in a new Strategic Plan, and a different way of thinking about making the institution better able to compete. It is critical to keep this goal in mind because it is important for the institution as it moves ahead in making needed changes to achieve desired outcomes.

As background, Chair Carbonell cited an excerpt from the resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees last year that was the impetus for the work of the task force in examining shared governance issues. The resolution states that the Board of Trustees recognizes the value of shared governance and of a strong and constructive relationship between the Faculty and the Administration.

As the work of the task force has proceeded, Chair Carbonell said that it is more obvious to him and to members of the task force who are not insiders at the university that shared governance is a wonderful institution at GW that needs not only to be preserved but strengthened going forward. The task force took this into consideration as it went forward with its work, which was to look not just at the *Faculty Code* but also at related governance documents, such as the *Faculty Organization Plan* and school bylaws, to ensure that it comprehensively understands how the university currently governs itself as an institution. The task force will continue in its work to listen carefully to feedback provided so the right way forward can be found to formulate its recommendations concerning faculty governance.

Chair Carbonell observed that the President had already introduced Trustees Mark Hughes, who chairs the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, and Madeleine Jacobs, who chairs the Diversity and Inclusion Committee of the Board. Trustee Dick Blackburn could not be present at the meeting, is a member of the Board's Governance Committee. Other members of the task force introduced at the Senate meeting were faculty members Alan Greenberg from Milken Institute School of Public Health, Michael King, from the Chemistry department in Columbian College, and Edward Swaine from the Law School. Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Dianne Martin is the administrative member on the task force.

Chair Carbonell next described the three phases of the task force's process of initiating as broad a dialogue as possible about faculty governance at the university. The first phase consisted of school-based meetings to discuss governance with faculty members from every school. The task force met with faculty in several ways, at meetings with department chairs and at school faculty meetings and special meetings in its effort to meet with as many people as possible. The Task Force posed a series of questions focused on how GW's governance system intersects with the university's aspirations and its Strategic Plan, and whether or not the present governance model is suitable for what the university is trying to accomplish.

The first part of phase two involved task force engagement in a series of town hall meetings, the most recent having taken place the morning of the Senate meeting at the Mount Vernon Campus. The task force also conducted such a meeting at the Virginia Science and Technology campus. The focus of these town hall meetings provided an opportunity to engage with faculty at a second level and examine in more detail principles the task force had begun to formulate in response to feedback obtained from meetings in the schools. Feedback obtained from the town hall meetings reinforced in many respects that obtained from the earlier meetings in phase one. Chair Carbonell indicated that the last pieces of phase two would consist of the task force's meeting with the Senate March 21, after which an electronic survey will be distributed to faculty that would request responses to a series of questions to further elicit as much feedback as possible.

Phase three of the task force's work will consist of forming and presenting its recommendations. Chair Carbonell said this process would begin early in the week of March 24, following the last town hall meeting of the Task Force.

Chair Carbonell next summarized meetings held by the task force. Over 23 meetings have been held with faculty members in department and school meetings as well as town

hall meetings. Seven meetings of the task force have been held where it discussed feedback and notes from those meetings. Chair Carbonell also said he had met with the Senate Executive Committee twice and Task Force members had joined him for a third meeting in February. The group has also met with the Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom twice, and plans to meet again the following Tuesday, on March 25. Chair Carbonell noted that this was his second meeting with the Senate.

Chair Carbonell said he thought it important to state how the task force has started to frame its recommendations, as it became very clear as conversations were held with the faculty what its task was. He read the following from a handout he had brought to the meeting. (That document is included with these minutes.)

The university task force believes that the university can only aspire to be as good as its faculty. In addition, the highest quality faculty is driven by the caliber of the individual members of the faculty, their leadership, the environment in which they work and their motivation and engagement.

The task force seeks to understand faculty governance in this context. The only way in which the university can achieve its aspirations is to have the best faculty possible. The university's location is terrific, the campus buildings are great, and GW has wonderful students, but the university can never be better than its faculty can make it.

Chair Carbonell next turned to a set of five guiding principles drafted by the task force. These are, in summary: participation in governance, that is, who gets to participate; provisions for academic freedom; the present appointment, promotion and tenure system and where it needs to go; procedures for the appointment, review and retention of administrators, deans and academic administrators within schools and programs; and school, departmental, center and institute rules and procedures and how those can be brought both in line with the institution's aspirations. Chair Carbonell commented on each of these principles in some detail.

The first principle, that of expanding participation in governance for all full-time faculty, is first because the task force has heard it with the loudest voice. The current system reserves certain governance roles for tenured and tenure-track faculty only. What the task force has heard over and over again is that the university has clinical faculty and research faculty who feel like second-class citizens.

The university needs to examine its definition of full-time faculty in order to ascertain who is included in that community and who is not. There is variability among the schools, particularly in the School of Medicine where there are a very large number of faculty, because anybody who teaches medical students must have a faculty appointment. The ultimate goal would be that when the Faculty Senate assembles, or any other body assembles, whether it is at a department or school level, that body is represented in and populated by everyone who is considered a full-time faculty member at the university.

Professor Simon said he thought the word "full-time" has to be very carefully defined because there are nearly 1,500 people in the Medical School who are not employed or paid by the University, for example, a surgeon at Holy Cross Hospital who takes a GW medical

student into the operating room with him. That surgeon is required by the licensing committee on medical education to have a faculty appointment, but he and other doctors like him are not full-time faculty. They are designated clinical faculty. It is important to think very carefully before a redefinition of faculty ranks is adopted.

Chair Carbonell responded that he thought it important to make the point that there are certain principles that will require time and deliberation to get right. He added that he thought that this principle was one where it makes sense to put together a group to examine these definitions. In the present *Faculty Code*, the definitions of faculty type [description of faculty ranks] are extensive and they may not need to be. It may be necessary to find a way to clarify these and make clear who is full-time and who is not. The principle in the end is that the university cannot be a place where there is a second-class citizenry that it counts on to move forward the objectives of the institution, whether they are teaching students or doing research or something else. That is an important principle that needs to be established. However, understanding who that is may be a bit more complicated than simply deciding it is anyone who is full-time.

The second principle concerns academic freedom, i.e., promoting academic freedom for all faculty as the University becomes more global and online. The principle is to promote academic freedom for all faculty, meaning all faculty members, whether they are full-time or part-time. The task force wants to have an environment in which academic freedom exists for everyone. The notion that faculty members only have academic freedom if they have tenure is something the task force does not want to support because there are activities at the university, whether they be research activities or teaching activities, where academic freedom is an important construct to maintain. As the university becomes more global and online the question is how to think about academic freedom, and there are three important components to this.

A second component of this principle is about teaching. Current provisions about teaching really confine themselves to the classroom, and the classroom is a different place than it used to be. Faculty members may teach abroad, and it is important for everyone to understand that the *Faculty Code* won't necessarily trump the law in the country where the teaching is conducted. The university also needs to think about the teaching freedoms extended not just in the classroom, but when other media are employed, particularly online courses.

A third component of academic freedom is one encountered as the task force launched its process. Chair Carbonell said there is a lot of bullying at the university and there are things that happen at the university that would get people kicked out of fourth grade, and it is intolerable. The university cannot have an environment in which people bully one another and restrict the freedom of things that other people want to do. If someone has a different opinion, that is what places like the university are about. If people are participating in things like helping the Chairman of the Board look at faculty governance that shouldn't be something that gets them shunned.

The university needs to make a statement concerning academic freedom. Chair Carbonell said he was not sure how this would be enforced, but most likely the faculty would have to do this. The important thing is for the institution to make a statement that

says it is not acceptable to be a bully, nor is acceptable at the university to create an environment in which people don't feel free to think what they think and do what they do because they are afraid of what someone else might do to them.

Chair Carbonell said that he thought that the discussion scheduled with the PEAFC Committee the following Tuesday would be a promising venue to further discuss this and as this is a relatively straightforward matter, he added that he was hopeful that a draft could be agreed upon to address strengthening *Faculty Code* provisions in this area.

Professor Castleberry said it sounded to him like the Chair thought the academic freedom provisions in the *Faculty Code* only exist for full-time, regular active status faculty who are tenured or tenure-track. Chair Carbonell responded that that was not the case in the current *Code*.

Professor Castleberry agreed, saying that academic freedom in the *Code* exists for all classes and all members of the faculty at GW. Governance is restricted to certain faculty ranks, and that is so in the *Code* and in school bylaws, but academic freedom exists for everybody. The university also has other policies that can come into play if people are being bullied. Chair Carbonell responded that the task force has carefully compared the academic freedom provisions of the *Faculty Code* with policies in place at other institution, and the university can adopt provisions that are better than what it now has.

Chair Carbonell turned next to the third draft principle concerning the appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) process for faculty. The purpose of this principle is to align the university's APT criteria and procedures with the university's aspirations and ensure consistent and transparent processes and high-quality results across the entire university. The system in use at present is largely departmental, and nothing needs to happen to that. However, there are two issues the task force has learned about with respect to the system that goes beyond that, whether it is at the school level or at the university level. One is that the process by which APT cases go forward is cumbersome and it's opaque, especially to the candidate. The end result is a kind of tapestry of levels of quality across the institution that does not help the university -- to have programs that are weak and stay weak, or programs that are strong just to stay strong. The university needs all of its programs to strengthen over time.

A second issue is that if broad governance rights are granted to all faculty, tenured and non-tenured, then the current mechanisms of appeal that exist in the Senate because it only has tenured faculty will have to be administered only where there are tenured faculty. There may also be elements where it is desirable for only the tenured faculty to participate. The task force does not at this time have a specific proposal, but the thinking is that a way could be found to put into place a university-wide mechanism to administer tenure, to include school-wide mechanisms and existing departmental mechanisms, working together to build a tenure system.

Chair Carbonell indicated that this is not something that can be done by May. It will require some thought and study, but a system is needed that aligns with where the Board is trying to take the institution. There are centers where faculty members have no

departmental affiliation and they do not have access to tenure [which is departmentally based]. So a way must be found to deal with this as well.

Professor Galston asked the Chair to elaborate on what was meant by a university-wide component to the tenure system and how it would be different from what is in place now. Chair Carbonell reiterated that the details of this have yet to be worked out, however, a study has been commissioned to look at procedures at about a half dozen other institutions. At this point, the idea in mind is that there would be an elected university-wide tenure committee, and it would in effect administer the tenure system – that tenure cases would go to them and this is how it would work. While saying that the way something is done at another institution is better than it is at GW is not necessarily always a good idea, there are institutions such as Stanford where there is a small committee that in effect grants tenure to everybody university-wide. Members of the committee are very senior faculty members who are highly regarded, and they are the ones that make the final decisions. The current system where tenure cases go to the Board of Trustees makes absolutely no sense; trustees don't really have the background to evaluate whether these tenure decisions are correct or not. The Board should be in the business of allocating financial resources. While the number of tenure lines is part of allocating financial resources, deciding whether or not somebody gets tenure is not. It is not helpful to have a process that is the equivalent of a rubber stamp. Hopefully a new process would have a mechanism in it that says that, at the university level, it is understood that there are certain standards and that there are ways to make sure those standards are adhered to across the institution.

Turning to the fourth draft principle, that of defining a consistent and appropriate role for the faculty and the administration in the selection, performance appraisal and retention of deans and other senior academic administrators, Chair Carbonell said this is something that has changed over the last decade. For those who have been at the university more than ten years, it's common knowledge that GW historically has not been very good at fundraising. The university is a lot better now, and has just announced the receipt of a very generous \$80 million gift. This happened in part because the Board decided it wanted to transform fundraising at the university. A new president had to be brought in, and the way in which the development office worked had to be changed. The deans are now expected to spend half of their time fundraising because philanthropists don't just give money to institutions because it makes them feel good to be affiliated with that institution. The work of Dean Goldman and faculty members in what is now the Milken Institute School of Public Health was instrumental in obtaining this incredibly generous gift because they were able to impress upon the donors that they could have a transformative effect in advancing public in the nation and around the world.

Being a dean today is very different that it was just ten years ago. The university currently has a system where it looks like an academic appointment, but it is not just that now that they are responsible for going into the outside world to obtain financial resources for their schools. In view of this, GW needs to have a system that produces the best possible deans for the institution, because in the end, the deans are where the rubber meets the road in fundraising. It is also important to be sure that the university's academic administrators and department chairs are in a position to have the time and the skills to devote to fundraising.

Chair Carbonell said he hoped that university would not to have to look for another dean in the near future, but now is the time to sit down and figure out how to produce the best outcomes going forward. Certainly faculty will participate, but there are schools in which faculty have asserted to people from the Board of Trustees on dean search committees that they cannot vote. The question is why that is so, when these people are volunteering their unpaid time to participate in a process to find the best possible dean.

In addition to appropriate roles for faculty and administrators in the selection of deans are the matters of performance appraisal and retention. It is necessary to give feedback to deans and review their performance, but it does not necessarily mean this has to happen every five years. In fact, some schools do this, but in others they don't review the dean's performance at all. In some, the only feedback received is by holding a vote of no confidence. Meaningful ways to evaluate decanal performance and provide constructive feedback must be found and implemented. Retention of deans is also very important. The question to be asked is how to hire people who can stay at the university long enough to do three things: bringing in the best faculty members and nurturing them; operating and administering their schools, and bringing in philanthropic resources.

The fifth draft principle concerns school, departmental, center and institute rules and procedures. This will involve creating a consistent framework of faculty titles, policies and procedures across the university, while at the same time providing for the unique needs of each unit. It is important to begin to think about coming up with a consistent framework for these and asking the schools to make rules for themselves that fit within that framework. At the same time, schools must have the latitude to do what they need to do.

Professor Castleberry said he did not want to be the only person talking at the meeting, and that he did not disagree with what the Chair was saying. Certainly there is uniqueness across all the schools of the university. In regard to the last comment made about the policies and procedures the schools use to search for deans, these are defined in the *Code*. It is largely left to the schools to monitor these policies and procedures; at the same time it is up to the schools to follow the *Code*. The Senate does not police these searches, and the Senate does not concern itself with specific actions of a school, it deals with matters that impact all of the faculty across schools.

Professor Castleberry indicated that he did see a compelling need to make a lot of changes to the system currently in place. It is not broken in his opinion. In fact, it has served the university very well in his experience. If one points to Dean Goldman as a wonderful, dynamic representative of one of the university's schools who is successful at fundraising, it is important to remember that her selection was the result of the process in place. The same is true of former Dean of the Law School Michael Young. When he left GW to accept the presidency of the University of Utah that was not necessarily a bad thing for the university. Professor Castleberry said he regarded Dean Young as a star who went on to a higher level, and that reflected well on GW.

Chair Carbonell said that the premise which merits discussion is that the only things that can fixed are broken to begin with. The issue of full-time faculty participation in governance is broken. There are people that are really angry about this. Classifying

research professors as research staff in the *Code* makes people incensed, and it's an unnecessary treatment of people who are valuable members of the university community.

Chair Carbonell said there are other things that are not broken, and that he would agree with Professor Castleberry that Dean Goldman went through the existing process and she has been terrific. There are other deans who are terrific as well, but that doesn't mean that change is unavailable. Change is available if something better than what exists today can be put into place. The key issue is improvement, and people need to be convinced that change isn't the enemy.

Chair Carbonell concluded his remarks with two observations. First, he said he thought that the task force's interactions with faculty, whether in the Senate, the Executive Committee, or the PEAFF Committee, has been a productive way to proceed. He added that he wanted to apologize up front that he did not realize that would be the case, and the first time he came to the Senate he didn't have that thought. The task force plans to continue this interaction in the future, because it is a critical way to get the right results.

Secondly, in terms of timing, the task force is going to make a set of recommendations and some of them will likely be implemented relatively quickly. Others may take more time. The plan going forward is to continue to work with the Senate, the Executive Committee, and the PEAFF Committee, with the goal of coming back in April with a set of recommendations. The next step would be looking at how to put together the groups that have to work on some of the discussed areas which are complicated but not impossible, particularly given all of the smart people here at the university.

On a personal note, Chair Carbonell said he has been Chair of the Board of Trustees since July and he had no idea this experience was going to work out in this way. It has been a great way to get to know and interact with the faculty. He said that he has thoroughly enjoyed it, including those parts where people were very candid and did not confine their remarks to saying nice things. He added that he thought that the rest of the Trustees would agree with this assessment; everyone has realized that GW is a unique place, and it is not going to be alright to just copy procedures at other institutions the university aspires to emulate. It is essential to look at the university's own unique way of operating, but it is also important to make sure that much needed change is possible. Chair Carbonell then reiterated what he has said at many meetings – one of the biggest challenges for any institution is that it tends to be allergic to risk in every way, shape, or form, not just in a process such as this, but in others as well. Unless the university finds a way to take on risk, it is unlikely it will achieve the vision that it has established. Finally, Chair Carbonell said he looked forward to continuing to work with all of the members of the Senate and he thanked the group for its attention. Chair Carbonell's remarks were met with applause from the Senate.

President Knapp thanked Chair Carbonell and other members of the task force for spending their time with the Senate at the meeting and said he was sure the process would provide further opportunities for dialogue.

Professor Garris, Chair of the PEAFF Committee, commented that there has been a lot of interaction with Chair Carbonell and task force members about these issues, and he

thought that was a good thing. He also said that he has been extremely impressed with the dedication of the Board of Trustees and these interactions have been unprecedented. He added that in all of his years at GW he had never seen the trustees take the time to really inform themselves about how things are done, or to try to talk to people and understand these issues in a deep way. Professor Garris said that he thought this process is going to generate a lot of dialogue between various constituencies of the faculty and he thought that what will emerge from this process will impact the university in a very positive way.

RESOLUTION 13/4, "A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE POLICY ON RETAINING INCOMPLETE GRADES ON STUDENTS' TRANSCRIPTS (13/4)"

Professor Robert J. Harrington, Chair, of the Educational Policy Committee, introduced Resolution 13/4. He read the Resolution, which recommends that, effective with the courses taught in the fall semester 2014, the "I" indicator on students' transcripts be removed once an actual grade has been reported and recorded.

Professor Harrington urged the adoption of Resolution 13/4 to alter the University's current policy of retaining the record of Incomplete grades on student's transcripts even after a final grade has been assigned for the course. The University's Council of Associate Deans requested that the Faculty Senate look into this matter, and the Senate Executive Committee asked the Educational Policy for its recommendations. On information provided by the Registrar, who reviewed policies of market basket schools in this area, the Educational Policy Committee agreed to recommend a change to the policy so that the grade recorded in a student's transcript should only reflect the student's overall performance in the course.

Professor Harrington said he knew that this is an item that does not have necessarily total acceptance by the faculty, however, the Registrar researched the matter and advised that the vast majority of students' transcripts have but a single "I" grade on them. They are several that have multiple "I" grades but they are few. What faculty do agree on is an "I" should be assigned for a suitable reason. These grades are usually assigned toward the end of a course, usually in connection with failure to take a final examination as scheduled, and a makeup final examination is scheduled. No one is suggesting that the policy of changing an Incomplete grade to an "F" if coursework is not completed within a 12 month period be altered.

Professor Harrington thanked Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Assessment Cheryl Beil for her counsel and assistance in crafting this Resolution as well as the next one (13/5) to be considered at the meeting.

Discussion followed. Professor Yezer said that the Resolution suggests that a majority of schools surveyed remove "I" grades once coursework is complete, and Professor Harrington confirmed this was the case.

Professor Roddis said it seemed to her that once coursework is complete the student should have the grade on their transcript simply show the work is complete. She added that she was puzzled about the policy of retaining "I" grades on transcripts forever. Professor McAlevey said he favored the Resolution, and added that he thought the reason for the

existing policy is primarily historical, and that it was likely meant to counter the possibility of abuse on the part of students who accumulate a large number of Incomplete grades before they master the material, at times sitting through courses a second and third time before receiving an actual grade.

President Knapp observed that the punctuation of the text of the Resolution needed to be corrected, and he indicated that the Senate Coordinator could do this. There being no objection to this suggestion, the question was called, a vote was taken, and Resolution 13/4 was adopted as amended.

RESOLUTION 13/5, "A RESOLUTION TO ALERT STUDENTS WHO ARE DOING SUBSTANDARD ACADEMIC WORK EARLY IN THE SEMESTER"

On behalf of the Educational Policy Committee, Professor Harrington, Chair, introduced and moved the adoption of Resolution 13/5. He read the Resolution, which encourages faculty to assign graded work early in the semester, but no later than the fifth week of the semester. It also encourages faculty to enter information about students' academic performance, especially those who are doing substandard work, into the Faculty Feedback System in Banner as soon as this information is available so that it can be accessed by undergraduate school and athletic advisors. The Whereas Clauses spell out the rationale for this: 81% of entering freshmen graduate by the end of the sixth year compared to a median of 90% for GW's market basket schools and 18% of the students who leave before graduating have a cumulative grade point average below 2.0. Another 11% have a cumulative grade point average between 2.0 and 2.49.

Professor Harrington said that he had talked with one of the reporters from *The Hatchet* about the Resolution a couple of days before, and he thought that students are very much aware that the effect of adopting the recommendations in the Resolution will be a big help to those students who are not doing well early in the semester. One way of implementing the Resolution's provisions envisioned by the Educational Policy Committee is that some sort of brief quiz early in the semester could be given. This will identify students who are doing really well, but if it shows that none of the students is doing particularly well, that would indicate something else needing attention.

Professor Harrington was asked if this policy would apply to M.A. and Ph.D. students. Discussion followed after which Professor McAleavey made a motion to add the word "Undergraduate" before the word Students' in the title of the Resolution. The motion was seconded and approved by unanimous vote. Professor Yezer made a motion to further amend the Resolution by entering the phrase "assign work that is graded early in the semester" rather than "assign graded work early in the semester." This amendment was accepted without objection.

A faculty member asked what the phrase "faculty should be encouraged" in Resolving Clause 1) means. Professor Harrington said that if he were a department chair that he would tell the faculty to schedule a quiz in the first five weeks of the semester and report back the results immediately.

The Chair suggested that the punctuation in the Resolution be standardized and indicated that the Senate Coordinator would do this. The suggestion was accepted without objection.

A vote was taken, and Resolution 13/5 was adopted as amended by unanimous vote. (Resolution 13/5 is included with these minutes.)

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. NOMINEES FOR ELECTION TO THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE NEW EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE 2014-15 SESSION

Professor Rehman moved the nominations of the following faculty members to the Nominating Committee: Scheherazade S. Rehman, Convener; Brian Biles (SPHHS), Michael Castleberry (GSEHD), Robert J. Harrington (SEAS), David McAleavey (CCAS), Gary L. Simon (SMHS), Joyce Pulcini (SON), and Roger Trangsrud (GWLS).

Professor Rehman indicated that Professor Robert Rycroft (ESIA) had agreed to serve on the Committee if elected but this information was not received in time for it to be included on the agenda.

There were no nominations from the floor, and the entire slate of nominees was approved.

II. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Rehman presented the report that is included with these minutes.

III. PROVOST'S REMARKS

Provost Lerman said he had had a number of inquiries concerning when makeup classes would be scheduled for the 3.5 snow days during the spring semester. He gave a preview of the preliminary schedule, subject to change because of an impending snowstorm early the next week, which might alter the plan. [The snowstorm materialized but University classes were not cancelled that day.] The final schedule, which the Provost indicated would be widely distributed, was published the week after the Senate meeting and is as follows:

- **Monday, April 28: Last day of regularly-scheduled Monday classes**
- **Tuesday, April 29: The original Make-up Day is now a *Designated Tuesday* – The regular Tuesday schedule will be followed to make up for classes cancelled due to snow on Tuesday, January 21**

- **Wednesday, April 30: *Designated Monday*** - The regular Monday schedule will be followed. Wednesday classes DO NOT meet.
- **Thursday, May 1: The first Reading Day is now a *Designated Thursday*** - The regular Thursday schedule will be followed to make up for classes cancelled due to snow on Thursday, February 13
- **Friday, May 2: The second Reading Day is now a *Designated Monday*** – The regular Monday schedule will be followed to make up for classes cancelled due to snow on Monday, March 3. Friday classes DO NOT meet.

There are no make-up classes scheduled for those classes cancelled the morning of Monday, March 17. Final exams will begin as scheduled on Monday, May 5.

Provost Lerman reminded everyone that the Faculty Honors Ceremony would be held the following Monday, March 31, beginning at 4 p.m. in the Jack Morton Auditorium. About three years ago the University combined a number of faculty awards ceremonies into this one, which honors faculty members for distinction in teaching, research, and service. A reception will follow the Ceremony, and the Provost encouraged as many faculty to attend as possible to participate in thanking and honoring their faculty colleagues.

The Provost followed up on his promise to update the Senate at each of the meetings during the spring semester about progress that has been made on implementing the University's Strategic Plan. As most know, Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion Terri Reed has led a Steering Committee to study implementation of the undergraduate citizenship and leadership initiative. Provost Lerman said that the work of that Committee led to the creation of a working group to deliberate and offer recommendations on implementing this initiative and operationalizing this requirement. Provost Lerman said he had appointed the members of this group, which include faculty from each of the schools. It also has a significant student membership because the Administration believes that students have a stake and a great deal of insight about this. The Provost said that he would be happy to share the charge to the group with anyone interested, and added he looked forward very much to receiving the group's recommendations, which will ultimately be approved by the faculty.

CHAIR'S REMARKS

In view of the unprecedented number of snowstorms this year causing the University to cancel classes, President Knapp said he has often been asked what the University's criteria for closing are when a significant snowfall is predicted. The largest single factor is the status of public transit operations, because such a large percentage of the University's staff depend upon the subway and Metrobus to travel to campus. He also observed that while many are snowed out due to inclement weather, he is snowed in because he lives at the F Street House on campus. This, of course, provides the opportunity to observe firsthand the dedication of the University's staff as they work to clear paved areas of snow and otherwise keep critical functions of the University operational. President Knapp said that he has found every opportunity he could to thank the staff for the excellent job that they do, and he added that he hoped everyone would take the time to do the same.

President Knapp also commented on what he termed a transformational gift to what is now the Milken Institute School of Public Health. This is an \$80 million gift which comes in three parts: \$10 million from the Milken Family Foundation naming the deanship of the School, \$40 million for the School at large from the Milken Institute, and \$30 million from Sumner Redstone to create a prevention and wellness center which will be established to address what has become an increasingly epidemic crisis in the United States and the world -- that of chronic diseases, particularly but not exclusively associated with obesity. By many estimates these diseases are costing the economy something like a trillion dollars a year. They are also not only a source of tremendous suffering but of mortality as well.

The President said that when he returned from the celebration of this gift in Los Angeles, he had an opportunity to meet with approximately 300 members of the School's faculty, staff and students at the F Street House. He said he noted on that occasion that as proud as everyone is of what this gift means for the University, what is even more important is what it is going to mean in the lives of people around the world, because it will allow the University to focus expertise both within the Milken Institute School and beyond on the policy community in Washington D.C. The gift is really the result of the fact that the donors are very interested in having a significant impact on public health. Their decision to make this extraordinary investment to bring about further change in the national and global situation with respect to chronic diseases was made after a period of more than two years of deliberation. As has already been mentioned, this is a vote of confidence in Dean Goldman and the School's faculty, but it is also a vote of confidence in the University. It is a recognition of the opportunity GW has as a University with faculty having local connections with the policy world located in the heart of the nation's capital.

President Knapp said that in his experience one of the things that makes this gift extraordinary is that it all comes to the University over the next six years, and that means the present value of the gift is much greater than is often the case when a gift of this size is made over a longer period. This means that its impact will be felt quickly; in fact, the University has already had some recruiting success in connection with it. The President said he knew that Dean Goldman was not then present at the meeting, but he offered congratulations to the School's faculty and Senators from the Milken Institute School -- Professors Katz, Lantz, and McDonnell -- for their part in helping the School's secure this landmark gift.

President Knapp provided a brief update on discussions underway in connection with a possible relationship between the University and the Corcoran Gallery of Art, including its Corcoran College of Art and Design, and the National Gallery of Art. If details of this arrangement can be agreed upon, this will be a tremendous opportunity for the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences in particular, which has six departments that are directly relevant to this area. There are also other parts of the University such as the Graduate School of Education and Human Development that have an interest in what will be done with arts education in this facility.

President Knapp commented on reports in the press that the art collection from the Corcoran will be sold, and noted that the National Gallery is not permitted to sell any art. If the arrangements are finalized, the National Gallery will decide which parts of the art

collection that are now part of the Corcoran Gallery should be made a part of its permanent collection. Pieces that it does not accept will be distributed to other museums around the country. This has been done multiple times with other collections, the idea being that it will provide a way for museums to acquire very distinguished pieces of art they would not otherwise be able to obtain. These artworks will still be identified as part of the Clark Collection in affiliation with the National Gallery.

There have also been suggestions that there will be no art left in the Corcoran Gallery, which is an extraordinary complex of two buildings – the original Beaux Arts building on 17th Street across from the White House Ellipse, and a second building on E Street which houses the Clark Collection. There is a beautiful suite of exhibit halls on the second floor of the atrium of the Beaux Arts building; these are some of the most beautiful exhibition halls in the world. Those will be used by the National Gallery to house what is being called the Corcoran Contemporary exhibition of contemporary art works for which there is really no suitable space now in the National Gallery. On the main floor of the Beaux Arts building a legacy gallery will house some of the most distinguished pieces of the Corcoran collection. GW will have an opportunity to expand academic offerings in the Corcoran College of Art and Design if an agreement can be finalized by the parties to this arrangement. Finally, it has not been clear in reporting on this topic that the University is potentially in line to receive assets from the Corcoran Gallery which will help pay for renovations to the building.

President Knapp announced that the men's basketball team has now reached the post-season phase of the NCAA tournament. They will play Memphis in a game beginning at 6:55 that evening in Raleigh, North Carolina. Provided they win, they will move on in the tournament.

As most know, faculty and members of the Board of Trustees came up with a program for student athletes that really emphasized the importance of the ideal of the student athlete. The President said the current team is the most athletically and academically successful men's basketball teams the University has had thus far in his years at GW. This shows that there is not necessarily a tradeoff between academic success and athletic success. GW's student athletes, men and women alike, are terrific ambassadors for the University and fulfill the ideal of the student athlete which the University embraces and seeks to foster. The President concluded his remarks by congratulating the team on their success thus far, wishing them well, and encouraging everyone to watch the game and support the team.

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Newcomer, Chair of the Senate University and Urban Affairs Committee, said she hoped Senate members would join the Committee for the second of two events sponsored this year. The first was a very successful event last November that focused on the Committee's role in addressing homelessness in the District of Columbia.

This second event, Celebrate and Connect, will focus on Public Health. This is scheduled for Monday, April 7 in the Marvin Center, third floor. It will highlight and showcase the tremendous amount of involvement in the community on the part of faculty

and students from the School of Nursing, the Milken Institute School of Public Health, and other faculty members in the health sciences. Professor Newcomer thanked Professor Pulcini of the Nursing School for pulling this event together and noted that because the first event was scheduled on a day when snow caused its postponement, Professor Pulcini had now had to do this twice.

Professor Newcomer also invited Senate members to join her at an event on Monday, March 24 at 5:30 p.m. at the Trachtenberg School of Public Policy & Public Administration when University Professor Amitzi Etzioni will be interviewing Jared Bernstein about inequality.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:47 p.m.

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

A TRIBUTE IN MEMORY OF WILLIAM BYRON GRIFFITH

It is with deep sorrow that The George Washington University Faculty Senate acknowledges the recent death of William Byron Griffith, Elton Professor of Philosophy and Professor of Public Policy, and former Director of the Graduate Program in Philosophy and Social Policy. Bill died February 10, 2014 at the George Washington University Hospital of a brain trauma suffered during a fall in January. Bill was at the time completing a long and brave recovery from surgery and prolonged hospitalization for ruptured patella tendons sustained a year earlier.

A native of Forth Worth, Texas, Bill attended the University of Notre Dame and graduated Magna cum Laude in 1958. He was awarded a Fulbright Scholarship at the Université de Louvain, Louvain, Belgium where he studied the philosophy of Edmund Husserl and received a Certificate in 1959. Bill next entered the Ph.D. program in philosophy at Yale University in 1960. Supported by a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship and then a Danforth Fellowship, Bill completed his MA in 1962 and his PhD just a year later. At Yale, Bill was a student of the famous philosopher, Wilfred Sellars, who directed Bill's PhD on the philosophy of Ludwig Wittgenstein.

Having been commissioned a 1st Lieutenant while still at Yale, Bill served in Operations Research with the U.S. Army Security Agency between 1962 and 1964. Accepting a position at GW in 1964, Bill then began his long and distinguished academic career of 50 years. Bill chaired the Department of Philosophy for a total of 17 years, implementing a significant revision of the curriculum, emphasizing applied philosophy and interdisciplinary programs, and carefully overseeing a growth in both the number of philosophy majors and the size and talent of the Department's faculty.

As a scholar, Bill was truly a public philosopher. He rose to the twin challenges of promoting the value of interdisciplinary studies as well as demonstrating the contributions philosophy could make to public policy and the professions. Bill Griffith was an innovator and a pioneer in bringing the fruits of ethics, logic, and philosophical analysis to such fields as biomedical research, business, economics, environmental science, law, and public policy. He designed and taught a number of innovative courses such as his very popular graduate courses on Ethics and Policy Issues, and his Seminar on Economic Justice.

The scope of Bill's life-long concern with bringing philosophy to the professions and to public debates are evident from the venues through which Bill published, as well as the forums and associations in front of which he spoke. These included the following: economics journals including articles co-authored with Robert Goldfarb, a Canadian law journal, the American Statistical Association, the National Academy of Public Administration, the American Historical Association, the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, the Association for Social Economics, the Center for Public Choice, the National Economics Club, the Society for Public Administration, the U.S. Census Bureau, for which Bill served as a Confidentiality Analyst, and UNESCO, among others.

A TRIBUTE IN MEMORY OF WILLIAM BYRON GRIFFITH

William Griffith's strongest legacy to the GW he loved concern his significant accomplishments as a program developer, overseer, and sustainer as well as staunch advocate of faculty rights and faculty participation in University governance. As department chair, Bill took a major role in bringing to GW Professor Peter Caws as University Professor of Philosophy, and Professor Kenneth Shaffer as University Professor of Medical Humanities, in establishing a bioethics program between Columbian College and the Medical School, in helping to develop the public policy programs, serving as faculty trustee of the Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area, and serving as the chief architect of the Department's own Graduate Program in Philosophy and Social Policy, the first of its kind in the nation where, between 1988 and 2012, Bill served as director.

Nowhere was Bill's service more appreciated than in the Faculty Senate in which he served for a total of 36 years in 18 two-year terms between 1969 and 2010. During this span Bill served for 6 years as chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (1984-87 and 1989-92) much of which overlapped with his service as chair of the Department of philosophy and service as director of the department's graduate program. In addition, while in the Senate, Bill chaired on a number of major standing committees, including: Fiscal Planning & Budgeting which he chaired for 9 years, Professional Ethics & Academic Freedom, which he chaired successively for 15 years; Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies, chaired for 3 years, and Educational Policy, for 2 years. In addition, he served as a Faculty Representative to the GW Board of Trustees and on several of the Board's standing committees.

As demonstrated during his service in the Faculty Senate and as redoubtable parliamentarian for Columbian College, Bill was never diffident about questioning or correcting colleagues, or administrators. He was, metaphorically speaking, often St George pitted against our administrative 'dragons.' Yet, all who knew Bill admired him for his sense of fair play and good humor as well as his high standards. Bill was awarded the Trachtenberg Prize for Service in 1993, and Bill was always available for students, faculty, deans, and administrators; they sought the benefit of his experience and wise counsel, and were refreshed by his warmth and wit.

Bill was married for 53 years to Professor Patricia Browning Griffith, a novelist and playwright who teaches creative writing at GW. The two actively supported literature and the arts in DC and frequently opened their home in Sheperd Park, DC for the benefit of artists, writers, and sculptors. Bill was a long time supporter of the Pen/Faulkner Foundation, and served as director for 5 years of the Friends of the Washington Review of the Arts for which he was also a frequent contributor as he was for the G.W. Forum.

I ask that the George Washington University Faculty Senate extend its sympathy to the family and loved ones of William B. Griffith. He will be greatly missed by his faculty colleagues at GW, by his numerous professional contacts, and by the thousands of GW alumni for whom he was a gentle but challenging teacher and mentor.

A TRIBUTE IN MEMORY OF WILLIAM BYRON GRIFFITH

The Department of Philosophy is planning to hold a Memorial Service and Reception in Bill's honor at 4 p.m. on Friday, May 2nd in the Harry Harding Auditorium at 1957 E St. and we hope to see many of you there. We are also compiling a book of tributes from Bill's GW colleagues for Pati, his daughter Flannery, and his sister, and we welcome your remembrances. Please send any statements you would like us to include to our Executive Aide, Amanda McLaughlin, at philosop@gwu.edu by mid-April.

Read by his Philosophy Department colleague, Professor Paul Churchill, into the Record of the Faculty Senate at its meeting on March 21, 2014

HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE STRATEGIC PLAN AND BOARD RESOLUTION - MAY 2013

The George Washington University will enter its third century in 2021. Our strategic plan for the period leading up to this milestone reflects our aspirations to provide a unique, rigorous education to every one of our students and to secure our position as one of the world's premier research universities.

Whereas, the Board of Trustees recognizes the value of shared governance and of a strong and constructive relationship between Faculty and the Administration; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Trustees of the George Washington University charges the next Chair of the Board with forming a committee, to include board members, faculty, and administrators, to engage with the Faculty and the Administration in a review of faculty governance over the 2013-2014 academic year; and

Resolved, That, at the conclusion of those deliberations, the committee shall recommend to the Board any appropriate revisions to the Faculty Code and related governing documents.

FACULTY GOVERNANCE TASK FORCE – Members and Review Process

Trustees: Nelson Carbonell, Mark Hughes, Madeleine Jacobs, Richard Blackburn

Faculty: Alan Greenberg, Michael King, Edward Swaine

Administration: Dianne Martin

- ❖ Phase 1 - School based meeting to discuss governance
- ❖ **Phase 2 – Town Hall feedback meetings and Faculty Survey**
- ❖ Phase 3 – Finalize and present recommendations

[DRAFT] RECOMMENDATIONS – Guiding Principles

The members of the Faculty Governance Task Force believe that the University can only aspire to be as good as its faculty. In addition, the highest quality faculty is driven by the caliber of its individual members, their leadership, the environment in which they work, and their motivation and engagement.

The Faculty Governance Task Force, after a broad initial consultation with faculty in every school in the university and upon hearing about many key issues reiterated throughout the school-based meetings, is considering the following list of guiding principles;

- ❖ **Participation** – Expand participation in governance for all full-time faculty.
- ❖ **Academic Freedom** - Promote academic freedom for all faculty as the University becomes more global and online.
- ❖ **Appointment, Promotion, Tenure (APT)** – Align APT criteria and procedures with the university's aspirations and ensure consistent, transparent and high-quality processes and results across the entire university.
- ❖ **Appointment, Review and Retention of Administrators** – Define a consistent and appropriate role for the Faculty and the Administration in the selection, performance appraisal and retention of Deans and other senior academic administrators.
- ❖ **School, Departmental, Center and Institute Rules and Procedures** – Create a consistent framework of faculty titles, policies and procedures across the University, while providing for unique needs of each unit.

Please provide feedback: www.trustees.gwu.edu/governance

Faculty Governance Task Force

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, DC

The George Washington University will enter its third century in 2021. Our strategic plan for the period leading up to this milestone reflects our aspirations to provide a unique, rigorous education to every one of our students and to secure our position as one of the world's premier research universities.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, DC

Whereas, the Board of Trustees recognizes the value of shared governance and of a strong and constructive relationship between Faculty and the Administration; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Trustees of the George Washington University charges the next Chair of the Board with forming a committee, to include board members, faculty, and administrators, to engage with the Faculty and the Administration in a review of faculty governance over the 2013-2014 academic year; and

Resolved, That, at the conclusion of those deliberations, the committee shall recommend to the Board any appropriate revisions to the Faculty Code and related governing documents.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, DC

Faculty Governance Task Force

- Trustees: Nelson Carbonell, Mark Hughes, Madeleine Jacobs, Richard Blackburn
- Faculty: Alan Greenberg, Michael King, Edward Swaine
- Administration: Dianne Martin

Task Force Process

- Phase 1 - School based meeting to discuss governance
- **Phase 2 – Town Hall feedback meetings and Faculty Survey**
- Phase 3 – Finalize and present recommendations

Task Force Meetings

- 23 meetings with faculty members
- Over 600 faculty attended meetings
- 7 Faculty Governance Task Force meetings
- Two meetings with Senate Executive Committee
- Two meetings with PEAFF
- Two meetings with Faculty Senate

Guiding Principles [DRAFT]

- Participation
- Academic Freedom
- Appointment, Promotion, Tenure (APT)
- Appointment, Review and Retention of Administrators
- School, Departmental, Center and Institute Rules and Procedures

Participation

Expand participation in governance for all full-time faculty.

Academic Freedom

Promote academic freedom for all faculty as the University becomes more global and online.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, DC

Appointment, Promotion, Tenure (APT)

Align APT criteria and procedures with the university's aspirations and ensure consistent and transparent processes and high-quality results across the entire university.

Appointment, Review and Retention of Administrators

Define a consistent and appropriate role for the Faculty and the Administration in the selection, performance appraisal and retention of Deans and other senior academic administrators.

School, Departmental, Center and Institute Rules and Procedures

Create a consistent framework of faculty titles, policies and procedures across the University, while providing for unique needs of each unit.

Questions and Comments

www.trustees.gwu.edu/governance

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, DC

**A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE POLICY ON RETAINING INCOMPLETE
GRADES ON STUDENTS' TRANSCRIPTS (13/4)**

WHEREAS, It has been The George Washington University's policy to retain the indication of grades obtained after an Incomplete has been recorded on students' transcripts with an "I", and

WHEREAS, the council of Associate Deans has asked the Faculty Senate to see if there is a case to amend this policy to allow for removal of the 'I' grade on completion of the course when an actual grade has been reported, and

WHEREAS, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate referred this matter to the Educational Policy Committee, and

WHEREAS, after the Educational Policy Committee, on the information provided by the Registrar who had reviewed the policies of the Market-Basket schools on this matter, agreed to recommend implementation of the following procedure, and

WHEREAS, the grade recorded in the transcript should reflect the student's overall performance in the course, **NOW, THEREFORE,**

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

Effective with the courses taught in the fall semester 2014, the "I" indicator on students' transcripts shall be removed once an actual grade has been reported and recorded.

Faculty Senate Educational Policy Committee
February 28, 2014

Adopted as amended, March 21, 2014

**A RESOLUTION TO ALERT UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS WHO ARE DOING
SUBSTANDARD ACADEMIC WORK EARLY IN THE SEMESTER (13/5)**

WHEREAS, About 81% of the entering freshmen graduate by the end of the sixth year compared to a median of 90% for GW's market basket schools, and

WHEREAS, 18% of the students who leave before graduating have a cumulative grade point average below 2.0, and another 11% have a cumulative grade point average between 2.0-2.49, and

WHEREAS, the undergraduate schools and the athletic advisors have successfully piloted a Faculty Feedback System in Banner whereby faculty can easily add notations about students' academic performance to date, which can then be passed on to advisors, **NOW, THEREFORE,**

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

- 1) That faculty be encouraged to assign ~~graded~~ work that is graded early in the semester but no later than the 5th week of the semester, and
- 2) that faculty be encouraged to enter information about students' academic performance, especially for those students who are doing substandard academic work, into the Faculty Feedback System in Banner as soon as this information is available.

Faculty Senate Educational Policy Committee
February 28, 1014

Adopted as amended, March 21, 2014

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Scheheherazade S. Rehman, Chair

March 21, 2014

I would like to thank Professor Paul Churchill for reading the very moving memorial tribute to our departed colleague, Bill Griffith. We are all saddened by his loss, and a copy of the Tribute will be forwarded along with our condolences to his family.

I would also like to thank our Board Chair, Nelson Carbonell and members of the Board of Trustees Governance Task Force, for coming to the Senate today to discuss the work of that group.

Last but not least, I want to thank Professor Robert Harrington for all of his work as Chair of the Senate's Educational Policy Committee this year. The Committee has had a very busy year, with the two Resolutions considered today, and as I understand it, there is likely to be at least one more submitted for this session.

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee established the proposed slate for membership on the Nominating Committee to nominate Executive Committee members for the 2014-15 Session. The Nominating Committee will meet to put together a slate of nominees to be presented at the April 11th Senate meeting.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

We expect that at the April 11th Senate meeting Vice Provost Dianne Martin will update us on the status of the Lyterati (Faculty Annual Report) Project. We look forward to hearing what she has to report on this topic.

As everyone will recall, the call for Annual Reports of Senate Standing Committees will be on the agenda for the April meeting, so we would ask that Committee Chairs please begin work on preparing these. In addition, the annual Faculty Senate group photo opportunity will take place at the beginning of the April 11th meeting.

FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE SERVICE FORMS

Some may have seen with the notice of the posting of the February minutes to the Senate website that the deadline for volunteering for Committee service has been extended to April 1, 2014. We have had a gratifying response to our call for volunteers thus far, but in the interest of trying to nominate a representative from each of the schools to each Committee, we are extending the time for faculty to volunteer from March 19 to April 1. The work of Senate Committees is a critical part of the Senate's contribution to shared governance, so I hope all of you will consider volunteering to serve as well as encouraging your colleagues to do so.

NEXT MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is scheduled for March 28, a mere week from now due to the rescheduling of this Senate meeting. Please submit resolutions, reports and any other matters for consideration prior to the March 28th meeting.