

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
HELD ON APRIL 10, 2015
IN THE STATE ROOM

Present: President Knapp, Provost Lerman, Registrar Amundson, and Parliamentarian Charnovitz; Deans Dolling and Feuer; Professors Brazinsky, Castleberry, Costello, Dickinson, Downes, Fairfax, Galston, Garris, Gee, Hawley, Harrington, Katz, Lantz, Lindahl, Marotta-Walters, McAleavey, McAlister, McDonnell, Newcomer, Parsons, Price, Prasad, Pulcini, Roddis, Sarkar, Shesser, Sidawy, Simon, Swaine, Swiercz, Thompson, Weiner, and Williams

Absent: Deans Akman, Brown, Eskandarian, Goldman, Livingstone, Morant, and Vinson; Professors Jacobson, Khoury, Miller, Rehman, Squires, and Wald

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:14 p.m. following a slight delay to permit the annual photograph of the Senate to be taken.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on March 20, 2015 were approved as distributed.

RESOLUTION 15/1, "A RESOLUTION TO ENDORSE A REVISED EDITION OF THE FACULTY HANDBOOK OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY"

Professor Garris noted that Resolution 15/1 had been briefly discussed at the February Senate meeting and following that discussion, had been recommitted to the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF) for further consideration. He requested and received the consent of the Senate so that Professor Wilmarth, Chair of the PEAFF Committee, could reintroduce and present Resolution 15/1.

Professor Wilmarth confirmed that the Committee had come to the Senate in February with close to a final version of the Faculty Handbook that was distributed with Resolution 15/1 and showed the changes that had been made up to that time.

Resolution 15/1 and the Faculty Handbook attached to it with the meeting agenda for the April 10 Senate meeting show the changes that were made since the February Resolution was discussed. All of the changes made are very technical amendments relating to various academic programs and requirements.

The only substantive change appears on page 18 and 19 in Section 2.7.3.5. This was requested by the Administration and indicates that faculty members should develop their course assignments, projects, syllabi, and evaluation exercises to correspond to the learning

objectives required by their accrediting body. The PEAFF did not see anything problematic with this, as it is certainly one of the faculty's existing responsibilities.

Professor Wilmarth called the Senate's attention to the sixth Whereas Clause in the Resolution. This revision was not discussed at the February meeting, but it basically states an expectation about regular, active-status faculty keeping current in their fields and making and engaging in publishable scholarship. The only concern PEAFF had with this provision was that the Committee did not want for it to create any expectation of a new post-tenure review. This was discussed with the President and the Provost and they assured the Committee that this statement was not intended to create any new type of post-tenure review, although it could be a factor in terms of a faculty member's annual review and annual merit salary increases.

Based on that assurance and the Committee's careful review of the Faculty Handbook, the PEAFF unanimously endorsed and recommends the adoption of this revised edition of the Faculty Handbook.

It should be noted that Resolution 15/1 also provides that the PEAFF Committee understands and expects that when the Faculty Handbook is again considered for substantive revision, that once again it would be presented to the Faculty Senate for the same type of review and recommendation process that has been followed in the review just concluded.

Professor Wilmarth had the following to say about the Handbook revision process:

I would like to express my appreciation, and the Committee's appreciation, to Vice Provost Dianne Martin and University Counsel Richard Wietzner for the very collaborative and collegial manner in which we reached agreement on the contents of the new edition of the Faculty Handbook. We had a number of significant disagreements along the way, but we resolved those disagreements in a spirit of mutual collaboration, respect and compromise. I believe that the very productive process that led to our resolution today should remind all of us of what the Administration and the Faculty can achieve for the University when we remain faithful to GW's very strong principles and traditions of collaborative shared governance.

There being no questions concerning the Resolution, a vote was taken. Resolution 15/1 was approved by unanimous vote. (Resolution 15/1 is included with these minutes. The final version of the Faculty Handbook approved at the meeting was included with the agenda for the April 20th meeting and can be found in Exhibit A on page 5 of the agenda at this link:

http://www.gwu.edu/%7Efacsen/faculty_senate/pdf/Agenda4-10-15.pdf

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

President Knapp requested and received the consent of the Senate to postpone the item "Introduction of Resolutions" so that the Faculty Governance Discussion could proceed.

FACULTY GOVERNANCE DISCUSSION

Nelson A. Carbonell, Jr., Chair of the GW Board of Trustees first addressed the Senate. His remarks were as follows:

Thank you, President Knapp. Thanks to all the members of the Faculty Senate for having us here today. Madeleine Jacobs and I will both present and then take your questions at the end.

As many of you know, I am a proud graduate of the George Washington University and this May will celebrate the 30th anniversary of my graduation. I believe in the three decades since I graduated from GW, that our University has become one of the best universities in the nation. I also believe that in the next 30-years, GW has the opportunity to be counted among the best universities in the world. I believe that it is our shared responsibility as the leaders of this institution to make that opportunity a reality.

In 2013, the Board of Trustees approved vision 2021 -- the Strategic Plan -- to carry the University into its third century. The plan's four pillars provide the foundation for transformation and advancement of the institution. In addition to the plan, the Board revised the university's bylaws and charged its Chair with conducting a review of the *Faculty Code* and related faculty governance documents.

That effort commenced nearly 2 years ago with the establishment of a task force to conduct the review. The task force identified five areas of improvement: academic freedom, participation, dean search and review, school rules and procedures, and appointment promotion and tenure. Last year, we completed the work on academic freedom which was approved by the Board at its June 2014 meeting.

The Board also charged us to establish Working Groups in each of the remaining four areas to provide recommendations. Each of the four groups is composed of faculty, who in each case constitute a majority of the Working Group and includes one member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The groups also had members of the administration and were each convened by two trustee co-chairs, who are also members of the Board's subcommittee on faculty governance.

I asked my colleague and the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, Madeleine Jacobs, to lead the Working Group effort. Chair Jacobs has ably led the Working Group process, which produced its first draft recommendations in January. These draft recommendations were shared with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the administration and the Board subcommittee.

The Working Groups received feedback from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and subsequently revised and provided final recommendations in March, which were again transmitted to the Board subcommittee as well as the Senate and the administration. Shortly, Chair Jacobs will take you through the Working Group process and the high level recommendations in each of the four areas.

The Working Group recommendations highlight important issues that face GW as an institution. Although the details of the solutions still need to be worked out, the principles and beliefs embodied in these recommendations are important to understand.

First, the Working Groups articulated that all of our full-time faculty deserve a voice in shared governance. Non-tenured faculty are not second class citizens. They too share the commitment to the future of the institution. Our faculty, both tenured and non-tenured, are the most important asset that the institution has.

Second, the Working Group believed that we need to attract and retain the best deans to lead our ten schools and insure our future. Although the faculty are the critical voice in this process, incorporating trustees and others will lend a needed perspective in order to find the best leaders. GW needs the best deans that it can recruit and retain in order to take full advantage of our opportunity and meet our aspirations.

Third, while each school has unique qualities, we are one University and together we are stronger. Establishing a consistent set of rules and procedures across the institution, while allowing for the unique needs of each school, will serve our University well.

Finally, a strong tenure system is essential. However, tenure is a privilege that should be granted only to those faculty who do not simply exhibit “professional competence” but excellence in their discipline and embody the drive to move the institution forward.

Some have seen changes to the tenure system as an attack on tenure. I want to be clear that we need the tenure system and a vibrant tenured faculty to achieve our aspirations. In the 30 years since my graduation, the University has seen a dramatic improvement in the caliber of its students. The joke among my peers in the alumni community is that many of them couldn’t get into GW today.

In the next 30 years, we will turn over most of our existing faculty. The youngest of the baby boomers, of which I am one, will be in their 80s. I believe that to take full advantage of our opportunities, we must aspire to the same transformation in our faculty. In 30 years time, a retiring faculty member should be able to joke with his colleagues that he would never have gotten tenured today.

Our current system tenures over 80% of those that enter the tenure track. At our peer institutions that percentage is closer to 50%. I have been told this is due to our superior recruiting and evaluation process for new tenure-track faculty. Even though I don't believe that we could actually be that much better, a less deferential and more stringent tenure process would still tenure 80% of those that enter tenure-track if we are indeed that good at recruiting. The next generation of GW's tenured faculty needs to be the best it can be.

Before closing I would like to make a comment on the process moving forward. First of all, the Board has taken no action; there are no Board resolutions, and our Board members have yet to formally deliberate any of these proposals. The notion that these proposals come from the Board is incorrect. They come from the Working Groups made up largely of faculty which each include members of this Senate. The first time any of these changes will be formally taken up will be at the May meeting of the Board of Trustees.

Last year, the task force recommendation on academic freedom was provided to the Board as well as to this Senate and to the administration. In May of last year, we received a resolution from the Senate on academic freedom and input from the administration on the academic freedom provision. The Board took up that resolution at its May meeting and decided that it needed further input which we received from members of the Senate Executive Committee, the administration, and the task force. In June, the Board adopted the revision to the academic freedom clause of the *Faculty Code*.

I envision that most of these recommendations will move through a similar process. As the president mentioned, we expect input from the administration over the next week. We have a joint conference call scheduled next week between the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board and committees of the Senate. We expect to receive a resolution from the Senate prior to our May Board meeting at which point the Board's Academic Affairs Committee will begin to formally discuss the revisions.

My expectation is that we will need additional input before finalizing a resolution, hopefully in June. As we have demonstrated in the past, we will take additional time if it is required. In the case of the expansion of participation rights to non-tenured faculty, these will have to be voted on by the Faculty Assembly in the fall. I believe we are on track for a successful conclusion of the remaining three items by June, and if not by October at the latest.

So here we sit, the leaders of the institution: the President, the Faculty Senate, members of the Board of Trustees. I believe that we as leaders shouldn't see the *status quo* as the only answer. I believe that we as leaders need to listen to all voices. I believe that we as leaders need to proceed with an open mind to all ideas. I believe that we as leaders, quite simply, need to lead.

I believe that the world around us has changed and will continue to change; and that we not only must change, but more importantly, we must demonstrate to ourselves that we can change. Since I came before you twenty months ago, together we all have listened, and worked, and collaborated across the University in our effort to strengthen faculty governance. I am confident in our collective ability to join together and lead the George Washington University to a bright future.

Thank you. I'd now like to turn it over to Trustee Jacobs.

Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees and the Subcommittee on Faculty Governance Madeleine Jacobs thanked the Senate for the opportunity extended to Board Chair Carbonell and herself to attend the meeting, and added that it is always a pleasure and an honor to be with the Senate. Trustee Jacobs made the following remarks:

Following on Nelson's remarks, I am here to present at a high level the process we've followed and the recommendations from the four Working Groups on faculty governance. Before I make my remarks, I would like to introduce the 24 of 47 members of the Faculty Governance Working Groups who are here today. They may be able to answer questions that I can't answer.

Working group members who are from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee are Professor Paula Lantz, Professor Sylvia Marotta-Walters, Professor Joyce Pulcini, and Professor Anton Sidawy. Other Trustees present at the meeting are Trustee Kyle Farmbry, Trustee Wes Burnett, and recent Trustee Mark Hughes, Other Working Group members who are here today Professor Joan Butler from the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, Professor Lorena Barber from the School of Engineering and Applied Science, Professor Gretchen Wiersma from the School of Nursing, Professor Karen McDonnell, from the Milken Institute School of Public Health, who also serves on the Faculty Senate, Professor Toni March from the College of Professional Studies, Professor Mary Jean Schumann from School of Nursing, Professor Doug Shaw who is also an Associate Dean at the Elliott School of International Affairs, Professor Hugh Agnew from the Elliott School of International Affairs, Rene Stewart O'Neill, Vice Provost Dianne Martin, and Senior Vice Provost Forrest Maltzman from the Office of the Provost, Professor Christine Pintz from the School of Nursing, Professor Margaret Plack from the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, Dean David Dolling from Engineering and Applied Sciences, Professor Ryan Watkins from the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, and Professor Edward Swaine from the Law School. Thank you all very much for all of your hard work these past seven months.

This afternoon I want to cover two areas. The first is process; the second is the high level recommendations. I'm not using a Power Point because a full presentation would take two hours. Indeed, because of time limitations in this meeting, I will be referring you to the website for the full recommendations as transmitted from the Working Groups to the

Subcommittee on Faculty Governance, as well as the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and the Administration on March 9 and March 23. Those recommendations, transmittal letters, and rationale are available in their entirety and unedited online at:

Trustees.gwu.edu/governance

If you have not done so already, I urge you to read the recommendations at that site, as that is the only place where you will find them as transmitted.

I hope that we can all agree that everyone wants GW to be the best University it can be. That is the only agenda that the Board of Trustees brought to this review.

As Chair Carbonell said, through a series of nearly 30 town halls and school meetings and a survey to full time faculty, five areas were identified to be studied. These were academic freedom, participation, school rules and procedures, dean search and review, and appointment, promotion, and tenure. As noted, the Faculty Senate adopted a resolution on academic freedom last spring, which was amended slightly by the Board of Trustees and adopted in June 2014.

In the fall of 2014, four Working Groups were assembled to study the four remaining areas. The Working Groups were composed of 43 Working Group members of whom 27 were faculty, 8 were school and University administrators, and 8 were Trustees. Each Working Group had a member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

The Working Groups met 38 times for more than 90 hours. They transmitted their draft recommendations in early January to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The feedback from the Executive Committee and some of its committees was received by the Working Groups in early February and they reconvened to consider all the recommendations.

Then, as noted, they transmitted their recommendations in March. They are consensus recommendations which means that not every single member of the Working Groups agreed with every single word or recommendation. However, the Working Group members did sign off on the recommendations and approved their transmittal.

Since the recommendations were transmitted from the Working Groups to the Subcommittee on Faculty Governance, as well as the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Administration in March, members of the Faculty Governance Working Groups and I have conducted five town halls—one each on the Mount Vernon and Virginia Campuses, and three on the Foggy Bottom Campus. Not counting members of the Working Groups, about 120 faculty members attended these town halls. The Power Point used in those town halls is also available on the Trustees website. On April 7, a survey was also deployed to full-time faculty asking their views and comments on some of the most salient recommendations of the Working Group. The survey will close on April 21 and I urge you and your colleagues to fill it out if you have not done so already.

This has been a collaborative process. The Trustees have consistently kept the full faculty, Faculty Senate, and Faculty Senate Executive Committee updated on its progress throughout the year.

- Trustee Carbonell briefed the full Faculty Assembly in October 2014
- I briefed the Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate Executive Committee in November 2014
- I also briefed the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in December 2014 and in February 2015.
- Chair Nelson Carbonell and I met with Professors Garris and Wilmarth in February.

Collaboration, however, does not mean that we are in agreement on every item. In some cases, the Working Groups accepted the feedback from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. In some cases, they went back to the drawing board and began over. And in some cases they decided to maintain their original recommendations. In all cases, there was robust discussion.

Finally, before I address some of the recommendations, I want to make a personal appeal to you:

- I worked for 21 years for the world's leading scientific society, the American Chemical Society, most recently as its CEO. I was surprised to learn that our bylaws were 25,000 words long—five times longer than the bylaws of any other scientific society. They had accreted over the 136 years of the Society's history—a paragraph here, an addition here, and soon, you had 25,000 words.
- Do I think that if we were writing those bylaws today they would be 25,000 words? Absolutely not!!! The best way to update governing documents is to ask yourself: If I were writing these documents today from a fresh start, what would they say.
- So I ask you sincerely to look at the recommendations of the Working Groups by asking yourself simple questions: Do they make sense? Are they clear and concise? Are they fair? Do they protect faculty from capricious and arbitrary administrators? Are they transparent? Do long time faculty have the opportunity to participate in the life of the university?
- We have to allow the University to achieve its full potential. The *Faculty Code* and *Faculty Organization Plan* have to allow us the opportunity to be who we can be.

The Committee on Academic Affairs will not deliberate until it receives feedback from the Administration, and a Faculty Senate resolution. Professor Garris and about 15 members of the Faculty Senate are presenting their views to the full Committee on Academic Affairs next week. The Committee on Academic Affairs is looking forward to receiving Faculty Senate resolutions on the recommendations at its May meeting, where they will be discussed further. That is where we are today.

Now, I will review the recommendations of the Working Groups:

Participation

- Faculty of each school should be trusted and empowered to have the ability to decide who will best represent their school at the Faculty Senate.
- Enfranchise some non-tenured faculty members and enable them to serve alongside their tenured colleagues in the Faculty Senate.

Working Group Recommendation:

"...The members of the Faculty Senate shall be either (1) tenured faculty members or (2) full-time faculty members (regular or specialized) who have attained the rank of associate professor or higher. Vice presidents, associate vice presidents, assistant vice presidents, vice provosts, associate vice provosts, deans, associate deans and assistant deans shall be ineligible for election as members of the Senate.

- The Working Group considered recommendations from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to place the following restrictions on non-tenured faculty members to serve on the Faculty Senate:
 - Time Served: Completed 6-years full-time at GW.
 - Quota: Majority of faculty representing each school must hold tenured appointments.
- After consideration, the Working Group decided to stay with its original recommendation.

Now, I will turn to the Working Group for School Rules and Procedures.

School Rules and Procedures

The School Rules and Procedures Working Group proposed two main objectives:

- Recommends streamlining the Faculty Code's complex structure of faculty titles and grades of academic personnel.
- Recommends identifying a common set of rules that each school at the University should maintain within its own rules and procedures.
- Recommends streamlining the Faculty Code's complex structure of faculty titles and grades of academic personnel.
 - Recommends the consolidation of grades of academic personnel: limited service, special service, and research staff into new grade of personnel titled "specialized faculty."

- Recommends specifying that non-tenure accruing faculty are on “presumptively renewable” contracts to delineate their long-term relationship with the university.
- Recommends 75:25 goal for 75% of regular full-time faculty to hold tenure-accruing appointments.
 - Proposes creation of a provision to permit schools to request a different ratio in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and the approval of the Provost.
 - Provision removes the need to exempt certain schools from the 75:25 goal as schools that were previously exempted will have to meet the amended ratio as agreed upon with the Provost.
- Recommends identifying a common set of rules that each school at the University should maintain within its own rules and procedures.
- The Working Group considered several recommendations from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee which would have retained current language in the Faculty Code.
- After discussion, the Working Group chose to maintain its original recommendations.

Now, I will turn to the Working Group for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure.

Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

The APT Working Group proposal advances three objectives:

- Reinforcing an expectation of faculty excellence
- Advancing faculty participation in the process
- Enhancing transparency

Expectation of Faculty Excellence

- The Working Group recommended strengthening language for attaining tenure from competence to excellence in research, teaching, and engagement in service.
- Revising the current Faculty Code in this regard would align University criteria with standards of excellence already applied in many schools and departments and reflect the university’s aspirations to be among the top-tier research universities.
- The Working Group also strengthened the current language in the Code to ensure that criteria are established and published at each step of the process.

School-Wide Personnel Committees

- The Working Group recommends that a school-wide personnel committee, regardless of whether it is an elected body or a committee of the whole, will have the status of a faculty recommendation for appointments, renewals, tenure, promotions, and termination of services originating from departments.

University Wide Personnel Committee

- The Working Group accepted a proposal from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to eliminate the Provost's Advisory Council (PAC) from its original recommendation. Using the Executive Committee's proposed University Nonconcurrency Committee as a starting point, the Working Group developed the University-Wide Personnel Committee.
- In this recommendation, the Provost will seek UWPC advice in all tenure, promotion, and appointment with tenure cases involving a disagreement between a faculty recommendation and a dean.
- The advice of the UWPC would not constitute a faculty recommendation.

Transparency

- The Working Group recommends that each school, or each and every one of a school's departments, shall establish and publish written procedures to provide reviews to guide faculty members concerning their progress toward tenure.
- The Working Group recommends that the dean and Provost promptly notify the relevant department and school-wide personnel committee of any concurrence or non-concurrence with their recommendations.
- Additionally the Working Group recommends that the Provost shall promptly notify the candidate and the President in the event of a non-concurrence by the Provost.
 - A candidate may petition their case to the President, where the President's decision shall be final.
 - A decision by the Provost or the President to approve tenure shall be transmitted to the Board of Trustees.
- The Working Group considered multiple recommendations from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
- The Working Group accepted using the term "excellence" in place of "outstanding" to align with current *Faculty Code* language.
- As referenced before, the Working Group used Faculty Senate Executive Committee feedback to craft its proposal for a University-wide Personnel Committee.
- The Working Group considered the Executive Committee's proposal to maintain current *Faculty Code* language concerning school-wide personnel committees. After discussion, the group decided to maintain its original recommendation.

Now, I will turn to the Working Group for Dean Search and Review.

Dean Search and Review

The three main areas of this recommendation are:

- Streamlining standards for searches.

- Enfranchising non-tenured faculty members and Trustees to serve and vote on committees.
- Creating periodic comprehensive review of deans.

Streamline standards for searches

- Evaluated best practices used by each school.
- Drafted set of uniform, minimum standards to make search processes more efficient for schools.
- Would permit each school to decide the actual composition of its search committee.
- Set minimum criteria for a school's dean search committee to include:
 - At least five full-time faculty members elected by school's full-time faculty
 - The Provost or a representative designated by the Provost.
 - One or more current students, and alumni.
 - In consultation with the Provost, the Chair of the Board of Trustees will appoint one or more Trustees to serve as members.
 - Other members may be added in accordance with procedures approved by a school's full-time faculty.
- Each search committee shall establish criteria for the dean search, including a position description, which shall be approved by the Provost.
- The Working Group recommends permitting the President and Provost specify how many candidates the committee recommends. Recommended candidates would be presented in a Non-Prioritized List.

Enfranchise non-tenured faculty members and Trustees to serve and vote on committees

The Working Group recommends:

- All full-time faculty within a school eligible to serve on search committee.
- Full-time faculty members and Trustees will be voting members.
- In accordance with procedures approved by a school's full-time faculty, voting rights may be extended to other members.

Create periodic comprehensive review of deans

- Process that helps deans succeed in leading their schools.
- Solicit input from multiple constituencies at the college.
 - Faculty, senior staff, alumni, and students.
- Results confidential to the dean, President, Provost, and Board of Trustees.
- Provost would share the top-line findings with the faculty.
- The Provost will discuss with each Dean, at the time of the Dean's appointment or reappointment, the criteria by which the Provost will facilitate a comprehensive review the Dean at least every three years.
- The process for the comprehensive review, established by the Provost, shall generally be consistent across schools, subject to adjustment for the differing conditions of each school.

- After consideration of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee's recommendations, the Working Group accepted a proposal to set a minimum of five full-time faculty to serve on a search committee.
- The Working Group decided not to accept an Executive Committee proposal to limit the number of Trustees on a search committee to two members.
- The Working Group also discussed the other Executive Committee recommendations. Among the Working Group's decisions:
 - It decided that the faculty of each school should be trusted to elect their representatives on a deans search committee, regardless of tenure status.
 - It decided that the criteria for the dean search, including a position description, drafted by a search committee should be approved by the Provost, as the dean reports to the Provost.

Thank you for your time. Chair Carbonell and I will now take your questions.

Before opening the floor for discussion, President Knapp thanked Board members for the tremendous amount of volunteer effort they had put into the governance document revision effort, along with faculty members and other representatives of the Working Groups.

Professor Parsons said he was concerned about the process to be followed in revising the governance documents. At the town hall meetings Trustee Jacobs seemed to suggest that she and presumably Trustee Carbonell had decided to propose to the Trustees that the University's customary 70 year tradition of shared governance and the process for hammering out rules for the University should be dumped. What was less clear was what Trustee Jacobs had just said, in which something was said about waiting to make changes after a Senate resolution is received. This would bring the process back into the tradition of shared governance, so Professor Parsons asked for a clarification on the process to be followed.

Trustee Jacobs said she thought both she and Chair Carbonell had articulated the process to be followed and she called upon him to respond. Chair Carbonell responded that he thought the process used last year in crafting the Academic Freedom amendment worked well and the plan is to follow that. The Board will have to look at the details of the proposals and additional time and/or input may be required to complete the work. The notion that the Working Group recommendations alone would go to the Board for consideration has never been the case; those who have worked on the governance document revisions can attest to that.

Professor Parsons asked if the customary traditions the University follows in making decisions about important processes would continue. Chair Carbonell said he was unsure exactly what those processes are; he had simply articulated the process that was used last year to pass the Academic Freedom provisions. That seemed to work well, so that process will again be followed this year.

Professor Parsons opined that these processes for changing the *Code* are laid out in that document. Chair Carbonell said they were not. Professor Parsons then suggested these processes might be laid out in the *Faculty Organization Plan*. President Knapp responded that what is in the *Organization Plan* refers only to changing that *Plan*. The Parliamentarian confirmed at the last Senate meeting that there is a requirement that the Faculty Assembly approve proposed changes to the *Organization Plan*, but there is no language applying that requirement to changes in the *Faculty Code*.

Professor McAlister thanked the Trustees for coming to the Senate meeting and for all the time they had spent pondering and discussing governance document revisions. As a board member at other institutions, she said she knew it is a labor of love and she thought their efforts were very much appreciated.

Although it probably does not need to be stated, Professor McAlister said she wanted to reiterate that every faculty member she knows at the University is absolutely supportive of the goal of making GW better. At the most basic level it means faculty will get more money for their research and the quality of the student body will also get better.

The governance document review process has produced some important, useful and widely accepted components. Many of those changes have wide agreement. Thus, when Trustee Jacobs displayed the Power Point presentation at the Town Hall meetings, there were a number of times when people had no questions or comments on proposed changes.

What is important to recognize is that the Senate is involved in the process thus far through the work of three Senate Committees. These responses have been widely shared by the Senate Executive Committee among the faculty. It is not as if the Working Group proposals stand alone, but there are detailed and specific responses from the Senate Committees that the Senate will presumably be discussing and voting upon.

Where there are there are specific differences of opinion, they have been considered by the three Senate Committees. These differences are based on principles arrived at through long meetings, and they are not designed to do anything other than support the excellence of GW as a research and teaching institution. There seems to be a hint in some statements that the Working Groups want to be nimble and the Senate wants to cling to the old way of doing things; that is simply not the case. To closely analyze and at times to disagree strongly with the Working Group proposals is a sign of investment, not disrespect.

Professor McAlister said she valued her colleagues who served on the Working Groups. Many of them worked very hard, but the Senate, as the elected representative body of the faculty, must do its job. That job is not just to support what the Working Groups did but to offer detailed, considered, and principled responses. It is then going to be the job of the Board of Trustees to respond to these Senate proposals and not just to the proposals of the Working Groups.

President Knapp noted that the Senate at its May 2015 meeting had made a substantive amendment to the Academic Freedom proposal that had emerged from the PEAFF Committee last year. Once the proposal was transmitted to the Board, a relatively small change was made was made by the Board before the final language was approved.

Professor McAlister summed up by saying that when one says the process worked well last year, it was because the Board responded to the Senate Resolution. When there are real disagreements about proposed changes, it needs to be remembered that the Senate is the faculty's representative voice. Hopefully, the Board will respond to and vote on what the Senate proposes.

President Knapp noted that the Senate at its May 2015 meeting had made a substantive amendment to the Academic Freedom proposal that had emerged from the PEAFC Committee last year. Once the proposal was transmitted to the Board, a relatively small change was made by the Board before the final language was approved.

Professor McAlister summed up by saying that when one says the process worked well last year, it was because the Board responded to the Senate Resolution. When there are real disagreements about proposed changes, it needs to be remembered that the Senate is the faculty's representative voice. Hopefully, the Board will respond to and vote on what the Senate proposes.

Chair Carbonell said it is absolutely the Board's hope that the proposal sent by the Senate is one that it does not have to alter. Still, the Board needs to consider all of the input, including that of the Working Groups, who put in a lot of energy and a lot of effort into this exercise. At the end of the Board's deliberations, if there are circumstances that still need to be resolved, the plan is to have dialogue with people to see if whatever issues happened to be can be resolved.

Professor Roddis said she thought it would clear the air a lot if a rumor that is currently going around could be addressed, and that is, when the Board approved the Senate's Academic Freedom Resolution last year, if that meant it adopted the exact wording as submitted to it by the Senate. Chair Carbonell said there was a minor change to the Resolution that the Board discussed with the Senate Executive Committee, so what the Board passed was not identical to the language in the Resolution from the Senate. However, the language was not substantively modified from that forwarded by the Senate.

There being no further questions, the discussion was concluded.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. NOMINATIONS FOR ELECTION TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE 2015-2016 SENATE

Professor Galston , Convener of the Nominating Committee, moved the nominations of the following faculty members:

Professor Charles A. Garris, Jr., Chair. A vote was taken, and Professor Garris was elected.

Members: Greg Brazinsky (ESIA), Sylvia Marotta-Walters (GSEHD), Karen McDonnell (Milken School Institute of Public Health), Marie Price (CCAS), Joyce Pulcini (SON), Anton Sidawy (SMHS), Paul Swiercz (SB), Art E. Wilmarth, Jr. (Law)

The entire slate was elected.

II. NOMINEES FOR ELECTION OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION COMMITTEE

Professor Garris moved the nominations of the following individuals to the Committee:

Professor Joan E. Schaffner as Chair for a one-year term; Professors Ravi S. Achrol and Nicholas Kyriakopoulos for three-year terms ending April 30, 2018.

The nominations of Professors Milos Doroslovacki and Paul Swiercz were added at the meeting to the slate.

A vote was taken and the entire slate was elected.

III. NOMINATION FOR REAPPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT OF PROFESSOR STEVE CHARNOVITZ AS PARLIAMENTARIAN FOR THE 2015-16 SESSION

The Senate voted in favor of Professor Charnovitz's reappointment.

IV. ANNUAL REPORTS OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

No annual reports were submitted.

V. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

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

VI. PROVOST'S REMARKS

Provost Lerman commented on the admissions picture for the incoming class of freshmen for Fall, 2015. This year there were approximately 19,900 applicants for undergraduate study at the University as compared to 19,000 last year, a significant increase. GW will admit a somewhat larger class this year than last – the target is to admit about a hundred more freshmen than last, and that requires admitting more students from the applicant pool. Overall, the quality of applicants is up somewhat and that is a tribute to GW becoming more competitive in attracting students with top academic rankings. The size and diversity of the freshman class should become clear over the next month. There is a good pool of transfer applicants as well and notifications to them will go out shortly.

The next phase of the admissions is critical as prospective students make decisions about enrollment. Today we held the first of a series of five admitted student days at which students and their parents are invited to campus. Faculty may have noticed the 1,200 parents and their admitted students who are visiting campus to learn more about the University. Provost Lerman said he had participated along with faculty members and deans in a panel that morning welcoming these visitors. He added that it is surprising what a difference the personal touch makes in giving visitors a positive image of the University, so if Senators see people puzzling over a campus map, it is totally appropriate to introduce yourself and give them a personal welcome.

Provost Lerman said everyone owes great thanks to the admissions staff led by Karen Felton, Dean of Admissions, who reports to Lori Kohler, who is Director of Enrollment Management – they have done a fantastic job, bringing a discipline and structure to the admissions process along with ensuring that admissions staff project a friendly environment for GW to high schools and prospective students.

The Provost also expressed his thanks to Professor Art Wilmarth and the PEAFC Committee, as well as to Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Dianne Martin for producing the new *Faculty Handbook*. This has required updating in many areas, and it has taken a long time, but the process, as noted by Professor Wilmarth in his earlier remarks, was a model of collaboration in which disagreements were discussed and worked through, concerns were resolved, and reassurances could be given. All of the people who participated in this lengthy exercise deserve thanks for the hard work they devoted to producing a final revision of the *Handbook* upon everyone could agree.

VII. CHAIR'S REMARKS

Following up on Provost Lerman's remarks, the President noted that the University faces a bit of a paradox as students in the pool to which admissions are offered become stronger and stronger academically. This represents another level of competition, so it is a little hard to know how many of these highly qualified students will accept GW's admissions offer than it is to gauge this when applicants are somewhat less academically qualified, because they obviously have more options.

On a more somber note, probably everyone has seen the budget announcements made earlier in the week about efforts already underway to actively reduce expenses in the central University Administration by 5%. This has been a very carefully targeted restructuring to find ways, where possible, of reducing costs. Clearly, this has a human cost because it means there is a reduction in the number of positions in the central Administration, and that means a number of individuals had to be notified that their positions were no longer going to be filled here. In all those cases, the University is helping them in the transition process to find other opportunities for employment.

That is one part of what is being done; there are many other steps that are being taken to reduce expenses. This is all driven as the Senate has heard before by the fact that in 2013 GW's overall enrollment amounted to about 170,000 credit hours. This year it was down to about 160,000 and that gap is what accounts for the need to find ways to rebuild

both the University's graduate and professional enrollments. As has also been said, the undergraduate picture looks very robust; it has been in the graduate and professional programs where there has been a downturn – this year the University's enrollment is about 700 students below the Foggy Bottom cap, as compared to 2013 when enrollments were right up against the enrollment cap. This enrollment dip also affects GW's other campuses and that is the challenge the University faces.

President Knapp said he had spoken to a number of groups about this, most recently to all the chairs of the Arts and Sciences departments about what this is going to involve, particularly rebuilding on-campus programs that GW has traditionally had, but also looking for innovative ways of developing new programs that will attract additional new students because GW remains a very heavily tuition-dependent institution. The University's financial structure is the greatest competitive disadvantage in that less of the University's operations expense is covered by its endowment and philanthropy than at other institutions. That is being addressed in the current capital campaign, but in terms of the percentage of student financial aid supported by the endowment and by philanthropy, GW is toward the bottom of the list of market basket peer institutions the University compares itself to. The Power and Promise campaign for scholarships is turning this around, and GW's capital campaign which was launched last June with \$515 million raised is now up to about \$734 million, and that is proceeding rapidly apace. There is more work to be done, and it takes a long time to realize the fruits of these fundraising efforts because many of the funds raised come in the form of pledges. It is also true that the endowment can only be tapped for a relatively small percentage of funds. For all these reasons, GW remains largely tuition dependent and that is why efforts to increase enrollments are critical.

The current plan to address these issues will be submitted to the Board of Trustees this month for an initial discussion by the Board Committee on Finance and Audit and next month for a final decision when the Board approves the budget. The Administration believes that the budget plans it has made will enable the University to turn this situation around in a couple of years and return it to the level it has previously enjoyed. At this point it is a short-term problem, but if it is not fixed, it will become a long-term problem, so that is why it is being addressed both on the expense and revenue fronts.

The President then commented on two new features of the budget process. For the first time a rolling five year planning process will be utilized in which every year assumptions and performance will be measured against the plan and planning will be extended another five years out. This should put the University in a better position to anticipate and handle the kinds of ups and downs in the economy that are driving things like the ebbing and flowing of graduate enrollments nationally as well as at GW.

Also for the first time this year, a new budget model developed by the Deans and the Provost was adopted that gives a great deal more incentive to the schools by allowing them to retain a much more significant proportion of the revenues they generate in a number of areas. So they will retain 70% of revenues from graduate programs on campus, 80% for programs off-campus, and 85% for online instructional programs. The hope is that this model will give the deans a clear sense of what they can achieve working with faculty if they develop new programs -- they will know exactly what the results of that will be and what

that will mean for their programs. So that is something to look forward to, but of course it is all subject to the Board's approval at its May meeting.

President Knapp noted that the GW Museum and the Textile Museum are now open every day of the week except Tuesday. The reason for the Tuesday closing is that University visitors, such as those coming for the admitted student visits mentioned by the Provost, often extend their stay, and Tuesday is a good day for them to have the opportunity to visit these two new facilities.

People might also want to stop by the Corcoran Museum where the student exhibition of senior projects has been put on display. They are very interesting, very innovative, and will give viewers a sense of the imaginative energies of these students who are now part of GW's Corcoran School of the Arts and Design. The exhibition is particularly interesting because this is done as an educational program at the Corcoran. The students not only mount and label these exhibits, but they also figure out where the works fit into an art historical perspective, so their artworks are used as an instrument for developing their historical and cultural knowledge. It's a very sophisticated approach to the senior theses that viewers can certainly enjoy. It also shows that the University has tremendous opportunities to develop a unique and very powerful model of arts education in the heart of this Nation's Capital so this will be something to watch in the future.

In conclusion, President Knapp noted that this Senate meeting would be the last for Professor Simon as an elected representative, after something like eighteen years. That is probably not a record but it is still pretty good, and President Knapp thanked Professor Simon for his service.

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Parsons said he thought it odd to have a set of rules that do not include a rule on how rules are changed. He added that he was a bit surprised that in the current reconsideration of the *Faculty Code* no one is looking at the question of how the *Code* should be modified that everyone agreed to. He suggested that this question be examined some time next year.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

Elizabeth A. Amundson

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

**A RESOLUTION TO ENDORSE A REVISED EDITION OF
THE FACULTY HANDBOOK OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY (15/1)**

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate has previously endorsed the adoption of the University’s Faculty Handbook, including the most recent revision of that Handbook in 1999; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Handbook is a matter of great interest and concern to the faculty, as it represents a part of the contract of each faculty member with the University (subject, in the case of certain part-time faculty members, to the terms of a collective bargaining agreement between the University and Service Employees International Union Local 500); and

WHEREAS, the University Administration has proposed to adopt a revised edition of the Faculty Handbook in the form attached to this Resolution as Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate’s Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF) has reviewed the proposed revised edition of the Faculty Handbook for consistency with the rights, privileges and duties of faculty members as set forth in the University’s *Faculty Code* and *Faculty Organization Plan*; and

WHEREAS, the PEAF Committee has raised questions about the following new language included in Section 2.7 of the revised Handbook:

“Throughout the university there is the expectation that all regular, fulltime faculty will stay current in their field and engage in publishable scholarly and applied research or its equivalent in creative work in the arts. It is expected that special service faculty will stay current in their field and in teaching pedagogy.”

WHEREAS, in response to those questions, the President and the Provost have assured the Executive Committee and the PEAF Committee that the new language in Section 2.7 will not provide a basis for any form of post-tenure review of the performance of tenure-accruing faculty, except for the existing customary annual review of faculty performance for the purpose of determining merit increases in faculty salaries; and

WHEREAS, based in part on the President’s and the Provost’s foregoing assurances, the PEAF Committee has endorsed the revised Faculty Handbook in the form attached to this Resolution as Exhibit A, and the Faculty Senate believes that the revised Handbook is consistent with the best interests of the University and its faculty; **NOW THEREFORE**

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

- (1) That the Faculty Senate hereby endorses the University’s revised Faculty Handbook in the form attached to this Resolution as Exhibit A; and

- (2) That the Faculty Senate's endorsement in Paragraph (1) of this resolution is based in part on assurances given by the President and the Provost that the new language included in Section 2.7 of the revised Faculty Handbook will not provide a basis for any form of post-tenure review of the performance of tenure-accruing faculty, except for the existing customary annual review of faculty performance for the purpose of determining merit increases in faculty salaries; and
- (3) That the Faculty Senate understands and expects that future proposed revisions to the Faculty Handbook will be presented to the Faculty Senate for its review and recommendations in accordance with the procedures followed in connection with the adoption of this Resolution.

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
January 14, 2015

Recommitted to the PEAFC Committee, February 13, 2015

Adopted by the Faculty Senate, April 10, 2015

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Charles A. Garris, Chair
April 10, 2015

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

- **Faculty Governance**

The Executive Committee has had a very busy month.

The Executive Committee has been taking a reasonable and pro-active approach to the governance issue by utilizing the standing committees and other resources of the Faculty Senate to develop solutions commensurate with our common goals of excellence and continual improvement at GW as enunciated in *Vision 2021* and by Chair Carbonell in his remarks. In response to the statements of Chair Carbonell and Trustee Jacobs, Professor Melani McAlister eloquently articulated the heart-felt commitment to excellence of the GW Faculty.

The Executive Committee's approach has been to do everything we can to make sure that the Faculty is well-informed as to the complex issues involved in the proposals for changes in the governance documents, make the subtleties as transparent as possible, and to make sure that the Executive Committee receives feedback so as to understand the many concerns of the Faculty. The following are some of our activities:

- We have been closely coordinating with PEAFF and ASPP and working on new proposals which will address Faculty concerns yet be mindful of the need to bring into alignment Faculty goals and Board goals.
- We have created documents presenting the Working Group and Senate Committee recommendations side-by-side with the current *Faculty Code* and *Faculty Organization Plan* to facilitate comparison. This has been distributed to all Faculty.
- We have produced an OVERVIEW document which shows the impact of each of the changes. This has been distributed to all Faculty.
- We have created an on-line forum, gw.hoop.la, where we have had very extensive discussion of the issues. gw.hoop.la has proven to be an excellent medium for the faculty to share their thoughts and analyses of the governance issues and has proven very valuable to the Executive Committee in having a clear vision of Faculty sentiment. We read the input we get carefully and learn much from the wisdom of our Faculty.

The forum will remain active for at least the next couple of months, so please continue to provide your thoughts and to consider the thoughts of colleagues. We thank those who have provided guidance and shared their thoughts.

- Executive Committee members have made it a point to attend Town Hall meetings organized by the Board, and to encourage the Faculty to do the same. These have also been excellent forums for Faculty opinion, from which we have learned a lot.

At the February 13 Faculty Senate meeting, I stated:

“While some changes may be better received by the Faculty than others, I am confident that shared governance will be strengthened by this process and overall, the Faculty will be pleased. Be assured that many of your Senate and Faculty colleagues are working very hard to achieve that end. The ultimate desired outcome is a set of enhancements to Faculty Governance that Faculty, Administration, and Board can applaud.”

Today, I repeat this goal, and promise that we are working harder than ever to make it happen. You may judge for yourselves from Chair Carbonell’s and Trustee Jacobs’ presentations today, from the materials distributed, from the recent Town Hall meetings, from gw.hoop.la, and other venues how close we have come to reaching agreement. I cannot report success at this time. It is clear from all of the feedback we have received, there is a strong consensus among Faculty that if the recent recommendations of the Working Groups were implemented in their entirety, it would constitute a major leap backwards for shared governance at GW. The effect would be counter to the goals of *Vision 2021*. However, we must remember that the Working Group recommendations are NOT the Board recommendations. In the famous words of Yogi Berra: *“It ain’t over till it’s over.”*

On Tuesday, April 14, the Executive Committee will have an in-depth discussion with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board and we will present our arguments. We may have another follow-up meeting in early May with the Academic Affairs Committee. Thanks in large part to the strong outpouring of concern from the Faculty through all of the venues, I believe the Board realizes the deficiencies in the Working Groups’ recommendations and will be responsive to our proposals.

We are currently working on a series of resolutions for presentation at the May 8 Faculty Senate meeting. We look forward to receiving the Administration's response to the Working Group recommendations and will attempt to include their recommendations to the extent possible. The resolutions will include concrete proposals in each of the four areas that would be acceptable to the Faculty. The Faculty Senate will have the opportunity to carefully review these resolutions and amend as needed at the Senate meeting.

In a best-case scenario, the Board might choose to accept one or more of these resolutions at their May or June Board meetings. What is not accepted could be the subject of further collaborative work with Senate Committees in the coming academic year, following the model used last year in our Academic Freedom resolution.

In these resolutions, the area of PARTICIPATION in the Faculty Senate by non-regular contract faculty must be deferred because changes in the Faculty Organization Plan require a vote in the Faculty Assembly, which will not take place until October 2015. Furthermore, there has been concern that the Research, Teaching, and Clinical faculty have not been properly queried on whether or not they wish such participation, given that there is a high risk that they might lose their protections under the National Labor Relations Act if they do fully participate in University governance. Hence, the resolutions to be presented at the May Senate meeting will only deal with full-time regular faculty (both Tenure/Tenure-Track and contract) but will involve participation of regular contract faculty, as well as the issues of Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure; Dean Search and Review Processes; and School Rules and Procedures. Issues of participation by non-regular contract faculty will be taken up in the Fall.

- **Compensation and Benefits** The ASPP Committee brought forward a resolution entitled: A RESOLUTION TO UPGRADE TOTAL FACULTY COMPENSATION. The Executive Committee observed that the Benefits Task Force recently commissioned by President Knapp is currently studying the overall benefits and salary combination and how it compares with market basket institutions. The Executive Committee was informed that the Benefits Task Force has acquired an abundance of new data to support their analysis. The Benefits Task Force is currently scheduled to present its findings in May. Furthermore, due to current University budget issues, there is virtually no chance that an across-the board compensation increase will be implemented in the next academic year. The Executive Committee therefore recommended that

ASPP defer its resolution until the Fall when the Report of the Benefits Task Force is available and any forthcoming resolutions from ASPP can incorporate the findings of the Benefits Task Force.

- The ASPP Committee also prepared its (Compilation of Top Administration Salaries: Comparison with Faculty Salaries and Tuition Increases. The data is for 2011 and 2012. We have been advised that ASPP will provide data for 2013 soon. The data is attached.

- **Faculty Handbook**

We can all be pleased (and relieved) that the Faculty Handbook in its final form has been approved by all parties, and finally by the Faculty Senate in its unanimous vote for Resolution 15/1. Particular thanks are due to Vice Provost Dianne Martin, Professor Wilmarth, and PEAFC Committee members, and Richard Weitzner of the General Counsel's Office who all labored long and hard to bring this lengthy and complex document to the Senate in final form.

I would like to reiterate the comments made by Professor Wilmarth in presenting Resolution 15/1. The process employed in creating the new Handbook was a fine example of the benefits of shared governance. The PEAFC Committee, working with VP Martin from the Provost's Office, and Richard Weitzner from the Office of Office of General Counsel made many modifications and changes to the Faculty Handbook, and had many tough discussions for over a one year period. The process was slow and at times frustrating as agreement was not always readily forthcoming. However, in the end, agreements were made, concerns were clarified, and an excellent and useful guide for the Faculty was successfully obtained.

In our efforts to improve our governance documents, following this model, I am hopeful that with patience and hard work, changes will be made in the *Faculty Code* and the *Faculty Organization Plan* that we all are pleased with.

- **George Washington University Faculty Association**

The Hatchet has done an excellent job of providing coverage of the very important governance issues. They have been very effective and evenhanded in informing the entire university community of the concerns and hopes of the various

constituencies at GW. There is only one clarification I would like to make. In the April 6, 2015, edition of the Hatchet, it stated that the GWUFA was “a group that formed as an **alternative** to the Faculty Senate last year.” In actuality, it is an independent, but **symbiotic** organization that shares exactly the same goals and aspirations for the University and the Faculty as the Faculty Senate. However, unlike the Faculty Senate which is an elective body, GWUFA is a grass roots organization where all are welcome. Many members of the Faculty Senate are also members of GWUFA and I try to attend as many meetings of GWUFA as I can. GWUFA has a respected and important voice at GW and the Faculty Senate is mindful of that voice. Again, I would like to clarify that The Faculty Senate and GWUFA are **symbiotic** organizations, NOT **alternative** organizations. While GWUFA may not be in agreement on all things the Faculty Senate does, and vice versa, and we may even criticize each other’s positions at times, we are NOT competing organizations. At worst, we are siblings who disagree.

- **Upcoming Faculty Senate Activities**

May Faculty Senate Meeting: In May, we expect to devote the entire meeting to faculty governance. As I said previously, we anticipate that one or more resolutions on governance will be offered for consideration by the Senate.

GRIEVANCES

1. A grievance for the School of Engineering and Applied Science has been received. The grievance is in the mediation stage.
2. A grievance from the School of Medicine and Health Sciences has been received.

- **Other Matters**

Elections for Senate representatives are now complete in all schools but the Elliott School and the results are expected shortly. New senators will begin their terms on May 1, 2015, and May 8 will be the first meeting they attend as voting members.

The current Executive Committee will meet jointly with the new 2015-16 Executive Committee members on April 24. At this joint meeting, Chairs and Committee members of Standing and Administrative Senate Committees will be selected for election at the May 8th Senate meeting.

The Executive Committee invites all current Committee Chairs and Committee members to communicate their willingness to serve another term. There is also still time to encourage faculty to apply for service on these Committees. The work of Senate Committee has been particularly important this year when so many proposals for amendments to the faculty governance documents have been brought forward for consideration within a very compressed time frame.

This meeting concludes the work of the Faculty Senate for 2013-14. I would like to thank the President and the Provost for their commitment to participation and leadership in these meetings. We also thank Professor Charnovitz for his attention to detail and his continuing commitment to facilitating the work of the Senate as the Parliamentarian.

The Executive Committee also extends its profound gratitude to Professor Kurt Darr, for his dedicated service as Chair of the Dispute Resolution Committee for the last thirteen years. As the longest serving Chair of the Committee, Professor Darr has shown an unwavering commitment to securing due process and a fair hearing for grievants in accordance with the provisions of the *Faculty Code*. He has been exemplary in his leadership of the Committee, so much so that many of the members now serving have done so for multiple terms. The wisdom and collegiality he has displayed in what is often a difficult role will be sorely missed. We wish him the best in his future pursuits, and welcome his continued involvement in Senate Committee work next year.

Thank you very much.