

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
MAY 12, 2010 IN THE STATE ROOM

Present: President Knapp, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman, Registrar Amundson and Parliamentarian Charnovitz; Interim Dean Reum; Professors Barnhill, Biles, Castleberry, Cordes, Corry, Dickson, Galston, Garcia, Hotez, Johnson, Ku, Lipscomb, McAleavey, Pagel, Parsons, Shesser, Simon, Wilmarth, Wirtz, and Yezer

Absent: Deans Barratt, Brown, Burke, Dolling, Futrell, Lawrence, Phillips, and Scott; Professors Boyce, Costanza, Garris, Harrington, Helgert, Kessman, Klaren, and Rehman

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by President Knapp at 5 p.m. The President noted that the Special Meeting was the first meeting of the 2010-11 Session beginning on May 1. He then introduced newly elected and re-elected Senate members. Newly elected members present at the meeting were Professors Ku, McAleavey, Shesser and Yezer; Professor Kessman was absent. Re-elected members present were Professors Cordes, Galston, Hotez, Lipscomb, Wilmarth, and Wirtz. Professors Harrington, Helgert, and Klaren were absent. President Knapp also noted that Professor Charnovitz was re-appointed as Parliamentarian for the 2010-11 Session.

RESOLUTION 10/1, "A RESOLUTION PRESENTING RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE PROPOSAL FOR A NEW SCHOOL OF NURSING"

President Knapp observed that Substitute Resolution 10/1 was being distributed to Senate members. He said he would give everyone a few moments to review the Substitute Resolution, following which Professor Wilmarth would introduce it and seek unanimous consent to consider it in place of the Resolution circulated with the meeting agenda. President Knapp inquired about changes made to the original Resolution. Professor Wilmarth indicated that there were several changes in the Resolving Clauses (but not in the Whereas Clauses) of the Substitute Resolution. He added that the Special Report appended to the Substitute Resolution was identical to that circulated with the meeting agenda.

On behalf of the Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing, Professor Wilmarth advised the Senate that, after the May 12th meeting agenda was circulated with Resolution 10/1, members of the Special Committee had met with the leadership of the proposed School and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman on Monday, May 10th. At that point, the conclusion of the Special Committee was that the School was

not yet ready to operate as an independent school. As set forth in the original Resolution, the Special Committee recommended that the School of Nursing should operate as a school within the School of Medicine and Health Sciences for a transitional period. At the meeting on Monday, May 10th meeting, the Nursing leadership was very forceful in saying that that a school within a school would not, in their judgment, be workable, nor would it accomplish their objectives. They supplied quite a bit of additional information to the Special Committee along with a number of clarifications and additional commitments in an effort to show that the School could operate as an independent unit as of the official launch date in September 2011.

Professor Wilmarth said he would be happy to answer questions about differences between the Resolution 10/1 and the Substitute. There being none, he requested and received unanimous consent for Substitute Resolution 10/1 to be considered. Professor Wilmarth then asked for and received unanimous consent for the privilege of the floor to be extended to Professor Cherian, Chair of the Special Committee.

Professor Cherian reviewed the timeline of the Special Committee's work during the Spring Semester. He recounted that he had met with the nursing leadership in March and April. The Special Committee developed a document outlining the need for a strategic plan for the School, and this was shared with the nursing leadership. At the April 9th Senate meeting, a Resolution (09/5) was adopted that called for the strategic plan to be submitted to the Senate in time to permit 30 days for the plan's review.

On April 13th, the Nursing leadership submitted the strategic plan. Three pages of corrections to the 133 page document were submitted on April 16th. All of these documents were distributed to Senate members and members of the Special Committee. The Special Committee reviewed the plan within two weeks and developed a report for the Senate Executive Committee that identified nine issues and concerns about the Nursing School proposal. These issues and concerns are reflected in the report as nine benchmarks that the Special Committee thought should be addressed before the decision was made to establish an independent School of Nursing. Professor Cherian noted that this report, dated May 3, 2010, was appended to Resolution 10/1 and circulated the past week with the May 12th Senate meeting agenda.

At a meeting held on May 10th, the Special Committee received supplemental verbal and written information that allowed it to reconsider the nine issues and concerns in its report. Based on this input, the Committee was able to dismiss or diminish the importance of a number of these. Substitute Resolution 10/1 calls for supporting the establishment of a School of Nursing, conditional upon four understandings, as set forth in Resolving Clause 1. These are:

- (a) At least three tenured faculty members who are not academic administrative officials shall be appointed to the faculty of the School of Nursing by August 31, 2011;
- (b) At least 75% of the regular, active-status faculty of the School of Nursing shall hold tenured or tenure-accruing appointments by August 31, 2014;
and

- (c) By August 31, 2010, the Dean of the School of Nursing shall submit a supplemental memorandum to the Faculty Senate Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing, and that memorandum shall address in sufficient detail the remaining concerns specified in the Special Committee Report dated May 3, 2010; attached to this Resolution as Appendix A.

In addition, Resolving Clause 2 of Substitute Resolution 10/1 provides:

2. That the Faculty Senate's support for the School of Nursing expressed in this Resolution is contingent upon final approval of the amendment to the asterisked footnote on page 18 of the Faculty Code proposed in Resolution 09/3, adopted by the Faculty Senate on March 12, 2010, so that said footnote will not apply to the School of Nursing.

Discussion followed. Professor Parsons inquired about the number of tenured faculty members in the Nursing Department and was advised there is one – Senior Associate Dean Jean Johnson.

Professor Yezer requested an explanation concerning Resolving Clause 2 of the Resolution. Professor Wilmarth briefly recounted what had transpired at the Senate meeting on March 12th, when Resolution 09/3 was adopted. The footnote on page 18 of the *Faculty Code* applies only to the Medical Center and provides that in the governance of the Medical Center, all faculty who are eligible for membership in the Medical Faculty Assembly may participate. Thus, special service, clinical and research faculty members, who are members of the Faculty Assembly, have full governance rights (including *Code*-specified governance rights normally reserved for regular, active-status faculty) in the Schools currently under the umbrella of the Medical Center, i.e., the School of Medicine and Health Sciences and the School of Public Health and Health Services. The School of Nursing would join these two Schools as part of the Medical Center. When this footnote was inserted into the *Faculty Code*, the School of Medicine and Health Sciences was the only School in the Medical Center. At the Senate meeting on March 12, the Senate adopted Resolution 09/3, which recommends that the language of the footnote on page 18 of the *Code* should be amended so that the words “Medical Center” would be changed to “School of Medicine and Health Sciences.”

In order to clarify the sequence of events concerning these various matters for faculty members new to the Senate, President Knapp noted that the recommendations to amend the *Faculty Code* contained in Resolution 09/3 are pending before the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees and would be considered the next day. In addition, the Medical Faculty Senate adopted and forwarded a Resolution opposing adoption of these changes to the *Code*, and this was transmitted to the Medical Center Committee of the Board. Both recommendations are now before the Academic Affairs Committee. President Knapp said he understood that Vice President Lehman intended to recommend that the Academic Affairs Committee accept the recommendations contained in Faculty Senate Resolution 09/3 for approval by the full Board of Trustees.

In response to a question by Professor Wirtz, President Knapp said that recommendations by the Medical Center Committee are advisory to the Academic Affairs Committee. The Academic Affairs Committee is the Committee appointed to consider issues and make recommendations concerning the University's *Faculty Code* to the full Board of Trustees. Vice President Lehman confirmed that this information was correct.

Discussion followed. Professor Barnhill observed that the establishment of new ventures was not without risk, and added that it did not appear to him that the Nursing Department was ready to become an independent school, as it does not presently have adequate faculty, program structure, activity level, or the number of students necessary to warrant approval of school status. He also expressed concern about the precedent that might be set if the Nursing School is approved prematurely and other small departments seek school status. Professor Barnhill expressed support for a process that would allow the Nursing department to grow its programs and attract faculty and students of high quality as well as the financial resources which would make it appropriate to confer independent school status upon it.

Professor Wilmarth requested and received the privilege of the floor for Senior Associate Dean Johnson. Dean Johnson said the nursing leadership understands and appreciates the issues and concerns raised by the Special Committee. The Nursing Department presently has a very creative faculty and tremendous growth has been achieved since 2004 when the first nursing degrees were offered. The market for nursing is very strong. It simply will not be possible for the program to achieve its potential if it remains a department, as this greatly affects the caliber of students, faculty and researchers it can attract.

Professor Yezer asked how common it is for nursing to be organized as an independent school. Dean Johnson responded that it was very common. At the top level these programs are all independent schools; the bottom quartile is comprised of programs and departments. Professor Ku said his impression is that the demand for nursing education is very high and with the health reform bill there will be potential federal funding to help support Nursing Schools. However, this federal funding represents soft money that does not provide the long-term funding necessary for a Nursing School to succeed. Dean Johnson agreed that there is often tension between funding sources. As research grants grow, faculty time has to be restructured to accommodate these activities. She added that she believes the School can grow its research portfolio by attracting tenured faculty who could potentially bring their NIH research grants with them. The Nursing Department has already generated over \$5 million in grant revenue, but presently none of that comes from NIH funding since school status is required to receive this sort of support.

Professor Cordes said he was the former director of the Trachtenberg School of Public Policy and Public Administration and participated in its formation. This involved making a decision about whether or not to seek independent school status. The decision was made to become a school within the Columbian College rather than a degree-granting academic unit. This was primarily because the University requires that free-standing degree-granting units make a significant financial contribution from their budgets each year. Professor Cordes asked if the Nursing School leadership was comfortable with this financial requirement and if it would allow the School sufficient retained funds to move its

programs forward. Dean Johnson responded that the Medical Center uses a different budgeting process than the Unified Budget model utilized by the rest of the University. She added that she was comfortable going forward that the School could meet the contribution assigned to it by the Medical Center.

Professor Shesser spoke in support of establishing a Nursing School. Nursing is a profession that is in tremendous demand and he said he thought this School will complement the other two Schools in the Medical Center. He added that he thought Dean Johnson has done an extraordinary job in developing the nursing program, and having worked with her for many years, he said he could think of no academic administrator with the skill set that Dean Johnson would bring to bear on leading the School. Professor Shesser said he thought the School would be a winning proposition from an academic and financial standpoint, and that it would enhance the reputation of the Medical Center and the University.

Professor Castleberry agreed with Professor Shesser's observations and spoke in support of Substitute Resolution 10/1. He added that he thought the Nursing School proposal has been carefully vetted by the Special Committee, which has worked incredibly hard in a very short period of time to formulate its recommendations. Professor Castleberry urged that the Senate approve the Resolution and support the establishment of the Nursing School.

Professor Wirtz also spoke in support of Substitute Resolution 10/1. He said that the issues raised by Professor Barnhill had given him considerable concern in evaluating the Nursing School Proposal, and that it was precisely those sorts of issues that generated the original Resolution 10/1 which called for the nursing program to become a school within a school. Professor Wirtz said that his change of mind came about because he thought that nursing is an extraordinarily fast-moving field and the University is in a unique position to fill this educational niche due to the groundwork laid by the Nursing Department. The apparatus is in place to expand significantly these endeavors. While Faculty Senates tend to be conservative by nature, Professor Wirtz said he thought that in this case the usual sort of cautionary approach is probably not warranted. In addition, the University is moving in a new direction now that GW has new leadership at the administrative and Board levels. It is important going forward to demonstrate that the Senate is prepared to look carefully and judiciously at proposals as they arise. Professor Wirtz reiterated his strong support for the Substitute Resolution and urged that fellow Senate members vote to approve it.

Professor Corry concurred with Professor Wirtz's observations. He also asked how the impact of growing nursing education programs would impact the enrollment cap in place at the Foggy Bottom campus. Dean Johnson responded it would not; the School will retain but not augment the student enrollment it now has at the Foggy Bottom. New programs, including the Bachelor's program, would be located at the Virginia campus.

As a general observation, Professor Parsons said that he thought there was no shortage of underfunded academic enterprises at GW. He added that he hoped the Nursing School will be well-funded by the University so that it can succeed.

Professor Wilmarth said that he supported the adoption of Substitute Resolution 10/1, but added that he also associated himself with a number of the concerns raised so eloquently by Professor Barnhill. Even though he thought the proposal a close call, he said he greatly respected the very dynamic leadership of the Nursing Department which has had a very good track record in the last several years, and was very hopeful the School would be successful. He added that he did not think the Nursing School would receive an overabundance of funding, at least at the outset, and the margin for error is not large. Still, he said he was persuaded by the case for a Nursing School because nursing is a unique discipline with a strong potential for growth.

Professor Wilmarth concluded the discussion by reviewing the conditions set forth in the first Resolving Clause of Substitute Resolution 10/1. He asked if the administration is committed to meeting all of the conditions. He also said he hoped that the administration would strongly and enthusiastically support the second Resolving Clause of Resolution 10/1 as well as the underlying matter, i.e., approval by the Board of Trustees of the recommended changes to the *Faculty Code* set forth in Resolution 09/3.

President Knapp called upon Vice President Lehman to respond, and he assured the Senate that all of the items in Resolving Clause 1 of Resolution 10/1 will be pursued. The financial commitments relative to item 1 (a) already exist in writing. Item 2 is already before the Academic Affairs Committee and Vice President Lehman said he planned to recommend strongly that Resolution 09/3 be accepted and changes outlined therein be made to the *Faculty Code*.

The question was called, a vote was taken, and Substitute Resolution 10/1 was approved with none opposed and one abstention. Based upon advice from the Senate Parliamentarian, President Knapp advised that Substitute Resolution 10/1 would henceforth be denominated as Resolution 10/1 with the same date and title. (Resolution 10/1 is attached.)

ADJOURNMENT

President Knapp thanked the Special Committee and the Senate for their work on this issue. Dean Johnson also thanked the School of Nursing Committee and the Faculty Senate for their support. There being no further business before the Senate, the meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

**A RESOLUTION PRESENTING RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE PROPOSAL FOR
A NEW SCHOOL OF NURSING (10/1)**

WHEREAS, a proposal to establish a new School of Nursing was presented to the Faculty Senate on April 13, 2010, and was amended on April 16, 2010;

WHEREAS, Article IX.A of the *Faculty Code* provides that:

“The Faculty Senate or an appropriate committee thereof is entitled to an opportunity to make recommendations on proposals concerning the creation, consolidation, or elimination of schools or other major components of the University.”

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee appointed the Faculty Senate Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing (the “Special Committee”) to review and evaluate the proposal to establish a new School of Nursing;

WHEREAS, the Special Committee prepared a report dated May 3, 2010 (the “Special Committee Report”), a copy of which is attached to this Resolution as Appendix A, which described the Special Committee's evaluation of the proposal and presented the Special Committee's recommendations for further action;

WHEREAS, for the reasons explained in the Special Committee Report, the Special Committee concluded that the proposal presented a persuasive case for the concept of a School of Nursing but did not sufficiently address a number of significant concerns set forth in the Special Committee Report;

WHEREAS, on May 10, 2010, the leadership of the proposed School of Nursing met with the Special Committee and provided additional information in an effort to address the concerns expressed in the Special Committee Report; **NOW, THEREFORE**

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

1. That the Faculty Senate supports the establishment of a School of Nursing, conditional upon the following understandings:
 - (a) At least three tenured faculty members who are not academic administrative officials shall be appointed to the faculty of the School of Nursing by August 31, 2011;
 - (b) At least 75% of the regular, active-status faculty of the School of Nursing shall hold tenured or tenure-accruing appointments by August 31, 2014; and
 - (c) By August 31, 2010, the Dean of the School of Nursing shall submit a supplemental memorandum to the Faculty Senate Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing, and that memorandum shall address in

sufficient detail the remaining concerns specified in the Special Committee Report dated May 3, 2010; attached to this Resolution as Appendix A.

2. That the Faculty Senate's support for the School of Nursing expressed in this Resolution is contingent upon final approval of the amendment to the asterisked footnote on page 18 of the Faculty Code proposed in Resolution 09/3, adopted by the Faculty Senate on March 12, 2010, so that said footnote will not apply to the School of Nursing.

Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing

Professor Edward J. Cherian, Chair
Professor Brian L. Biles
Professor Gary L. Simon
Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr.
Professor Philip W. Wirtz

May 10, 2010

Adopted May 12, 2010

APPENDIX A

The George Washington University Faculty Senate

Report of the Special Senate Committee Regarding the Proposed School of Nursing

May 3, 2010

To: Michael S. Castleberry, Chair
Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Re: Review of the Proposal for a School of Nursing

The April 13, 2010 proposal for a School of Nursing (as amended by 3 pages and supplemental information received on April 16, 2010) has been reviewed on an expedited basis by the members of the Special Committee, working both independently and in two meetings during the past 14 business days.

The proposal contains a great deal of information which responds to that requested in Appendix A of the Senate Resolution of April 9 concerning the proposed School of Nursing. The proposal presents a persuasive case for the concept of a School of Nursing. However the Special Committee has identified several major concerns that have not been sufficiently addressed in order to ensure the successful formation and operation of an independent School of Nursing outside the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.

- 1) The proposed School of Nursing should have a core of tenured faculty (in addition to the Dean and Senior Associate Dean) in order to have the requisite academic stature to be able to attract additional highly qualified faculty, to perform faculty appointment, promotion and tenure (APT) functions and decisions, and to establish Faculty Senate representation.
- 2) The School of Nursing should be in full compliance with the University's Faculty Code including compliance with the following requirements:
 - at least 75% of the School's regular active-status faculty must be tenured or tenure-track faculty;
 - APT committee composition, independence and process;
 - search committee composition and process for searches for faculty and academic administrators;
 - curriculum development process.
- 3) The standards for student admissions to the various degree programs should be consistent with other GW established programs, and clearly specified.
- 4) The proposed School's stated goal of achieving top 25 academic status (US News and World Report) should be fully described and the academic rigor and standards in

APPENDIX A

admission, instruction and degree qualifications for students should be specified. In addition aspiration schools and competitive schools should be identified.

- 5) The School should be a financially self-sustaining unit, including costs of admissions, fiscal management, instructional design, student services, learning systems & support, and career development and placement. The School should be able to fully cover its direct costs and also to make substantial indirect cost contributions toward the University's overhead. Funding sources to accomplish this requirement of financial independence should be fully identified including; endowment, tuition, University contributions, donor contributions and other sources. Proposed scholarships and tuition discount rates should be specified and data (including market studies) to support projected enrollments should be provided.
- 6) The proposed School plans to occupy space at the Virginia Science and Technology Campus (STC) for some 55% of their space needs and the Foggy Bottom campus for 45% of their space needs. Enrollment, faculty and staff head count growth proposed for the School at the Foggy Bottom campus would place added strain on the University's ability to comply with the DC BZA order limits, and should be justified as being consistent with the University's overall campus development plan. Development and future growth of the proposed School should be primarily directed at the Virginia STC.
- 7) A senior Board of Advisors, totally independent of business connections with the leadership of the Department of Nursing and the Medical Center, is a necessary asset for successful School formation.
- 8) Letters of intent from INOVA Fairfax Hospital System and from other partner hospitals indicating their intent to participate with the School for student rotations and clinical experiences are needed in order to demonstrate the viability of the proposed School's instructional and business plans.
- 9) The proposal for the School of Nursing identifies a potential governance conflict in the duality of the Medical Center Faculty Senate and the University Faculty Senate. It is essential that this conflict be resolved and the proposed School of Nursing should affirm that it participates in shared governance of the University through the University Faculty Senate.

The formation of an independent School of Nursing operating outside the School of Medicine and Health Sciences should be predicated and conditioned upon achievement of the following benchmarks related to the above concerns:

- 1) A minimum of three tenured professors (exclusive of the Dean and Senior Associate Dean) should be part of the regular active status faculty of the School.

APPENDIX A

- 2) The School's faculty composition, APT criteria and process, search committee composition and process for academic administrators, and curriculum development process should be in full compliance with the University Faculty Code.
- 3) Detailed descriptions of student admissions standards should be available for review.
- 4) A detailed plan, including timeline, for achieving the School's stated goal of top 25 academic status (US News & World Report), describing aspiration and competitive schools, should be available for review.
- 5) The School should demonstrate its financial independence (including its ability to cover all direct costs of essential School functions and to make substantial indirect cost contributions toward the University overhead) based on sources of revenue and funding details in its financial and operational plans; if the School cannot yet achieve full financial independence, its financial and operating plans should describe in detail the amounts, sources and duration of needed University subsidies until full financial independence is achieved and a credible timeline for achieving such independence.
- 6) The essential primary functions of the school including faculty, staff and students should be established at the Virginia STC and any proposal to locate School programs at the Foggy Bottom campus must demonstrate compliance with the University's campus plan and DC BZA limits on faculty, student and staff headcounts.
- 7) Activation of a fully independent Board of Advisors.
- 8) Receipt of letter(s) of intent from INOVA Fairfax Hospital System and other partner hospitals, indicating their commitment to participate with the School for student rotations and clinical experiences.
- 9) Resolution of the potential conflict in governance by affirming that the School participates in shared governance through the University Faculty Senate.

Until all of the foregoing benchmarks are satisfied as determined by a subsequent review by the Faculty Senate, the Special Committee recommends that the proposed School of Nursing should operate as a school within the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.

Edward J. Cherian, Chair

Committee Members:

Brian Biles,
Gary Simon
Arthur Wilmarth
Philip Wirtz