

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR FACULTY SENATE
MEETING HELD ON MAY 9, 2014
IN THE STATE ROOM

Present: President Knapp, Provost Lerman, Registrar Amundson, and Parliamentarian Charnovitz; Deans Dolling, Feuer, and Johnson; Professors Arnesen, Brand, Brazinsky, Costello, Diab, Feldman, Fairfax, Galston, Garris, Gee, Harrington, Hawley, Katz, Khoury, Lantz, McAleavey, McDonnell, Newcomer, Parsons, Price, Prasad, Pulcini, Rehman, Roddis, Sidawy, Swaine, Thompson, and Weiner

Absent: Deans Akman, Brown, Eskandarian, Goldman, and Vinson; Interim Deans Kayes and Maggs; Professors Castleberry, Dickinson, Jacobson, Lindahl, Marotta-Walters, Miller, Shesser, Simon, Squires, Swiercz, and Williams

CALL TO ORDER

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

INTRODUCTION OF NEWLY-ELECTED AND RE-ELECTED FACULTY MEMBERS

President Knapp introduced the following newly-elected faculty members: Professors Eric J. Arnesen, Mona T. Diab, Ilana Feldman, Dina R. Khoury, and Ayanna T. Thompson. (Gregory D. Squires was absent.)

The following re-elected faculty members were also introduced: Professors Gregg A. Brazinsky, Robert J. Harrington, Paula M. Lantz, Sylvia Marotta-Walters, David McAleavey, Anton Sidawy, and Edward Swaine. (Laura Dickinson, Robert M. Shesser, and Paul Swiercz were absent.)

President Knapp also introduced Steve Charnovitz, the re-elected Parliamentarian for the 2014-15 session, as well as members of the Senate Executive Committee: Professor Charles A. Garris, Chair, Miriam Galston, Paula Lantz, Marie Price, Joyce Pulcini, and Anton Sidawy. Sylvia Marotta-Walters and Paul Swiercz were absent.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on April 11, 2014 were approved as distributed.

RESOLUTION 14/1, "A RESOLUTION TO REQUEST INCREASED UNIVERSITY CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARDS HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS"

On behalf of the Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies Professor Murli Gupta, Acting Chair, introduced Resolution 14/1.

Professor Gupta observed that the cost of health care has gone up quite substantially in the last year, and that the faculty and staff share of insurance premiums costs has increased by approximately 12.5%. Factoring in higher deductibles and copayments for employees, the total cost increase could be as high as 25% in 2014 as compared to 2013. There have been many discussions across the campus concerning why costs are so high and the faculty and staff share of the cost increases has grown so much compared to the University's contribution.

Professor Gupta provided summary data showing that from 2013 to 2014, the total cost of fringe benefits is projected to increase from approximately \$81.1 to \$83.6 million. [Exact figures do not seem to be available.] The total projected medical and prescription drug costs for active employees and retirees in 2013 was \$40.3 million in 2013 and is expected to be \$44 million in 2014, an increase of \$3.7 million or a 9.2% increase. The total cost for active employees only, not including retirees, went up from \$36.75 to \$40.756 million, an increase of approximately \$4 million, or 10.5%. For this population, GW's contributions to health care costs went up from \$25.973 million (which was nearly 71% of total costs in 2013) to \$27.995 million, an increase of \$2.022 million. In 2014 the University contribution to health care costs is expected to be 68.7% of the total cost. Put another way, the University contribution for 2014 is projected to increase 7.8%, but employee contributions will increase 18.4%. In fact, the employee share of the cost burden for health care will increase even more because of higher deductibles and copayments in 2014.

Professor Gupta provided information about health care costs for the previous two years taken from his Benefits Advisory Committee files. (This information is included with these minutes.) These figures are not widely available, but they do shed light on the issue of cost increases. In 2011 the University contributed \$21.4 million, or 71% of total health care costs, and in 2012, \$22.9 million, again, a 71% share of the total, in contrast to the projected 68.7% share for 2014. It was this reduced contribution level that caused the ASPP Committee to bring forward Resolution 14/1.

Professor Price observed that this topic has generated a good deal of discussion among faculty members in the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences (CCAS). She requested and received the consent of the Senate so that Professor Tyler Anbinder (History) could present his findings on GW's marketbasket schools' contributions to health care at their institutions.

Professor Anbinder thanked Professor Gupta and members of the ASPP Committee for proposing Resolution 14/1. He said he had attended a CCAS faculty meeting during the fall 2013 semester at which many faculty members asked why health care costs would increase so much in the next calendar year. Vice President for Human Resources (HR) Sabrina Ellis had responded by giving the following reasons: skyrocketing health care costs; the northeast [U.S.] is so expensive for healthcare; graying workforce; self-insurance; and GW faculty prefer expensive PPO plans to allow out-of-network choices.

Professor Anbinder said that when he examined these reasons, he concluded that these were really not the most important factors in the large cost increases to GW faculty. Health care insurance in the northeast U.S. is not more expensive than it is in other places, and, in places with graying workforces, health care costs are actually lower than they are than in those with younger employees. In addition, most large companies are self-insured,

just as GW is. Professor Anbinder said he had concluded that the biggest factor in employee cost increases is GW's proportionately reduced contribution to these costs. Professor Anbinder also said he opposed the provision in Resolution 14/1 that the University should increase its contribution to health care costs by reductions in the salary merit pool.

Professor Anbinder reviewed information in a document he distributed at the Senate meeting (included with these minutes) which references information taken from Faculty Senate minutes (FSM) about health insurance costs over the last several years. From 2011 to the present, the GW contribution to total faculty health care costs for active and retired faculty has been reduced from 74% to 66%. (Note: the 68% proportion cited by Professor Gupta pertains only to the percentage paid for active [but not retired] faculty; for the sake of consistency and because the information provided to the Senate each September cites percentages for both active and retired faculty, those figures were cited by Professor Anbinder.) This significant piece of the health care cost picture was not conveyed when faculty asked why costs were going up so much. While it is expected that rates will increase from year to year, if the University had not cut the percentage of health costs that it paid, the increase borne by faculty would have been about half as much. Professor Anbinder added that he thought this is a key example of the need for the University to be more transparent with the faculty about such issues.

Professor Anbinder also summarized meetings with Provost Lerman and Vice President Ellis at which conversations were held concerning which institutions GW should compare its health care costs to. Although he said he started out by referencing costs at GW's marketbasket schools, Professor Anbinder said he was told not to do this because that list includes aspirational as well as peer institutions, and GW does not have the financial resources of, for example, Duke or Vanderbilt. In addition, he was advised that the list of comparable institutions should not include places outside the northeast U.S. Professor Anbinder then settled on two institutions, American University (AU), and Boston University (BU), and, on the advice of Vice President Ellis, used PPO premiums to draw comparisons. While faculty at AU, BU, and GW pay about the same in premiums, GW is contributing a lower share of its plan costs than the other two institutions. GW faculty also pay more than the other institutions in terms of co-pays for doctor and specialist visits, emergency room visits, and in particular, out of network services. According to Vice President Ellis, GW's plan is organized in this way because GW faculty make extensive use of out of network providers primarily because so many Washington doctors will not take insurance any more. GW faculty members' out of network co-pays amount to 40%, compared to AU (25%) and BU (20%).

Professor Anbinder said he had characterized GW's plan as below average and Provost Lerman had disputed that characterization. However, in all of the key areas examined, GW is below average. The average U.S. employer pays 72% of a family plan PPO premium, so GW is below the average on that metric. Large employers pay even more. In addition, employers with older employees provide a larger share of health care premium costs than GW does, with the average national co-pay per specialist at \$35, compared to GW's plan cost of \$50.

Professor Anbinder concluded by saying that in all of the ways described, GW's faculty health plan is below par. He added that he did not see a reason why GW cannot offer a health plan with coverage and costs as good as that enjoyed by faculty at AU or BU,

or perhaps even adopt a plan on par with the federal employee health benefit plan. He reiterated his support for the resolution in principle, while at the same time emphasizing that he did not support a reduction in the salary merit pool to provide for additional funds for the University's contribution.

Professor Newcomer said that the reason she would not support the Resolution as introduced was because she agreed with Professor Anbinder. She added that she was very disappointed in the way in which this matter has been handled – there has been a lack of transparency and a lack of collaboration to figure out alternative ways of handling plan cost increases rather than simply adopting a position that there are fixed resources at the University, and faculty cannot get more than a predetermined amount. This seems to fly in the face of statements made repeatedly by the Board Chair when he talks about the value of GW's faculty, saying that GW is only as good as its faculty, and that the University wants the best faculty it can possibly have.

Discussion followed. Professor Brazinsky proposed an amendment to the first Resolving Clause of Resolution 14/1 so that it would read as follows:

1. That the administration of the University and the Board of Trustees are urged to pay a higher proportion of the medical and prescription drug plan expenses without reducing increases to the merit compensation pool

The amendment was seconded, and discussion followed. Vice President Ellis asked if the figures in the information distributed by Professor Anbinder referred to employee only or family premiums and Professor Anbinder responded that all entries were for family plans. Vice President Ellis said that when the Benefits Advisory Committee (BAC) [which includes Professors Biles, Gupta and Castleberry] compares plans with other institutions there is an extensive level of benchmarking to determine how GW's plans compare to them. In its review of overall benefits, the BAC looks to see where there is probable tolerance within the GW community in making decisions that will impact costs. So, for example, when prescription drug plans are compared and it is apparent that GW's drug spend is 31% higher than it is at GW's market-basket schools, part of the reason is that GW has not implemented steps to try to push people into using either generic prescriptions, or to try to limit very expensive brand formulary prescriptions. The important thing is to use the money GW provides in the best way possible. GW has begun to take some of the steps to reduce costs that other institutions have taken, and there are still additional steps that will need to be looked at. Vice President Ellis said the BAC as well as the ASPP Committee would need to be involved in this, and she thought it would be important for the information Professor Anbinder provided to the Senate to be given to these groups so it can be determined where there are differences between GW's plan and those cited in his presentation.

Further discussion followed between Professors Brazinsky, Gupta, Feldman, and President Knapp, who observed that the merit pool was part of total compensation for faculty, so it would not be possible to increase the money devoted to benefits without the Board increasing the total amount of money in the compensation budget. Professor Anbinder said he wanted to go on record as opposing a shift of existing funding for the merit pool to the medical benefit pool. At this point faculty are unhappy with the medical plan offered and skeptical of the explanations that have thus far been furnished for making choices in this area.

Professor Feldman said a case might be made to the Board to increase the overall compensation pool, particularly if the annual increases are capped at a projected inflation rate of 3%. This seems not to have taken into account very high increases in health care costs, so in fact it represents a misvaluation of the overall cost landscape.

Professor Parsons said he supported the amendment and agreed that what faculty really want is for University decisions about such matters to be transparent. In addition, he said he thought there is a general feeling that the University is in a situation where money is very short. The Board has enormous building aspirations and that puts pressure on the overall budget. The University can report wages that can be compared to the 80th AAUP percentile for faculty members each year to the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. However, these benchmarked wages do not represent total compensation. An increase in the employee-paid share of health care costs is invisible when only the total compensation budget is considered.

Professor Galston spoke in favor of the amendment. Professor Lantz requested that the amendment be read. Professor Brazinsky said that he had devised some simplified wording as follows:

1. That the administration of the University and the Board of Trustees are urged to pay a higher proportion of the medical and prescription drug plan expenses without reducing increases to merit compensation.

Professor Newcomer, who seconded the original amendment, indicated her agreement with this change. Professor Gupta said that this was what he personally favored in the first place, but the Committee's view had prevailed in crafting the final Resolution.

A vote was taken on the amendment and it was approved. A vote was taken on Resolution 14/1 as amended, which was adopted by unanimous vote.

RESOLUTION 14/2, "A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE WITH RESPECT TO ACADEMIC FREEDOM"

On behalf of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, Professor Charles Garris introduced Resolution 14/2. He reminded the Senate that about a year ago at its May meeting, the Board of Trustees charged Chair Nelson Carbonell with forming a task force to explore faculty governance documents, including the *Faculty Code*. This was done, and in September 2014 there was a tremendous amount of faculty concern expressed about how changes to the *Code* might influence the shared governance process. A resolution (13/3) was adopted at the November 8th Senate meeting calling for any changes to the *Code* or faculty policies recommended by the Board of Trustees Governance Task Force to adhere to the University's long established and unbroken tradition and procedures of shared governance, which require the Faculty Senate, as the elected representative of the faculty, to consider and act on changes to the *Faculty Code* or Faculty Policies that are proposed by the Administration, the Board of Trustees, or other members of the University community before such changes are submitted to the Board of Trustees for final action. The Resolution also indicated that the Senate and its Committees would be pleased to offer consultation to the Task Force in discussing proposed changes to the *Code* or other governance documents, and that a careful review

of the Task Force's final report would be conducted following its delivery to the Senate. Further, the Senate would consider and act as expeditiously as possible on any changes proposed before such changes were submitted to the Board of Trustees for final action.

Since the Governance Task Force was formed, the PEAFF Committee has developed a very good collaborative relationship with its members, including Chair Carbonell and Trustees Blackburn, Hughes, and Jacobs, who have regularly met with the Committee. Numerous updates have been received on the work of the Task Force, most recently through Chair Carbonell's presentation at the April 11th Faculty Senate meeting.

The Task Force has identified five areas that they think should be addressed in the review of faculty governance documents. One of these was the issue of Academic Freedom, and that is the first issue to be considered by the Senate in Resolution 14/2.

At the March 25th meeting of the PEAFF Committee, the Task Force brought forth wording for a proposed modification to Article II. of the *Faculty Code*, which is the section concerning Academic Freedom. This modification was extensively discussed with Task Force members, and another meeting of PEAFF was called to continue the discussion on April 8th. Working in very close collaboration with Task Force members, the original proposal was modified and incorporated into Resolution 14/2.

Professor Garris said that the principles of academic freedom at the University have not been modified at all. The principles that faculty members shall enjoy freedom of investigation subject only to legal restrictions and such guidelines as shall be recommended by the Faculty Senate and adopted by the University remain, but this precise wording has been relocated. Professor Garris said it was not the intent of the Trustees to change the spirit or the principles of the *Faculty Code* with respect to academic freedom. Rather, they wanted to elaborate on it and add wording that expanded it but did not change the substance in any way. The phrase "in the classroom, physical, virtual or wherever located" was added because it takes into account that in a modern University, the classroom is not limited to simply one campus; it could be anywhere in the world.

The second thing the Board wanted to add also left the academic freedom issue of investigation untouched and a paragraph that does not conflict with current practice at the University was added. In the section pertaining to academic freedom, the *Code* does not address faculty rights and responsibilities. What the Task Force suggested adding was the language now contained in the third Resolving Clause of Resolution 14/2, which provides that "by virtue of their membership in the academic community, faculty members as well as students, administrators and trustees have an obligation consistent with Academic Freedom to act with civility, to acknowledge the right of others to express differing opinions, and to foster and defend intellectual honesty, freedom of inquiry and instruction, and freedom of expression of ideas on and off-campus." Extensive discussion was held with the PEAFF Committee and it was agreed that this was consistent with the practice of academic freedom at GW and would be a very positive addition to the *Code*.

Following Professor Garris's remarks, the Senate discussed the Resolution at some length. Professor McAleavey suggested removal of the hyphen in the word "where-ever" in Resolving Clause A of the Resolution. He also questioned whether or not the phrase "by virtue of their membership in the academic community" should be deleted. In addition, he moved to delete the

phrase “as well as students, administrators, and trustees,” as well as the phrase “on and off the campus.” Professor Garris spoke in favor of retaining the third phrase in the Resolution. Discussion continued, after which Professor McAleavey moved to delete the first two phrases in the Resolution he had mentioned, but not the third. [The correction to the spelling of “what-ever” was also omitted from this motion but it was editorially corrected later in the meeting.] The motion was seconded.

There being no further discussion of Professor McAleavey’s amendments and they were adopted by a vote of 13 in favor and 10 opposed.

Professor Feldman said that she approved of civility in principle and understood the spirit behind the proposed wording. She also expressed concern about legislating this in the context of *Code* provisions concerning academic freedom. One of the things that academic freedom protects is the right to express and pursue ideas and avenues of investigation that are unpopular. This could conceivably be used by people to accuse others of being uncivil as a means of stopping those lines of inquiry since a finding of incivility would be a violation of the academic freedom portion of the *Code*.

Professor Garris said the PEAFF Committee had looked hard at this language. One Committee member pointed out that GW is run on very democratic principles, however, these principles can also be the total opposite of academic freedom principles. The feeling of the Committee was that disagreeing with people or being opposed to various positions taken by other faculty members is not inconsistent with civility. People can recognize unpopular opinions, disagree with them, or even hate those opinions, but they are still required in a University community to be civil, and that is the point the Task Force’s proposed language was trying to convey. Professor Garris added that he was sure there is no thought that people would be accused of an academic freedom violation by bringing up an unpopular issue, in fact, the intent of Clause C is just the opposite.

Professor Roddis suggested that perhaps the difference of opinion could be resolved by using language similar to that of the American Association of University Professors concerning academic freedom and she cited some language that might be incorporated into Clause C. On a point of order, the discussion was returned to consideration of Professor Feldman’s pending amendment.

Further discussion followed, after which Professor Feldman was asked to read the amendment to Resolving Clause C and she did so. “faculty members should show respect for the opinions of others, foster and defend intellectual honesty, freedom of inquiry and instruction, and the free expression of ideas.” Further discussion ensued. with the President suggesting that the word “and” be added before the word “foster.” Professor Feldman also clarified that the words, “on and off campus” were not included in her amendment. [This phrase was previously removed by the adoption of Professor McAleavey’s amendment.] The amendment was seconded.

At the suggestion of Professor Swaine, Professor Feldman agreed to add the words “consistent with academic freedom” before the words “faculty members” as this was inadvertently omitted from the amendment as it was in process.

A vote was taken on Professor Feldman’s amendment and the amendment was approved. Professor McAleavey formally moved removing the hyphen from the word “where-ever” and the removal of the word “exposition” from Resolving Clause A, so that it would read “a faculty member shall be guided by ...”_ The motion was seconded, a vote was taken, and the amendments were approved.

There being no further discussion a vote was taken on the adoption of Resolution 14/2 as amended and it was adopted. (Resolution 14/2 as amended is included with these Minutes.

RESOLUTION 14/3, "A RESOLUTION ON THE NEED FOR A LONG TERM BUDGET MODEL"

Professor Garris requested that Professor Yezer be granted the privilege of the floor and there was no objection. On behalf of the Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting (FP&B), Professor Yezer, a member of the Committee, introduced Resolution 14/3.

Professor Yezer advised that the FP&B Committee had worked with the administration during the past year on a proposed budget model that would replace the Unified Budget Model now in use in seven of the University's schools. The outcome of this work was a model that Professor Yezer said he thought was significantly better than the initial version. However, this new model and the Unified Budget Model it will replace are essentially revenue allocation models and do not provide very much information on the cost side.

In Resolution 14/3, the FP&B Committee proposes that another improvement to the University's budget process be developed -- a multi-year budget model capable of analyzing fiscal implications for operating surpluses of alternate revenue and cost scenarios. Just as detailed models are designed to predict the performance of new airplanes and chemical plants, it is possible to map out alternate budget scenarios which will accurately predict performance results in the area of budgeting. Using such a model, it would be possible to generate scenarios where changes are tested, and the fiscal consequences of these changes can be observed before implementation. For example, the size distribution of classes could be changed simultaneously with altering the fractions of classes taught by adjunct faculty and the results would show the revenue and cost implications over a 5 year period. Resolution 14/3 calls for the administration to proceed promptly to construct such a model for application to issues such as the fiscal implications of alternative future plans for development, including the Corcoran acquisition, and further, that the model resulting from this effort should be shared with the Faculty Senate.

A short discussion followed. Professor Newcomer asked if this model would facilitate the goal of the Strategic Plan in the area of interdisciplinarity and making easier for students to have double majors. Professor Yezer responded that the model would simply be a way of working out the long-range cost and revenue implications of different scenarios. Provost Lerman observed that Resolution 14/3 deals with the entire University budget rather than the ways in which funds and costs are allocated to the seven deans under the Unified Budget Model.

Professor McAleavey inquired what the University does now in the area of budget forecasting. Provost Lerman said that most of this happens in the Office of the Executive Vice President and Treasurer. The administration does look at multiple years, but he said he thought the model proposed in Resolution 14/3 would allow the administration to test a much wider range of scenarios than it can at present.

There being no further discussion, a vote was taken, and Resolution 14/3 was adopted. (Resolution 14/3 is included with these minutes.)

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

President Knapp requested and received the consent of the Senate to introduce Resolution 14/4 “A Resolution of Appreciation” for Professor Rehman’s three years of service on the Senate Executive Committee, the last year as Chair.

The President read the Resolution, which was adopted by acclamation, and presented it to Professor Rehman, who briefly expressed her appreciation for the sentiments expressed. (See her remarks on this and other matters under Brief Statements and Questions.) There followed a round of applause.

UPDATE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR NEW FACULTY MEMBERS (BACKGROUND SCREENING POLICY)

Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Dianne Martin presented the update, which included a powerpoint presentation included with these minutes. She advised the Senate that the implementation of background checks for new faculty members (and staff) is part of the University’s response to the Penn State Freeh Report, which was reviewed by a University Committee that made recommendations about ways to further enhance ways in which the whole GW community can be protected. She read the preamble to the new policy, which states: *It is the policy of the university to conduct a Standard Background Screening for all Finalists for Faculty and Staff positions, and for current GW Staff and Faculty who are Finalists for transfer or promotion to certain positions, and to conduct additional background screenings in certain instances, consistent with business necessity.*

While GW has been conducting background screenings for staff for several years, faculty are at present screened only for verification of their employment and their academic credentials. Background screenings under the policy to be implemented will add screening for criminal activity, sex offenses, and verification of a valid social security number. These screenings will be conducted by the Human Resources staff and the review of all faculty and academic administrative screenings will be conducted with the Provost’s Office if a question arises. The University’s Office of the Senior Vice President and General Counsel, the Office of Safety and Security, or other University offices, as appropriate, may be asked to assist in the review. Information received from background screenings will only be used to determine the finalist’s qualifications and suitability for the particular position they will fill. In addition, the information will not be used to discriminate on any basis protected by applicable law or University policy.

A criminal record, negative credit history, or other adverse result will not necessarily be an automatic bar to employment at the University. Assessments will be made on an individual basis, taking into account factors including but not limited to the passage of time and the severity, frequency, and nature of an adverse result, as well as its relationship to the position in question, and the implications for the general safety and security of the university community as well as the security of university assets. Information concerning the requirement for a pre-employment background screening will be conveyed going

forward to new faculty members. Detailed procedures for the implementation of this new policy are still being worked out.

Discussion followed. Professor Thompson asked if a department has indicated it wants to hire an individual who has something in their background that would render them unemployable by GW, how that information would be conveyed to the department. Vice Provost Martin responded that the department would know the individual would have to go through the background check. While actual procedures are to be worked out and not yet in writing, the department would be informed that the University would not be able to hire that individual without supplying what the details might be.

Professor Parsons asked about how much time it would take to conduct these background checks. Vice Provost Martin responded that faculty members, particularly part-time faculty members hired, can be appointed contingent upon the successful completion of the background screening process. In some instances, prospective faculty may be aware of their own issues and voluntarily bring them up.

Vice President for Human Resources Sabrina Ellis said that background checks take about 5 days if it is someone who has completed all of their education in the U.S., but can take longer if not. Vice Provost Martin said that academic background checking is already done by Faculty Affairs, so the new part of the background check would be the criminal and sexual offense check and the social security number check, which would be done through Human Resources.

Professor Sidawy asked if the checks would include fingerprinting. In the experience of clinical faculty, this takes longer than five days. Vice Provost Martin said that, as far as she knew, fingerprinting would not be required.

Professor Harrington noted that the School of Engineering and Applied Science has quite a number of part-time faculty who do not necessarily teach continuously but rather come and go from year to year. He inquired if these people would have to be checked every time. Vice Provost Martin responded that the University and the Office of General Counsel are working on the details of some sort of time policy, perhaps a window of 24 or 36 months.

Professor Weiner asked how this policy would apply to faculty hired overseas – these people often do not need or have a social security number. Vice President Ellis said that the social security number check would apply only to individuals hired within the U.S. Individuals hired outside of the U.S. would need to pass the criminal and sexual offenses background check.

Further discussion followed with Professor Weiner asking if a criminal offense would be something deemed illegal in the U.S. or in a faculty members' home country. Vice President Ellis said this was a good question. Laws applying in international locations would have to be taken into account in evaluating results of background checks. She added that arrests are really not the focus of background checks, rather, HR evaluates specifically any type of criminal conviction that would raise a safety or security risk with students because so many of them are minors. This is really the overall focus and intent in terms of

pursuing a background check expansion to cover faculty. President Knapp said he thought there always has to be a provision for the exercise of judgment in such matters.

Professor Arnesen said the element of judgment was precisely what concerned him. Judgments such as this have consequences. Who is doing the judging and the criteria used are not things to be left up in the air, nor is a check the box approach desirable. He added that he would want specifics about what is a barrable offense and what is not before going forward with this policy. Vice Provost Martin said she thought it impossible to anticipate every possible circumstance that might be encountered and the University would just have to use good judgment and discretion, understanding that these are academic decisions.

Professor McAleavey said he recalled that there was sentiment at the last Executive Committee meeting to ask a committee to look into this policy during the 2014-15 academic year, and added it seemed to him there ought to be committee input on it so issues can be examined more carefully. Professor Garris said he would definitely put this on the agenda for the coming year, and Professor Rehman, the Executive Committee Chair for 2013-14, agreed with this way of proceeding.

The question of whether not final conclusions about the contents of background checks and eligibility for employment would rest with HR or with Faculty Affairs was posed. Vice Provost Martin said that not all of the procedures have been worked out as yet but Faculty Affairs would receive the information from HR, and Academic Affairs would make the decision about whether or not a faculty member was eligible for employment.

Provost Lerman noted that GW is a member of a group of fourteen universities and that he had polled his fellow provosts at these institutions on this topic. There has been a significant change since initial conversations about faculty background checks four years ago when essentially no one was requiring them; now everyone is. The standard of care has shifted. Events at Penn State were certainly very significant in everybody's thinking about this. There have also been situations at the University where a faculty member has been told to leave as a result of a sexual offense. Had a background check been done, he said he thought most reasonable people would have agreed that the person never should have been hired. The Provost added that he thought it entirely reasonable to think about having someone articulate the principles to be utilized with respect to these background checks and consider what the right set of checks and balances should be. However, it is neither possible nor feasible to enumerate every possibility as Vice Provost Martin pointed out.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. NOMINATION FOR ELECTION OF PROFESSOR GREGG A. BRAZINSKY (ESIA) TO THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE 2014-15 SESSION

Professor Garris called upon Professor Rehman, Convener of the Nominating Committee, to move the nomination, and Professor Rehman did so. There were no nominations from the floor and Professor Brazinsky was elected by unanimous vote.

II. APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING DATES FOR SENATE MEETINGS FOR THE 2014-15 SENATE SESSION

The following dates as recommended by the Senate Executive Committee were approved by the Senate:

September 12, 2014	January 9, 2015
October 10, 2014	February 13, 2015
November 14, 2014	March 20, 2015
December 12, 2014	April 10, 2015
	May 8, 2015

III. NOMINATIONS FOR ELECTION OF CHAIRS AND MEMBERS OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

The list of Chairs and members of Senate Committees for the 2014-15 session was distributed at the meeting and Professor Garris moved the approval of the list. There were no nominations from the floor, and the list posted to the Senate website following the meeting and appended to these minutes was approved.

IV. NOMINATIONS FOR APPOINTMENT OF THE FOLLOWING FACULTY MEMBERS BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES TO BOARD COMMITTEES

The following faculty members were elected for appointment to the following Board Committees:

Academic Affairs: Charles A. Garris Jr., Executive Committee Chair
External Affairs: Kathryn Newcomer, University and Urban Affairs Committee Chair
Student Affairs: Jennifer Frey, Faculty Co-Chair, Joint Committee of Faculty and Students

Professor Garris noted that the Chair of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee had not yet been elected, so the nomination of that individual to the Committee on Advancement would be deferred until the September Senate meeting.

V. NOMINATIONS FOR APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT TO ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES

Professor Garris moved the nominations for appointment of faculty members for the following Committees:

Committee on the Judicial System: Professors Michael S. Castleberry and Mary J. Barron; University Hearing Board: Professors Bruno Petinaux and Beverly Westerman; Marvin Center Governing Board: Professors Leonard Friedman and Cory Jurgensen

Student Grievance Review Committee: Professors Majeda El-Banna, Vivek Jain, Carol Lang, Joyce Maring, Edward Robinson, and Richard Ruth

The entire slate was approved.

VI. TRIBUTES TO RETIRING FACULTY WHO HAVE SERVED ON THE FACULTY SENATE

Professor Galston read the tribute to Jack Harlan Friedenthal, Howrey Professor of Trial Advocacy, Litigation and Professional Responsibility.

As Professor Castleberry was absent, Professor Garris read the tribute to Janet Craig Heddeshimer, Professor of Counseling, Emerita.

As Dean Goldman was unable to be present at the meeting, Professor Lantz read the tribute to Richard Windsor, Professor Emeritus of Prevention and Community Health.

The tributes are included with these minutes.

VII. ANNUAL REPORTS OF FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

The reports of the Committees on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting, Honors and Academic Convocations, Libraries, and Physical Facilities were distributed with the meeting agenda.

The reports of the Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies (including Fringe Benefits) and the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom were distributed at the meeting and are included with these minutes.

CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

President Knapp requested and was granted the consent of the Senate to hear the Provost's remarks as the next item of business because he had to leave the meeting due to travel.

IX. PROVOST'S REMARKS

Provost Lerman thanked Senate members and their colleagues for their support of students under stress, particularly in connection with the recent passing of several of their peers. He added that he thought it is really heartening to see the GW community come together under such difficult circumstances to support one another.

The Provost encouraged everyone who could attend the upcoming commencement to do so. This is, of course, the academic event marking the end of the academic year, the culmination of many years of hard work, and the achievement of great aspirations by students.

As it does each year, Academic Affairs continues to develop plans to implement the University's Strategic Plan. This year the focus was on a number of items, including shifting the admissions process more toward emphasizing opportunities for undergraduates across the University. Consistent with the aspirations of the Plan, one or two major

interdisciplinary centers have been launched. As Professor Yezer pointed out, work has been undertaken on revising the Unified Budget Model in order to develop a model that is more transparent and better relates what deans and their schools do to the level of funding they have available to do it. In the coming year, the University will continue to operate under the existing older model but the new model will be run in parallel as a shadow model so that deans can know what would have happened under the new alternative. It is expected that the dry run of the new resource allocation model will become the operating model in FY 15.

Lastly, this is the time of year that Academic Affairs presents the administration's recommendations to the Board of Trustees for the tenure and promotion of faculty members. This is also the culmination of processes that began in the schools a year ago, sometimes a little more, in which candidates for tenure and promotion brought forth their qualifications and the faculty deliberated and voted upon them. Provost Lerman said that having read these cases, there being about 40 this year, faculty should feel comfortable that GW will be in great hands in the coming generations. There are once again, extraordinarily strong tenure cases in all three areas of evaluation: including research, teaching, and service. This reflects, among other things, great recruiting and great mentoring, and is something of which everyone should be proud.

VIII. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Charles A. Garris, Jr. Chair, presented the report included with these minutes. The report to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees referenced in the Executive Committee report is also included with these minutes.

X. CHAIR'S REMARKS

President Knapp seconded the Provost's invitation for faculty to attend commencement activities, saying he thought their presence is very much appreciated by graduating students and their families. GW's commencement is a pretty spectacular event that takes place on the national mall, with a usual attendance of about 25,000 people. The President also noted that in the coming week, multiple diploma and awards ceremonies will be held across the University. In the midst of all of this activity, the new home of what is now the Milken Institute School of Public Health will be dedicated. The building is really an extraordinary architectural achievement; among other things, the rather odd-shaped site was beautifully filled by the building, and it is eligible for platinum LEED certification, although that is not guaranteed. The building is very sustainable, with bamboo wall surfaces that also serve as soundproofing panels. There is an extraordinary use of light throughout the building. All of the desks in the offices are standing desks, likely a deliberate healthy choice on the part of Public Health faculty. In addition, the building is designed to feature the stairwells and encourage their use, rather than focusing on the elevators, which are equipped with doors that are deliberately set to close slowly.

President Knapp concluded by joining Professor Garris in wishing everyone a restful and productive summer.

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

Professor Rehman read the following statement at the meeting:

I am sorry I was not able to make my senate report in person to this body but I was out of the country -- it's one of the hazards of being an international business professor.

“First, I am very thankful for the three-year term limit on the Executive Committee. Second, and more importantly, I would like to thank the Senate and, in particular, I would like to thank the Senate Executive Committee and the Senate Standing Committees for all their hard work; mostly behind the scenes. I would like to also thank the University Board of Trustees, especially Chair Nelson Carbonell, Mark Hughes and Madeleine Jacobs, for working over the last year with the Senate and the PEAFF Committee on faculty governance issues. Last, but not least, I would like to thank Susan Campbell, the Senate Coordinator, for her tireless work and her fastidious attention to detail which makes the Senate work seamlessly. I believe the Senate is in very good hands with Professor Charles Garris as the Executive Committee Chair during an era of significant governance discussions. I appreciate very much the kind words in your last resolution. It was an honor to serve you all. Thank you.”

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Senate, the meeting was adjourned at 4:31 p.m.

Elizabeth A. Amundson

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

**A RESOLUTION TO REQUEST INCREASED UNIVERSITY CONTRIBUTIONS
TOWARDS HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS (14/1)**

WHEREAS, costs of Medical and Prescription Drug plans have increased at a rapid pace (from \$40.3M in 2013 to \$44M in 2014) where the active employee contributions in 2014 increased by 12.5% (with Plan Design Changes), and

WHEREAS, these costs could have increased by larger amount (to \$46M) with active employee contributions increasing by 25% if copayments and deductibles were not increased in 2014 (without Plan Design Changes), and

WHEREAS, the University contributions to health and welfare benefits (consisting of medical, prescription drug, disability, life/AD&D, tuition, retirement, etc.) increased by 3.08% (from \$81.1M to \$83.6M) in 2014, and

WHEREAS, the projected increase in Medical and Prescription Drug contributions for active employees for 2014 is \$4.002M of which employees pay \$1.980M and the university pays \$2.022M, and

WHEREAS, the total projected Medical and Prescription Drug contributions for active employees for 2014 is \$12.761M which is 31.3% of total costs, while the university contributions for 2014 total \$27.995M which is 68.689% of total costs; the university contribution to these costs decreased from 70.6% to 68.689% while employee contributions increased from 29.33% to 31.3%, and

WHEREAS, the merit increase pool for 2014 was 3% which provided the 3% increase in university contributions to the health care costs, and

WHEREAS, many faculty received very little or no merit increases in 2014 while their health insurance costs increased substantially in 2014, **NOW,**
THEREFORE,

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

1. That the administration of the University and the Board of Trustees are urged to pay a higher proportion of the Medical and Prescription Drug plan expenses ~~out of the compensation pool without causing a decrease in percentage of the merit pool by more than 1/4 of 1%;~~ and without reducing increases to merit compensation, and
2. that any changes shall be communicated to the Faculty Senate in a timely manner.

**Faculty Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies
April 25, 2014**

Adopted, May 9, 2014

**The George Washington University
Comparison of Benefits Cost Changes from 2013 to 2014**

	2013	2014	Change	% Change
GW Total Projected Contributions to Health and Welfare Benefits (includes Medical, Rx, Life/AD&D/Tuition/Retirement etc)	\$81.1M	\$83.6M	\$2.5M	3.08%
Total Projected Medical and Prescription Drug Costs- Actives and Retirees	\$40.3M	\$44.0M	\$3.70M	9.20%
Total Projected Medical and Prescription Drug Costs- Actives Only	\$36.754M	\$40.756M	\$4.002M	10.90%
GW Contributions to Health Insurance and Rx Costs- Actives Only	\$25.973M	\$27.995M	\$2.022M	7.80%
	70.7% of total	68.7% of total		
Employee Contributions to Health Insurance and Rx Costs- Actives Only	\$10.781M	\$12.761M	\$1.98M	18.40%
	29.3% of total	31.3% of total		

Total costs of Health Insurance and Rx went up in 2014 by 10.9% (projected)

GW contributions increased by 7.8%

Employee contributions increased by 18.4%

Further, Employee costs went up even more due to higher deductibles and copayments

In Previous Years, GW contributed 71% towards Health Insurance Costs:

2011: \$21.4M, 71% of Total

2012: \$22.9M, 71% of Total

Why Have Our Health Care Costs Gone Up so Much Last Two Years?

We've Been Told:

- Skyrocketing Health Care Costs
- Northeast is so expensive for healthcare
- Graying workforce
- Self-insurance
- GW faculty prefer expensive PPO plans to allow out-of-network choices

The Hidden Cause of Our Huge Medical Expense Increases: GW's Reduction in Percent of Costs Paid

YEAR	GW Total	Faculty Total*	GW Percent	Faculty Percent	Source
2010	~\$20,800,000	~\$7,300,000	74%	26%	Sep. '11 FSM
2011	~\$22,200,000	~ \$7,800,000	74%	26%	Sep. '11 FSM
2012	\$23,700,000	\$ 9,800,000	71%	29%	Sep. '12 FSM
2013	\$27,600,000	\$12,700,000	68%	32%	Sep. '13 FSM
2014	\$29,100,000	\$14,900,000	66%	34%	Sep. '13 FSM

In 2011, the increase in health care costs was paid 74% by GW and 26% by faculty.
In 2014, the increase in health care costs was paid 31% by GW and 69% by faculty.

* Faculty total includes retired faculty.

Choice of Comparison Schools and Plans

Comparison of Family PPO Plan Premiums

	GW	AU	Boston U.
Endowment	\$1.3 B	\$478 M	\$1.3 B
Endowment per Student	\$54,000	\$37,000	\$37,000
Premium Paid by Faculty for PPO Plan	\$623	\$521	\$683
Premium Paid by University	\$1028	\$968	\$1326
Percent of Total Premium Paid by Employer	62%	65%	66%

Comparison of GW PPO Plans to AU and BU PPO Plans

	GW Medium PPO	AU PPO	BU PPO		GW Basic PPO
Co-pay Primary Care	\$25	\$20	\$20		\$25
Co-pay Specialist	\$50	\$40	\$20		\$50
Co-pay emergency room	\$150	\$75	\$100		20% of bill
Family Deductible in-network	\$1000	\$400	\$0		\$1700
Family Deductible out-of-network	\$1500	\$1500	\$1000		\$1700
Responsibility for out-of-network expenses	40%	25%	20%		40%
Maximum Family out-of-pocket expenses, network	\$5000	\$5500	\$0 (just co-pays)		\$6000
Max. family out-of-pocket expenses, non-network	\$10000*	\$8000	\$4000		\$8500

Does GW have an “average” health insurance plan?

- Only 38% of insured Americans have a deductible of \$1,000 or more.
- Avg. US employer pays 72% of family PPO plan premiums.
- Avg. large US employer with avg. employee salary of \$56K or more pays 76% of premium for family plan.
- Avg. employer with older employees (35% age 50 or older) pays 77% of premium for family plan (72% when less than 35% of employees are 50+)
- Avg. specialist co-pay is \$35.
- Avg. primary care co-pay is \$23.

**A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE *FACULTY CODE* WITH RESPECT TO
ACADEMIC FREEDOM (14/2)**

WHEREAS, Article II. of the *Faculty Code*, entitled “ACADEMIC FREEDOM,” currently provides:

- A. A faculty member shall enjoy freedom of investigation subject only to legal restrictions and such guidelines as shall be recommended by the Faculty Senate and adopted by the University.**
- B. A faculty member shall enjoy freedom of expression. In the classroom, a faculty member's exposition shall be guided by requirements of effective teaching, adherence to scholarly standards, and encouragement of freedom of inquiry among students. In speaking and writing outside the University, a faculty member shall not attribute his or her personal views to the University.**

WHEREAS, the mission statement of The George Washington University (GW) declares that GW “commits itself to excellence in the creation, dissemination, and application of knowledge,” and that GW “provides a stimulating intellectual environment for its diverse students and faculty” by “fostering excellence in teaching” and by serving as “a center for intellectual inquiry and research”; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees recognizes and affirms the value of GW’s long tradition of shared governance based on constructive dialogue and collaboration between the Faculty and the Administration; and,

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees has approved a strategic plan for the period leading to 2021, which seeks to make GW one of the world’s premier research universities; and,

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees has formed a Task Force on Faculty Governance, which has reviewed the *Faculty Code* and faculty governance documents of GW’s market basket institutions and seeks to clarify GW’s governance processes; and,

WHEREAS, teaching in the 21st Century will involve an extension and adaptation of the traditional classroom mode of instruction for a wide variety of media and remote locations; and,

WHEREAS, maintaining a civil and collegial academic environment in the context of wide-ranging research and teaching activities occurring within GW’s multidisciplinary structure will be of paramount importance for GW’s ability to achieve recognition as a premier research university; NOW, THEREFORE,

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

That Article II. of the *Faculty Code* be amended to read as follows:

“Subject only to legal restrictions and such guidelines as shall be recommended by the Faculty Senate and adopted by the University:

“A. A faculty member shall enjoy freedom of expression. In the classroom (physical, virtual, and wherever located), a faculty member's ~~exposition~~ shall be guided by requirements of effective teaching, adherence to scholarly standards, and encouragement of freedom of inquiry among students. In speaking and writing outside the University, a faculty member shall not attribute his or her personal views to the University.

“B. A faculty member shall enjoy freedom of investigation.

~~“C. By virtue of their membership in the academic community, faculty members (as well as students, administrators, and trustees) have an obligation, consistent with academic freedom, to act with civility, to acknowledge the right of others to express differing opinions, and to foster and defend intellectual honesty, freedom of inquiry and instruction, and free expression of ideas on and off the campus.”~~

“C. Consistent with academic freedom, faculty members should show respect for the opinions of others and foster and defend intellectual honesty, freedom of inquiry and instruction, and the free expression of ideas.”

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom

April 8, 2014

Adopted as amended, May 9, 2014

A RESOLUTION ON THE NEED FOR A LONG TERM BUDGET MODEL (14/3)

- Whereas:** the University is considering modifications of the current model used to allocate expenditures among schools and overhead activities of the institution, and
- Whereas:** the University is currently contemplating significant ventures, such as the Corcoran acquisition, that have multi-year effects on costs and revenues, and
- Whereas:** Moody's Investor Service last review of the University in January 2013 noted under "challenges" the "uncommonly high operating leverage", and "thin debt service coverage with operating cash flow of 10.2% covering debt service by 1.7 times," and
- Whereas** if the University is to move into the first ranks of research and teaching institutions, it cannot be cutting budgets to maintain operating cash flow, and
- Whereas** neither the current "Unified Budget Model" nor the proposed alternative allows multi-year (4-5 years at least) tracking of future operating costs or alignment of those costs with revenue sources, **NOW, THEREFORE,**

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

1. That the Faculty Senate believes it is essential that a multi-year budget model able to analyze fiscal implications for operating surplus of alternative revenue and cost scenarios, be developed.
2. That the University should proceed promptly to construct such a model and apply it to issues such as the fiscal implications of alternative future plans for development, including the Corcoran acquisition.
3. The model resulting from this effort should be shared with the Faculty Senate.

Revised and Adopted by the Senate Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting

April 18, 2014

Adopted by the Faculty Senate, May 9, 2014

Notes to Accompany the Resolution on the Need for a Long Term Budget Model

Anthony Yezer

April 20, 2014

This year the Fiscal Planning and Budget Committee participated in the development of what will be termed the proposed budget model (PBM) which is designed to replace the current unified budget model (UBM). The Committee finds that the PBM has some significant advantages over the UBM but, as the resolution voted out of Committee suggests, even the PBM falls significantly short of the type of model that is needed to ensure the future fiscal health of the University.

Both the UBM and PBM are formulas for allocating the revenue that the University has left after it deducts “overhead” costs of the institution. One issue is that this residual revenue is only verified during the year in which the funding must be committed and this has led to mid-year budget cutting. This problem can be solved by allocating revenue on a three year moving average basis.

The second problem with these models is that they do not measure the cost of providing educational and research services. This is an issue both for “overhead” costs where the future funding needs of the University are not known and for the operating costs of the Schools where long term personnel decisions are being made.

The Long Term Budget Model, (LTBM) requested in this resolution would emphasize detailed measurement of the costs of both the physical plant and academic operations. Furthermore it would integrate the two. The size distribution of classes would be related to the types of faculty teaching courses. Currently, there is a mix of faculty from new adjuncts through senior tenured professors and there is a mix of physical facilities. There is no model that relates the sizes and types of classes which are taught through the types of faculty teaching them to the ultimate operating costs for instruction and physical plant. Similar statements can be made about the facilities and personnel involved in research. Furthermore, the LTBM must be capable of estimating these costs and revenues over 4 to 5 year periods so that the consequences of decisions made in one year for the future fiscal viability of the University can be assessed. LTBM's exist at other institutions. The Resolution calls on the Administration, Trustees, and Faculty to develop a LTBM for GWU that is equivalent to the best at competing institutions.

A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION (14/4)

WHEREAS, Scheherazade S. Rehman has earned the highest level of respect, gratitude, and admiration of the University community, and

WHEREAS, her term of service on the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate has reached its statutory limit, NOW, THEREFORE,

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

That the following citation be issued:

Scheherazade Rehman has provided distinguished service as a member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, of which she was elected Chair for the 2013-14 Session. She has provided steadfast leadership in a year of transition for the Senate when its elected membership was expanded by forty percent, from 29 to 40 members. This same year, the University formally approved and began to implement the University's Strategic Plan and the Board of Trustees established a Task Force on Faculty Governance to review and propose amendments to the *Faculty Code*. The Senate and its Committees, including the Executive Committee, have worked tirelessly in collaboration with Task Force members to launch this work, with the result that a proposed amendment to the Academic Freedom portion of the *Code* will be introduced by the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom for the Senate's consideration at the May 9, 2014 meeting. During the 2014-15 Session, the work of reviewing faculty governance will continue with the formation of working groups to review and propose amendments as appropriate, to the *Faculty Code*.

Professor Rehman has performed this year with the same steadfastness and commitment that have been a hallmark of her twenty-five years of service to the University. These qualities have proven indispensable in her leadership of the Faculty Senate. At the same time she served as Chair of the Senate Executive Committee she continued her work for the third year as Chair of the Faculty Honors and Convocations Committee.

To all of the regular and unforeseen issues that she and the Executive Committee had to face this year she brought a resolute sense of duty, her keen intellect, her capacity to reach out and obtain consensus from colleagues, and her unwavering faith in all that the Faculty Senate represents and seeks to accomplish.

THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
HEREBY EXPRESSES ITS DEEPEST APPRECIATION AND GRATITUDE TO
PROFESSOR SCHEHERAZADE S. REHMAN
FOR HER DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

Steven Knapp
President

[SEAL]

Adopted by acclamation, May 9, 2014

Background checks for GW faculty and staff

Implementation of background screening for new faculty is part of GW's response to the Penn State Freeh report and the need to protect our whole community by making sure that all of our new employees, both faculty and staff, have background screening.

New Policy states: It is the policy of the university to conduct a Standard Background Screening for all Finalists for Faculty and Staff positions, and for current GW Staff and Faculty who are Finalists for transfer or promotion to certain positions, and to conduct additional background screenings in certain instances, consistent with business necessity.

A standard background screening will include screening for criminal activity, sex offenses, a valid SSN, and verification of employment/academic credentials. Currently, faculty are only screened for verification of employment/academic credentials. Background screenings for staff have been taking place for several years.

Review of Staff background screening results will be conducted by HR, and review of Faculty and academic administrator background screening results will be conducted by the HR in consultation with the Provost. **The VPHR and Provost may consult with the Office of the Senior Vice President and General Counsel, the Office of Safety and Security, and other university offices, as appropriate, to assist in the review.** The information received from background screenings will be **used only to determine the Finalist's qualifications and suitability for employment or engagement as determined by the university**, and will not be used to discriminate on any basis protected by applicable law or university policy.

A criminal record, negative credit history, or other adverse results are not an automatic bar to employment at the university. Assessments will be made on an individual basis, taking into account factors including, but not limited to, the passage of time and the severity, frequency, and nature of an adverse result, as well as its relationship to the position in question, and the implication for the general safety and security of the university community as well as the security of university assets.

A TRIBUTE TO JACK HARLAN FRIEDENTHAL
Howrey Professor of Trial Advocacy, Litigation, and Professional Responsibility

Professor Jack Harlan Friedenthal, who is retiring from the GW Law School at the end of the 2013-2014 academic year, is known nationally and internationally for his work in the areas of civil procedure and evidence. For tens of thousands of students and countless law professors, his name is synonymous with “civ pro” because of his leading casebook (*Civil Procedure: Cases and Materials*, with Miller, Sexton, & Hershkoff), now in its tenth edition (2010), and his canonical treatise (*Civil Procedure*, with Kane & Miller). As is described below, he has held numerous leadership positions in law schools and elsewhere, and he has made major contributions to legal scholarship. Yet what captures Jack Friedenthal most is that he is, in the words of Associate Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, “wholly without airs, uncommonly natural, and naturally nice.”*

Professor Friedenthal was a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Stanford (1953). He served for two years as a Private in the U.S. Army Financial Corps (where he distinguished himself once as “Soldier of the Month”), graduated from Harvard Law School in 1958 (Magna Cum Laude), and began teaching at the Stanford Law School. He spent the next summer serving as the Acting Deputy District Attorney in Ventura County, California, and then joined the faculty of Stanford Law School, where he progressed through the academic ranks in short order. In 1980 he became the George E. Osborne Professor of Law at Stanford, which position he held until he joined the GW Law School as Dean in 1988. Also while at Stanford, he served for three years (1984-1987) as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at the law school. He was a member of a range of committees at Stanford, and he was elected by the University-wide faculty to serve on the Stanford University Advisory Board, which reviewed all appointments, tenure decisions, and promotions at Stanford before they were submitted to the University President for approval.

While at Harvard, Jack met his wife, Jo Anne, who became a securities lawyer in San Francisco. The couple has three children: Ellen, Amy, and Mark. Jack was a devoted parent and he participated enthusiastically with his professional wife in raising their family. Nonetheless, in addition to his personal and professional activities already enumerated, he found time during those years to be a founding member of the San Francisco Neighborhood Legal Foundation and to help organize and manage the East Palo Alto Community Legal Services Office, both of which organizations provide legal services to low-income people.

Seeking an even greater series of challenges, Professor Friedenthal came to the George Washington University in 1988 to serve as Dean of the Law School, then known as the National Law Center. During his ten-year tenure as Dean, he “led the Law School in many ways including: negotiating a long term financial relationship between the Law School and the University which has allowed the Law School to flourish and expand for over twenty years, creating the first Board of Advisors to the Law School, inaugurating the appointment of Research Professors of Law and an expanded summer research grant program to encourage and recognize faculty scholarship, dramatically expanding the number and quality of faculty offices at the Law School, recruiting more than a dozen distinguished scholars from other leading law schools and an equivalent number of outstanding new teachers to expand and improve the Law Faculty, and building

* The Honorable Ruth Bader Ginsburg, “In Celebration of Jack Friedenthal,” *George Washington Law Review*, Vol. 78 (2009), p. 1.

a strong Development Office at the Law School to enhance its ability to reach out to alumni and others for financial support.”** As a result of Dean Friedenthal’s efforts, the Law School secured a position of prominence in the legal academy that has lasted until this day.

Equally important for the life well-being of the Law School was Dean Friedenthal’s habit of “walking the halls.” He would poke his head in offices with open doors and ask, “How’s it going? Anything I can do for you?” He treated all faculty with the same degree of respect and warmth, no matter how junior or senior, and he behaved similarly with staff at all levels. An example of the way Dean Friedenthal inspired so much affection and loyalty was the annual party that he and Jo Anne threw at their home at the beginning of each academic year for faculty and staff, their partners, spouses, and children—which event they have continued to host ever since. In addition to seeing that everyone is well supplied with delicious food and abundant drinks, the Friedenthal basement is turned into a play room for children, stocked with puppets, toys, and games, and overseen by babysitters. This lively party is often the first encounter that new faculty and staff have with the larger Law School community, and it signals to them the collegial and supportive side of the School’s hard-driving academic environment. If you can only make a first impression once, Jack and Jo Anne have mastered the art of first impressions.

During and since his tenure as Dean, Jack Friedenthal has continued to engage in public service in a multitude of ways. He served with distinction on this Faculty Senate from 2002-2005, chaired the Faculty Development & Support Committee for two years, and chaired the Athletics and Recreation Committee for eight years. He was Co-chair of the Committee on the Hiring and Retention of Women and Members of Ethnic Minority Groups at GW. He has been Special Master for cases between the National Football League Management Council and the NFL players, a Member of the Infractions Committee of the NCAA, a Member of the Eligibility Committee of the NCAA, a Bar Review Lecturer, a Consultant to a federal district court on actions by citizens of Guam against the US government, a Consultant to the Government of the Marshall Islands, a Consultant to the California Law Revision Commission and other law revision committees, and a Member of the National Architectural Accreditation Board.**

Professor Friedenthal has inspired generations of students with his intelligence, good judgment, decency, and attentiveness to their concerns. Long after they have forgotten the difference between issue preclusion and claim preclusion, they will remember his unique combination of intellectual and ethical virtues and that he always had the time and willingness to listen to their questions and concerns.

It will surprise no one that Professor Friedenthal plans to continue writing and volunteering during retirement. It is the heartfelt wish of this body that he enjoy these and more leisurely activities to the fullest, and we express our gratitude for the extraordinary contributions he has made to the Law School and the University.

The George Washington University Faculty Senate, May 9, 2014

** From the Emeritus Resolution of the George Washington University Law School Faculty

A Tribute to Janet Craig Heddesheimer

Professor of Counseling, Emerita

Janet Heddesheimer received her B.A. degree from Coe College in 1965, and her M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Ohio State University in 1968 and 1971, respectively. She began her career at GWU in 1973 as an Assistant Professor of Counseling. She retired at the end of the fall semester 2013 after 40 years of exceptional service.

Professor Heddesheimer served the University in numerous ways. She chaired the Department of Counseling, Human, and Organizational Studies from 1987 to 1990. She served as the GSEHD Associate Dean for Academic Affairs from 1990 to 2011. She served on the Faculty Senate from 1977 to 1981. During her Faculty Senate years she was a member of the Faculty Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies during 1979-1980; she chaired the Admissions and Advanced Standing Committee in 1980-1981.

Professor Heddesheimer has been a noted scholar and teacher. She has served on a number of editorial boards in Counseling and Supervision and has published numerous articles and monographs. These include a monograph on developing counseling skills among financial aid personnel, and a publication on the professionalizing of the teacher workforce. She obtained a number of grants. Notable among them was a grant to study stress among professional caregivers of AIDS patients and a grant to study the academic needs of Latin American youth.

Prior to her administrative years as an Associate Dean, Professor Heddesheimer developed a number of new courses in Counseling. She was known as a superior, challenging professor. She directed more than 50 dissertations in Counseling. As Associate Dean she developed guidelines for personnel actions, developed a faculty mentor program, and established protocols for financial aid awards to students.

We shall sincerely miss Professor Heddesheimer's warmth, collegiality, good humor, intellectual acumen, and kindness. We wish her great joy in retirement from the University and hope that she will remain active in many of our endeavors.

Read into the record of the Faculty Senate on May 9, 2014.

Tribute to Professor Richard Windsor
Professor Emeritus of Prevention and Community Health
Milken Institute School of Public Health

Dr. Richard Windsor's story as an academic is inspiring to all. He is an international leader in the treatment of tobacco addiction services to countless pregnant women. With 96 peer reviewed publications, Dr. Windsor made important contributions to the practice of public health in many areas, but none more than in the prevention of smoking among pregnant women. Through his Smoking Cessation and Reduction in Pregnancy (SCRIPT) treatment trials that he conducted over nearly a 30-year period, Richard Windsor developed effective tobacco control interventions that have improved the health not only for women and their children where he developed it, West Virginia, but also nationally and internationally.

After serving in the military, Dr. Windsor attained a B.S. in Community Health Education at Morgan State, an M.S. and a Ph.D. in Community Health Education at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign and a Master of Public Health at the Johns Hopkins University. He was an Assistant Professor at Hopkins before he was recruited to the University of Alabama at Birmingham, where he was promoted through the ranks, tenured, and eventually appointed to Chair the Department of Health Behavior in the University of Alabama at Birmingham School of Public Health. He joined the GW School of Public Health in 2004 as a professor with tenure. For three years he chaired the Department of Prevention and Community Health. During his time at GW, he has been a special assistant to the University of Alaska in the design and development of their program and school of public health.

Dr. Windsor tirelessly provided service to his Department and School, especially on all matters related to appointments, promotion and tenure policies. He also was an articulate leader on the issues of raising standards in doctoral training. He has been a strong and effective mentor to a generation of junior faculty members.

Richard Windsor was elected to represent the School of Public Health on the Faculty Senate and served one two-year term between 2008-2010 with distinction and dedication as a Senator protecting the rights and privileges of tenure. He served on several Senate Committees, including the Research Committee in 2001-02, the Physical Facilities Committee in 2006-07, and the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF) for three years from 2011 to 2014. He was unwavering in his role as a guardian of faculty rights as a Senator and as a member of the PEAF Committee. We have all deeply appreciated his service to the nation, the school and the university throughout his career at GW.

Read into the record of the Faculty Senate, May 9, 2014

The George Washington University
Faculty Senate Committee on
Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies
(including Fringe Benefits)

Final Report 2013-14
May 7, 2014

We had a busy year with four meetings held in the fall semester and another four meetings in the spring semester. Key issues considered this year are:

Medical and Prescription Drug Costs for 2014:

- Without plan design changes, active employee contribution rates would increase approximately 25% in 2014.
- With the proposed plan design changes, the increase would be approximately 12.5%.
- Cost increases are being driven by anticipated utilization, increased enrollment, and fees from Health Care Reform.
- Co-pays increased to be in line with the market.
- In 2014, the price of generic prescriptions will increase from \$10 to \$15.

What We Know About Our Population:

- 60% of covered individuals choose the Basic Plan.
- 40% of covered individuals choose the Basic plan for Individual/Employee only.
- 17% of covered individuals choose the High plan.
- GW does not give faculty cost of living raises, only merit raises, so the rising health care costs may translate into a reduction in the overall value of salary + benefits for our faculty.

Health Care Costs—Data on GW contributions: At the request of ASPP Committee, the Benefits Administration provided comparative data on the health care cost increases in the recent years as well as health care costs at some of the market basket schools. The market basket data indicates that our health care costs are lower than some of the comparable schools. While GW's contributions to Active Medical and Prescription Budget will be increasing in 2014 by 7.8%, Employee contributions will be increasing by 18.4%.

There was a discussion of the possibility of adding the members of the Medical Faculty Associates (MFA) to the GW health plan. This would be attractive because it would (i) reduce the cost of premiums for the MFA members and (ii) lower costs for the GW plan by adding roughly 1000 largely younger and healthy participants. The costs would be reduced for the MFA faculty because their group is too small to self-insure and it is not large enough to command a more favorable rate in the marketplace. This idea is currently being studied.

Timeline of Faculty Involvement in 2014 Benefits Discussions: The Committee Chair, in consultation with VP for HR, created a Timeline of Faculty Involvement in Benefits Discussion that was approved by the Committee and shared with the Provost and others. On April 23, the Provost met with select faculty members to discuss a circulating petition regarding the health care cost increases. Participants included some individuals who signed the petition as well as some members of the ASPP. Partly as a result of the meeting, the Committee Chair drafted a Resolution on Health Insurance Costs.

Resolution: “Resolution to request increased university contributions toward health insurance costs”

- Discussion about resolution: discussed impact on merit.
- We have an older “unhealthy population” which causes our claims to be high.
- Essentially saying that the faculty are asking the university to pay a higher percentage of health care costs which will reduce the merit pool.
- Faculty who don’t get health insurance through the university (perhaps use spouses’ benefit) will not benefit from this resolution – about ¼ of faculty and staff do not get university health care benefits. However, ¾ of the faculty and staff will benefit from increased university contributions.

The resolution was approved unanimously and sent to the Senate Executive Committee with a request for its placement on the agenda of the May 9 Faculty Senate meeting.

Faculty Salary Equity: Faculty Salary Equity Committee Chair Professor Steven Tuch and Associate Provost for Faculty Recruitment & Personnel Relations Annie Wooldridge attended our meetings to provide updates on their committee’s work. Their committee was charged in 2009 to identify salary differences at the university that might be attributable to factors like race, age, gender, etc. Using 2011 salary data, 111 low outliers were identified in Phase 1. In Phase 2, determination of possible non-discriminatory reasons for these outliers was made through information obtained from the Deans for 88 faculty members. A total of 23 cases still remain awaiting action by Provost’s office.

In many cases, Dean’s comments repeated references to the fact that salary issues have been addressed since the 2011 data. Thus the Salary Equity Committee recognized that more recent data needed to be considered. It recently examined 2013 salary data and identified 81 new outliers in Phase 1. Letters have been sent out to the Deans to obtain information on these new cases and the process is expected to be completed by the end of the academic year.

Faculty Salaries: The Provost presented a document *Core Indicators of Academic Excellence* to the Faculty Senate in February 2014; this document included the faculty salary data for 2012-13. Some highlights: teaching loads have decreased to an average of 9.7 credits yearly for full time faculty members; the student-faculty ratio has improved; average faculty salaries, in aggregate (including the law school but excluding medical salaries), have reached the 80% of AAUP benchmark averages at all ranks at GW. However, not all schools have reached the 60% of the AAUP averages -- all ranks in CCAS and the assistant professor rank of GSHED lag this significant benchmark. The Committee urged the administration to raise the salaries in those ranks and schools to 60% of the AAUP averages, as per the long-standing resolution of the Faculty Senate.

Faculty Handbook: Dianne Martin, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, presented both the outline/table of contents and physical copies of the handbook itself at several meetings of the ASPP committee. (Faculty Handbook will be online though annual snapshots in the form of a pdf file will be available.) Significant changes have been made to streamline the information contained in the Faculty Handbook to make it easier for faculty to navigate. It relies heavily on links to primary sources to ensure that the information remains up to date. The Committee approved the changes to the Faculty Handbook. Some of the changes are:

- The procedure for completing the I-9 has been revised to allow for online completion. There is also new language relating to foreign nationals appointed to the university. While the university cannot grant tenure to foreign nationals, there is now a procedure in place to help them attain resident status.
- The allowance for moving expenses has been raised.
- The parental childcare leave policy is now in the handbook, and conforms to language in the *Faculty Code*.
- The policy for short-term medical leave has been clarified. There is now a vendor involved in the gap between a 30 day leave that can be granted by departments/deans for short term disability and the six month timeline at which long term leave takes over.
- The language about numbers of courses to be taught by each faculty member has been clarified, giving chairs and administrators more leeway to act according to departmental needs and more in keeping with a research university. A range of courses is now provided for better transparency and consistency.
- Retiring or resigning faculty who do not have emeritus status will now have email access for one year following the personnel decision. There was no previous policy about that in the handbook.
- At the committee's recommendation, a statement about users of information technology will be added, along with a link to the IT webpage where such information can be found. This change will help faculty to know the limits under which their use of email currently operate.
- Both the new Smoke-Free Campus and Sexual Harassment Policies have been added to the handbook.
- The policies and procedures covering research will be unified across the document.

Diversity in Faculty Ranks: Vice Provost for Diversity/Inclusion, Terri Harris Reed attended our December 6 meeting to talk about increasing diversity at all levels of professoriate, and also how to increase diversity at the upper levels where the number of women Professors is only 25%. She discussed the need to increase the pool at the beginning of hiring process. As there will be 50 or more new hires according to the strategic plan, it is important to develop policies which increase diversity in hiring.

Review of the Faculty Code: There were several discussions of the Board of Trustees' plan to revise the *Faculty Code*. Different members of ASPP relayed the discussions at their academic units when BOT Chair Nelson Carbonell visited to explain the project. Questions were raised in many places about the projected deadline (approval by the BOT in May), but some members of ASPP said that Chair Carbonell was now planning to pursue a more realistic schedule.

Background Checks: All new faculty will have to undergo background checks which will include education, social security and criminal background checks. There may be additional checks, fiduciary or safety (like credit checks or drug screen) for certain positions. Policy will be effective immediately. Faculty must agree and will be part of the new faculty offer. This will be included in advertisements for employment (standard ad language). This will also be part of the new collective bargaining agreement.

Review of Promotion/Tenure Process at GW: Last year, the ASPP Committee examined the ways in which promotion and tenure procedures and criteria are communicated to Faculty – and navigated by Faculty, Chairs, and Deans - across the university. Several key points emerged during the ensuing discussion; these were made a part of the Committee Annual Report for 2012-

13. The Chair, on invitation from the Faculty Senate, gave a presentation on the Committee recommendations at the February 14, 2014 meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Respectfully Submitted,

Murli M. Gupta, Acting Chair
May 7, 2014

Acting Chair: Gupta, Murli M., Mathematics
Abravanel, Eugene, Psychology, Emeritus
Achrol, Ravi, Marketing
Galston, Miriam, Law
Kanungo, Shivraj, Decision Sciences
Kumar, Rakesh, Biochemistry
Marotta-Walters, Sylvia, Counseling
Monfared, Ashkan, Surgery, Neurosurgery
Pintz, Christine, Nursing
Plack, Margaret, Health Care Sciences
Rau, Pradeep, Marketing
Rosenbaum, Sara, Health Policy
Schanfield, Moses S., Professor of Forensic Sciences and of Anthropology
Sell, Susan, Political Science
Sidawy, Anton, Surgery
Wickenheiser, Adam, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering
Zaghloul, Mona, Engineering & Computer Science

Non-voting:

Acquaviva, Kimberly D., Nursing, Executive Committee Liaison (Fall)
Katz, Louis H., Executive Vice President and Treasurer
Harrington, Robert, Executive Committee Liaison (Spring)
Lerman, Steven, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
Martin, C. Dianne, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Shea, Mafona, GW Libraries Human Resources Client Partner, Gelman Library
Wirtz, Philip, Vice Dean for Programs and Education, GW Business School

**A RESOLUTION TO REQUEST INCREASED UNIVERSITY CONTRIBUTIONS
TOWARDS HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS (14/01)**

WHEREAS, costs of Medical and Rx plans have increased at a rapid pace (from \$40.3M in 2013 to \$44M in 2014) where the active employee contributions in 2014 increased by 12.5% (with Plan Design Changes), and

WHEREAS, these costs could have increased by larger amount (to \$46M) with active employee contributions increasing by 25% if copayments and deductibles were not increased in 2014 (without Plan Design Changes), and

WHEREAS, the university contributions to health and welfare benefits (consisting of medical, Rx, disability, life/AD&D, tuition, retirement, etc.) increased by 3.08% (from \$81.1M to \$83.6M) in 2014, and

WHEREAS, the projected increase in Medical and Rx contributions for active employees for 2014 is \$4.002M of which employees pay \$1.980M and the university pays \$2.022M, and

WHEREAS, the total projected Medical and Rx contributions for active employees for 2014 is \$12.761M which is 31.3% of total costs, while the university contributions for 2014 total \$27.995M which is 68.689% of total costs; the university contribution to these costs decreased from 70.6% to 68.689% while employee contributions increased from 29.33% to 31.3%, and

WHEREAS, the merit increase pool for 2014 was 3% which provided the 3% increase in university contributions to the health care costs, and

WHEREAS, many faculty received very little or no merit increases in 2014 while their health insurance costs increased substantially in 2014, **NOW,
THEREFORE,**

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

1. That the administration of the university and the Board of Trustees are urged to pay a higher proportion of the medical and Rx plan expenses out of the compensation pool without causing a decrease in percentage of the merit pool by more than $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1%; and
2. That any changes shall be communicated to the Faculty Senate in a timely manner.

**Faculty Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies
April 25, 2014**

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
2013- 2014 Academic Year

The PEAFF Committee met as a whole committee on October 9, 2013, January 16, February 11, March 25, and April 8 2014.

1. POLICY ON CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND COMMITMENT FOR FACULTY AND INVESTIGATORS

In response to recommendations from the Division of Grants Compliance and Oversight of the National Institutes of Health, which published guidelines on conflict of interest regulations for NIH funded universities, the administration proposed some amendments to the existing GW policy. PEAFF reviewed them and opined that they were minor clarifications of existing policy and did not change the substance of our approved policy. PEAFF then recommended adoption of the amended policy and developed Resolution 13/2: "A Resolution to Amend the Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment for Faculty and Investigators." The resolution was presented to the Faculty Senate on October 11, 2013 and passed.

While the approved policy met NIH guidelines, the administration felt that a new policy was needed to provide clearer guidance to faculty and investigators. Vice Provost Dianne Martin, as Chair of this university committee, formed an ad hoc committee which includes representatives from the Office of VP Research, representatives from each of the schools and me as Chair of PEAFF. Dr. Martin periodically reported to PEAFF on the status of the new policy and solicited input from PEAFF. At this time, the new policy is being developed and PEAFF will continue to be updated in the Fall semester.

2. PATENT, SOFTWARE, AND TANGIBLE RESEARCH MATERIALS POLICY

In Fall 2012, the GW Office of Technology Transfer, then under Dr. Charanjeet Guron, provided the subcommittee with a DRAFT "Patent, Software and Tangible Research Materials Policy" which was virtually newly written, rather than a revision of the current policy on "Patents and Scholarly Works". The current policy was adopted in April 1996 and revised in 2005. It was believed to be in need of major revision in view of changes in law and in the increased emphasis on research at GW. The PEAFF subcommittee reviewed the draft policy provided by Dr. Guron with an eye to fairness to the university, particularly with respect to the use of university resources, fairness to the inventors, and the effect of the policy on the ability of the university to encourage participation in generating commercializable intellectual property. The subcommittee sent the draft policy to a wide spectrum of stakeholders in the university community and requested comprehensive reviews. Reviewers included current and past faculty inventors, research administrators, IP Law faculty, and the Faculty Senate Committees on Research and Fiscal Planning and Budgeting. The response was excellent. Based on this response, the PEAFF subcommittee submitted numerous changes and recommendations on December 12, 2012. To date, no official administrative response to the heavily amended patent policy has been obtained, largely

because of the departure of Dr. Guron and the reorganization of the Office of Technology Transfer.

PEAF reinitiated discussions with the Office of Entrepreneurship under James Chung, the Office of Technology Transfer under Dr. Steven Kubisen, and Assistant Vice President for Industrial Research Thomas Russo. Dr. Kubisen gave a presentation on new initiatives and discussed preliminary issues concerning the patent policy. It was agreed that PEAFF would form a subcommittee to work with Dr. Kubisen in amending the draft patent policy so as to provide an incentive for faculty to participate in intellectual property development at GW. At this time, there has been no work done concerning this policy.

3. FACULTY GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK

In May of 2013, the GW Board of Trustees passed a resolution calling on Board of Trustees (BOT) Chair Nelson Carbonell to form a committee of trustees, faculty and administrators to review and recommend any appropriate changes to the *Faculty Code* and other associated governance documents, which define respective roles in a system of shared governance. Chair Carbonell affirmed that the shared governance system has served the university well for decades and will continue to serve us well in the future. The purpose of this initiative by the BOT is to improve the system of shared governance in light of the strategic plan, Vision 2021, also passed by the BOT in May 2013, and our shared aspirations for a better university.

The Task Force was established and many meetings were scheduled to discuss governance issues with a wide variety of groups and contexts. Plans were made for further input from faculty through a website and an on-line survey.

While the extensive fact-finding effort of the Task Force was applauded, it was considered essential that any changes to the *Faculty Code* or faculty policies recommended by the Task Force shall adhere to the university's long established and unbroken tradition and procedures of shared governance. This tradition requires the Faculty Senate, as the elected representative of the Faculty, to consider and act on changes that are proposed by the administration, the BOT, or other members of the university community before such changes are submitted to the BOT for final action. To this end, PEAFF presented to the Faculty Senate on November 8, 2013 resolution 13/3: "A Resolution on the Established Procedures for Approving any Changes to the Faculty Code or Faculty Policies that may be Recommended by the Board of Trustees Governance Task Force." The resolution passed unanimously.

The Task Force identified five areas which need to be addressed in the faculty governance framework:

- i. Academic Freedom
- ii. Participation in governance
- iii. Appointment, promotion, and tenure criteria and procedures.
- iv. Appointment and review of deans and other senior academic administrators
- v. School, Departmental, Center and Institute rules and procedures.

Concerning Area 1, academic freedom, the PEAFF engaged in extensive discussions with the Task Force and Chair Carbonell. From these discussions, amendments were created for Section II of the Faculty Code which emphasized that academic freedom applies to the extended classroom and reinforced the obligation of faculty, administrators, students, and trustees to act with civility and acknowledge the right to express differing opinions, and for free expression of ideas on and off the campus. PEAFF approved "A Resolution to Amend the *Faculty Code* with Respect to Academic Freedom." This resolution will be presented to the Faculty Senate on May 9, 2014.

In discussions with the Task Force, it was agreed that changes in the other four areas will require time and deliberation before changes in governance documents can be made. The PEAFF was requested for input on how implementation of changes might be made. After extensive discussions between PEAFF and the Task Force, the following process was recommended:

- (a) Four working groups will be established, each to address one of the areas.
- (b) The Task Force will prepare a charge for each of the working groups clearly specifying the scope of their work.
- (c) The BOT would assign chairmanship of a working group to a member of the BOT.
- (d) The working group would be composed of board members, faculty, and administration.
- (e) Advice in providing members from the faculty would be sought from the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.
- (f) The Executive Committee will be offered the opportunity to concur on faculty members selected for each working group.
- (g) Members of the working group would be selected based on their expertise and experience in the specific focus area.
- (h) Resources will be provided by the BOT for administrative support and possible invitation of guests from other institutions, or possible site visits by working group members.

It is understood that the working groups will be established and commence work during the summer months. It is anticipated that there will be close coordination between the working groups and the Executive Committee during the summer .

4. **FACULTY HANDBOOK**

The Faculty Handbook was last revised in 1999 and is widely considered to be out of date. The Faculty Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policy (ASPP) took the lead in working with the administration to revise the Faculty Handbook, particularly with a view towards benefits issues. After making several amendments, ASPP approved the revised version of the Faculty Handbook on January 31, 2014. In February, PEAFF was then asked to review this version and amend as needed. A PEAFF subcommittee on the Faculty Handbook was established consisting of Professors J. Butler, J. Cawley, C. Garris, L.

Robinson, and A. Wilmarth. Several concerns were raised and recommendations made. The subcommittee worked closely with Vice Provost Martin and all issues were resolved and an amended version was accepted by PEAFF and the Provost's office. PEAFF had planned to submit a resolution to the Faculty Senate recommending adoption of this amended Faculty Handbook. However, the Office of General Counsel requested that the Faculty Handbook in its present form not move forward until they had the opportunity to make further changes. At present, the Faculty Handbook revision process is on hold pending recommendation of amendments from the OGC.

5. COPYRIGHT POLICY

The current GW Copyright policy was originated on October 11, 1990, and was last amended on April 1, 2005. Due to changes in copyright law and in current practice concerning electronic dissertations, the policy was updated by the Provost's office in collaboration with the library and the OGC. The amended version was distributed to PEAFF for comment. PEAFF identified at least one issue that needed clarification. It is planned to present a resolution to the Faculty Senate to accept the amended copyright policy once this issue is resolved.

Respectfully Submitted,

Charles A. Garris, Jr. Chair

*Chair: Garris, Charles A., Jr., Engineering
Ben-Tzvi, Pinhas, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering
Biles, Brian , Health Policy
Butler, Joan, Clinical Research and Leadership
Cawley, James, Prevention & Community Health
*Castleberry, Michael, Special Education and Disability Studies
Darr, Kurt J., Health Services Management & Leadership
Frey, Jennifer Rebecca, GSEHD - Special Education
Irwig, Michael, Medicine
Kyriakopoulos, Nicholas, Engineering
Loew, Murray, Engineering
Malliarakis, Kate Driscoll, Nursing
McDonnell, Karen, Prevention & Community Health
Price, Marie, Geography
Robinson, Lilien F., Art History
Roth, Katalin, Medicine
Teitlebaum, Joel, Health Policy
Watkins, Ryan, Educational Leadership
Wilmarth, Arthur E., Jr., Law
Windsor, Richard, Prevention and Community Health

Non-voting:

Vinson, Ben , Dean, Columbian College of Arts and Sciences

Bezanson, Deborah Associate University Librarian for Research & User Services, Gelman Library
Maggs, Gregory, GW Interim Dean, GW Law School
*Marotta-Walters, Sylvia, Executive Committee Liaison, GSEHD-Counseling
Martin, C. Dianne, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Weitzner, Richard, Associate General Counsel

*Member of the Faculty Senate

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Charles A. Garris, Chair

May 9, 2014

I would like to extend my congratulations and a warm welcome to the newly-elected members of the Faculty Senate. All of us look forward to working with you.

On behalf of the Executive Committee, I have the following report:

RESOLUTIONS

The Faculty Senate adopted six resolutions during the 2013-14 session. Of those, three Resolutions have been forwarded to the President for his response.

Resolution 13/1 concerning the adoption of a revised Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence Procedures Policy, and Resolution 13/2 concerning amendments to the Conflicts of Interest and Commitment Policy were approved by the President. No formal response to Resolution 13/3 concerning the Established Procedures for Approving any Changes to the *Faculty Code* or Faculty Policies that may be recommended by the Board of Trustees Governance Task Force has as yet been received.

As customary, the remaining resolutions for the 2013-14 session (all three introduced by the Senate Educational Policy Committee) summarized below will be forwarded to the President for administrative response.

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

Resolution 13/4 recommends that, effective with courses taught in the fall 2014 semester, the "I" indicator on student's transcripts be removed once an actual grade has been reported and recorded. The University's current policy retains the record of "Incomplete" grades on students' transcripts even after a final grade has been assigned for the course. Following agreement that minor editorial changes be made to standardize the format of the Resolution, Resolution 13/4 was adopted as amended.

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

Resolution 13/5 encourages faculty to assign graded work early in the semester, but no later than the fifth week of the semester. It also encourages faculty to enter information about students' academic performance, especially those who are doing substandard work, into the Faculty Feedback System in Banner as soon as this information is available so that it can be accessed by undergraduate school and athletic advisors. An amendment was made to the Resolution to make it clear that this procedure would apply to alert "undergraduate" students. Following agreement that minor editorial changes be made to standardize the format of the Resolution, Resolution 13/5 was adopted as amended.

RESOLUTION 13/6, “A RESOLUTION TO UPGRADE INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS SEEKING TO REGISTER FOR COURSES”

Resolution 13/6 was formulated by the Educational Policy Committee after the Student Association made a request to Vice Provost Ehrmann that the Senate might look at this issue with respect to the way in which students who want to register fairly early on in the process, particularly online, could get more information about courses they were interested in. This was referred by the Senate Executive Committee to the Educational Policy Committee.

The Resolution expresses the view that students deserve adequate information before registering online, and they may wish to know whether their own interests and major concentrations will be advanced by courses they would choose. Further, faculty teach best to students who have selected courses appropriate to their interests. Consequently, Resolution 13/6 encourages faculty to submit to the Registrar one of three kinds of information about each course to be offered the following semester:

- A draft syllabus for the upcoming term, clearly designated as tentative and subject to revision before the course begins, or
- a syllabus used in a previous version of the course, clearly marked as subject to change, or
- a form provided by the Registrar including such information as the course aims in a paragraph briefly describing what students will be expected to learn.

Following discussion by the Senate, an amendment to the Resolution by the addition of the phrase “submission may be on an individual basis or through the faculty member’s department. or school” was moved, seconded and approved. Resolution 13/6 was adopted as amended by unanimous vote.

Resolutions adopted by the Senate today, May 9, 2014, are formally a part of the Senate’s 2014-15 session. We plan on forwarding these to the President along with the remaining resolutions from the 2013-14 session. When the administrative response to all of the resolutions is received, it will be distributed to members of the Faculty Senate with the Senate’s agenda.

PERSONNEL MATTERS

Nonconcurrences

The Executive Committee has received three administrative nonconcurrences with faculty personnel recommendations in late April. Two originated in the School of Business, and the other in the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences. The Executive Committee will conduct its customary review of these cases and provide its recommendations to the administration as soon as these can be scheduled.

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

During the 2014-15 session, the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (PEAF) will consider recommendations concerning the nonconcurrency process devised by the Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies (ASPP). Professor Gupta, Chair of the ASPP Committee, reported on these recommendations at the Senate meeting on February 14th. The PEAF Committee's recommendations will be submitted to the Executive Committee once their review of these recommendations is complete.

OTHER MATTERS

As reported at the April 11th Senate meeting, the work of the Task Force on Faculty Governance will continue through the 2014-15 session. As was explained by Chair Carbonell at the April 11 Faculty Senate meeting, four working groups will be formed by the Task Force over the summer to address specific areas for improvement in our shared governance system. The Executive Committee expects to collaborate with the Task Force to recommend faculty to participate in these working groups. This will be a very important effort towards modernizing and strengthening our shared governance system. The Executive Committee will seek your support in providing committed contributors to carry out the tasks of each working group.

A new full-time faculty organization known as the "George Washington University Faculty Association" has emerged. Currently, it has over 100 members. Professor Rehman and I met with members of the organization's steering committee. From our lengthy discussions, it became clear that the goals of the GWUFA correspond closely with those of the Faculty Senate. We therefore strongly encouraged them to work within the Faculty Senate committee structure through membership in the committees and interaction in various ways. We emphasized that they will certainly have a voice through the Faculty Senate in bringing issues of importance to the attention of the administration and to the faculty. The GWUFA will have a meeting on May 14, from 1 to 3 p.m., and I plan to attend. I would also encourage other Senators to attend so we can be more responsive to their concerns.

Several proposed changes to the Copyright Policy are expected from the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Once these are received, the recommendations will be forwarded to the PEAF Committee for its review and recommendations.

The long-awaited revision of the Faculty Handbook is nearly complete. The new Handbook was revised extensively and approved by the ASPP and PEAF Committees in close collaboration with the Provost's Office; however, the Executive Committee has been advised that the University's Office of the General Counsel has now made a few additional changes. We expect these proposed changes to be forwarded to the Executive Committee for further review as soon as they are available.

ANNUAL REPORTS

The Annual Report of the Chair of the Senate Executive Committee for the 2013-14 session of the Faculty Senate will be distributed with the agenda for the September 12th Senate meeting.

Chairs of Senate Standing Committees for the 2013-14 session who have not yet submitted annual reports for their respective Committees should do so during the coming week so that these reports can be distributed with the minutes of today's meeting.

The Faculty Senate committees are the backbone of our shared governance system. All of the hard work resulting in carefully reasoned and well-articulated recommendations comes from the committees. It is essential that our committees are strengthened with strong leadership and committed faculty. It is therefore very important that every Senator take part in at least one committee. Two committees are even better. I strongly encourage any Senator who does not belong to a Senate Standing Committee to join. Sue can sign you up today, but you can decide at your leisure over the summer.

The Executive Committee urges the newly-constituted Standing Committees to begin their work as soon as possible and to hold their first meetings at the beginning of the fall semester. Over the summer, the Executive Committee will send to Committee Chairs various matters for consideration by their Committees.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Report to the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees submitted for their May 2014 meeting is included with the minutes of this meeting.

The next regular Senate meeting is scheduled for September 12, 2014. Resolutions and/or reports to be included on the agenda for this meeting should be submitted to the Executive Committee and the Senate Office no later than August 15th.

On behalf of the Executive Committee, I would like to express our appreciation to Board of Trustees Chair Nelson Carbonell, Richard Blackburn, Mark Hughes, and Madeleine Jacobs for their leadership on the Board of Trustees' Governance Task Force. Their unprecedented engagement with the faculty, their efforts to learn the inner workings of the University, and their collaborative approach to working with the faculty for the betterment of George Washington University is gratefully acknowledged.

We would also like to express our appreciation to Vice Provost Martin for her tireless efforts to work with the faculty in creating better policies and flow of academic information.

We would like to thank the many new emeriti and retirees for the excellent service they have provided to the Faculty Senate and the University. Their wisdom and service will be missed in the future.

In conclusion I would like to extend my best wishes to all of the members of the Faculty Senate for an enjoyable and productive summer.

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE FACULTY SENATE TO THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES**
Scheherazade S. Rehman, Chair
April 21, 2014

JANUARY MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Report on Research

Vice President for Research Leo Chalupa presented a Report on Research that included information on research expenditures and indirect costs for the University from fiscal years 2009 through FY 2013. Information on extramural expenditures and indirect costs for the first quarter of fiscal years 2009 through 2014 were also provided. He included information on sources of overall research funding as well as a breakdown of federal funding sources. Also included were metrics for the Office of Technology Transfer.

A second focus of the Report was on initiatives undertaken by the Office to help faculty become more efficient in obtaining research funding. These include launching a principal investigator dashboard, and providing, in partnership with the Provost's office, staff to work in schools with the open budget model. A monthly newsletter and Sponsored Projects Handbook have been published, The Office has also conducted a Principal Investigator summit to provide information to faculty about securing research funding. A boot campus for new faculty is now offered for faculty, particularly new faculty, to learn to put together grant applications. There is also a series of monthly lunches with senior faculty who are very successful in research, so that they can offer their feedback about the research climate at the University, and for new faculty in research-oriented disciplines, so they can get acquainted with the Office's staff and that staff can learn what they can do to make these faculty members functional and competitive in obtaining grants.

FEBRUARY MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Report from the University Librarian

University Librarian and Vice Provost for Libraries Geneva Henry presented a Report which described her vision for the Library in the context of the four themes and goals of the University's newly-adopted Strategic Plan. She then outlined how the Library can contribute to the achievement of these goals through activities associated with each of the themes and goals, first, through fostering cross-disciplinary collaboration between faculty and students and serving as a meeting ground for bringing the whole community together and providing education for innovative communications across the disciplines. In the area of facilitating cross-disciplinary collaboration, Library staff are already very engaged in facilitating teaching and learning as well as building on their engagement in the local community and exploring partnerships with them. In the area of globalization, the Library has a key role to play as it already has a global resource center and a significant number of unique collections. These are building and growing. In addition to serving as a hub that celebrates and supports cultural differences in terms of a common meeting ground, particularly for students, the Library also fosters engagement with the international community surrounding the University through its outreach programs.

In the area of governance and policy, education around information policies, open access and law are some of the things that GW students should know about. The Library provides education about what can and cannot be done with information, what copyright means, and educates students about open access and alternatives to traditional copyright. Another area in which librarians are closely involved is in working with information used by research teams. This requires not only understanding important issues associated with the use of increasingly large datasets, but working collaboratively with many other parts of the University to ensure that information about these is communicated to the University community. Partnering with federal agencies is also important in the data management and policy areas as new policy mandates are issued. Librarians communicate the impact of these mandates on the academy and help these agencies shape and refine the mandates so that they are not only observed but do not impede the ability of researchers to conduct their research. In the area of citizenship and leadership, the University Library's Special Collections provide a natural platform for this theme in terms of making primary source materials available to faculty and students. Resources such as the new National Churchill Library and Center that will coming into the Gelman Library will provide a unique perspective on leadership, as will the acquisition of the Washingtoniana Collection, which will provide a unique opportunity for researchers to examine these materials from a citizenship and leadership perspective.

Librarian Henry also outlined her priorities for the libraries, the first being getting research back into the libraries, primarily by engaging librarians with faculty research. The libraries can also offer shared facilities where research about information is underway. While librarians are already very engaged in providing information that enhances teaching and learning, the demands for them to be in the classroom exceed the hours that they can physically do so. Discussions are underway about creating online modules for faculty and student use outside the classroom. A third priority, already mentioned, concerns enhancing the University's Special Collections while at the same maintaining the core collections. Enhancing collaborations across the campus and the community is the fourth priority, and last but not least is creating an environment to provide what students will need to be competitive in the 21st century. There will be an increased need for training faculty and students in new media, and for the Library to be able to offer access to a multimedia lab and Global Information System capabilities along with work stations and appropriate software to enhance the ability of researchers to manage and analyze data. This latter will be particularly important as the libraries partner more on grants and providing services that will enhance the ability to secure these.

ANNUAL REPORT ON CORE INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

Provost Lerman presented this annual report to the Senate. This year's report includes all of the information presented to the Board of Trustees, however a new dashboard segment has been added at the beginning which outlines information about the quality of the incoming freshman class over the last ten years and profiles the median SAT and ACT scores of freshman matriculants. Also included is information about undergraduate student graduation rates after four and six years of study and information about students' post-baccalaureate plans six months after commencement. The percentage of master's and doctoral level students employed at graduation is also included, as is data on

the student-faculty ratio and information provided by Vice President for Research Leo Chalupa at the January meeting of the Senate.

Information on Faculty Composition is provided in the Report with respect to the number and percentage of regular, active-status tenure-track and tenured faculty in the schools. A breakdown of these faculty by school is included in the Report. This section also contains data about full-time underrepresented faculty over a span of ten years. Also reported are faculty teaching loads and faculty salary data.

The final segments of the report provide information in detail on undergraduate and certificate program enrollments as well as enrollments in master's and doctoral programs, the Law School, and the Medicine and Health Sciences areas.

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE NONCONCURRENCE PROCESS

Professor Murli Gupta, Acting Chair of the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee, presented recommendations concerning the nonconcurrency process formulated by a subcommittee and approved the whole Committee. The following suggestions were made for faculty and administrators to consider as they align expectations with guidelines in connection with the promotion and tenure process:

- i. Schools are advised to establish “appointment, promotion, and tenure” orientation sessions where deans and chairs of APT Committees talk directly with new faculty and provide them with the specific school policy in writing or direct them to it on-line.
- ii. Faculty are reviewed against the criteria that are in place for them at the time of their hiring, or as indicated in their appointment letters.
- iii. All school APT Guidelines are communicated in writing as well as orally.
- iv. Faculty are encouraged to ask about the process at every level as they are charting their course towards their ultimate goal of promotion or tenure.
- v. Faculty are encouraged to maintain ongoing portfolios of their accomplishments as they move toward promotion or tenure.
- vi. Departmental chairs and APTs do due diligence throughout the review process, to include reviewing for alignment with annual reviews, three year contract reviews, and final reviews for promotion and tenure.
- vii. Departmental APT committees explicitly state the balance expected from faculty in the three areas of research, education and service. Departmental APTs align their procedures and reviews so as to meet university deadlines.
- viii. The Provost's office establishes specific deadlines for promotion and tenure application submissions and communicates such deadlines to various schools and faculty.

Following Professor Gupta's remarks, Professor Rehman indicated that the Executive Committee would forward the Committee's recommendations to the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom for its consideration and recommendations.

REPORT OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

In her report to the Senate, Professor Rehman, Chair of the Executive Committee advised the Senate that Professor Kurt Darr, Chair of the Dispute Resolution Committee, had advised the Executive Committee and the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom that the University Administration was not in compliance with *Faculty Code* requirements to provide requested copies of documents relevant to a grievance currently in process. Professor Rehman requested that the Administration rectify this so that the grievance could proceed in a timely fashion.

Provost Lerman responded to this concern by informing the Senate that the Administration had provided access to all of the documents associated with the grievance in process. It has not, however, provided physical copies of these documents in large part due to confidentiality of information concerns. He said this was not in any way an effort to withhold information from the grievance committee, rather, it concerned only the form in which access to the information would be provided. He characterized this as a procedural interpretation question, because all of the information is available to the grievance committee in terms of access rather than physical copies.

Professor Rehman responded to these remarks by saying that, while she sympathized and agreed with a number of the Provost's comments, the grievance process outlined in the Faculty Code is quite clear – both parties to a grievance have the right to copy materials relevant to a grievance.

MARCH MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION 13/4, “A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE POLICY ON RETAINING INCOMPLETE GRADES ON STUDENTS’ TRANSCRIPTS ”

Professor Robert J. Harrington, Chair, of the Educational Policy Committee, introduced the Resolution, which recommends that, effective with courses taught in the fall 2014 semester, the “I” indicator on student’s transcripts be removed once an actual grade has been reported and recorded. The University’s current policy retains the record of Incomplete grades on students’ transcripts even after a final grade has been assigned for the course. Following agreement that minor editorial changes be made to standardize the format of the Resolution, Resolution 13/4 was adopted as amended.

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

On behalf of the Educational Policy Committee, Professor Harrington, Chair, introduced the Resolution. Resolution 13/5 encourages faculty to assign graded work early in the semester, but no later than the fifth week of the semester. It also encourages faculty to enter information about students’ academic performance, especially those who are doing substandard work, into the Faculty Feedback System in Banner as soon as this information is available so that it can be accessed by undergraduate school and athletic advisors. An amendment was made to the Resolution to make it clear that this procedure would apply to

alert “undergraduate” students. Following agreement that minor editorial changes be made to standardize the format of the Resolution, Resolution 13/5 was adopted as amended

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

Chair Carbonell introduced members of the Faculty Governance Task Force present at the meeting and reported on the work of the group. He began by citing an excerpt from the Board Resolution adopted last year which was the impetus for the work of the task force in examining shared governance, and it states that the Board of Trustees recognizes the value of shared governance and of a strong and constructive relationship between the faculty and the administration.

Chair Carbonell also described the first three phases of the task force’s process of initiating as broad a dialogue as possible about faculty governance at the University. The first phase consisted of school-based meetings to discuss governance with faculty members from every school. Chair Carbonell’s report listed all of the meetings in which the task force has engaged. At these meetings, the task force posed a series of questions focused on the way in which GW’s governance system intersects with the University’s aspirations and its Strategic Plan, and whether or not the present governance model is suitable for what the University is trying to accomplish. The first part of phase two involved task force engagement in a series of town hall meetings. The focus of these town hall meetings provided an opportunity to engage with faculty at a second level and examine in more detail principles the task force had begun to formulate in response to feedback obtained from meetings in the schools. The last piece of phase two consisted of the task force’s meeting with the Senate at its meeting on March 21, after which an electronic survey would be distributed to faculty that would request responses to a series of questions to further elicit as much feedback as possible.

Phase three of the task force’s work will consist of forming and presenting its recommendations. Five guiding principles in draft form were presented, those being: expanding participation in governance for all full-time faculty; the promotion of academic freedom for all faculty as the University becomes more global and online; the alignment of appointment, promotion and tenure procedures with the University’s aspirations, along with ensuring consistent, transparent and high-quality processes and results across the entire University; defining a consistent and appropriate role for the faculty and the administration in the selection, performance appraisal and retention of deans and other senior academic administrators; and, with respect to school, departmental, center and institute rules and procedures, the creation of a consistent framework of faculty titles, policies and procedures across the University, while providing for the unique needs of each unit.

At the conclusion of his remarks, Chair Carbonell indicated that he and the task force would continue to meet with members of the Senate’s Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom to continue their discussions on relevant issues, as well as with the Senate Executive Committee and the Senate as a whole.

APRIL MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

RESOLUTION 13/6, "A RESOLUTION TO UPGRADE INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS SEEKING TO REGISTER FOR COURSES"

Professor Robert J. Harrington, Chair, of the Educational Policy Committee, introduced the Resolution. The Resolution expresses the view that students deserve adequate information before registering online, and they may wish to know whether their own interests and major concentrations will be advanced by courses they would choose, and further, faculty teach best to students who have selected courses appropriate to their interests. Consequently, Resolution 13/6 encourages faculty to submit to the Registrar one of three kinds of information about each course to be offered the following semester:

- A draft syllabus for the upcoming term, clearly designated as tentative and subject to revision before the course begins, or
- a syllabus used in a previous version of the course, clearly marked as subject to change, or
- a form provided by the Registrar including such information as the course aims in a paragraph briefly describing what students will be expected to learn.
- Resolution 13/6 was amended by the addition of the following language following the bullet points listed:

Submission may be made individually or through the faculty member's department or school

Resolution 13/6 was adopted as amended by the Senate.

DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE FACULTY GOVERNANCE TASK FORCE

Nelson A. Carbonell, Jr., Chair of the GW Board of Trustees attended the Senate meeting along with members of the task force. He provided a process update, noting that the promised electronic faculty survey had been distributed. Once that process is closed, the task force will begin to finalize and present its recommendations. In addition, the task force's website is open for comment, with the option to provide both direct e-mail comment and anonymous submissions. All of the documents the task force has produced or has been using thus far, including the University Charter and Bylaws, the *Faculty Code*, and notes from all of the task force's meetings, have been posted to the site.

Chair Carbonell reviewed the draft guiding principles provided to the Senate at its March meeting and said these have framed the questionnaire distributed.

Based on strong feedback received from faculty, the task force framed and discussed with the Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Freedom a resolution to amend the *Faculty Code* section on academic freedom. The task force and the PEAFC Committee collaborated in two meetings to refine and edit the draft resolution, following which the

Committee approved the resolution and sent it forward to the Senate Executive Committee. It is expected this Resolution will be considered at the May 9th Faculty Senate meeting.

The task force will in the next step in the process propose the creation of working groups composed of faculty, administrators, and trustees to provide recommendations concerning each of the remaining four guiding principles [expanding participation in governance for all full-time faculty; the alignment of appointment, promotion and tenure procedures with the University's aspirations, along with ensuring consistent, transparent and high-quality processes and results across the entire University; defining a consistent and appropriate role for the faculty and the administration in the selection, performance appraisal and retention of deans and other senior academic administrators; and, with respect to school, departmental, center and institute rules and procedures, the creation of a consistent framework of faculty titles, policies and procedures across the University, while providing for the unique needs of each unit.]

Working group membership, charters and timelines will be developed in collaboration with the administration and the Faculty Senate. The working groups will be chartered by the Board of Trustees Committee on Academic Affairs and it is expected their recommendations will be formulated and proposed during the 2014-15 academic year.

REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE LYTERATI PROJECT (FACULTY ANNUAL REPORTING SYSTEM)

Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Dianne Martin provided an update on the work of the Faculty Information System Advisory Committee (FISAC) which was established at the request of the Faculty Senate due to unhappiness expressed by faculty members about the initial module's format. The Committee was composed of Senate members, as well as other faculty members, and administrators responsible for the establishment of the reporting system.

Vice Provost Martin reviewed the Charge to the Committee, and reviewed key conclusions the group had reached concerning the confidentiality of data entered into and retained in the system, what data is confidential, and whether or not the information can be searched (faculty members can opt out of this).

During the next phase of this process, the FISAC will continue to monitor the 2014 annual report process and provide input on any new modules for the Lyterati system. FISAC will also provide recommendations for a GW Faculty Finder initiative that will combine Lyterati data with VIVO. Vice Provost Martin's complete Report will be included with the minutes of the April 11th Senate meeting once these are posted to the Senate website.

May 9, 2014

FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEES
2014-15 Session

STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRS

2014-15
Executive
Committee
Liaison

- | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|
| 1. | APPOINTMENT, SALARY, AND PROMOTION POLICIES
(INCLUDING FRINGE BENEFITS)
Chair: Professor Robert J. Harrington | Galston |
| 2. | ATHLETICS AND RECREATION
Chair: Professor Roger Fairfax | Brazinsky |
| 3. | EDUCATIONAL POLICY
Chair: Professor Michael S. Castleberry | Price |
| 4. | FISCAL PLANNING AND BUDGETING
Chair: to be elected | Swiercz |
| 5. | HONORS AND ACADEMIC CONVOCATIONS
Chair: Professor Scheherazade S. Rehman | Lantz |
| 6. | LIBRARIES
Chair: Professor David W. McAleavey | Galston |
| 7. | PHYSICAL FACILITIES
Chair: Professor Kim Roddis | Sidawy |
| 8. | PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM
Acting Chair: Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr. | Garris |
| 9. | RESEARCH
Chair: to be elected | Lantz |
| 10. | UNIVERSITY AND URBAN AFFAIRS
Chair: Professor Kathryn Newcomer | Pulcini |
| 11. | JOINT COMMITTEE OF FACULTY AND STUDENTS
Acting Faculty Co-Chair: Professor Jennifer Frey | Marotta-
Walters |

***Member of the Senate**

The most current Committee List is available online at www.gwu.edu/facsen/faculty_senate/pdf/CmtList.pdf

MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEES
2014-15 Session

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The list of Executive Committee members for the 2014-15 session can be found at this link:

http://www.gwu.edu/%7Efacsen/faculty_senate/execcom.html

DISPUTE RESOLUTION COMMITTEE

Chair: Professor Kurt J. Darr (SPHHS)

APPOINTMENT, SALARY, AND PROMOTION POLICIES, (INCLUDING FRINGE BENEFITS)

*Chair: Robert J. Harrington, Engineering and Applied Science
Anbinder, Tyler, History
Gupta, Murli M., Mathematics
LeLacheur, Susan, Phys. Asst. Studies
Maring, Joyce, Physical Therapy
*Marotta-Walters, Sylvia, Counseling
Plack, Margaret, Prof., Physical Therapy
Rau, Pradeep, Prof., Marketing
Williams, James, International Education and & International Affairs
Schanfield, Moses S., Forensic Sciences

Non-voting:

*Galston, Miriam Executive Committee Liaison
Katz, Louis H., Executive Vice President and Treasurer
Lerman, Steven, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
Martin, C. Dianne, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Shea, Mafona, GW Libraries Human Resources Client Partner, Gelman Library
Stewart, Andrea W., Gelman Library (alternate)

ATHLETICS AND RECREATION

*Chair: *Fairfax, Roger A., Jr., Law
Barron, Mary J., Exercise Science
Falk, Nancy, Nursing
McHugh, Patrick, Management
Westerman, Beverly, Exercise Science

Non-voting:

*Brazinsky, Gregg A., Executive Committee Liaison
Brown, Ann, Reference and Instruction Librarian, Gelman Library
Julien, Andre, Assistant Athletic Director
Director of Athletics and Recreation
TBD, Student Liaison
Warner, Mary Jo, Senior Associate Director of Athletics and Recreation

***Member of the Senate**

The most current Committee List is available online at www.gwu.edu/facsen/faculty_senate/pdf/CmtList.pdf

EDUCATIONAL POLICY

- *Chair: Castleberry, Michael S., Special Education and Disability Studies
- Carter, Geoffrey, English
- Han, Zhiyong, Biochemistry
- Jakeman, Rick, Educational Leadership
- Robinson, Lilien F., Fine Arts and Art History (to be elected)
- Rowe, Walter, Forensic Science
- Schwartz, Daniel, History
- Seavey, Ormond, English
- Turley, Clinical Research and Leadership
- *Weiner, Robert, International Business

Non-voting:

- Amundson, Elizabeth A., Registrar
- Beil, Cheryl, Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Assessment
- *Price, Marie D., Geography and International Affairs Executive Committee Liaison
- Feuer, Michael J., Dean, Graduate School of Education and Human Development
- Gaspar, Debbie, Coordinator of Education and Instruction, Gelman Library
- TBD, Student Liaison
- Konwerski, Peter, Vice Provost and Dean of Student Affairs
- Small, Daniel, Executive Director, Student Financial Assistance

FISCAL PLANNING AND BUDGETING

- *Chair: to be elected
- Biles, Brian, Health Policy
- Buchanan, Neil H., Law
- Cherian, Edward, Information Systems and Technology Management
- Cordes, Joseph, Economics
- Dimri, Goberdhan, Biochemistry
- Lang, Roger, Electrical and Computer Engineering
- *Parsons, Donald O., Economics
- Tielsch, Global Health
- Yezer, Anthony M., Economics

Non-voting:

- Beheler, Melia, Director of Finance and Administrative Operations (Gelman alternate)
- Brown, Michael E., Dean, Elliott School of International Affairs
- *Swiercz, Paul, M., Management, Executive Committee Liaison
- Charles, Leroy, Assistant Vice President for Health Affairs
- Katz, Louis H., Executive Vice President and Treasurer
- Lerman, Steven, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Maltzman, Forrest, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Planning
- Morsberger, Mike, Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations
- Rose, Vanessa R., Chief Budget Officer
- Stewart, Andrea W., Gelman Library

***Member of the Senate**

The most current Committee List is available online at www.gwu.edu/facsen/faculty_senate/pdf/CmtList.pdf

HONORS AND ACADEMIC CONVOCATIONS

*Chair: Rehman, Scheherazade S., International Business and International Affairs

*Castleberry, Michael S., Special Education and Disability Studies
Friedman, Leonard, Health Services Management and Leadership
Ingraham, Loring J., Professional Psychology
Plack, Margaret, Physical Therapy

Non-voting:

Baldassaro, Sarah G., Assistant Vice President for Communications
TBD, Student Liaison
Kinniff, Jennifer, Public Services and Outreach Librarian, Gelman Library
Lantz, Paula M., Health Policy Executive Committee Liaison
Martin, C. Dianne, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Zeljak, Cathy, Director, Global Resources Center, Gelman Library (alternate)

LIBRARIES

*Chair: McAleavey, David W., English
Ahlquist, Karen, Music
Harizanov, Valentina, Mathematics
Lunsford, Beverly, Nursing
Robinson, Edward, Forensic Science
Stott, Richard, History

Non-voting:

Linton, Anne, Director, Library Services, Himmelfarb Health Sciences Library
*Galston, Miriam, Executive Committee Liaison
Pagel, Scott B., Director, Law Library

PHYSICAL FACILITIES

*Chair: Roddis, W. Kim, Civil and Environmental Engineering
Helgert, Hermann J., Engineering and Applied Science
Anderson, Catherine, Interior Design
Gallo, Linda L., Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Emeritus
Gudenus, Carl, Gudenus, Theatre and Dance
King, Michael M., Chemistry
Pericak, Arlene, Nursing

Non-voting:

Amundson, Elizabeth A., Registrar
Beheler, Melia, Director of Finance and Administrative Operations, Gelman Library
Sidawy, Anton, Surgery, Executive Committee Liaison
Katz, Louis H., Executive Vice President and Treasurer
O'Neil Knight, Alicia M., Senior Associate Vice President for Operations
TBD., Student Liaison

***Member of the Senate**

The most current Committee List is available online at www.gwu.edu/facsen/faculty_senate/pdf/CmtList.pdf

PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Acting Chair: Wilmarth, Arthur E. Jr., Law
 Biles, Brian, Health Policy
 Butler, Joan, Clinical Research and Leadership
 *Castleberry, Michael S., Special Education and Disability Studies
 Cawley, James, Prevention and Community Health
 Frey, Jennifer, Special Education
 Homayounpour, K. Cyrus, American and Saudi Arabian Dialogue Education Center
 Loew, Murray, Electrical and Computer Engineering
 Robinson, Lilien F., Fine Arts and Art History
 Roth, Katalin, Medicine
 Ruth, Richard, Professional Psychology
 Teitelbaum, Joel, Health Policy
 Vayas, Amita, Prevention and Community Health

Non-voting:

* Garris, Charle A., Jr., Executive Committee Liaison, Engineering
 Maggs, Gregory, Interim Dean, GW Law School
 Bezanson, Deborah Associate University Librarian for Research & User Services,
 Gelman Library
 Martin, C. Dianne, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
 Weitzner, Richard, Associate General Counsel
 Vinson, Ben, Dean, Columbian College of Arts and Sciences

RESEARCH

<p>*Chair: to be elected Casey, Andrea, Human and Organizational Learning *Diab, Mona, Computer Science Dimri, Goberdhan, Biochemistry Nixon, Douglas, Microbiology, Immunology and Tropical Medicine</p>	<p>Przytycki, Jozef H., Mathematics Shin, Peter, Health Policy Williams, James, International Education and International Affairs</p>
---	---

Non-voting:

Vinson, Ben , Dean, Columbian College of Arts and Sciences
 Chalupa, Leo M., Vice President for Research
 Dolling, David S., Dean, School of Engineering and Applied Science
 *Lantz, Paula, Health Policy, Executive Committee Liaison
 Mandeville-Gamble, Steven, Associate University Librarian for Collections and Scholarly Communication, Gelman Library
 TBD, Student Liaison

***Member of the Senate**

The most current Committee List is available online at www.gwu.edu/facsen/faculty_senate/pdf/CmtList.pdf

UNIVERSITY AND URBAN AFFAIRS

***Chair: Newcomer, Kathryn, Public Policy and Public Administration**
Jacobson, Leslie, Theatre and Dance
LeLacheur, Susan, Physician Assistant Studies
Wetenhall, Tanya Theatre and Dance

Non-voting:

Bergis, Jules, University Archivist, Gelman Library
Cannaday Saulny, Helen, Associate Vice President, Student and
Academic Support Services
Cohen, Amy, Executive Director, Civic Engagement and Public Service
Demczuk, Bernard, Assistant Vice President for District of Columbia Affairs
***Pulcini, Joyce, Nursing, Executive Committee Liaison**
Katz, Louis H., Executive Vice President and Treasurer
Konwerski, Peter, Senior Associate Vice President and Dean of Students
Robinson, Sammie, Associate Director, Undergraduate Admissions
Scarboro, Donna, Associate Vice President for International Programs
TBD, Student Liaison

***Member of the Senate**

The most current Committee List is available online at www.gwu.edu/facsen/faculty_senate/pdf/CmtList.pdf

The following Committee is not a Standing Committee of the Faculty Senate, but is listed for information:

JOINT COMMITTEE OF FACULTY AND STUDENTS

Faculty Members:

Acting Co-Chair: Frey, Jennifer, Special Education

Abell, Bruce M., Surgery

Diab, Mona, Computer Science

Han, Zhiyong, Biochemistry

Lunsford, Beverly, Nursing

Student Members

To be submitted by the Student Association
(Student Co-Chair and 6 student members)

Non-voting:

Beil, Cheryl, Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Assessment

Guenther, Roy, Executive Associate Dean, Columbian College of Arts and
Sciences

Konwerski, Peter, Vice Provost and Dean of Student Affairs

Marotta-Walters, Sylvia, Counseling, Executive Committee Liaison

Varasteh, Aria, Student Liaison, (Gelman Library staff appointee)

* Wooldridge, Annie B., Assistant Vice President, Faculty Recruitment and Personnel

***Member of the Senate**

The most current Committee List is available online at www.gwu.edu/facsen/faculty_senate/pdf/CmtList.pdf