The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, January 15, 2010 at 2:10 p.m. in the State Room, 1957 E Street, N.W., 7th Floor.

AGENDA

1. Call to order

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of December 11, 2009 (to be distributed)

3. A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE WITH RESPECT TO THE PARTICIPATION OF RESEARCH FACULTY IN THE GOVERNANCE OF THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND HEALTH SERVICES (09/3) Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (The Resolution and Report are attached.)

4. Introduction of Resolutions

5. Report on Research: Vice President for Research Leo M. Chalupa

6. Report on the School of Engineering and Applied Science: Dean David S. Dolling

7. General Business
   a. Report of the Executive Committee
   b. Interim Reports of Senate Standing Committees: Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies, Physical Facilities, Research, Joint Committee of Faculty and Students (The Reports are attached)
   c. Chair’s Remarks

8. Brief Statements (and Questions)

9. Adjournment

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary
A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE WITH RESPECT TO THE PARTICIPATION OF RESEARCH FACULTY IN THE GOVERNANCE OF THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND HEALTH SERVICES (09/3)

WHEREAS, Article I.B.1 of the Faculty Code requires that at least 75% of the regular, active-status faculty members in each school must hold either tenured or tenure-accruing appointments, except for (i) faculty in the Law School and in the College of Professional Studies, and (ii) faculty in the Medical Center who are “stationed at affiliated institutions”; 

WHEREAS, Article I.B.1 of the Faculty Code requires that at least 50% of the regular, active-status faculty members in each department of a school must hold either tenured or tenure-accruing appointments, except for (i) faculty in the Law School and in the College of Professional Studies, and (ii) faculty in the Medical Center who are “stationed at affiliated institutions”; 

WHEREAS, Article I.B.1 of the Faculty Code plays a vital role in supporting the University’s commitments to academic excellence and shared governance because:

(1) Article I.B.1 ensures that most regular, active-status faculty members will have an opportunity to earn tenured status and, accordingly, will have strong incentives to achieve excellence in teaching and scholarship by satisfying peer-reviewed standards of academic rigor, independence and objectivity; and

(2) Article I.B.1 also ensures that (i) faculty members who participate in governance of schools and departments will be regular, active-status faculty members who are engaged in all three major areas of faculty responsibility (namely, teaching, productive scholarship, and service to the University, professional bodies and the public) as set forth in Articles IV.A.6.b) and IV.B.1 of the Faculty Code, and (ii) the predominant group of such faculty members will have the opportunity to earn tenured status and thereby obtain appropriate independence in carrying out the shared responsibility of regular, active-status faculty in University governance pursuant to Article IX of the Faculty Code and Parts A through D of the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code (“Procedures”);

WHEREAS, the School of Public Health and Health Services (“SPHHS”) is a school that is subject, without exception, to the requirements of Article I.B.1 of the Faculty Code;

WHEREAS, as discussed in the attached report of the Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (“PEAF Report”), the composition of the regular, active-status faculty of the SPHHS has not complied with Article I.B.1 since the founding of the SPHHS in 1997;
WHEREAS, for more than seven years, the Faculty Senate and its Committees have made sustained efforts to persuade the SPHHS to come into compliance with Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code, including the following:

(1) On April 14, 2002, the Faculty Senate adopted Resolution 01/11, in which the Faculty Senate called on the Dean of the SPHHS to develop a plan to bring the SPHHS into compliance with Article I.B.1 by the Fall semester of 2007, but the SPHHS failed to develop such a plan or achieve such compliance;

(2) In May 2008, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate sent a memorandum to the Dean of the SPHHS, in which the Executive Committee requested that the Dean of the SPHHS provide, not later than September 19, 2008, a detailed, comprehensive plan to bring the SPHHS into compliance with Article I.B.1. within a reasonable period not to exceed five years;

(3) On September 24, 2008, Interim Dean Josef J. Reum of the SPHHS sent the Executive Committee a preliminary draft of a plan to bring the SPHHS into compliance with Article I.B.1 within the requested five-year period, and the Executive Committee referred Interim Dean Reum’s draft compliance plan to a Special Joint Subcommittee on Compliance by the SPHHS with the Faculty Code (“Joint Subcommittee”),

(4) After consultation with the Joint Subcommittee, Interim Dean Reum submitted a revised compliance plan on February 2, 2009, and the Joint Subcommittee advised the Faculty Senate, at its meeting on March 13, 2009, that the revised compliance plan appeared to be feasible and appeared to provide a reasonable basis for bringing the SPHHS into compliance with Article I.B.1 by 2013;

(5) As shown on Figure 1 attached to the PEAF Report, based on information provided by the Office of Medical Center Faculty Affairs and Program Development (“OMCFAPD”), the number of regular, active-status faculty with tenured or tenure-acrueing appointments in the SPHHS increased from 17 in 2007 to 29 in 2009, while the number of regular, active-status faculty with non-tenure- accruing (“NTA”) appointments increased from 20 to 30; and

(6) The Joint Subcommittee submitted a report to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on October 26, 2009 (“Joint Subcommittee Report”), which expressed “reservations on the validity of the [the SPHHS compliance] plan as well as the guidelines being used to implement the proposed plan,” and the Report further explained that “our reservations center around the lack of specific Faculty Code compliance criteria and processes needed for legitimate search establishment and operations and [faculty appointment, promotion and tenure committee] selection and tenure issues.” The Joint Subcommittee Report specifically noted a “lack of formal process and criteria for faculty (and indeed Dean) selection, promotion and tenure” decisions at the SPHHS; and
WHEREAS, during its repeated efforts to persuade the SPHHS to come into compliance with Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code, the Faculty Senate and its Committees have become aware of the very significant (and potentially decisive) role played by research faculty in the governance of the SPHHS, as follows:

(1) In the fall semester of 2008, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee began to discuss with the University Administration the launching of a search for a new Dean of the SPHHS that would comply with the Faculty Code;

(2) During the course of those discussions, the Executive Committee learned that the SPHHS has a large number of research faculty who do not hold regular, active-status appointments but who actively participate in the governance of the SPHHS pursuant to an asterisked footnote to Part A of the Procedures, on page 18, which provides: “In the governance of the Medical Center, all faculty eligible for membership in the Medical Center Faculty Assembly shall be eligible to participate wherever the term ‘regular’ faculty appears in this document”;

(3) As explained in the PEAF Report, the footnote on page 18 of the Procedures was added to the Faculty Code in the mid-1970s, long before the founding of the SPHHS in 1997, and was intended to provide governance rights in the University’s Medical Center to clinical medical faculty and research medical faculty who worked in the four existing units of the Medical Center, all of which provided medical education and medical care services at that time (namely, the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, the University’s Hospital, the University’s Health Plan, and the University’s Medical Faculty Associates). Neither the Faculty Senate nor the University’s Board of Trustees specifically discussed the desirability of applying the footnote on page 18 of the Procedures to governance matters arising within the SPHHS when the SPHHS was established as a new school within the Medical Center in 1997;

(4) As discussed in the PEAF Report, the number of research faculty in the SPHHS has grown rapidly in recent years, during the same period of time that the Faculty Senate has repeatedly called upon the SPHHS to come into compliance with Article I.B.1. of the Faculty Code. According to information provided by OMCFAPD and shown on Figure 1 attached to the PEAF Report, the number of research faculty in the SPHHS has increased from 11 in 2002 to 26 in 2007 and 45 in 2009; and

(5) As further indicated in the PEAF Report, research faculty in the SPHHS have joined with NTA faculty to dominate the governance of the SPHHS since the school’s founding, as indicated by (i) service by research faculty as voting members of committees that determine the appointment, promotion and tenure of regular, active-status faculty members within the SPHHS, and (ii) most recently, the refusal by research faculty and NTA faculty in the SPHHS to agree to a
Dean’s search process that would conform to Part C.2.of the Procedures by establishing a core search committee consisting solely of tenured faculty members. Instead, despite the intervention of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, the core search committee established for the current Dean’s search in the SPHHS includes five tenured faculty members, two faculty members who hold NTA appointments and two research faculty; and

WHEREAS, members of the research and NTA faculty in the SPHHS are frequently appointed on short-term contracts, may be subject to substantial influence from the administration of the SPHHS and therefore lack the scholarly independence that a tenured faculty position confers and requires; and

WHEREAS, in schools within the University outside the Medical Center, research faculty do not participate in the governance of schools and departments because they do not hold regular, active-status appointments under Article I.B.1 of the Faculty Code and, instead, hold research staff appointments under Article I.B.4 of the Faculty Code. Consequently research faculty in schools outside the Medical Center are not counted for purposes of applying the 75% and 50% requirements set forth in Article I.B.1; and

WHEREAS, research faculty do not enjoy comparable rights of participation in the governance of the schools of public health at The Johns Hopkins University and Columbia University, which are schools with nationally-recognized standards of academic excellence that the SPHHS aspires to emulate and surpass; and

WHEREAS, even if the SPHHS achieved compliance with the 75% and 50% requirements set forth in Article I.B.1 of the Faculty Code, the continued participation of research faculty in the governance of the SPHHS pursuant to the asterisked footnote on page 18 of the Procedures would defeat the purposes of Article I.B.1. Under those circumstances, the combined numbers of research and NTA faculty could still prevent tenure-accruing faculty from exercising their Code-guaranteed rights to develop academic standards of excellence in the SPHHS with respect to (i) the appointment, promotion and tenure of faculty, (ii) the appointment of academic administrative officers, and (iii) the development of curriculum and academic programs; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate therefore believes that the SPHHS will not achieve true compliance with Article I.B.1 of the Faculty Code and Parts A through D of the Procedures, and will not fulfill the University’s aspirations for academic excellence, unless the asterisked footnote on page 18 is amended to remove the SPHHS from the scope of that footnote;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

1. That the asterisked footnote to Part A of The Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code (“Procedures”), on page 18, be amended to read as follows:
In the governance of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, all faculty of that School who are eligible for membership in the Medical Center Faculty Assembly shall be eligible to participate whenever the term “regular” faculty appears in this document.

2. That, upon adoption of the foregoing amendment by the University’s Board of Trustees, the Dean of the School of Public Health and Health Services (“SPHHS”) shall take immediate steps to develop governance procedures for the SPHHS that shall bring the SPHHS into full compliance with Parts A through D of the Procedures not later than December 31, 2010.

3. That the Dean of the SPHHS shall submit a report to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee not later than January 31, 2011, describing the steps taken by the SPHHS to achieve full compliance with Parts A through D of the Procedures.

4. That the report by the Dean of the SPHHS referred to in Paragraph 3, above, shall also (i) describe the progress made by the SPHHS in moving toward full compliance with Article I.B.1 of the Faculty Code and (ii) provide an estimated date for achieving full compliance with that provision.

Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom of the Faculty Senate December 18, 2009
Report by the Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom on Participation by Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Research Faculty in the Governance of the School of Public Health and Health Services

December 18, 2009

Background

In the mid-1970s, an asterisked footnote was added to the GWU Faculty Code. That footnote, found on page 18 of the Faculty Code, states: "In the governance of the Medical Center, all faculty eligible for membership in the Medical Center Faculty Assembly shall be eligible to participate whenever the term 'regular' faculty appears in the document." In the mid-1970s the Medical Center was comprised of four University-owned and controlled entities, all of which were engaged in providing medical education and medical care services: the GWU Medical School, the GWU Medical Faculty Associates, the GWU Hospital, and the GWU Health Plan. Establishment of the School of Public Health and Health Services (SPHHS) did not occur until 1997—two decades later.

Current Situation

The Medical Center Faculty Organization Plan states in Article II. The Medical Center Faculty Assembly, Section 1. Membership, that:

The voting membership of the Faculty Assembly shall consist of all faculty members in the following grades of academic service:

1. Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor.
2. Clinical Professor, Professorial Lecturer, Associate Clinical Professor, Associate Professorial Lecturer, Assistant Clinical Professor, Clinical Instructor, Lecturer, Special Lecturer, Adjunct Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Instructor.
3. Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, Assistant Research Professor, Research Instructor

In addition, such members of the Administrative Board as might not otherwise be qualified for membership shall be members of the Faculty Assembly.
The foregoing list includes the full range of faculty ranks included in the Medical Center Faculty Assembly. No distinction is made as to whether voting members of the Medical Center Faculty Assembly are tenured or nontenured faculty, or whether voting members hold regular, active-status appointments or research appointments. The footnote on page 18 of the *Faculty Code* has been interpreted to mandate that all like-designated faculty members in the SPHHS are eligible to vote, in the same manner as regular active-status faculty, on all matters pertaining to governance of the SPHHS.

The long-term impact of the footnote on page 18 has resulted in undue influence over the governance of the SPHHS by non-tenure-track (NTT) regular, active-status faculty and by research faculty, who total 75 in 2009. In contrast, only 28% (29 of 104) of the faculty members in the SPHHS in 2009 are regular, active-status faculty members with tenured or tenure-track appointments (please see Figure 1, attached). As also shown on Figure 1, the composition of the regular, active-status faculty in the SPHHS has not complied at any time since the school’s founding in 1997 with Article I.B.1. of the *Faculty Code*. Article I.B.1. requires that at least 75% of the regular, active-status faculty in the SPHHS, and at least 50% of the regular, active-status faculty in each department, must hold tenured or tenure-accruing appointments.

A plurality of the NTT and research faculty in the SPHHS is located in the Department of Health Policy. Figure 1 shows the very significant growth of NTT and research faculty in the SPHHS, especially since 2003. The number of NTT faculty has grown from 11 to 30 between 2003 and 2009, while the number of research faculty has increased from 12 to 45 during the same time period. The information on Figure 1 was provided by the Office of Medical Center Faculty Affairs and Program Development.

As indicated above, the footnote on page 18 of the *Faculty Code* makes no distinction between tenured and untenured faculty, or between regular, active-status faculty and research faculty. NTT and
research faculty are ineligible for tenure. Unprotected by tenure, NTT and research faculty members are at significant risk of control and undue influence by administrators in the units in which they are appointed.

**Consequences of the Footnote on Page 18**

In violation of Part B.2. of the *Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code*, research faculty have served on appointment, promotion and tenure (APT) committees within departments of the SPHHS. Also in violation of Part B.2., research and NTT faculty serving on APT committees have voted on recommendations for faculty appointments with tenure.

A recent example of the undue influence of NTT and research faculty can be found in AY 2008-2009, when tenured faculty in the SPHHS sought to develop a *Code*-compliant dean search process. The tenured faculty’s efforts to establish a *Code*-compliant search process were thwarted repeatedly during a year-long effort because the footnote on page 18 of the *Faculty Code* allowed NTT and research faculty to participate fully. This problem could not have occurred in any school of the University outside the Medical Center. Despite numerous meetings with, and mediation by, the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (EVPAA), the efforts to establish a *Code*-compliant process were deadlocked. Finally, in July 2009, the EVPAA acted to establish a dean search committee that is a hybrid of tenured (5 members) and NTT and research (4 members) faculty. This dean search committee (and, therefore, the dean search process) does not comply with Part C.2. of the *Code Procedures*. It has been characterized, however, as a one-time exception to the requirements of the *Faculty Code* that recognizes (and remedies) the impasse that the presence of the footnote on page 18 had caused within the SPHHS, in order to initiate the long-delayed start of the SPHHS dean search.

A review of the Columbia University *Faculty Handbook* and the policies and procedures issued by the office of the dean of The Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Public Health reveals no comparable provisions that grant research faculty the level of participation in governance that they have in
the SPHHS. Research faculty members at these two prominent schools of public health are recognized in various ways, but they are not given full and equal participation in governance.

The unintended consequences of the footnote on page 18 of the *Faculty Code*, which clearly undermine *Code*-compliant faculty governance in the SPHHS, must be remedied if similar problems are to be avoided in the future.

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
December 18, 2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Non Tenure Track</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Tenure/Tenure Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1**

School of Public Health and Health Services
Non Tenure, Research and Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty 1997-2009
**Prior to 2004 - no tenure track**
The ASPP Committee met three times during the Fall 2009 semester. The following are the issues discussed and actions taken.

**Assessment of faculty performance.** The charge to ASPP asked us to continue our consideration of the current state of assessing faculty performance at GW. This year’s Committee read the report on assessment of faculty teaching that was produced at the end of 2008-2009. This report was a product of a joint subcommittee formed by ASPP and PEAF.

Based upon a University-wide survey, the report concluded that different academic units employ different methods of assessment of faculty teaching. It was also the opinion of the subcommittee that this diversity is desirable and that no change to existing methods of assessment of faculty teaching was necessary. After a full discussion, the members of ASPP agreed with the conclusions of the report. The members of PEAF similarly discussed the report and concluded that there was no need for change.

**Retirement plans’ investment options.** The Committee decided to appoint a subcommittee to review the investment options available for the University’s retirement plans to see if the options should be expanded. Ravi Achrol and Murli Gupta volunteered to serve on the subcommittee, which will work in consultation with the Benefits staff. At the December meeting, they presented a summary of their meeting with Jennifer Lopez, Executive Director Tax, Payroll and Benefits Administration and her group. ASPP members also discussed the large differences in management fees charged by different funds and expressed their concern that default funds may be among the more expensive options. The subcommittee was asked to continue its deliberations on these issues and to have addition meetings with Jennifer Lopez.

**Policy Change at Smith Center Pool.** Historically, faculty who are members of the Health and Wellness Center were permitted to use the pool at the Smith Center at specific times each week. Last year, after the Smith Center renovations, faculty were notified that this benefit would no longer be available. After discussion ASPP decided to recommend that this policy should be reversed and faculty should again be allowed to use the pool during specific hours of the day. Gene Abravanel volunteered to research this issue further and report back to the Committee.

**Changes in SMART TRIP policy.** In January of 2010, Metro planned to create three purses for the SMART Trip program – one purse for pretax funds, one for parking and one for money contributed by faculty/staff – not pre-tax. GW was unaware of this policy change till someone read it in the Washington Post. The DC Government delayed the change for the time being. Richard Lanthier will to monitor the issue and report back to the Committee.

Respectfully,

Miriam Galston, Chair ASPP

1/6/10
During the Fall semester 2009 the Senate Committee on Physical Facilities met twice.

At its first meeting the committee travelled to the Virginia Science and Technology Campus, where it received a briefing by AVP Craig Linebaugh on the status of the campus physical infrastructure and plans for future construction. AVP Linebaugh reported on plans for migrating offices from Research I to Research II in order to provide more space in Research I for laboratories, and discussed the status of plans for the construction of the Transportation Research Building. He also offered a comprehensive summary of the various ongoing research projects and the associated laboratories.

At its second meeting Hermann Helgert gave a report on the activities during the Summer and Fall 2009 in connection with the Science and Engineering Complex. Significant events included:

- The engagement of Boston Properties to manage the process of planning, design and construction of the SEC
- The appointment of an Operating Committee that includes representatives from the Administration, the Faculty Senate, SEAS, CCAS, and Boston Properties.
- The hiring of Ballinger Architects in October 2009 to conduct the programming and benchmarking of the SEC.

During November and December 2009 Ballinger engaged in a series of meetings with representatives of the administration, as
well as with the deans of SEAS and CCAS and the chairs of relevant SEAS and CCAS departments. In addition, Ballinger conducted two faculty forums open to all SEAS and CCAS faculty and met on several occasions with the Operating Committee.

Also at the second meeting of the committee Associate Vice President for Academic Operations Jeffrey Lenn provided an update on the status of the classroom renovation activities and the building projects at the Mt. Vernon Campus.

Members: Linda Gallo, Hermann Helgert (Chair), Hugo Junghenn, Edward L. Murphree, Margaret Plack, David Ullman

Ex-Officio: Alicia O’Neil, Elizabeth Amundson, Brian Biles (Executive Committee Liaison), Juan Ibanez, Louis Katz, Jeffrey Lenn, Jean Pec
The Faculty Senate Research Committee met once during the fall semester.

At that meeting Prof. Hotez called to order and members of the Committee introduced themselves. Participants included:

Boyce (Music); Chiappinelli (Pharm/Phys); Donaldson (Biology); Friedman (HSML); Hawley (Anat/Reg. Biol); Jeremic (Biology); Martin (Cardiology); Wright (HCSc); Ishizawa (Sociology)
Ex-officio: Chalupa and Simon
Bottazzi – note taker

A brief introduction was done by Professor Hotez on the agenda topics. Vice President for Research Leo Chalupa also provided an update on the current landscape and the strategies to advance research at GWU. He mentioned that GWU is in the process of merging the financials and budgets between Med Center and the main GWU campus. In addition, he mentioned that there will be an announcement that as an incentive program up to 6% and 4% of Indirect Cost Recoveries (ICR) will be returned back to Principal Investigators and Department Chairs, respectively. In addition Deans will receive 2% ICRs back. Dr Chalupa was in full agreement that the topics presented in the agenda were sound and that the involvement of the Faculty Senate on any of those would be of tremendous help.

The Committee deliberated on moving forward as a major theme an investigation into the following possible areas:

1. Evaluation of the research landscape at GWU in comparison to its market basket schools.
2. Developing a strategic vision for GWU research.
3. An assessment of the “geography” of science at GWU, and the concern that development of new research space at GWU is being pursued as one of independent entities, including the SEC complex, C06 renovations in Ross Hall, the Loudoun Virginia campus, a new initiative in Fairfax county with INOVA Hospital, and a new research building jointly sponsored by Children’s National Medical Center and the Washington VA Hospital.
4. The absence of coordination between GWU Medical Center and the basic sciences, i.e., physics, chemistry, biology, mathematics (with CCAS) and bioengineering and computational sciences (at SEAS), which so far has hindered applications for the NIH new discovery pathways of the NIH roadmap.
5. Near total absence of physician investigators at GWU Medical Center with only three physician scientists remaining on the entire campus.

Based on these deliberations, the Committee decided to focus primarily on item 3, i.e., the development of a report for the Faculty Senate to address specifically the current and future geography of science at GWU and also item 4, i.e., on how this geography would impact the gaps between Medical Center and Main Campus.
Next steps: the Committee will schedule on a monthly basis during the Spring 2010 semester the following sessions:

1. A meeting with the planning architects and Boston Properties to gather information about the plans for the SEC building
2. A meeting with the Virginia Campus task force to gather information about the plans for Loudon County campus
3. A meeting with Dietrich Stephan who heads the IGNITE Institute in Fairfax, VA.
4. A meeting with Payette (the architects involved in the renovations for Ross Hall) to discuss the plans once the CO6 grants are awarded to GWU

Based on these sessions, the Research Committee will provide an assessment of how to begin integrating these new research opportunities into a coherent framework, as well as efforts to integrate the medical campus with the basic sciences and engineering.

In addition, proposed revisions to the resolution on open access for scholarly articles were reviewed and several comments were provided to Dr Simon to be forwarded to Professor Scott Pagel. In summary the Committee seeks clarifications on a more defined definition of “articles” primarily as it refers to creative arts.
The JCFS met three times during the Fall Semester, 2009 (September 22, October 29, November 19).

In addition to those matters stipulated by the Senate’s Executive Committee* the JCFS put the following matters on its academic year agenda:

1. Access to language tutors
2. Flood of Infomail from university administration to students
3. Educating on LGBT issues
4. University scholarship monies not available to foreign nationals.

The Language Center has a very limited number of tutors and these tend to be work-study students. The Language Departments would be able to extend the services of part-time faculty for the purpose of tutoring, but these departments don’t have the funds to provide such services. Private classes outside of GW are available, but at a steep per hour price. We understand from the information we’ve received that it is desirable to increase the availability of language tutoring for our students.

The administration has established an ad hoc infomail task force under the leadership of Assistant VP David Steinour. We hope that VP Steinour can meet with the committee in the spring semester. The issue surrounding the amount of infomail sent to students is that students are automatically deleting these mailings without reading them because the students feel overwhelmed by the number of such mailings.

With the Senate, the President, and the Board having passed the resolution last May regarding an alteration of the university’s non-discrimination policy to assert “gender identity” as a protected category,
we believe that the university is working positively to protect the rights of lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, and transgendered students.

Item #4 above has not yet been discussed.

*The issue of academic advising structures was not discussed in detail, though a meeting between Professor Wade and Associate Dean of CCAS Paul Duff has taken place and the content of this meeting will be presented to the committee in the spring semester.

Respectfully Submitted,
Alan Wade, Faculty Co-Chair
January 5, 2010