CALL TO ORDER

The Assembly was called to order by President Knapp at 2 p.m. He welcomed all of the members of the Assembly and extended a special welcome to the new faculty members present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular Faculty Assembly held on October 30, 2009 were approved as distributed.

President Knapp requested and received the consent of the Assembly to change the order of the agenda so that the new faculty introductions and the announcement of Bender Teaching Award recipients could be made following remarks by the University’s new Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, Steven Lerman.

REMARKS BY STEVEN KNAPP, UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

President Knapp’s remarks are included with these minutes.

THE PROVOST, A NEW ROLE, A NEW MODEL

Provost Lerman’s remarks are included with these minutes.

NEW FACULTY INTRODUCTIONS

Provost Lerman introduced newly-appointed faculty from each of the Schools listed on the agenda, asking them to stand as a group. The Assembly greeted the new faculty members with applause.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RECIPIENTS OF THE BENDER TEACHING AWARDS

Provost Lerman advised the Assembly that the formal presentation of the Bender Teaching Awards would take place at a new Faculty Honors Ceremony scheduled for the spring semester, 2011. He then asked that recipients stand when their names were read. The following faculty members were recognized in the category indicated: General Teaching
Recognition: Jeffrey Brand-Ballard, Associate Professor of Philosophy and Takae Tsujioka, Assistant Professor of Japanese; Outstanding Teaching by a Non-Tenured, Full-Time Faculty Member: John Sides, Assistant Professor of Political Science; Use of Innovative Technology: Maria Matta, Assistant Professor of Decision Sciences, and Christine Pintz, Assistant Professor of Nursing. The Assembly applauded these faculty members in turn.

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Professor Michael S. Castleberry, Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, welcomed everyone to the Assembly, including a special welcome to new faculty and emeriti faculty present. He said he thought that new faculty had made a terrific decision in deciding to come at this exciting time to be a part of the life of the University. GW has a very active Faculty Senate with a long record of shared governance and two-way communication between the faculty and the administration. New faculty members can access Faculty Senate agendas, minutes, and other information, including the current Faculty Code and Faculty Organization Plan on the Senate website at: http://www.gwu.edu/~facsen/

Professor Castleberry briefly mentioned highlights from the Senate Report (attached to these minutes), including a summary of Resolutions adopted during the 2009-10 Senate session. One Resolution adopted at the beginning of the 2010-11 session endorsed the creation of a new School of Nursing at GW. The Administration and the School of Nursing worked on this for a long time, and the Faculty Senate established a Committee to participate in the process. The work of this Committee will continue, in part to support the School’s efforts to come into compliance with Faculty Code requirements. The Senate is also expected to entertain a Resolution to provide for representation for the School on the Senate and the Senate Executive Committee. Other matters covered in the Faculty Senate Report include a summary of personnel actions (grievances and nonconcurrences), and reports made to the Senate during the session.

Professor Castleberry agreed with the Provost in his expression of appreciation for Don Lehman, the former Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, and for the former Dean of the Law School, Fred Lawrence, who brought low-key guidance and an incredible sense of humor to the many forums in which he participated during his years at GW. Professor Castleberry also noted that the Senate adopted a Resolution of Appreciation during the 2009-10 session recognizing Professor Lilien Robinson’s exceptional service to the Senate, where she served for 14 years as Chair of the Executive Committee, and over 3 decades as an elected representative. Professor Robinson’s diplomacy, sound judgment, and exceptional leadership skills have been a key factor in the effectiveness of the Senate during her years of service.

Professor Castleberry concluded his remarks by saying that he thought those present at the Assembly could detect in the remarks by the President and the new Provost a sense of the energy that is being generated at GW. There is an atmosphere of excitement and anticipation for changes that lie ahead. He added that he thought change does not come without risk and sometimes nervous energy surrounding it, but both of these can be viewed as markers of forward progress.
ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Assembly, President Knapp adjourned the meeting at 3:45 p.m. after inviting everyone to the reception in the Brady Gallery upstairs.

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary
In his annual address to the Faculty Assembly, President Steven Knapp outlined his vision for GW.

Oct. 7, 2010

By Jamie L. Freedman

The state of the university is sound, GW President Steven Knapp affirmed at the annual Faculty Assembly Oct. 5 in the Jack Morton Auditorium.

The fall meeting—which brings together all regular, full-time GW faculty members--featured a comprehensive State of the University address by Dr. Knapp, who updated the professors on the year’s highlights, discussed his top institutional priorities and outlined his vision for GW.

The president’s remarks began with an overview of GW’s record-setting undergraduate and graduate entering classes. “This academic year has gotten off to a great start, especially when it comes to our increasing selectivity as an institution,” Dr. Knapp said.

The class of 2014 is the most academically qualified class in GW history. “We had just short of 22,000 applications this year for our undergraduate freshman class and accepted 31 percent of the applicants, which is our lowest admit rate ever,” Dr. Knapp said.

“Nearly three quarters of our entering students were in the top 10 percent of their high school graduating class, and their average SAT score was 1960 out of 2400, which again is a record number.”
The university’s graduate programs, too, received the highest number of applicants in university history—15,700—coupled with the lowest-ever admit rate—42 percent. “The medical school received 10,500 applications—the highest ever, and an admit rate of 3 percent, which is steady with previous years,” the president continued. “And the Law School’s entering class is the strongest ever with a median LSAT of 167 out of 180—that’s the 95th percentile—and a median cumulative undergraduate grade point average of 3.79.”

The university’s new faculty members and deans are an equally impressive group, the president continued. “Each year, I am more and more impressed by the caliber of the faculty that we are recruiting and bringing into this institution,” he said. “It’s a very encouraging sign of where this institution is moving, as we strive to achieve our aspiration to become the premier research university in the broader capital region.”

The president emphasized that throughout the recent economic downturn, GW was able to continue recruiting top faculty and investing in the future. “Unlike many of our peer institutions who at the time of the financial crash found themselves strapped, we have remained financially strong, which has enabled us to continue hiring and growing while other universities have had to either freeze or reduce their programs,” he stated.

Progress in one of GW’s top institutional priorities, research and discovery, was highlighted by the identification of 10 cross-disciplinary initiatives that will be the subject of special focus in the years ahead, he said. The president highlighted three of the targeted initiatives: computational biology, the global status of women and autism. Dr. Knapp spoke about the university’s plans to launch a computational biology institute in the near future, as well as an institute focusing on global women’s issues.

“We have existing strengths across the institution in the fields of global women’s issues, autism and many other focus areas, as well as extraordinary opportunities in those fields presented to us by our location in the nation’s capital,” Dr. Knapp said.

Another area of growth at the university centers on GW’s physical infrastructure. “Next week, our Board of Trustees will be acting on a proposal to build a state-of-the-art science and engineering complex on our Foggy Bottom Campus to address the most urgent scientific and technological problems of our time,” President Knapp said. Several other new academic facilities are in the works, including a new home for the School of Public Health and Health Services, a new law learning center on G Street, and the renovation of the Ames Building on the Mount Vernon Campus.

The president lauded GW’s two newest residence halls—West Hall, which opened this fall on the Mount Vernon Campus, and South Hall, which has achieved LEED Gold certification. “I am confident that West Hall will also achieve LEED Gold,” he said. “It is another very welcome addition to the university.”

“So, how do we pay for all this new construction, plus the ongoing recruitment of top faculty from around the world?” the president asked.
Discussions are currently underway regarding the launch of a comprehensive new capital campaign, he said. The GW Power and Promise Fund, a philanthropic campaign to quadruple support for need-based scholarships, is making strides. “It’s a pretty ambitious goal, but by dramatically increasing philanthropic support for scholarships, we won’t have to draw so much on tuition revenue to cover student aid,” the president explained, pointing out that GW has increased scholarship support by 47 percent over the past five years, and is budgeting $150 million for student aid this academic year.

Dr. Knapp updated the faculty on the latest news regarding the Innovation Task Force—which he established last year to help propel GW to the next level of excellence. “So far, $17.5 million in recurring savings have been identified toward the ITF’s total target of $60 million over five years, and we are now at the implementation phase for the first six innovation initiatives,” he said.

Dr. Knapp concluded his remarks by referencing GW’s strong partnerships with institutions in Washington and beyond. “We continue to engage the world from this nation’s capital in a variety of ways,” he said. “Today on our campus, we are co-hosting the GreenGov Symposium in partnership with the White House. This summer, we signed a new memorandum of understanding with the Smithsonian, building upon our 100-year partnership. And we recently entered into a partnership with Politico, the political publication, to support our Battleground Poll. All of these partnerships give a great deal of visibility to GW.”

“It is an exciting time at the George Washington University, as we prepare for the university’s bicentennial celebration in 2021 and for the centennial of our arrival in Foggy Bottom in 2012,” he said. “We are poised for a decade of transformation ahead, as the university continues to grow in stature.”

GW’s Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Steven Lerman, who joined the university this summer, next took the podium, introducing the university’s new faculty members and thanking his predecessor Donald Lehman for helping ease his transition to GW.

Dr. Lerman thanked everyone in attendance for the “wonderful welcome” he has received at the university. “I have felt a part of this community from the day I arrived on campus,” he said.

“GW is a place on the move,” he said. “This is a pivotal time in the university’s history, as we aspire to become a premier, world-class research and teaching university. We have both the wherewithal and the intellectual capacity to make it happen, and I’m deeply committed to being a part of that.”
Thank you. Let me add my welcome to everyone here. As it’s obvious this is the first faculty assembly meeting I’ve attended here at George Washington University, I’m told this is actually a great turnout of the meeting, which I think I attribute to us as faculty.

This is the one time here that we gather together as a faculty and I think it’s important that this happen. It also reminds us that we are all, as faculty members, part of multiple communities. We’re all part of departments and some of us part of sub-units within departments. We’re part of programs; we’re part of the institute's research centers; we’re part of schools. And I think this event is to remind us a bit that we’re also part of a larger institution, the George Washington University. In my case, I’m also part of the administration. But I think it’s useful to make sure we remind ourselves—and at least once a year is a good time to do it—that this larger entity that we’re part of is really critical to the success of all of us. All of us float up on the rising tide of the growth of quality of excellence here at our university.

Before I go any further though, I thought it would be appropriate for me to acknowledge and recognize my predecessor, Don Lehman. Don served here at George Washington University and has served for more than 30 years, first as a professor at the department of physics, later as director of research and finally, as vice president and then executive vice president for academic affairs. I got to know Don early on during the search process and I found him to be one of the most admirable, capable individuals and a person of enormous integrity, someone who's devoted himself to service to his own university, GW, and someone who welcomed me in a way that I thought was extraordinary. In the short time that we overlapped when I was arriving here, he took endless hours to begin to educate me about the complexities of academic affairs here at GW. He was generous with his time and generous in spirit. He still is on the faculty serving as a special adviser. I call on him regularly for advice and inside information.

One of the interesting things about coming to a new institution is you come to learn how much you knew about the place you left and how little you know about the place you just arrived. Don has been an enormously wonderful individual in on-boarding me, telling me where the various skeletons are buried and, like in any other institution, the scale of complexity, what obligations existed that he made commitments for and that ought to be acknowledged and retained, and of course where all the landmines are going to be in the future that he can foresee.
I can do nothing but thank him. He's been generous personally. He and his wife invited my wife and I to dinner just actually this weekend with his predecessor, Rod French, and I got a lesson in what is probably a 25- to 30-year history of academic affairs with GW. They don’t make classes this good by the way. So when Don decided to step down, GW had launched a search for his successor, and last spring I was delighted to be offered the position as a provost and executive vice president for academic affairs here at GW.

I was often asked why GW? And when I arrived here, I made some opening remarks in the welcoming ceremony for me, and I think a lot of the reasons were just articulated by President Knapp's presentation. GW is a place on the move. It's a combination of a superlative location and very responsible fiscal management through what is probably the worst recession in American history since the Great Depression, which has positioned it to be in a place to really now take advantage of all its assets. I think it's a pivotal time in GW's history and it’s completely imbued. Someone said from my home institution whatever Steve Knapp told me, I drank the Kool-Aid at that time because I became incredibly totally convinced that this was GW’s time. We as a faculty and as staff and student body here are going to have to make that happen, but the opportunity is out there for us.

Our aspirations are high. We want to make GW a premier world class research and teaching university. We want to make this the place that everyone in the world aspires to come to. We want to be on that list of places that you want to come to study, you want to come to work, you want to come to visit, you want to come to be a scholar, you want to come to be post-doc, and you want to come here as a career. And so those are high goals and to do them all in a way that is consistent with integrity and high quality is going to be a challenge to all of us. It's not something one turns a switch on overnight and has happen. It will be a long process over perhaps one or more decades, but we have both the wherewithal and the intellectual capacity to do that, and I'm deeply committed to being part of that.

One of the things that had happened is the creation of the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President and Academic Vice President for Academic Affairs. I think it really gives us a great opportunity to bring together strands of operation here at GW that previously have been separated and siloed. So under that banner has come student affairs and academic affairs and I think bringing those two together has both symbolic and practical importance. It allows us to see the students' experience as integrated and not think there is student affairs over here and academic affairs over there.

We, as faculty, have an obligation to see our students' experiences here holistically. After all, that's how they experience it. And to separate their student life from their academic life is an artificial separation that does not serve the interest of the students
and, frankly, doesn’t serve the institution’s interests as well. So bringing them all under one roof while we’ll induce changes in organizational structure as time goes on really is fundamentally a huge opportunity to—and this is an invented word—de-silo the university.

With that said, there’s lots of areas where silos exist in universities. I think one of the things we as a university need to have as one of our comparative strategic advantages is a nimbleness with respect to interdisciplinary research. Historically, this is not something universities are very good at. We restructure ourselves slowly and we find it hard to build institutions within our existing structures so as to facilitate interdisciplinary research. One of my aspirations for GW is we become a leader in this. Now, that doesn’t mean the death of the disciplines. The normal academic disciplines is where we build intellectual strength, it’s where each of us gets nurtured in our own research, it’s where our students learn the skills of thinking critically and where they develop those qualities of mind that build upon the generations within discipline. But I also think we have tremendous opportunities, particularly as faculty and research for cutting across the disciplines.

So one of the things I’ve been working on with the Council of Deans' members is finding more ways to communicate across the schools in ways that are productive for both research and teaching. Some of that involves examining what disincentives exist today for doing that. That is, in many cases these silos exist for reasons because we created incentive systems in how we measure things and how we do budgeting and other operations that encouraged the silo. Where that’s the case, we have to be much more creative and create budgeting and other systems in which collaboration within makes intellectual sense of crossing silos happens organically and naturally, and it’s to everyone’s advantage in all terms to do that.

Some very simple things. I’ll give a concrete example of what was apparently a very simple thing: At one point when we count sponsored research volume, we typically count it by where the research occurs. And so imagine yourself in a position of a rationale intelligent dean, which we have 10 of, and that is if I have a star faculty member doing a lot of sponsored research and that’s one of the things that I want to increase, if that faculty member goes off into an interdisciplinary institute, I lose that research volume. Well, that's not the thing we want to encourage.

So I worked with Leo Chalupa, and we’re going to begin rolling together research in two ways. One, by where the research actually happens so you know how well these interdisciplinary research institutes are doing. But a second and another role that will happen based on the school in which the faculty doing the research resides and in that way, deans will have credit for the faculty research that faculty does independent of where that faculty member chooses to undertake that research. there are many
much more profound disincentives in the system that we’re going to have to identify and work on and rectify to the best we can.

One of the other things I had done, and which is pretty common practice—I know President Knapp did it—is to do what Tom called the listening tour. Go out to different groups. I had the privilege of meeting with the new faculty early on in this semester. I’ve been meeting with dean groups within the schools. I began to go to school faculty meetings. I went to the chairs' meeting for the Columbian College, and I’ll continue to do that. If we have student meetings, we’ll continue to do that as well.

What's fascinating are some of the interesting things that arise. Some of them are administrative and annoying and problematic, and some of them are radical, deep and profound issues of education. I thought I'd share one of them with you because I actually have personal strong feelings about this one. The issue arose that is the prevalent model that's often spoken about of the student as a consumer; that is, thinking of us as a provider of services to a set of consumers that the student relationship to us as faculty is one of customer and purchaser. That is manifested in many ways. Faculty asks, so if I think educationally it's the best thing in my classroom for students to close their laptop computers and not multitask, is that something I should do? First, now we move from the abstract to something quite concrete.

My personal view on this is that students are not our consumers. Quite simply they're our students and the relationship we as faculty should have to our students is not one of consumerism but should be one that's appropriate for an educational institution. That means at times we will make judgments in what we think best for them, we will accept the obligations that they actually learn in our classrooms and outside of classrooms. If they're our consumers, frankly, we wouldn't care much because if they’re the consumers after all. The logical thing to do is have them pay tuition and if they learn, great; if they don’t learn, what do we care? We provided the service. That's not our obligation. They are our students and we have special obligations that are uniquely defined by that relationship.

So I urge all of us to take that message back both to our students and our colleagues and be much more comfortable about exerting and articulating that student relationship that we have with them. The faculty-student relationship is one of teacher to student. It goes back thousands of years. It is one that is, in my view, somewhat sacred and one that we inherit our responsibility to sustain in the phase of the society that at times will argue that we are simply the providers of services and they are the purchasers.
Let me talk a little also about some of the recent initiatives that have been on the table. President Knapp of course mentioned many of them. I will talk about them from another perspective, and that is the issue of faculty recruitment. In many cases, the fuel for these activities is not just the building, but it’s those who reside in the building, and we need to continue to identify the absolute best faculty we can find to lead the future.

This is going to be a huge challenge. As we build these facilities, we become more attractive to certain disciplines and we have to be able to recruit a faculty. And I think each of us, as faculty members, has the responsibility to think about, how do we recruit a faculty that’s better than we are? I mean, the simplest way of thinking about this if each faculty recruit is better than the average overall, in the long haul we will improve our faculty quality market. Now that’s a challenge because we each of course have self-confidence and we think we do things well. But I would urge us to continue the model that searches that fail to produce such candidates should be continued and not settle for the best we could get, and searches that identify truly great stars should be ones that we actively pursue and do so with great vigor.

Another area is career services. This is an area that our students and their families care about a great deal. Obviously, in down job markets like we’ve experienced in the last two years, there’s a growing concern among those that we are not doing a great job of placing our students. The Career Services Task Force, which President Knapp actually convened last year, is another way we’re looking to bring together faculty, staff and students. We need to continue to find ways to work like that on problems that are of importance to all of us.

A lot of the money that is being created through the ITF work, and I thought we could do a bit of reflection on my highest priorities for it. The biggest single priority will be faculty lines. Now that doesn’t mean that a hundred percent of the money will necessarily be spent there because sometimes we need to spend money that creates the work environment in which faculty can flourish, but I do think that the biggest thing I see is to build not just strengthening the faculty but actually adding more faculty in that.

The two areas that I'm going to be focusing on initially are what I have been calling research intensive faculty; that is, faculty that elevate the game for GW in areas that are more research intensive and particularly focusing around those who might ultimately move in to the science and engineering complex. The second area is in finding faculty to teach the new general requirements. The new general requirements, as I understand them—and I came actually after they were approved—is something that should get more attention outside of GW. It is a clear attempt to create a more rigorous general education curriculum for our students. It's
something that I think our students deserve and something that we owe them as part of that special relationship that we have with them as our students.

Expanding rigor runs a little bit against the trend around the country. I think that’s a good thing. I think we need to support that through faculty hires, bring faculty who can make those demands upon the intellectual abilities our students come to us with. As our students have gotten better, we can and should demand that their introductory curriculum is rigorous and they, frankly, should and will demand it of us. I don’t think that the “dumbing down” of higher education is something that in the long run earns much respect from our students; it is a short-term feel-good in terms of grade inflation and other things but in the long run it does not create a great institution of higher education and, frankly, it doesn’t create great citizens for the future which is part of our social obligation.

So with all of that, I’d like to thank you all for the wonderful welcome I’ve gotten here. People have been incredibly positive and welcoming. My wife and I have felt very much a part of this community from the day we arrived on campus. People have been generous of their time and generous in spirit and it’s something that I only partially expected that certainly when you're the new provost, you're expected to say hello, but I think people have gone way beyond that. I think they’ve offered their candid views about why they’re here and the strengths of GW, and where appropriate, they’ve offered their views about what needs to get improved and what things ought to be on my agenda. I welcome both of those and it’s been a wonderful ride.
I extend my appreciation to those members of the Faculty Assembly present here today and I welcome newly appointed faculty members and our emeriti faculty members who are present. On behalf of the Faculty Senate I offer the following brief report:

Faculty Senate Resolutions

During the 2009-2010 session and the first meeting of the 2010-2011 session the Faculty Senate considered six resolutions. The resolutions are briefly summarized below:

“A Resolution to Amend the George Washington University Equal Employment Opportunity Policy to Include ‘Gender Identity or Expression’”

Presented by the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, this resolution provides for inclusion of the term ‘gender identity or expression’ in the University's non-discrimination policies. This change is also consistent with the D.C. Human Rights Act.

“A Resolution Recommending Modification of the Unified Budget Model”

Presented by the Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting, the resolution addresses the allocation of tuition revenues in the case of students with majors in one School who subsequently declare a major in a second School. At present, full tuition is allocated to the School in which the student originally declared his/her major. The resolution provides that tuition revenue be divided equally between the two schools. The resolution was transmitted by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs to the Council of Deans which did not support the proposed change.

“A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Code With Respect to the Participation of Research Faculty in Certain Governance Matters in the School of Public Health and Health Services”

Presented by the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, the resolution was approved by the Faculty Senate. It addresses two main issues with respect to the provisions of the Faculty Code. The first issue restates the language of the Faculty Code in reserving certain governance rights for regular active-status faculty as defined in the Code. These include: adoption of written procedures for the governance of a School; the appointment, promotion, and tenuring of faculty; the appointment of academic administrative officers; and the development of curriculum and academic programs.
The second is the Faculty Code requirement that establishes the proportion of regular active-status faculty in non-tenure-accruing appointments with that of a department's regular active-status faculty in tenure-accruing positions. The Code requires that the percentage of regular, active-status faculty in non-tenure accruing appointments at the departmental level not exceed 50% and the percentage at the School level not exceed 25%.

In the SPHHS there are large numbers of research faculty in one-year appointments who do not hold regular, active-status appointments but participate in Faculty Code-specified governance matters because of SPHHS's interpretation of a footnote on page 18 of the Faculty Code. The footnote was added to the Code in the mid-1970's and was not written to apply to the SPHHS which was not a school at that time, having been established in 1997. The footnote applied to clinical and research Medical School faculty and allowed them to participate in governance in view of the fact that they have a key role in medical education with its emphasis on practice-base instruction.

The resolving classes of the resolution provide for:

-Change to the Faculty Code in Article I.B.1: by replacing “The foregoing shall not apply to the Medical Center faculty who are stationed at affiliated institutions” with ‘The foregoing shall not apply to the faculty of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences who are stationed at affiliated institutions’;

-Change to the Faculty Code footnote on page 18 by amending it to read: “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”;

-Compliance of the SPHHS in the development of governance procedures that will bring it into compliance with Parts A-D of the Faculty Code, which includes achieving the mandated ratio of tenured and tenure-accruing faculty to non-tenure accruing faculty.

This resolution called for changes to the Faculty Code and therefore required action by the Board of Trustees which approved these amendments on May 14, 2010.

“A Resolution on the Proposal for a New School of Nursing”

This resolution was presented with a report by the Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing appointed by the Executive Committee and chaired by Professor Edward Cherian. The Committee reviewed the proposal and worked with the Department of Nursing faculty to address deficiencies in the original document. The resolution expressed the Faculty Senate’s support for establishing the new School and outlined four understandings for this, and was adopted at a special meeting of the Faculty Senate on May 12, 2010. The resolution was then forwarded to
the Board of Trustees at their meeting on May 14, 2010, where it was approved and a
decision memorandum was appended to it.

“"A Resolution of Appreciation”"

The resolution expressed the Senate’s appreciation for Professor Lilien Filopovitch Robinson on the completion of her fifteenth year of service as Chair of the Senate Executive Committee and thirty-one years of service as a member of the Faculty Senate, including service as Chair of the Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies, the Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty, the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, and the Committee on Educational Policy. The resolution was adopted on April 9, 2010.

REPORTS

The Executive Committee arranged for the presentation of 17 reports to the Faculty Senate. These included the annual report of the College of Professional Studies, a report on changes to the University Retirement plans, a report on Administrative Salaries, on University Research, and updates on Budget and Finance. Also presented were updates on the Proposed Science and Engineering Complex, on the University Budget, on the Status of Women Faculty and Faculty of Color, and on the Proposed School of Nursing.

There were also status reports presented to the Faculty Senate from the School of Medicine and Health Sciences (Dean Scott) and the School of Engineering and Applied Science (Dean Dolling).

PERSONNEL MATTERS

Grievances

Three grievances were in process during the 2009-2010 session and the beginning of the 2010 session, two from Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, and one from the Elliott School of International Affairs.

One case in Columbian College was settled through mediation. The second case was dismissed by the Hearing Committee and, in accordance with the Faculty Code, reviewed by the Dispute Resolution Committee which affirmed the decision of the Hearing Committee. The grievance in the Elliot School of International Affairs was settled through mediation. No grievances remain at this point.

Nonconconcurrences

One nonconcurrence in the School of Engineering and Applied Science was reviewed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. Following its interviews with all parties, it did not find that compelling reasons had been provided for the administrative nonconcurrence with the faculty recommendation in favor of promotion and tenure. The Executive Committee invited the Dean to withdraw his
nonconcurrence. He declined and, in accordance with the Faculty Code, the department appealed to the President of the University. The President’s response, also in accordance with the Faculty Code, was to extend the tenure clock for one year at which time he will render a final decision on the matter.

Comments

This report on the work of the Faculty Senate would be incomplete without mention of the significant time and effort extended by the President of the University, former Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman, Provost Lerman, and Vice President and Treasurer Katz. The Chair thanks the members of the Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate for their involvement and participation during the 2009-10 and 2010-2011 sessions and particularly appreciates the effort and assistance of Sue Campbell in facilitating all matters relating to the Faculty Senate.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Castleberry, Chair
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