**Meeting notes from FGTF Meeting with Law School**  
**January 31, 2014**

**Process:** Chair Carbonell explained the Faculty Governance Task Force’s directive, as charged by the Board of Trustees by their 2013 resolution. The dialogue between the task force and the schools will continue in school-based and campus-based meetings throughout the spring. The task force must submit its recommendations to the Board of Trustees by the end of the current academic year. The task force is committed to transparency. All of the documents distributed to faculty will be posted online. The task force continues to engage the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, PEAF Committee, and Faculty Senate, throughout the process. Some faculty members questioned the reasoning behind the task force’s purpose. Chair Carbonell responded that the Faculty Code has not been recodified in ten years and that the Board of Trustees has no preconceived objections to the current state of the document. The purpose of the task force is to meet with faculty from all of GW’s ten schools and 3 major campuses to determine if the Faculty Code is in alignment with the Strategic Plan. In response to questions concerning the recommendations of the task force to the Board of Trustees, Chair Carbonell responded by stating that recommendations may be simple, and others may recommend further review before action is taken.

**Governance Rights:** Chair Carbonell queried faculty members as to how the University should apportion voting rights among the faculty. It was noted that different schools have different terminology for different faculty, e.g. research professor. Faculty continued, stating that governance rights were elaborate at the Law School, which is predominantly tenure or tenure track faculty. Traditionally, the Law School has been able to change its policies on governance on a unit by unit basis, all within the Faculty Code.

**Appointment, Promotion and Tenure/Cross Disciplinary Collaboration:** There was discussion of the thorniest questions posed when people are located in two departments due to cross disciplinary collaboration. Courses taught are cross listed and their research is completed in multiple silos. It might be a disadvantage for a candidate for tenure to conduct cross disciplinary research. An example provided was that of a legal historian with a Ph.D. as well as a J.D. In this case, the history department would like the faculty member to write a book, while the law school wants a law reviewed paper. The question here is: who is driving the tenure process? This is a major concern as the University seeks to recruit and retain highly qualified faculty for cross disciplinary work.

**Transparency/Grievance Process:** A faculty member noted that candidates for tenure are kept in the dark throughout the process. While processes for APT vary by school, this has been a common theme.

**Role of Faculty in Review and Appointment of Administrators:** A faculty member believed that the faculty is often marginalized through the termination process, and is limited in their rights in removing a dean based on a lack of access to documents. The faculty member noted that they thought the process should be more transparent and collaborative. Further, the grievant in a non-concurrency is not allowed to see the documents, which may well be a violation of due process.