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MARCH, APRIL 2015
Purposes of Today’s Town Hall Meeting

- To present revised draft recommendations on faculty governance to the GW Faculty.
- To gain direct feedback from the GW Faculty on revised draft recommendations.
- Working group recommendations are available online at trustees.gwu.edu/governance
Agenda

- Background
- Process 2013-2015
- Working Group Revised Draft Recommendations
  - Participation
  - School Rules and Procedures
  - Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure
  - Deans Search and Review
- Next Steps
Background

- In May 2013, the Board of Trustees approved a new strategic plan for the university: Vision 2021.
  - Cross-disciplinary collaboration
  - Globalization
  - Governance and policy
  - Citizenship and leadership

- Following the adoption of Vision 2021, the Board determined that it should review the university’s governing documents to ensure their alignment with the new strategic plan, beginning with the University Bylaws, which were reviewed and amended.

- In a resolution, Board of Trustees charged Chair Carbonell with forming a committee, to include Trustees, Faculty and Administrators, to engage with the Faculty and the Administration in a review of faculty governance over the 2013-2014 academic year. At the conclusion of its deliberations, the committee would recommend to the Board any appropriate revisions to the Faculty Code and related governing documents.
Background: 2013-2014 Academic Year

- Faculty Governance Task Force Established
- Meetings with Faculty Senate Executive Committee
- Faculty Group Meetings and Town Hall Meetings
- Faculty Questionnaire
- Analysis & Integration of Input, Charter Working Groups
- Participation
- Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure
- Deans Search and Review
- School Rules and Procedures
- Academic Freedom
Board Resolution and Composition

In June 2014, the Board of Trustees charged the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee with forming four working groups, each chaired by a member of the Board of Trustees, to include trustees, faculty and administrators, to engage with the faculty and the administration in a further review of faculty governance to be completed during the 2014-2015 academic year.

- 43 Working Group Members
  - 27 Faculty
  - 8 University and School Administrators
  - 8 Trustees

- Each working group includes a representative of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to maintain transparency.
- Each working group is co-chaired by two trustees.
Working Group Process up to this Point

**Fall 2014**
Working Groups review charges and meet to discuss ways to improve faculty governance

**Early January 2015**
Working Groups Transmit Draft Recommendations to Faculty Senate Executive Committee

**Late January 2015**
Faculty Senate Executive Committee Transmits Response to Draft Recommendations to Trustee Jacobs

**Mid-February 2015**
Working Groups Consider:
1. Faculty Senate Executive Committee Response
2. Education Advisory Board Research
Working Group Revised Draft Recommendations
Participation
Working Group Composition

- Trustee Grace Speights
- Recent Trustee Mark Hughes
- Paula Lantz (GWPUBH, FSEC)
- Joan Butler (SMHS)
- Lorena Barba (SEAS)
- Gretchen Wiersma (SON)
- Derek Malone-France (CCAS)
- Tom Geurts (GWSB)
Charge

A. Identify who should be considered full-time faculty.
B. Determine eligibility to participate in governance.
C. Examine voting rights of full-time faculty at peer-institutions.
D. Recommend appropriate changes to expand governance rights.
Participation

- Faculty of each school should be trusted, and empowered to have the ability to decide who will best represent their school at the Faculty Senate.
- Enfranchise some non-tenured faculty members and enable them to serve alongside their tenured colleagues in the Faculty Senate.
Participation

"...The members of the Faculty Senate shall be either (1) tenured faculty members or (2) full-time faculty members (regular or specialized) who have attained the rank of associate professor or higher. Vice presidents, associate vice presidents, assistant vice presidents, vice provosts, associate vice provosts, deans, associate deans and assistant deans shall be ineligible for election as members of the Senate."
Participation

The working group considered recommendations from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to place the following restrictions on non-tenured faculty members to serve on the Faculty Senate:

- **Time Served**: Completed 6-years full-time at GW.
- **Quota**: Majority of faculty representing each school must hold tenured appointments.

After consideration, the working group decided to stay with its original recommendation.
School Rules and Procedures
School Rules and Procedures
Working Group Composition

- Trustee Scott Amey
- Trustee Titilola Harley
- Forrest Maltzman (Office of the Provost)
- Marie Price (CCAS, FSEC)
- Doug Shaw (ESIA)
- Mary Jean Schumann (SON)
- Ryan Watkins (GSEHD)

- Suresh Subramaniam (SEAS)
- Gary Simon (SMHS)
- Scott Pagel (LAW)
- Jennifer Spencer (GWSB)
- Taylor Burke (GWPUBH)
- Toni Marsh (CPS)
Charge

A. Identify a consistent set of faculty categories (titles) across all schools

B. Examine current school rules and procedures for common themes

C. Research and review best practices for school rules and procedures at peer institutions

D. Recommend a framework for school and department operational rules and procedures that delineate what the appropriate areas for action and decision-making are at the department and school level
School Rules and Procedures

- Streamline Faculty Code’s complex structure of faculty titles and grades of academic personnel.

- Identify a common set of rules that each school at the university should maintain within its own rules and procedures.
School Rules and Procedures

- Recommends the consolidation of grades of academic personnel: limited service, special service, and research staff into new grade of personnel titled “specialized faculty.”
- Recommends specifying that non-tenure accruing faculty are on “presumptively renewable” contracts to delineate their long-term relationship with the university.
School Rules and Procedures

- Recommends 75:25 goal for 75% of regular full-time faculty to hold tenure-accruing appointments.
- Proposes creation of a provision to permit schools to request a different ratio in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and the approval of the Provost.
- Provision removes the need to exempt certain schools from the 75:25 goal as schools that were previously exempted will have to meet the amended ratio as agreed upon with the Provost.
School Rules and Procedures

- Working group researched the rules and procedures of each of the ten schools across the university
- Recommends Faculty Code be amended to include a list of core areas that each school should legislate on within their own rules and procedures.
School Rules and Procedures

- All school procedures, rules, and criteria shall be reviewed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and approved by the Provost and at a minimum provide:
  - The administrative and academic divisions of the school.
  - Steps for enacting procedures, rules, and criteria of the school, such as the appointment of school administrators with faculty appointments.
  - Elections (or appointments) to, and responsibilities of, standing committees and faculty advisory councils (as appropriate).
School Rules and Procedures

- Policies and procedures for maintaining academic standards such as:
  - Determining standards for graduation.
  - Reviewing curricula, including new academic programs.
  - Resolving student allegations of arbitrary or capricious academic evaluation.

- Policies and procedures for reviewing and approving rules and procedures of departments, or comparable educational divisions.

- Policies and procedures for appointment, periodic performance review, promotion, and/or tenure of faculty (as appropriate based on their position).
School Rules and Procedures

- The working group considered several recommendations from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee which would have retained current language in the Faculty Code.
- After discussion, the working group chose to maintain its original recommendations.
Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure
Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Working Group Composition

- Trustee Terry Collins, Chair
- Trustee Kyle Farmbry, Vice Chair
- Dianne Martin (Office of the Provost)
- Sylvia Marotta-Walters (GSEHD, FSEC)
- Paul Wahlbeck (CCAS)
- Pinhas Ben-Tzvi (SEAS)
- Margaret Plack (SMHS)
- Karen McDonnell (GWPUBH)
- Christine Pintz (SON)
- Edward Swaine (LAW)
- Hugh Agnew (ESIA)
- Ravi Achrol (GWSB)
Charge

A. Research tenure and promotion processes at peer institutions with University-wide APT processes.

B. Examine best practices for the APT process at peer institutions.

C. Recommend University-wide standards for promotion and tenure.

D. Report on different models for tenure and promotion.

E. Propose appropriate changes to the current code consistent with best practices.
Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

The APT working group proposal advances three objectives:

- Reinforcing an expectation of faculty excellence
- Advancing faculty participation in the process
- Enhancing transparency
Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

- Strengthening language for attaining tenure from competence to excellence in research, teaching, and engagement in service.
- Revising the current faculty code in this regard would align university criteria with standards of excellence already applied in many schools and departments and reflect the university’s aspirations to be among the top-tier research universities.
- The working group also strengthened the current language in the Code to ensure that criteria are established and published at each step of the process.
Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

School-Wide Personnel Committees (SWPC)

- The working group recommends a dual role for SWPC, regardless of whether it is an elected body or a committee of a whole:
  - In order to ensure consistent standards of excellence across the school, the SWPC review will have the status of a faculty recommendation for appointments, renewals, tenure, promotions, and termination of services originating from departments.
  - In the case of non-concurrence with a departmental recommendation, the SWPC will clearly identify compelling reasons for doing so and advise the dean of those reasons.
Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

University-Wide Personnel Committees (UWPC)

- Designed to ensure Provost consults faculty prior to issuing a final decision in cases of non-concurrence.
- Elected by a school’s tenured and tenure-track faculty
- Slate of at least two candidates per school, as determined collaboratively by the Provost and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
- Provost will seek UWPC advice in all tenure, promotion, and appointment with tenure cases involving a disagreement between a faculty recommendation and a dean.
- Provost may refer to the UWPC for advice in any other tenure, promotion, or appointment with tenure case
- The advice of the UWPC would not constitute a faculty recommendation.
Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Transparency

- The working group recommends that the dean and Provost promptly notify the relevant department and school-wide personnel committee of any concurrence or non-concurrence with their recommendations.
- Additionally, the working group recommends that the Provost shall promptly notify the candidate and the President in the event of a non-concurrence by the Provost.
- However, a candidate may request a review of the case by the President, where the President’s decision shall be final.
- A decision by the Provost or the President to approve tenure shall be transmitted to the Board of Trustees.
Tenure Process: Provost Approves Case

In case of a Dean’s decision to non-concur with a Faculty Recommendation
Tenure Process: Provost Disapproves Case

Provost

Candidate

President

Board of Trustees

Final Reviewer
Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure

- The working group considered multiple recommendations from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
- The working group accepted using the term “excellence” in place of “outstanding” to align with current Faculty Code language.
- The working group accepted a proposal to eliminate Provost’s Advisory Council (PAC) from the original draft recommendation. Using the Executive Committee’s proposed University Nonconcurrence Committee as a starting point, the working group developed the University-Wide Personnel Committee.
- The working group considered the Executive Committee’s proposal to maintain current Faculty Code language concerning school-wide personnel committees. After discussion, the group decided to maintain its original recommendation.
Deans Search and Review
Deans Search and Review Working Group Composition

- Trustee Weston Burnett
- Trustee David Nadler
- Rene Stewart O’Neal (Office of the Provost)
- David Dolling (SEAS)
- Anton Sidawy (SMHS, FSEC)
- Gail Weiss (CCAS)
- Greg Maggs (LAW)

- Alan Greenberg (GWPUBH)
- Paul Duff (CCAS)
- Lee Moerson (GWSB)
Charge

A. Review and Research procedures for selection of deans and senior academic administrators.

B. Identify appropriate stakeholders who should participate in the selection process.

C. Examine best practices for selection of deans and senior academic administrators.

D. Recommend appropriate procedures for the selection of deans and senior academic administrators.

E. Examine the review practices for deans and senior academic administrators at peer institutions.

F. Recommend a periodic process to include rubrics or metrics for regular evaluations of deans and senior academic administrators.
Deans Search and Review

- Streamline standards for searches.
- Enfranchise non-tenured faculty members and trustees to serve and vote on committees.
- Create periodic comprehensive review of deans.
Deans Search and Review

Streamline standards for searches

- Evaluated best practices used by each school.
- Drafted set of uniform, minimum standards to make search processes more efficient for schools.
- Recommendation would permit each school to decide the actual composition of its search committee.
Deans Search and Review

- At least five full-time faculty members elected by the full-time faculty of the school.
- The Provost or a representative designated by the Provost.
- One or more current students.
- One or more alumni.
- Other members may be added in accordance with procedures approved by a school’s full-time faculty.
- In consultation with the Provost, the Chair of the Board of Trustees will appoint one or more trustees to serve as members.
Deans Search and Review

- Each search committee shall establish criteria for the dean search, including a position description, which shall be approved by the Provost.
- President and Provost specify how many candidates the committee recommends.
- Non-Prioritized List.
Enfranchise non-tenured faculty members and Trustees to serve and vote on committees

- All full-time faculty within a school eligible to serve on search committee.
- Full-time faculty members and trustees will be voting members.
- In accordance with procedures approved by a school’s full-time faculty, voting rights may be extended to other members.
Deans Search and Review

Create periodic comprehensive review of deans

- Process that helps deans succeed in leading their schools.
- Solicit input from multiple constituencies at the college.
  - Faculty, senior staff, alumni, and students.
- Results confidential to the dean, President, Provost, and Board of Trustees.
- Provost would share the top-line findings with the faculty.
Deans Search and Review

- The Provost will discuss with each Dean, at the time of the Dean’s appointment or reappointment, the criteria by which the Provost will review the Dean.

- The comprehensive review will occur at least every three years.

- The process for the comprehensive review, established by the Provost, shall generally be consistent across schools, subject to adjustment for the differing conditions of each school.
After consideration of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee’s recommendations, the working group accepted a proposal to set a minimum of five full-time faculty to serve on a search committee.

The working group decided not to accept an Executive Committee proposal to limit the number of trustees on a search committee to two members.

The working group also discussed the other Executive Committee recommendations. Among the working group’s decisions:

- It decided that the faculty of each school should be trusted to elect their representatives on a deans search committee, regardless of tenure status.
- It decided that the criteria for the dean search, including a position description, drafted by a search committee should be approved by the provost, as the dean reports to the provost.
Next Steps
Going Forward

**February-Mid March 2015**
1. Working Groups Transmit Recommendations to Academic Affairs Committee
2. Academic Affairs Committee Transmits Recommendations to Faculty Senate and Administration

**Late March-Mid April 2015**
1. Hold Town Hall Meetings with Faculty
2. Deploy Faculty Questionnaire

**April-May 2015**
Receive Feedback from Faculty and Administration
trustees.gwu.edu/governance