MINUTES OF THE GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
Monday, March 16th, 2015; 4:00PM
Auditorium, ICC
(approved April 16th, 2015)

PRESENT: Berlinerblau, Biesenbach-Lucas, Boettcher, Bronstein, Celenza (by phone), Davis, Danielsen, De Fina, Diamond, Ecelbarger, Engler, Ernst, Federoff (represented by Crooke), Gillis, Glazer, Goldfrank, Harris, Hinkson, Hyams, Iglarsh, Kamrad, Lamm, LaRocque, Leister (by phone), Moran-Cruz, P.O'Connor (by phone), Roshwald, Shaw, Tsung, Vroman, T.Walsh, Young


GUESTS: Cynthia Chance (Director of Faculty Affairs), Elliott Crooke (Sr. Assoc. Dean for Faculty & Academic Affairs, Med. C.), John G. Greeno (Associate VP for Human Resources), Lisa Krim (Advisor to President for Faculty Relations), Adriana Kugler (Vice-Provost for Faculty), Barbara Mujica (Professor, Department of Spanish/Portuguese), Kathy Olesko (Associate Professor in SFS), Tom O'Regan (Director of Emergency Management), John Pierce (University Registrar), James Sutton (Interim Coordinator, Veterans Office) Joe Yohe (Risk Management)

The meeting was called to order by Wayne Davis at 4:04 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Motion #1: The minutes of January 20th, 2015 were approved with the following votes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aye</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open Forum

• Jennifer Boettcher announced upcoming Faculty Senate Elections and encouraged current senators to run again and nominate others. Nominations can now be made electronically and/or by hard copy.

• Lisa Krim reported that as of today, only 21% of faculty were in compliance for completing the RESPECT training and urged all faculty to complete this training module.

Update on Veteran’s Issues
(Barbara Mujica and James Sutton)

Dr. Mujica (Spanish and Portuguese) and Jim Sutton (Interim Coordinator, Veteran’s Office) provided updates on the services and events sponsored by the Georgetown University Veteran’s Office. Dr. Mujica highlighted that Georgetown ranked #1 in best schools for veterans from the U.S. News and World Report. They also reported on several projects, including the Veteran’s Support Team, Veteran Ally Program, Student Veteran’s Association, Warrior Scholar Project, various discussion panels, and annual reception (April 16th, 2015).

Faculty Senate members were reminded of the Veteran’s Office contact information: 224 Car Barn, ext. 7-2708; veteranservices@georgetown.edu.

Policies and Procedures Discussions for University Closure due to Inclement Weather

John Pierce met with Faculty Senate to describe the policies and procedures for Inclement Weather Policy. Three points were brought to discussion:

1. Procedures for determining Inclement Weather. The decision for school closure, liberal leave, or delayed arrival are made by a team of 5 administrators: John Pierce (Registrar, Provost’s Office), Elliott Crooke (GUMC), Tom O’Regan (Director of Emergency Management), Joe Yohe (Risk Management), and John Greeno (Human Resources). Discussions are held at 10 PM and 4 AM prior to inclement weather and decisions are based on a variety of factors, including Federal Government closures, DOT closures and updates, National Weather Service reports, and other area university closures.

2. John Pierce wanted to stress that the implementation of Instructional Continuity had NO impact on the decisions of whether or not to close campus or delay.

3. John Pierce then opened the floor for discussion, asking for input on how faculty dealt with midterm delays due to cancelled classes and how this could be addressed, considering instructional continuity is more challenging for exam periods. Discussion however mainly focused on whether or not the university should be closed, which forces cancellation of all classes. One suggestion by the Senate was that more liberal leave be granted, rather than closing the university all together. This would allow the freedom of faculty that wish to host live sessions to do so, giving students liberal leave to miss class as an excused absence without disrupting instruction. John Pierce noted that one problem with liberal leave is that staff employees are not paid if they take the leave. The Senate encouraged the University to develop an alternative to liberal leave that would allow staff to be paid.
Appointments

The following appointments were proposed:
1. Pamela Fox (English) to the Student Employment Experience Committee
2. Gwen Kirkpatrick (Spanish and Portuguese), George Luta (Biostatistics and Bioinformatics) and Dan Ernst (Law) for the Nominating Committee for Senate Officer Elections.

Motion #2: Move to approve all appointments across the board. The motion was approved with the following votes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aye</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of Revisions to the UCRT Guidelines for R&T Applications

*Process update from Wayne:* For the cancelled February meeting, Wayne had submitted the 02-12-15 draft plus a document with comments by recently tenured faculty on the 02-03-15 draft (as per suggestion by the Provost’s Office). The Steering Committee devoted its March 3rd meeting to revising the 02-15-15 draft on the basis of the comments received and further discussion of its own. The latest draft was presented in both clean copy form and a redline-strikeout form that compares the 03-03-15 draft to the draft previously considered by the Senate in December.

Much discussion and concerns were raised regarding several points of the document, including:
- Inclusion of research examples in the Research Statement that would more accurately reflect archival research, translations, etc. A proposal for using the term “discovery” was made. Another proposal to state “any research that advances knowledge.” Any wording or phrases that would add to the list was requested to be submitted to Wayne.
- A request for a definition or examples of “peer universities”, which are expected to provide external letters of support
- Request to add “review of published works” as evidence for research success.
- Adriana Kugler (Associate Provost) raised concern over the statement on page 3 of the redline-strikeout document that candidates external reviewers “may” receive the candidate’s research statement. She urged that there be a uniform practice. Wayne observed that “may” was used because the policy at the Law Center is not to send research statements to the external reviewers. It was then moved that campus wide policies should be developed, and that “consistent with campus policy” be added. This change was approved with the following votes:

Motion #3: Each campus should develop a uniform policy as to whether applicants for tenure or promotion should or should not send their research statements to external reviewers. The provision “consistent with campus policy” should be added to the statement that the external reviewers may receive the applicant’s research statement. The motion was approved by the following vote:
• Concern regarding the wording of the statement “UCRT expects nearly all faculty members who are eligible to vote to participate in discussion and vote” (p. 2 of mark-up). Some suggested removing “nearly” to reflect the importance of all eligible faculty participating and voting on decisions regarding rank and tenure. Other points included the need to keep “nearly” in an event that a department did now allow absentee voting and a faculty member eligible to vote could not participate or vote for extenuating circumstances (i.e., on leave, sabbatical, etc). Would that invalidate the application? Finally, the following motion was made and seconded, and approved by the following votes:

Motion #4: Leave “nearly” but add a footnote quoting the Faculty Handbook statement that eligible faculty have a responsibility to participate and vote in rank and tenure decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aye</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Discussion regarding the two statements on pg. 6 of the mark up regarding the meaning of “sustained level of achievement.” A final proposal was made to keep these two sentences and add a third sentence quoting the standard in the Faculty Handbook: A sustained level of achievement requires “scholarly activity at a level that meet or exceeds what is expected of full professors at peer research universities.”

• Feedback from junior faculty that the Research Statement in the dossier is too much “salesmanship” for the candidate. Others support the need for this exercise not only to reflect the impact that the candidate has made in the field, but also as a beneficial exercise for academic career paths.

• Wayne reminded us that the immediate goal was to have a version with preliminary Senate approval, which would be back to UCRT for comments. The Senate will then take up the matter for final approval after receiving input from UCRT.

Motion #5: To adjourn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aye</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting was adjourned at 6:01 p.m.
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