

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

The Faculty Senate

November 3, 2011

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, November 11, 2011, 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 held on October 14, 2011 (minutes to be distributed)
3. Introduction of Resolutions
4. Update on the Development of the University's Strategic Plan: Provost Lerman (see letter and attachment from the Senate Executive Committee Chair)
5. General Business
 - (a) Nomination for election to Senate Standing Committees:
Admissions Policy, Student Financial Aid, and Enrollment Management: Professor Jeffrey Brand-Ballard as Chair
 - (b) Report of the Executive Committee: Michael S. Castleberry, Chair
 - (c) Provost's Remarks
 - (d) Chair's Remarks
6. Brief Statements (and Questions)
7. Adjournment

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

FACULTY SENATE OFFICE

MEMORANDUM

November 2, 2011

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

RE: University Strategic Initiative 2021

The University Board of Trustees has charged the Provost with developing a new Strategic Plan for GW that leads us through the next 10 years into 2021 (GW's 200th anniversary). To this end, the Provost has created a University Executive Steering Committee to assist him.

The idea is to identify and develop a few themes (pillars) that will leverage and maximize the existing comparative advantages of the University. The themes will be derived from a bottom-up effort from the GW community (rather than a top-down effort from the Provost's Office). Input from Faculty Senate members is essential to the development of these themes. This plan is explained in more detail (with a timeline) in the accompanying document of October 6, 2011 by Steve Lerman and Forrest Maltzman.

It is hoped that once the themes are determined, each of the 10 schools will look to see how they can contribute to the University's universal 4-5 themes by a self examination and realignment, to the extent possible, of their own mission statements, goals, departments, programs, and fields. The Provost has stressed that this does not mean that "non-theme" related activities will be ignored or that they will not receive support...but rather that the themes/pillars of excellence will command significant resources and effort, including future fund raising.

This is to request that Faculty Senate members come to the November 11th meeting prepared to discuss potential themes (that are doable and operational) within the current framework of GW's strengths and weaknesses. To this end, please come prepared to listen to and discuss themes that you think are important over the 10 years during which the university can brand itself "world class". It will be necessary for Senate members to keep their comments succinct so that everyone can be afforded a chance to provide input.

I look forward to hearing more about the Strategic Planning Initiative from all of you.

Michael S. Castleberry, Chair
Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Members of the Executive Steering Committee

Steven Lerman, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

Cheryl Beil, Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Assessment

Doug Guthrie, Dean, GW School of Business

Forrest Maltzman, Senior Vice Provost, Academic Affairs and Planning

**Scheherazade Rehman, Professor of International Business and International
Affairs**

Terri Harris Reed, Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion

**Brian Richmond, Chair of the Department of Anthropology and Associate
Professor of Anthropology**

Sara Rosenbaum, Chair of the Department of Health Policy and

Professor of Health Policy and of Health Service Management

Proposed Strategic Planning Process
October 6, 2011
Steven Lerman and Forrest Maltzman

This document lays out a possible process for the development of a new strategic plan for the George Washington University. The plan will cover a ten-year interval from now until the university's 200th anniversary in 2021.

The plan will not try to be all inclusive. Our university is extraordinarily diverse in all its aspects, and any plan needs to leave ample room for the wide range of intellectual pursuits and academic programs our faculty and students will undertake. Instead, the plan will seek to make explicit our assumptions about the future environment in which the university will operate, establish broad goals for us as we head toward the end of our second century, and select a small number of major thematic areas on which we will focus a considerable portion of our resources.

Ideally, the plan will reflect GW's specific strengths and weaknesses. We intend to avoid, as much as possible, generic statements that might apply equally well to hundreds of our peers. This implies that the plan will leverage factors such as our favorable location in the District of Columbia, the strength of our faculty and academic programs in key areas, and existing and potential ties to other institutions. In addition, the plan must be based on a realistic assessment of our university's weaknesses so that we focus our resources on initiatives that are important and where there is a reasonable probability of success.

We expect that individual schools will develop more detailed plans guided by the overall university plan. These school plans will likely be much more detailed. Some of the school-based priorities should link to the university's overall priorities, while some may reflect distinctive aspects of each school that are not entirely aligned with the university plan. Any university-wide plan must allow room for academic units to make informed choices with local resources.

We also need to acknowledge that a plan cannot remain static over a ten-year interval. The plan will aim to develop strategies that are best for us based on what we know today. We need to be prepared to alter these strategies should the future evolve differently from what we now envision.

The proposed process is organized in ten stages. In describing these stages, we have provided examples to illustrate the ideas that might emerge. However, these are only examples and should not limit the scope of the actual planning process.

While the stages below are described as a linear sequence, we expect the actual process to be more iterative. For example, as subgroups work on specific areas of the overall plan, they may need to revisit some of the assumptions about future economic and social forces that might influence the choices among alternative strategies.

Lastly, it is critical that the plan engage the widest possible range of stakeholders, including faculty, staff, students, alumni, and trustees, in as transparent a way as possible. We need to incorporate into the planning process mechanisms for feedback and comment through a combination of face-to-face meetings and electronic media. We

plan to brief the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees regularly throughout the strategic planning process.

Stage 1: Form Strategic Planning Executive Committee. A small Strategic Planning Executive Committee will be formed. This committee will help guide the strategic planning process. [Target: October 2011]

Stage 2: Envision the Strategic Climate. Develop scenarios that describe the likely future(s) for which we will be planning. Examples of areas to be considered are:

- a. Future research funding, including federal, foundation, and corporate funding;
- b. The likely profile of our students (graduate and undergraduate), particularly the number of traditional undergraduates (18 to 22-year-olds) and older students; the likely preparation these students will have for a college curriculum;
- c. Future prospects for philanthropy to higher education in general and GW more specifically, with attention to likely overall philanthropy, keeping in mind potential effects of possible changes in the tax code;
- d. Expectations of students and parents with respect to teaching, particularly the uses of technology and the mix of onsite and distance education;
- e. Likely competition from both our current peers and for-profit universities;
- f. Major challenges society will face in areas such as competition for resources (e.g. energy, raw materials, water, and agricultural products), climate change, skills needed for the current and future economy, and increasing economic, health, and other disparities, both domestically and abroad;
- g. Globalization, including the increasing competition from universities abroad, the challenges of preparing our students for careers in a more globalized society, and opportunities for GW abroad.

These future scenarios will be developed by a small working group and subsequently vetted through a series of meetings involving various groups, including the Strategic Planning Executive Committee, the university's senior leadership team, trustees, faculty, students, and alumni groups. [Target: start October 2011]

Stage 3: Develop Theme for the University's Plan. Articulate a single theme that might provide broad guidance as the plan is developed. Examples include:

- a. Enriching public life
- b. Engaging the world
- c. A commitment to service
- d. New synergies (used by Purdue)
- e. Building on excellence (used by Maryland and GW in our most recent plan)

The Strategic Planning Executive Committee will focus on this aspect of the plan. [Target: November 2011]

Stage 4: Select Key Areas for Planning: Develop a list of three to six broad areas the plan will address. Examples of these include:

- a. Research and knowledge creation,
- b. Learning,
- c. Reputation,
- d. Globalization,
- e. Fiscal integrity,

- f. Diversity,
- g. Student life,
- h. Growth of GW outside DC, particularly at the VSTC and other Virginia sites,
- i. Outreach on key topics such as sustainability and globalization.

While all these are important, narrowing down what will likely start as a long list will help limit the plan's scope to those areas that are most important. The list that emerges will be the framework for the working groups. A few areas, where there has already been significant planning, may be incorporated into the plan via an abbreviated process (e.g. our strategy in the area of sustainability, where an active process is already underway). The university's leadership should select key areas for planning in consultation with trustees, deans, and the Strategic Planning Executive Committee. [Target: November 2011]

Stage 5: Establish Committee on Strategic Planning. This likely will be a large group consisting of students, faculty, staff, alumni, administration, and trustees. The group needs to be carefully selected with an eye towards plan development and subsequent implementation, familiarity with the breadth of activities that occur at GW and around the world, and an ability to work together. In addition to being appointed to the committee, members will also be appointed to one of the working groups associated with the areas selected in Stage 4. There will be one working group designated to serve all working groups through the collection and dissemination of data. [Target: November 2011]

Stage 6: Develop Strategic Intent. The Strategic Planning Executive Committee will provide draft goals and charge questions for each working group. The working groups will then review the goals and charge questions and propose any amendments they believe are appropriate. Examples of goals might include:

- a. Research and creation: (i) To become known as an institution where cutting-edge research is conducted. Or (ii) To be known as an institution where research is translated into policy.
- b. Learning: (i) To educate our students to develop tools to understand scientific, social, and political problems. Or, (ii) fostering a spirit of creativity among our students. Or, (iii) to challenge our students to expand their horizons.
- c. Reputation: (i) To become known as an institution with top-twenty programs. Or, (ii) to excel on national rankings conducted by the Princeton Review or U.S. News. Or, (iii) to become known for nationally prominent scholars.
- d. Globalization: (i) To be globally recognized as an institution whose impact is felt throughout the world. Or, (ii) to become known as an institution where an appreciation of global challenges is promulgated. Or, (iii) to become an institution where all students acquire skills to function in a global economy.
- e. Diversity: (i) To ensure that all of our nation's talent is utilized.

Examples of charge questions might include:

- a. Research: (i) What steps can be taken to ensure that the university's top scholars collaborate outside with junior scholars? (ii) What can be done to ensure that merit-pay and tenure-and-promotion decisions reward excellence? (iii) Given the strategic environment, where should we invest? (iv) What steps can be taken to ensure that our hiring process produces world-class scholars? (v) What is necessary to build top-ranked doctoral programs?

- b. Learning: (i) How can GW's location be best utilized for enhancing the student research experience? (ii) What can be done to ensure that the university's top-ranked programs be utilized to ensure that other units achieve the same recognition of excellence? (iii) What can be done to foster undergraduate research?
- c. Reputation: (i) What rankings shape our reputation? (ii) Given the strategic environment, where can GW most efficiently build top-ranked programs? (iii) What non-academic rankings shape the perception of the university?

The Strategic Planning Executive Committee would supply the first draft of potential goals and charges to the working groups. The working groups and full committee would refine them, and they would be reviewed by the Provost. [Target: December 2011]

Stage 7: Select Assessment Metrics. Identify a limited number of metrics (two to five) to assess whether we meet objectives associated with the goals. Working groups would develop these metrics for the Provost's review. [Target: December 2011]

Stage 8: Develop Tactics. Identify the specific steps GW needs to take (as well as any that should be halted) to enhance the probability of meeting the goals identified in stage 6. These tactics should derive from the charge questions. Tactics need to be discussed and evaluated in light of the strategic environment and the potential challenges identified in stage 2, as well as in light of the university's strengths and weaknesses. The working groups will develop these tactics. For example, to meet goals set in the area of research and creation:

- a. Hiring for scholars who require substantial start-up costs should be done at a more advanced level;
- b. Portion of the funds the university provides for research could be set aside for collaboration between junior and senior faculty;
- c. Faculty overhead return could be doubled when there are co-GW PIs and when one faculty member is securing a first grant. [Target: April - May 2012]

Stage 9: Align Campaign Goals and Messaging with Strategic Plan. The exploratory phase of GW's fundraising campaign started in July 2011. At that time, we made it clear that the more detailed set of priorities should be derived from the strategic plan that would be developed during this academic year. Once the plan is near its final form, we will work with the leadership of the Development and Alumni Relations organization to develop case statements corresponding to our major strategic directions. Similarly, the strategic directions for the university need to be reflected in how we describe GW externally. This will involve working closely with the Office of the Vice President of External Relations. [Target: Summer 2012]

Stage 10: Present Plan to the GW Community. The plan will be drafted and prepared for presentation. The Provost intends to present the draft at the June 2012 Board Retreat and the Faculty Assembly in October 2012. Additional presentations to the entire community (perhaps through town meetings) will follow.